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## Festival Program: Monday 22\textsuperscript{nd} – Friday 26\textsuperscript{th} October 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon 22\textsuperscript{nd}</th>
<th>Tues 23\textsuperscript{rd}</th>
<th>Wed 24\textsuperscript{th}</th>
<th>Thurs 25\textsuperscript{th}</th>
<th>Fri 26\textsuperscript{th}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>AELE Symposium</td>
<td>Social Policy Forum</td>
<td>Dean’s Symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-5:30 Holme Building</td>
<td>9-5:30 Holme Building</td>
<td>9-5pm Holme Building</td>
<td>10-1pm Room 612</td>
<td>9-5pm, Lecture Room 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Keynote 1: Prof Tony</td>
<td>- Keynote 2: Professor</td>
<td>Round Table</td>
<td>Making a Difference?</td>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinson</td>
<td>Meagher</td>
<td>10-1pm Holme Building</td>
<td>Research and its Impact.</td>
<td>Futures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Response: Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Raewyn Connell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Jenny O’Dea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Invited papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ann Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Lunch</td>
<td>Conference Lunch</td>
<td>Book Launch</td>
<td>Book Launch</td>
<td>Book Launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2pm Faculty Common Room</td>
<td>1-1.30 Faculty Common Room</td>
<td>1-1.30 Faculty Common Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Russell</td>
<td>Jenny O’Dea</td>
<td>Brian Paltridge and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Welfare in Football</td>
<td>Everybody’s Different</td>
<td>Sue Starfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aek Phakiti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis and Dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Competence and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing in a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFL Reading Test Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>AELE Symposium (cont.)</td>
<td>2-4pm Room 424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference (continued)</td>
<td>Conference (continued)</td>
<td>CoCo Workshop</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Invited Papers continued</td>
<td>- Parallel Papers ~</td>
<td>1-4pm Rooms 351 &amp; 230</td>
<td>Ethnography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continued</td>
<td>3-6pm Room 461</td>
<td>Remembering Glenbrook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China Photography Exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Launch &amp; Postgraduate</td>
<td>3-5pm Room 351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Faculty Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education &amp; Society in</td>
<td>Understanding poverty and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary China</td>
<td>education: What’s research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>got to do with it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eve</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-9pm Meta Centre 412</td>
<td>5-7pm Room 351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm Holme Building</td>
<td>6-9pm Meta Centre 412</td>
<td>6.30-9pm Meta Centre 412</td>
<td>PESSA Annual Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Dinner</td>
<td>International Masterclass</td>
<td>Oxford-Sydney Online “Debate”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest of honour: Gillian</td>
<td>End-of-Life Research</td>
<td>Resilience and Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert – NSW Commissioner for Children and Young People</td>
<td>The University of Sydney and The University of Warwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30-9:00am  | Registration             | Allen Madden Eora Peoples Representative  
Professor Merlin Crossley, Acting Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)  
Professor Derrick Armstrong, Dean, Faculty of Education & Social Work |
| 9:00-9:30am  | Welcome                  | Allen Madden Eora Peoples Representative  
Professor Merlin Crossley, Acting Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)  
Professor Derrick Armstrong, Dean, Faculty of Education & Social Work |
| 9:00-9:30am  | Keynote Address          | Professor Tony Vinson  
‘The distribution of disadvantage in Australia and the role of education in remedying it’ |
| 9:30-10:15am | Keynote Address          | Professor Tony Vinson  
‘The distribution of disadvantage in Australia and the role of education in remedying it’ |
| 10:15-10:45am| Response                 | Professor Gordon Stanley  
Response to Keynote |
| 10:45-11:00am| Morning Tea              | Professor Phillip Jones  
‘Educational research and the challenge of world (dis)order’ |
| 11:00-11:45pm| Invited Paper 1          | Professor Phillip Jones  
‘Educational research and the challenge of world (dis)order’ |
| 11:45-12:30pm| Invited Paper 2          | Associate Professor Tony Welch  
‘Issues In South East Asian Higher Education: Finance, Devolution and Transparency in the Global Era’ |
| 12:30-1:30pm | LUNCH                    | Professor Peter Goodyear  
‘University students’ interpretations of educational tasks: implications for rethinking educational design’ |
| 1:30-2:15pm  | Invited Paper 3          | Professor Peter Goodyear  
‘University students’ interpretations of educational tasks: implications for rethinking educational design’ |
| 2:15-3:00pm  | