Race and Language as Capital in School:
A Sociological Template for Language Education Reform

Allan Luke
Queensland University of Technology

> The most brutal social relations of force are always simultaneously symbolic relations. And acts of submission and obedience are cognitive acts which as such involve cognitive structures, forms of categories of perception, principles of vision and division. Social agents construct the social world through cognitive structures that may be applied to all things of the world and in particular social structures… The cognitive structures are historically constituted forms … which means we can trace their social genesis.
>
> - Pierre Bourdieu (*State Nobility*, 1998a, p. 53)

The educational problem

The narrative structures around race, power and speaking position have historically been written from the margins of power –from diasporic positions produced by histories of displacement, migration and cultural and economic marginalization. But it is a different task to document the experience of the symbolic and physical violence of racism, as First Nations, African-American, migrants in all countries, Jewish, and postcolonial people of colour have done for centuries. From the treatises of Dubois, to narratives of writers like Baldwin and Fanon, Morgan and Ghosh - we see the common theme of unbridled and deliberate, systematic yet gratuitous violence spanning diverse and often incomparable peoples, places and times. Even where it has been suppressed from official archives and histories, the experience of racism represented in oral tale and music, story and memoir, literature and cinema, poetry and art is visceral and ugly. It is not a figment of discourse or political correctness. It is materially and phenomenally real for those who have experienced it. It remains in the body, in memory and behaviour. For those who have not, it is often beyond comprehension.

Though we know its colour and its sources in our own times, in our own places and histories – it is not the exclusive domain of any particular dominant class or colour of male patriarchs. Even within this century, and at this moment, it is occurring not just white upon black and brown, but yellow upon white, black upon black, and so on. Racism appears to know no sociological and geographical bounds, operating across different state formations, political ideologies and economies, operating within heterogeneous cultural communities as well as across them. But as a raw act of power – racism historically is connected with the assertion of power by class and cultural

elites, by male patriarchy upon marginalized "others". Women have been participants and, indeed, everyday discrimination on the basis of race and language occurs within marginalized and diasporic communities. There are few exemptions on offer here. But not all racist moments or acts have co-equal force, material or bodily effect. And historically the locus of control for the large-scale and systematic assertion of racism has rested with ruling class men in power.

To understand racism requires that we not see it as simply a particular form of ubiquitous human evil, the product of fascist and patriarchal psychopathology, even where this is demonstrably the case. To disrupt and foreclose it, to deter and preclude it – we need to see racism as a practice of power, as an exercise of human judgment and action, an act of "discrimination" - however vulgar, however irrational and rationalised - within social fields where capital, value and worth are evaluated and exchanged. Through such an analysis we can augment our educational efforts to change hearts and minds – something that those of colour have fought to do in white dominated societies – with attempts to alter those social fields, to critique and to supplant the institutional structures, categories and taxonomies, and practical technologies that sustain them. This requires that we unpack its structures and practices. We can then situate and understand the partiality and limits of any particular educational intervention and approach – instead of wasting our energies and resources fighting over the "right" strategy, or abandoning in frustration particular pedagogic or curriculum approaches because they did not appear to work in particular cultural and social contexts. Strategic responses to sociologically and culturally complex, non-synchronic phenomena (McCarthy, 1997) must by definition be multi-layered and simultaneous.

For over three decades, those educators committed to education for equity and social justice have used "race", "ethnicity", "class" and "gender" as variables in explaining the unequal and stratified production and reproduction of knowledge, skill and disposition. The chapters in this volume highlight the role of language as a key variable in the production of educational equality and inequality. In classical quantitative research, factor and regression analysis demonstrate that these variables have differential yet combinatory effects upon the production of conventional educational achievement outcomes (OECD, 2005). We can begin the case for an anti-racist, linguistically fair approach to education from this strong empirical evidence that race, class, gender and language count. But how they are made to count, and the mechanisms of racism, sexism and exclusionary language education practices bear closer theoretical scrutiny.

Educational institutions are sociologically contingent, mediated and structured by their location within political economy, secular and nonsecular ideology, cultural history and place. But as well, they are structured and mediated by their human subjects, often idiosyncratically and eccentrically. The practices of racism and marginalization have particular coherent logics of practice: explanatory schema, taxonomies, operating procedures, even "sciences", that explain why, how and to what end particular tribes, communities and ethnicities count as less than fully "human" against an unmarked normative version of "man". But they also are characterised by degrees of volatility and unpredictability: human subjects tinker with, manipulate, bend and undermine rules in face-to-face exchanges.

What follows are general theoretical terms for describing the nexus of race and language, class, gender, sexuality in the habitus. Using Bourdieu's (1990) model of habitus, capital and social fields, my aim is to situate "race" and "language" as forms of capital brought into the contingent social and cultural fields of schools and classrooms. "Race" and "language" as forms of capital never have absolute, universal or guaranteed value, either generative or pejorative. They are key but not mutually exclusive or determinate. They are readable and interpretable elements of habitus brought to social fields of educational institutions. Institutions may indeed be racist. This may be asserted through overt exclusion from educational provision, peer bullying, authoritarian pedagogy, hegemonic curriculum content, face-to-face exclusion in classroom exchange, labeling and tracking, the legislation of linguistic monoculture, and so forth. We well know how racism can be built into the discourse and institutional structures of schools, universities and other educational systems, and that it is enacted in face-to-face interactional exchanges.

My own view is that the relationships of race, gender and class – and their semiotic representations and decodings in cultural practice and linguistic form – are sociologically contingent configurations. Each individual habitus constitutes a set of resources and representation, some acquired willingly, some historical and genealogical and, quite literally, genetic characteristics (e.g., skin colour, phenotype, physical appearance). These are reassembled to constitute one's capital brought to educational institutions, social fields. There human subjects in authority assign distinction and, through pedagogy, curriculum and evaluation, set out conditions for the transformation of capital into value. This entails the exercise of recognition and misrecognition, categorisation and discrimination: 'forms of categories of perception, principles of vision and division', in Bourdieu's (1998a, p. 53) words.

My case here is that the array of approaches adopted over the past four decades – including but not limited to compensatory education, progressive education, curriculum revisionism, anti-racist pedagogy, bilingual education, community schooling, culturally appropriate pedagogy, critical literacy and radical pedagogy – all constitute historically legitimate and reasoned strategies. Yet each in turn tends to focus on a specific and major element of what tends to be a larger, more comprehensive, historically durable and unyielding logic of practice. This is particularly the case in those modern societies and corporate entities that demonstrate the capacity to diachronically evolve, repressively tolerating diversity and difference to maintain the privilege and power of class and gendered, racial and linguistic elites.

At the least, we need to understand which strands and elements of the problem we can alter with which pedagogical approaches, how each of these educational strategies is necessarily partial and contingent – even as we acknowledge the thresholds and limits of educational interventions in societies and communities whose economies and institutions practice racism and linguistic discrimination with relative impunity.

Race and language in social fields

To parse the logic of educational discrimination on the basis of race and language requires that we begin by acknowledging that "race" itself is a Eurocentric construction, historically evolved as a term and category to scientifically demonstrate the superiority of Anglo/European cultures in the context of colonialism, slavery and

genocide (cf. Darder & Torres, 2004). This is not to say that other societies did not have comparable nomenclature of naming and vilifying ethnic and phenotypical "others", as Kam Louie[s (2002) history of Chinese constructions of western masculinity demonstrates. We can also begin with a recognition of the universal right to the language of one's community (Hymes,1996), despite the historical enlistment of science and political ideology to claim the intrinsic superiority of one language over another, again enlisted in the service of colonialism (Pennycook, 2007). The systematic destruction and desecration of language communities has been both a means for and an artefact of historical and contemporary domination, marginalization and exclusion (Phillipson, 2008).

But note the term "discrimination" in the first sentence above, as in the common terminology of racial or gender or linguistic discrimination. Discrimination entails judgment and evaluation, or the exercise of "taste". Bourdieu's (2007) analysis of French society moves beyond the classical structuralist definitions of class in terms of socioeconomic status and role. It augments classical Marxist analysis of class as indexical of relationships to ownership and control of the means of production. While not discarding these, Bourdieu points to the embodied competences of human subjects as the products of social class, specifically in their acquired and exercised tastes. Judgments around cultural and linguistic style are part of the tastes that constitute one's class disposition.

In Bourdieu's (1977) early fieldwork with the Kabyle, distinction and class are indexed in kinship and style (e.g., culinary, household practice) and in systems of exchange of value in everyday community and family life. Habitus is taken in much of the educational literature to refer to one's acquired cultural capital and total sociocultural disposition (Albright & Luke, 2007). But it also entails cultural schemata, structured categorisations and scripts (Holland & Cole, 1995; Bourdieu, 1998b). These constitute logics of practice, guides and categories for action, agency and everyday decisions. Consider "race", "gender" and "language" in these terms, not just as resources that human subjects bring to bear in social fields, but also as categorical distinctions schematically applied by human subjects in construing and assigning value in everyday exchange. Simply, human subjects are racialised, gendered and classed in discourse taxonomies that are deployed, however consciously and deliberately, by other human subjects. Racialising practices – that is, the use of categorical distinction in the assignment of arbitrary value to the habitus (cf. Omi, 1994) - are undertaken both by objects of power (e.g., students, learners, the racial "other") and by those who relationally exercise power (e.g., teachers, administrators, community elders), though obviously not with equivalent institutional force.

One's habitus moves across participation in overlapping social fields (school and classroom, community group, church and mosque, gang, workplace, university, language school, corporation). The school constitutes a social field and a 'linguistic market' (Mey, 1986) where prior competence, fluency, accent and dialectal variation, and indeed colour, kinship and ethnic affiliation, and "race" may be made to count in different ways. The habitus consists of "race" and "language" – but these are never freestanding. Habitus also comprises a complex combinatory blend of embodied durable resources including gender, kinship, sexual orientation, knowledge and skill, along with acquired resources including credentials and artefacts, social networks and affiliations, convertible wealth, religious affiliation and so forth.

Within any given social field, these forms of capital are evaluated by others who possess the symbolic power to set (and perhaps negotiate) the terms of exchange. In this way, the field and its authoritative agents set rules for the realisation, valuation, exchange and transformation of capital. In the school, this can lead to entry or exclusion, further access to linguistic goods, further training, promotion or demotion, levels of participation and so forth. Recognition and evaluation of student capital is what teachers do – both deliberately through developmental diagnostic observation and less overtly, through tacit assumptions about students' linguistic capacities on the basis of other visible forms of capital or through assumptions that level of fluency in a given language enables or disenables developmental access to another target language. Teachers read and interpret bodily dispositions (Luke, 1992).

This valuation – a *minting* process of symbolic recognition of capital – is undertaken by other human subjects in positions of authority (e.g., teachers, employers, bureaucrats, bosses). Here distinction and judgment *may* foreground or background "language" and "race" as principal or key discourse categories in judgment. This depends on the degrees of flexibility of the rules of exchange of the social field in question, and the relative agency and available anticipatory schemata, which can be idiosyncratic, asserted by those with authority. School rules, clinical ascertainment and diagnostic grids, testing and examination regimes, accountability systems, funding policies, administrative guidelines grant teachers and administrators varying degrees of local autonomy and flexibility in judgment. These are enabling and constraining contextual conditions for the exercise of schematic discrimination by those in authority.[1] In terms of race and language, this can entail both 'recognition' and 'misrecognition' of cultural and linguistic resources brought to the field (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990), replete with assumptions, presuppositions and stereotypes about what particular cultural and linguistic resources enable and disenable.

Race/ethnicity, gender, class, sexual preference *and* language constitute key, though not exhaustive, elements of embodied cultural capital. As such, they are differentially recognised and misrecognised, and exchanged for value in the multiple and overlapping social fields that people traverse. The rules of exchange within the fields are to varying degrees rigid and flexible, durable and transient. Each instance of the assignation of value in any institutional or social or community field has the potential for bending rules and elaborating schemata, what Bourdieu (1998a) refers to as agentive 'position-taking' in the face of structural forces of 'positioning'. And there are potential moments of agency not just for the person whose capital is put for exchange, but for those in positions of power who assert and regulate the rules for exchange. That is, through resistance, remaking or recombining and representing one's capital, an individual can attempt to alter the patterns and practices of judgment in a social field. Refusal to participate or surface compliance are principal options. But equally, for those asserting judgment in exchange – teachers, administrators,

---

[1] This doesn't apply exclusively to the assertion of racism or linguistic marginalization by and through rule systems. The relative agency of discrimination and taste may be asserted by a racist teacher flying under the legal-juridicial radar of official anti-discrimination laws – or it could rest in the hands of an anti-racist teacher flouting or subverting racist institutional rules.

counsellor, psychologists, judges, businessmen, community elders – there is the potential for them to alter, shift and bend conventions and systems of exchange.

Essentialism, multiplicity, habitus

In education, important theory on race and language through the 1980s and 1990s has been dominated by both African-American and US cultural and linguistic minority writers and, internationally, by the writings of postcolonial subjects writing either as migrants or intellectuals in former colonial states (e.g., Fine, Weiss, Pruitt, & Wong, 2004). Notably in the Subaltern Group and in recent African-American and Latino writing – the connections between race, gender and class were highlighted as a tripartite explanation of contemporary categories of marginalization (Spivak, 2006). With the rise of historical focus on gay and lesbian rights, and the concomitant emergence of queer theory – sexual preference has augmented these categories (e.g., Kumashiro, 2001). There are contending and potentially divisive hierarchies of misery tabled by historically marginalized communities – as each asserts its educational, linguistic and indeed, human rights. Disputes between and amongst Indigenous communities, feminists, white anti-racists, anti-poverty activists, radical socialist educators, between African-American and Hispanic communities, between and within migrant and second language communities have arisen over the prioritisation of strategy, over the allocation of resources, over shared political strategy and struggle. These reflect profound differences in histories and experiences of oppression and domination, even where communities have suffered at the hands of common and identifiable elites and are seeking to establish inclusive social coalitions.

Dialogue between racially and linguistically disenfranchised communities continues. But dissensus can set the grounds for a classic "divide and rule" situation – where valuable political solidarity and strategic potential are lost because of the inability to agree on a common front about what is to be done. It is complicated further by issues of eco-sustainability, which qualify any claim that education for social justice can aim for a better and more equitable division of the spoils of an infinitely expanding and ecologically voracious corporate capitalism. Redistributive justice (Fraser, 1997) cannot entail the more equitable distribution of inequitably and destructively acquired value and resources. And given our relatively recent understandings of the complex local push/pull effects of global flows, gains in one site by a marginalized community can readily translate into catastrophic loss elsewhere.

Yet attempts to forge new coalitions against power risk the hierarchical ranking of claims about who has been most aggrieved, contending essentialist claims about originary exploitation – a comparative victimology. The underlying assumption is that hierarchies of oppression can form the basis for priorities for emancipation. But the complexity of contemporary racism and oppression is that it operates across and in combinatory categories: that is, that difference within difference (C. Luke & A. Luke, 1999), heterogeneity and multiplicity are objects of power as often as singular identification might be. The force of racism may be exercised with subtle, nuanced categorical distinctions and qualifications as frequently as it might excise all members of a particular community or history from value and recognition (Matsuda et al., 1993).

In the last two decades, poststructuralist feminists provided the template of multiple subjectivity to explain the combinatory blends of identity, affiliation and disposition that human subjects develop. Postcolonial theorists speak of 'hybrid' subjectivity, of blended and heterogeneous identities that embody the lived experience of residual and emergent, colonial and postcolonial, Indigenous and non-Indigenous culture and language (e.g., Ang, 2000). This is an anti-essentialist proposition: against the notion that people have singular and defining identities or resources with essential, generalisable and population-specific characteristics. The concept of multiple subjectivity suggests that people are simultaneously and differentially positioned by discourse and practice – and that identity is an amalgam of different characteristics (Norton, 2000). In more recent work on social identity, the argument has been put that we strategically deploy different "selves". And in recent work on new economies and cultures, it has been argued that people strategically assemble and deploy different versions of the self from available discursive, semiotic and representational resources (Gee, 2000).

These notions of multiplicity and hybridity compound our traditional understandings of race and racism, which are derived from work over a century that bears witness to deliberate and brutal slavery, genocide and linguisticide. These historical phenomena were premised on two essentialist beliefs: (1) that there were inextricable phenotypical, genetic and structural isomorphisms between race and one's intrinsic human characteristics, virtues and value, and; (2) that race, culture, identity, affiliation and nation could be assembled by the state in homologous and singular correspondence (Hall, 1993). This essentialism has been used both as a discourse technology to massify, rule and, in instances, eradicate whole communities and cultures. At the same time, essentialism has been reclaimed in defiant attempts to reassert cultural and linguistic solidarity by threatened peoples in the face of racist power.

Individuals' and groups' differential identities are constructed in and through discourse. The critical multiculturalist and pedagogic notions of "voice" refer to those repressed histories, memories and experiences of diasporic and marginalized people. The notion of 'heteroglossia' derives not just from Bakhtin (1982) but also from Voloshinov's (2006) early conceptualisation of every speech act and dialogic exchange revoicing and invoking intertextually prior class struggles and exchanges. Weaving across these different concepts of positioning are the sociological dialectics of structure/agency, of interpolation of language and discourse and its relative power to impose discipline and power upon human subjects as against human subjects" capacities to resist, exercise and assert discipline and power. This potential for rule-bending and schema-elaborating agency includes not just those racialised objects of power, but the agency of those (like teachers) who stand in some position of epistemological authority, official authorisation and potential authoritarianism in these social fields.

Though much of the work of social fields is done through discourse, the world is not solely a construction of discourse. Discourse is, *inter alia*, a making visible of those 'cognitive structures, forms of categories of perception, principles of vision and division' (Bourdieu, 1988a, p. 53; cf. VanDijk, 1993). And not all discourses have coequal or significant effects upon species being, upon human subjects, upon material conditions and, indeed, upon our capacities to generate further discourse (Luke,

2004). Some discourses kill people, take away their livelihood, others humiliate, others marginalize and shame. Some modes and plays of *differance* make a difference in people's lives, others simply don't matter much. In this way, the ubiquitous poststructuralist observation that we can account fully for the world through discourse, or rather for the world's partiality and continually deferred (in discourse) meaning, is at worst glib and at best partial. It is particularly unhelpful for those who find that some of their phenotypical features, their gender or sexuality, their language and accent are not chosen, not wholly malleable through discourse – however their relative value may be assigned by others through discourse categories. And it is at best a footnote for those who are the objects of discourse and physical violence that trivialises, marginalizes and shames them.

Further, the very concept of multiple subjectivities as well has its problems: offering a human subject who is assembled and reassembled longitudinally through discourse and practical inscriptions without foundational basis. The concept of habitus offers a means for describing the tension between multiple positionings and identities, on the one hand, and a foundational basis of kinship and culture, gender and sexuality – without recourse to apriori essentialist claims about "all Latinos", "all women", "all Chinese", "all Aborigines" and so forth.

While habitus may be multiple and overlaid – elements are not of our choice and remain durably across our lives. If we are black in a white or yellow-dominated culture, if we are women in a patriarchal system, if we are youth who speak in non-standard dialects or accents – that structure of the habitus is durable. As ethnomethodologists claim, it may be construed through discourse and thereby made and remade in everyday talk (McHoul, 2001) - yet it remains a semiotic presence which is embodied prior to and within discourse exchange that cannot be elided or undone. We can wilfully hide it, alter it, redesign and garnish it by degrees. Yet whether it should or is made to count or not, it doesn't simply appear or go away as readily as might clothing or credential, or even accent and paralinguistic gesture. And no matter how many other acquired overlays of institutional, material, social and economic capital we acquire and develop, elements of habitus are omnipresent.

This isn't to take a cultural essentialist or genetic determinist position, or to assume that the discourses and practices of primary socialisation cannot be reshaped malleably in early cultural and linguistic socialisations. But all the discourse overlays and constructions in the world will not "undo" the social facticity of being white in a culture where yellow is the unmarked norm, or black in a white dominated culture, or female in male governed institutions. No cultural communities or social formations are without hierarchical discrimination and value, without an indexicality of an unmarked (typically patriarchal) norm and a marked other.

Significant forms of capital can be acquired later in life: cultural practices and disciplines are performed and reperformed, languages can be learned, accents can be altered, elaborated disciplinary and institutional codes can be mastered, schemata and scripts acquired and elaborated, credentials won, taste shifted. But those embodied dispositions, like their affiliated cultural and experiential and historical memories, remain. How and in what ways they can be modulated, withheld or "played" as trumps or jokers in fields of exchange and language games (C. Luke & A. Luke, 1998), marks out agentive action. But they occur in the context of structural

positionings within the field, via taxonomic and hierarchical classifications of value assigned (modified and perhaps even waived) by convention and by ruling class, patriarchy authority (or by surrogates acting on behalf of that authority) within the field.

Value is contingent on the field: race, gender and language, as other forms of capital, are "read" by participants in the field. Different value will be assigned to habitus via discourse exchange in specific social fields, and subfields within institutions, communities, families, societies. In this regard, the value assigned to habitus is an artefact of discrimination in discourse (and might be assigned differently as a social field changes). But it is also the biosocial fact that our bodies, and the linguistic capacity of those bodies, have some irrevocable characteristics that remain, no matter how many discourse or stylistic designs we may overlay over those bodies. The postmodern assumption that the human subject is wholly malleable, that face and body can be styled to assume an invented identity runs into the problems of the durability of one's internal schemata. The body does indeed remember. We remain, in many ways, products of kinship and blood. And our cultural and linguistic production – much of which is physical in both performance and outward appearance, is given, at the very least until the formal institutions of school, state, corporation, religion begin their work of longitudinally reshaping that performance.

But this isn't to speak of a fixed determination via kinship, biology or primary socialisation. It is simply to acknowledge that there are foundational first principles, embodied, culturally and linguistically generated and situated, which all subsequent learning, linguistic acquisition and development, literacy and textual competence are based upon, build from, and sit in longitudinal, reflexive relationship to. Linguistically-derived epistemological categories and an intuitive sense of lexico-syntactic function from one's first language and affiliated cultural practices remain, however modified and augmented.[2] But this, the overlaid and durable, shaping and shaped disposition each of us brings to a given field, doesn't preclude deliberate remaking of the habitus or agentive action within particular social fields – 'position takings' in anticipation of and in response to the 'positioning' that occurs through structural distinctions and categories of discourse that constitute rules of exchange within fields (Bourdieu, 1998a).

An understanding of the relationships between race and ethnicity, language and discourse requires that we contend with issues of multiplicity and durability at once, without recourse to essentialism and determinism. The premise here is that, though they may be differentially asserted and valued in different social fields – human subjects bring complex (and idiosyncratic) combinations of gender and sexuality, class disposition, colour and race, ethnic affiliation and identity, and linguistic competence to bear in social fields. Race is but one element. Language is but one element. Different social fields, often overlapping and not discrete, have in place conventions and rules of exchange that differentially value these forms of capital. Race might count in this particular field, in this particular political economy and

---

[2] Following the psychoanalytic feminist claim that the paleosymbolic experience prior to entry into language remains in body and memory (Kristeva,1983), I would argue that the initially acquired glossifications and functions have developmental and longitudinal salience.

cultural/institutional milieu. But it might be combined as a criterion of value by another form of embodied capital valued in the social field, say, gender and credential.[3]

So what we are – and how we agentively foreground different elements of our own dispositions in a social field (a classroom, a boardroom, a workplace, a mosque or church) entails discourse in the broadest sense. The very categories and "namings" with which we present ourselves and are valued have histories in discourse and language. But that discourse and language itself is produced by embodied subjects, by human agents with durable, embodied capital, augmented by and in cases overwritten by other forms of acquired and transformed capital – this process of valuation and exchange embedded in the structures of social fields.

The practical problem sociologically reframed

For the last four decades, there has been compelling empirical evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, that mainstream schooling systems in the US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the UK and many European states systematically discriminate against children from racially and linguistically "different" populations. The historical explanations for differential engagement, participation, achievement and outcomes vary, including: cultural and linguistic "deficit", limited home literacy resources, exclusionary and alienating curriculum content, early tracking and streaming, inequitable school funding, poor teacher quality, face-to-face classroom prejudice, and, more recently, socially-induced neuropsychological disorders. These explanations all remain in play in current research and policy.

The educational responses have been various. The legacy of both Frankfurt School and Birmingham cultural studies has been to focus on the racism and linguistic discrimination as dominant ideological formations, a critique of corporate media and curricula and to call for revisionist critique of mainstream curriculum and instruction as systematically excluding minority knowledge, competence, language and approaches to learning. African-American, Hispanic and Asian-American writers have called for a systematic recovery of 'voice' in history, literature, art, and the representation of everyday social and economic reality (e.g., Nieto et al., 2007). The legacy of feminist poststructuralist models has been a focus upon silences and exclusions in classrooms and curriculum. The focus on discourse has led to close analysis of the patterns of face-to-face exclusion and marginalization of speakers, the exercise of classroom forms of discrimination, and the differential representation and valuing of linguistic and textual forms, knowledge and experience (e.g., Luke, Kale, Singh, Hill & Daliri, 1995). The response has been to argue for more inclusive modes of pedagogy, ranging from dialogical models (e.g., Wong, 2005), to critical approaches to language and text (Norton & Toohey, 2004), to forms of culturally appropriate pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2005).

The educational response, then, centres on the politics of recognition, with calls for a general shift in school discourse to accommodate diverse ways of knowing and

---

[3] Consider, for instance, a recent *Economist* ('Nearer to overcoming', 2008) study that found that African-American women with postgraduate credentials earn substantially more than their white counterparts, while those without degrees earn less.

cultural interactional patterns. This entails: (1) voice and inclusion of repressed texts, discourses and histories in curriculum representation; (2) inclusive and purposive engagement with diverse languages and discourses (bilingual education; critical ESL; critical "foreign" language study); (3) expansion of school knowledge to include Indigenous, traditional and migrant epistemologies and intellectual fields; (4) more equitable, inclusive and democratic forms of classroom talk (critical pedagogy); (4) alteration of cultural patterns of interaction (culturally appropriate pedagogy); (5) explicit engagement with issues of racism and all forms of discrimination (anti-racist education, citizenship education, intercultural studies). Each has a different focus on the habitus and its potential for agency in the field of the school – stressing the alteration of:

- *Learner habitus*: remaking of student habitus prior to and in initial encounters with the field;
- *Language of the field*: alteration or augmentation of the dominant lingua franca of the school field;
- *Regulation of the field*: systematic alteration of interactional codes of the school as a field of exchange to accommodate those of diverse learners;
- *Knowledge in the field*: systematic inclusion of the alternative and revisionist school knowledge as a change in the value and discourse of the field;
- *Discrimination in social fields*: explicit analysis of the racist, sexist, class-based and other discriminatory rules of regulation of school fields and other institutions;
- *Teacher habitus*: alteration of teacher habitus, introducing new schemata for "discrimination" of student habitus and capacity at any of the pedagogic and curricular approaches noted above.

In what follows, I provide brief glosses on each family of approaches, treating them as institutional strategies that attempt to alter or shift relationships of exchange and value within school fields. My aim here is to unpack their assumptions about habitus, capital and field, rather than on whether they are educationally appropriate or effective in any specific school or classroom, community or system.

Learner habitus: The remaking of student habitus features in those models of compensatory education that entail the systemic early introduction of linguistic and cultural knowledge and practice that is seen as requisite to "mainstream" school achievement. This varies from preschool early intervention programs that focus on the introduction of dominant linguistic knowledge, knowledge of print, familiarity with interactional patterns of school and mainstream culture. Longstanding early childhood programs (e.g., *Headstart*) attempt to remediate student "lack" or "deficit", widely construed as cognitive, linguistic, or cultural. A similar assumption is found in those progressive humanist early childhood philosophies that are promoting middle-class, mainstream cultural approaches to "play" and social relations as an unmarked norm of psychosocial development. Deficit models feature prominently in early literacy debates. Many advocates of scripted direct instruction in phonics for minority and second language children work from the assumption that student habitus needs to be systematically altered through early intervention to accommodate the print practices of schooling (A. Luke & C. Luke, 2001).

Early systematic English as a Second Language instruction further attempts to enable the transition to English (or other dominant language) of instruction. Typically it is premised on the assumption that the mainstream instructional framing and knowledge content and classification are valid and, with transitional accommodation for language of instruction, can remain unchanged. Their varying ideological intents aside, the shared assumption of these models is that the habitus of the learner needs to be systematically modified at entry to enable them to develop mainstream forms of cultural capital, as defined in existing systems of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. The rules of exchange and value in the social field of the school and classroom remain beyond criticism.

Language of the field: Bilingual education alters the lingua franca of pedagogy and curriculum, shifting what counts in the linguistic market of the school. In contrast with compensatory models, it begins with an explicit recognition of the learner''s pre-existing linguistic habitus as having value in the home, cultural community and, indeed, other affiliated social fields. The approaches here range from transitional bilingual programs, to language maintenance programs, to attempts at "two way" education that focus specifically on bilingual exchange and intercultural understandings. The approaches vary in the degrees to which they recognise and grant exchange value in pre-existing linguistic competence other than that of the medium of instruction.

While these bilingual approaches move away from a deficit model of the habitus, they do so by degrees upon different assumptions about the need to alter the rules of value of the social field. Transitional bilingual education recognises the developmental and cultural value of L1 but assumes that the purpose of the bilingual education is to prepare the student for English medium instruction and social life. As in compensatory models, the dominant criterion of value in the field remains English, albeit with a recognition of the need for educational support to ensure access and use to the dominant language.

Language maintenance or "additive" approaches are premised on the assumption that L1 requires instructional support and educational recognition to preclude language loss and shift to dominant L2. That is, it recognises the value of existing linguistic habitus as an end in itself, rather than as a means to L2 and affiliated mainstream educational experience. This may entail a stronger recognition of the potential of L1 for application to domains of knowledge within the school field. In this way, additive models have the potential for altering the regulative rules of the field insofar as L1 is explored as a medium for altering the discourses of schooling.

Two-way bilingual and bicultural education, featuring in some Australian and New Zealand Indigenous contexts, argues for reciprocal setting of the conditions for exchange, with valuation and exchange of multiple linguistic and cultural artefacts and practices (e.g., Malcolm et al., 1999; cf. McNaughton, 2002). Models of two-way education thus attempt to alter the rules of recognition of the habitus, the interactional frameworks guiding exchange, and the dominant knowledge contents and structures of the curriculum.

Regulation of the field: A correlative focus is on changing the regulative rules of exchange within the classroom, shifting the structures of pedagogic action and how knowledge is interactionally framed through turn taking and exchange structures, topic nomination and choice, kinship and age/authority/status relations. Some models of culturally appropriate pedagogy focus on spatial organisation and on paralinguistics (e.g., "face", eye contact, gesture). Here the focus is on altering the social interactional and sociolinguistic exchange to better match those cultural practices and interactional patterns brought to school. The focus is on altering the rules of exchange within the field to accommodate diversity of student habitus. In some instances, its aim is the more effective transition to mainstream curriculum outcomes, as in the use of culturally appropriate patterns in reading instruction (e.g., Au & Mason, 1983). Where this is the case, like bilingual education, the recognition of difference in learner habitus is seen as a means towards conventional achievement as determined by existing rules of the field. In other instances, it entails an attempt to expand and alter the cultural knowledge that is made to count in the field, focusing on incorporating the knowledge and practices of learners and their communities.

Knowledge in the field: This entails an alteration of the structures and knowledge valued in the social field of the school and classroom. Curriculum entails a selective tradition of knowledge (Apple 1990): that is, a canonical set of cultural, social and political selections of what will be valued in the field from what is, in theory at least, an infinite range of possible social fields and disciplines, texts and discourses, knowledges and possible worlds. Work in critical multiculturalism, critical race theory, queer theory, feminist theory stresses the need for a more inclusive curriculum, one which includes voices, histories, memories and experiences, cultural genres, aesthetic forms and modalities of expression of those who have been marginalized from mainstream schooling and, more generally, dominant systems of cultural representation. This revisionist approach to curriculum is based on principles of 'recognitive justice' (Fraser, 1997) – that the elimination of misrepresentation of communities' and cultures' histories and their recognition in official knowledge will have the effect of altering the rules of value in the school. In this regard, it entails both the inclusion of minority "voices" in schooling – and can extend to the critique of conventional formations of knowledge and ideology, epistemologies and disciplines, cultures and practices that currently are made to count.

Discrimination in social fields: Critical pedagogy, approaches to critical literacy and anti-racist education offer varied pedagogic approaches. They share a focus on making the regulatory rules of the field of the school itself, and those of other significant social fields (politics and the state, workplaces, community and religious organisations) the objects of critical analysis. In sociological terms, these pedagogic approaches are further attempts to 'objectify the objectification' (Ladwig, 1996), by making transparent the rules of recognition, discrimination and exchange in dominant institutions. These bids to 'read the world' (Freire, 1987) might entail, for instance, working with students to identify how racial or linguistic discrimination works, where and in whose interests (Milovich et al., 2001), or engaging with a critical analysis of the rules of exchange and value in social fields of work, media, civic and community life (Luke, 2000).

Teacher habitus: There is a strong and ongoing focus in teacher education on the development of teachers who are able to recognise and capitalise upon linguistic and

cultural diversity. There is ample research that demonstrates how teachers' cultural deficit models, entailing a 'misrecognition' of student habitus, contribute to educational inequality (Comber & Kamler, 2004). Teacher habitus, as argued, entails embodied cultural disposition and taste, and salient schemata and scripts for reading and engaging with student habitus. Attempts to change teacher habitus occur in teacher training and specialised professional development programs: these range from anti-racist and anti-sexist programs, to training developmental diagnostic tools that recognise diversity, to engagement with many of the pedagogic and curriculum strategies noted above (Luke & Goldstein, 2006). The assumption here is that teachers can be trained to position-take in social fields in fair and equitable ways, using their discrimination even in those fields that have histories and structures that are based on the misrecognition and inequitable exchange of students" cultural capital.

A sociological template for whole-school language education reform

We can put to the side hairsplitting arguments in legislatures, courts and the media over whether this or that constitutes "racism", an "apology" or "genocide" (Luke, 1997; cf. Moreton-Robinson, 2004). There is overwhelming evidence – scientific, experiential, historical, narrative – that modern schooling is a sophisticated institutional technology for social reproduction, the stratification of knowledge and discourse resources, wealth and capital, power and force along the fault lines of race and gender, social class and culture.

But the moral consensus amongst members of linguistic and cultural minority groups who have experienced racism and sexism does not begin to resolve the complex issues around educational strategy. It is all too easy for us to agree on the need for fair and equitable approaches to schooling and language education. It is even easier to embrace the broad egalitarian goals of "empowerment" and "social justice" for those communities and student bodies who have been educationally marginalized. But the road of school reform has been full of potholes, detours and blind alleys – and along the way, we often find the abandoned vehicles of those educators who have preceded us. We also encounter other travellers who believe, often with good reason and evidence, that their distinctive map and journey are the only viable ones. Our distinctive approaches and solutions to the challenge of equitable education are based on different descriptive analyses of the problem.

I have here offered a cautionary but enabling map of the sociological terrain. The first lesson is about the limits of the school as a social field. Students live in and move across a range of community, economic, and social institutions before, during and after their formal schooling. Many of these domains remain exclusionary and discriminatory, precluding the use and extension of their educationally acquired capital. In this regard, the mobility of students across social fields cannot be seen to be "caused" directly by their level of skill, knowledge or educational credential. Rather it is contingent upon the systems of objectification and rules of exchange of other fields. In this regard, the assumption that English, or genres, or phonics or critical literacy vest students with durable, portable and universally valuable "power" is a spurious one (Luke, 1996). For power is always contingent upon whether the structures and authorities of social fields set out the conditions where it can be recognised and used for gainful purposes.

Further, governments and the private sector have shown a remarkable penchant for providing community conditions for the dysfunctional and uncoordinated availability. In Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, historically this has entailed the scattered, sporadic deployment of resources: a health policy push for hospitals and nurses this year, a press for curriculum reform around phonics in another, a new model of community policing one decade, a collaboration around community employment and private sector jobs the next (Luke, Land et al., 2002). While all of these might be of value in themselves, whole communities are left unable to convert and mobilise educationally acquired skills and knowledge, *sans* healthy living conditions, proper housing, generative social and community relations, meaningful and productive work. In North American urban settings, calls for educational reform often sit within contexts where the same state authorities and corporate advocates have failed to develop viable economic development, where community social capital is the object of active disinvestment, and where political franchise is precluded.

Language-in-education policy and practice therefore needs to sit as a subset of larger community-based social and economic policy. The political struggles for fair and equitable language and education are necessarily part and parcel of larger movements for social and economic justice.

That said, schools can make a difference. Following Bourdieu, I have argued that we can begin from an understanding of how "race" and "language" – and gender, sexual orientation and difference more generally – are made to count in the social fields of the school and society. The habitus is a complex amalgam of received and acquired dispositions, woven and rewoven together in ways that make essentialist and unitary claims about race and gender and social class as freestanding, universal phenomena at best contingent and, at worst, misleading. How student habitus is mis/recognised, evaluated, exchanged and, potentially, transformed is sociologically contingent. That is, it depends upon the structured and structuring rules of exchange in the field, and the relative agency and realised exercise of power of those whose human authority the field relies upon. As teachers, teacher educators, administrators, curriculum developers, educational bureaucrats and public intellectuals, we have within our grasp the possibilities of setting up fair and equitable rules and procedures for the evidence-based recognition of students' capital, and for establishing enabling conditions via curriculum, pedagogy and assessment for the optimal valuing, exchange and conversion of these complex forms of capital into a normative model of new human subjects: multilingual, transcultural subjects who remain grounded and engaged with their communities and cultures.

Children develop a sum total of dispositions across a life time, across multiple, non-synchronous social fields of families, communities, religions, the state and other key institutions. As an ideal type in modern democratic societies, the school's responsibility – in some sense quarantined in effect and force – is to enable the gainful and agentive, fair and transparent conversion of this habitus into one that enables a meaningful, gainful and agentive pathway to community cultures, to civic participation, to productive and meaningful labour. Despite attempts to change this historical mission to a grossly oversimplified market model, and in the face of the continued proliferation of patently racist and socially unjust social and economic structures and institutions – schooling remains a means for redress, for equity, and for change.

Constrained by policy contexts and the localised cadences of school reform, attempts to redress current conditions often are piecemeal: teachers' attempts at innovation and change are met with scepticism by others; principals often in the position can only push through or finance a single approach; state departments committed to reform are often frustrated by the limits of their own bureaucratic capacity at program development and implementation; policy funding regimes often target student groups by a single category of habitus. A sociological model provides us with a definitional threshold on the limits of purely race and language-based categorisation and ascertainment and funding strategies. Given the complexity and multiplicity of the habitus, single categorisations of students for funding, "treatment", remediation and intervention can misrecognise sources of exclusion and misdirect valuable resources.

Contra determinist readings of Bourdieu – those in power, those who are engaged in structural positioning, also have agency: the agency to disrupt hierarchical exchanges of value, the agency to make "exceptional cases", the agency to be rule bound by various degrees. The position-taking, agentive possibilities within a social field can be exercised not only by the object of racialised power, who can resist, but by those with power. Whether this demonstration is overt – as in sovereign benign pardon and exception – or covert, via a subtle bending of a rule – it is an everyday assertion of agency. But to massify power – even ruling class, patriarchal power - as absolute and never bending ignores the very contingencies of modern rule and law. Modern rule and law is by definition never literal, but always interpretive. In this way, unlike the customary exchange systems of gifting and bartering, modernist institutions have a range of capacities for being "non-racist", "non-sexist" and "non-discriminatory". They have legal and juridical rationale, won through legislation, for exception and exemption. The result can be construed as substantive or token. The simple fact is that teachers and principals, counsellors and clinicians everyday have the capacity to alter the fields of exchange.

What would a whole-school approach to equity and social justice for linguistic and cultural minority students look like? There is a series of practical implications of the Bourdieu model for curriculum and pedagogy, assessment and accountability issues in schools. My own view is that the school would operate from a sociological logic of practice, intervening to shift the field at the different structural pressure points I have described in this chapter. It would:

- *Accurately and fairly recognise and evaluate the cultural capital that students bring to school*: This would entail a much more detailed understanding and engagement with student habitus beginning with systematic, face-to-face developmental diagnostic procedures that would evaluate students' competence in their community languages, engage with their 'stocks of knowledge' (Moll et al., 1992) and repertoires of practice gained in community (McNaughton, 2002). The aim would be to identify and validate cultural scripts and schemata, skills, knowledges and practices, in order to set the optimal conditions for transformation and conversion of these into a substantially modified and augmented version of school knowledge. A principled, culturally and linguistically sensitive, sociologically grounded 'evidence-based approach' would supplant deficit thinking (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2004).

- *Change the lingua franca of the school field*: Depending upon community and student aspirations, it would provide a balanced program of English as a Second Language and/or bilingual programs for transitional bilinguals to enhance their English (or other mainstream language competence) in ways that do not directly contribute to language loss.
- *Change the regulative rules of interaction in the school field*: This would entail teachers developing pedagogic strategies that complement and reflect student cultural and community practices of exchange and gifting, paralinguistics and gesture and turn-taking. Culturally appropriate pedagogy would be one of a rich range of pedagogic repertoires that would include traditional didactic, constructivist and critical pedagogies as these are suited to the acquisition and practice of different kinds and levels of knowledge (Luke, 2007).
- *Revise the curriculum*: This would entail the revision of curriculum to include both community and mainstream, alternative and dominant curriculum fields and knowledges. Minority voices, histories, and world views would be included. There would be a direct but analytic engagement with new media and cultural forms. A critical approach to curriculum and pedagogy would enable students to compare and contrast these knowledges for evaluation and analysis. But such a critical stance would not entail an ideologically-based or *ad hoc* discarding of conventional scientific and cultural knowledge requisite for participation in mainstream education and economy (Young, 2008) – and it would articulate to a mastery of dominant technologies of discourse and inscription (Escobar, Fernandez, Guevara-Niebla & Freire, 1994).
- *Critique social fields*: the critical component of the program would engage students with a broad analysis of how social fields discriminate, their rules of exchange, and who they historically have included and excluded. The aim would be to make the discriminatory technologies that students will face transparent and available for naming and analysis. In critical literacy studies, for example, this entails an understanding of how texts work in specific social institutions; that is, how a media report is constructed by specific lexicogrammatical conventions, by particular historical authors, with particular intents and audiences. In sciences and social sciences, it would entail an analysis of how they operate as social fields, with particular criteria of access, rules of value and exchange.
- *Remake teacher habitus*: As Freire (2005) argued, the teacher can become a learner of student habitus, community culture and community language. But this is not to understate or undermine the significant role in enhanced teacher expertise in socially-grounded developmental diagnostic capacity, use of assessment data, field knowledge, L1 to L2 transition, and affiliated pedagogic repertoire. As an established epistemic authority and elder in the social field of the school, teachers require evidence-based discrimination about student learning as against operating from staff-room folklore, received wisdom and commonsense assumptions about the capacities of particular language groups and communities. The approaches noted above will require enhanced professional technical knowledge and professional expertise, and cannot be sustained solely by principled belief in justice and equality.

One of the *cul-de-sacs* of language education research has been its tendency to prioritise one form of capital as making a difference when in fact, they are always

deployed in situ (in a definable social field), and as part of a larger amalgam (the habitus's array of different modes of capital). How these are symbolically valued, how they are transformed in everyday practice depends largely upon the rules and practices of exchange in schools and classrooms. A combined, multiple strategy approach is needed.

I have here advanced a template for what an equitable classroom, curriculum and school should entail. The school's responsibility is to establish equitable and transparent rules of exchange that enable the student to transform their existing cultural capital into educationally acquired value, that is knowledge and skill (embodied capital), educational and cultural artefacts and performances (material capital) and credentials (institutional capital). This is the challenge for all teachers and systems. When these exchanges are misaligned, arbitrary, and non-transparent, the evidence is found in those who have achieved credentials without demonstrated work, those whose artefacts apparently exceed their acquired competence and skill, and those whose obvious skill and knowledge doesn't convert into value. An equitable and just classroom would set out clear, effective and enabling spaces and contexts, interactional patterns, and practices for the conversion and exchange of capital.

Schools are by definition dynamic but clearly circumscribed social fields. As such, they are limited in their capacity to "preserve" languages and cultures, should this be their intent, nor is their historical mission the simple recognition and acceptance of student habitus. Simply making schools more relevant and attuned to local communities and habitus can be self-annulling (Luke & Carrington, 2002). Teaching and learning are always about extending human development and potential, about moving students from the known to the new, about elaborating and extending existing cultural schemata and scripts, constructing and inventing new knowledge, new cultural practices and novel applications of existing ones. In this regard, the grounded recognition of student habitus, the validation and inclusion of community and minority knowledge, the use of community stocks of knowledge and expertise are not ends in themselves. They potentially enable the transformation and conversion of capital into value, expertise and, indeed, cultural practices and wisdom that did not exist for that individual and community before.

A postscript

As theoretical as this chapter might be, it actually started as an autobiographical reflection on race – but for the usual reasons, this proved more difficult than "doing theory". Perhaps at another time - but there is standpoint at work here.

This has been a sociological reflection about race and power – written from my experience of it as a variously racialised, class-located, Chinese male – and now middle class academic working in a white dominated society. This is not an archetypal story of the alterior, minority male in white-dominated societies nor a model minority narrative. I have lived across several and multiple life worlds, marked by differing combinatory historical relations of race, gender, class and location: in the Australia, Singapore, Canada and the US - never self-same, but shifting in status, with differential value attributed to my subjectivity (Asian, American, Chinese-American, Asian-American, Canadian, Asian Canadian, Australian, Han Chinese, Cantonese, heterosexual male, poor student, good student, senior bureaucrat, ruling

class, middle class, doctorally certified, North American accented English speaker). This is a both privileged and corrosive position of seeing and experiencing power from both sides: both its benign and productive moments, and its centralist negative, destructive force, both as racialised object of power and unmarked ruling subject asserting power, both as outsider and insider.

Racism is an act of power, a form of symbolic and physical violence. I have lived and written about race as position, as alterity, as "other", as object of power, violence and exclusion. Made through our own historical trajectories, many of us working in language and education, TESOL, literacy and related fields have worked as visible minorities. In the face of the social facts of social, economic and cultural reproduction in education – we have sided, with various strategies and political investments, with the "other", whether we have been marked by self-same colour and difference or not. But this siding brings with it an optics, a view from the histories of colonialism, patriarchy and domination that we set out to oppose and redress. Much of our work on the everyday experiences, institutional machinery, and discourse and material work by and which social institutions and formations exclude those of difference – has been premised on a one-dimensional theorisation of racism, sexism and other forms of exclusionary blindness, standpoint and miscategorisation. This is the historical irony: we have understood racism from the standpoint of marked, racialised subjects – not from the standpoint of unmarked racists. This may be where literature fails us, offering nothing other than stereotypes of racists. For I am not certain that white, male power in white dominated societies has a capable self-understanding.

For me this changed substantially first when I moved for several years into a life world, a political economy, institutional context, and a system of cultural and linguistic exchange where I was admitted to a centre, where I was not racially other but rather racially dominant, the unmarked normative male that theorists of gender and whiteness refer to. The combinatory capital I brought to this field – flawed but good enough to gain admission – was mixed and only enabled me access to being able to see and understand certain elements of its logics of practice. I spoke English but not Mandarin. So my sense of the field I worked in is, admittedly and necessarily, limited – I understood perhaps a third of what I saw and heard. Nonetheless, this was an experience of crossing in optics, standpoint and embodied context from margin to centre (and back again).

This has left me either a cosmopolitan subject of mixed pedigree, at times quite cognisant of the various kinds of difference (mine and others) at play in everyday life and in professional/academic work, and at times, quite naïve and confounded. I am not, as one senior white rationalist scholar put it to me many years ago: so multiple as to be simply confused. At the time, I explained to him that the many personas and identities we bear aren't a problem unless we are absolutely wedded to an essentialist unity of self, position and deed. It was his problem and not mine. It occurred to me later that his self-understanding as a rational male in a white dominant culture was wholly unproblematic: he needn't give it a second thought.

Nor am I naïve or sufficiently unmarked to believe in, to paraphrase another white male, critical rationalist colleague, to have learned about the 'universal good in all people' through these experiences of crossing. Having seen power and racism from both sides – as object and as subject - that universal virtue is at best elusive. I have sat

in board rooms and staff rooms sometimes silent and thereby complicit, regardless of my strategic rationalisations. More often than not, when speaking out or acting on behalf of others, I have asserted and at the same time expended and relinquished insider power and credibility. This is the case in those cultures where the saving of face is paramount and in those cultures that purport to value "being outfront".

To see racism, sexism, social class and linguistic discrimination from the vantage point of those who exercise power against others is unsettling. Yet it was my "defective" habitus, not fully culturally and linguistically suited for rule, but admitted by virtue of race, institutional and cultural capital, that enabled me to *see* racism and patriarchy at work. I could step outside of it as it occurred, hear my own words and others echo around the table. As Bourdieu (1990) notes, where the habitus is matched optimally to systems of value and rules of exchange, the legitimacy of these systems and rules appears seamless, natural and untroubled. And for many participants, it is not racism or sexism at all. It is just the way things are done.

These experiences continually unsettle and disturb my own understandings of race and language, difference and diversity. Each of our own racialised and gendered lives is an ongoing work in progress. But there is agency in both how we respond to racism, and in the ways that those in authority in social fields assert or choose not to assert it. Just as we need to continue critical work on where racism and sexism are asserted, upon whom and by whom, how and to what ends – we need to attend to instances where they are precluded, broken and effectively stopped. To do so, we too need to consider the "other", no matter how confounding and difficult a task that might be. The biggest test of my own commitment to social justice as a teacher have not been teaching the "oppressed" or about the "oppressed" – nor in recounting and reconciling tales of where I and my family have been objects of racism and sexism. It has been teaching empathetically and equitably students who are racist, some who were verbally abusive and physically menacing to me outside of the school. The biggest tests of my own work as a government bureaucrat and university administrator were what to do as part of a corporate and collegial body that was othering people of colour and difference, and an empathy for those exercising power.

Acknowledgement

References

Albright, J., & Luke, A. (2007). *Pierre Bourdieu and literacy education.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ang, I. (2000). *On not speaking Chinese.* London: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. 2nd Ed. New York: Routledge.

Au, K. H., & Mason, J. M. (1983). Cultural congruence in classroom participation structures: Achieving a balance of rights. *Discourse Processes, 6*, 145–167.

Bakhtin, M. (1982). *The dialogic imagination.* (V. Liapunov & K. Brostrom, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998a). *State nobility.* (R. Nice, Trans.) Oxford: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998b). *Practical reason.* (R. Johnson, Trans.). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2007). *Distinction.* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Comber, B., & Kamler, B. (2004). Getting out of deficit: Pedagogies of reconnection. *Teaching Education, 15*(3), 293-310.

Darder, A., & Torres, R. (2004). *After race.* New York: New York University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.) (2004). *Preparing teachers for a changing world.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Escobar, M., Fernandez, A., Guevara-Niebla, G., & Freire, P. (1994). *Paulo Freire on higher education.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fine, M., Weiss, L., Pruitt, L.P., & Wong, L. M. (Eds.) (2004). *Off white: Readings on power, privilege and resistance*. New York: Routledge.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus.* New York: Routledge.

Freire, P. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world.* London: Routledge.

Freire, P. (2005). *Education for critical consciousness.* London: Continuum.

Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic for research in education. *Review of Research in Eduation, 20*, 99-125.

Hall, S. (1993). Culture, community, nation. *Cultural Studies, 7*, 349-363.

Holland, D., & Cole, M. (1995). Between discourse and schema: Reformulating a cultural-historical approach to culture and mind. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 26*(4), 1-16.

Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Kristeva, J. (1983). *The Kristeva Reader.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Kumashiro, K. (Ed.) (2001). *Troubling intersections of race and sexuality.* New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). *Culturally relevant teaching.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ladwig, J. (1996). *Academic distinctions.* New York: Routledge.

Louie, K. (2002). *Theorising Chinese masculinity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luke, A. (1992). The body literate: Discourse and inscription in early literacy instruction. *Linguistics and Education, 4*, 107–129.

Luke, A. (1996). Genres of power: Literacy education and the production of capital. In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in society* (pp. 308–338). London: Longman.

Luke, A. (1997). The material effects of the word: Apologies, stolen children and public discourse. *Discourse, 18*, 343–368.

Luke, A. (2000). Critical literacy in Australia: A matter of standpoint and context. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 43*(5), 448-461.

Luke, A. (2004). Notes on the future of critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies, 1*, 149-152.

Luke, A. (2007). Pedagogy as gift. In J. Albright & A. Luke (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu and Literacy Education* (pp. 67-91). New York: Routledge/Erlbaum.

Luke, A., & Carrington, V. (2002). Globalisation, literacy, curriculum practice. In R. Fisher, M. Lewis, & G. Brooks (Eds.), *Language and literacy in action* (pp. 231–50). London: Routledge/Falmer.

Luke, A., & Goldstein, T. (2006). Building intercultural capital: A response to Rogers, Marshall and Tyson, *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(2), 202-224.http://www.reading.org/Library/Retrieve.cfm?D=10.1598/RRQ.41.2.3&F=RRQ-41-2-Rogers_Luke.pdf retrieved July 4, 2008

Luke, A., Kale, J., Singh, M., Hill, T., & Daliri, F. (1995). Talking difference: Discourses on aboriginality in grade one classrooms. In D. Corson & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Power and discourse in educational organisations.* Creskill, NJ & Toronto: Hampton Press & Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.

Luke, A., Land, R., Kolatsis, A., Christie, P., & Noblett, G. (2002). *Standard Australian English and language for Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.* Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Indigenous Education Consultative Body. http://cli.ed.qut.edu.au/documents/Standard_Australian/ESL_report.pdf retrieved July 4, 2008

Luke, A., & Luke, C. (2001). Adolescence lost/childhood regained. On early intervention and the emergence of the techno-subject. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 1*(1), 91-120.

Luke, C., & Luke, A. (1998). Interracial families: Difference within difference. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 21*, 728-733.

Luke, C., & Luke, A. (1999). Theorising interracial families and hybrid identity: An Australian perspective. *Educational Theory, 49*, 223-250.

McCarthy, C. (1997). *The uses of culture: Education and the uses of ethnic affiliation.* New York: Routledge.

McHoul. A. (2001). *How to analyse talk in institutional settings.* New York: Continuum.

McNaughton, S. (2002). *Meeting of minds.* Auckland, New Zealand: Learning Media.

Malcolm, I., Haig, Y., Konigsberg, P., Rochecouste, J., Collard, G., Hill, A., et al. (1999). *Towards more user-friendly education for speakers of Aboriginal English.* Perth: Education Department of Western Australia.

Matsuda, M., Lawrence, C.R., Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K.W. (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech and the first amendment.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Mey, J. (1986). *Whose language?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Milovich, I., Luke, A., Luke, C., Land, R., & Mills, M. (2001). *Moving forward: Students and teachers against racism.* Melbourne: Eleanor Curtain Publishers.

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (Ed.) (2004). *Whitening race.* Canberra: Australian Aboriginal Press.

'Nearer to overcoming' (2008). *The Economist,* May 8, 2008, http://www.economist.com/world/na/displaystory.cfm?story_id=11326407 retrieved July 4, 2008.

Nieto, S., Bode, P., Kang, E., & Raible, J. (2007). Identity, community, and diversity: Retheorizing multicultural curriculum for the postmodern era. In Michael Connelly, Ming Fang He, & JoAnn Phillion (Eds.), *Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 176-197). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning.* London: Pearson.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (Eds.) (2004). *Critical pedagogies and language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Omi, M. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States.* New York: Routledge.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) (2005). *School factors related to quality and equity.* Paris: OECD.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *English and the discourses of colonialism.* London: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (2008). The linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 4*(1), 1-43.

Spivak, G. (2006). *In other words.* London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism.* London: Sage.

Voloshinov, V. I. (2006). *Marxism and the philosophy of language.* (L. Matejka & I. Titunik, trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wong, S. (2005). *Dialogic approaches to TESOL: Where the ginko tree grows.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Young, M. F. D. (2008). From constructivism to realism in the sociology of the curriculum. *Review of Research in Education, 32*, 1-28.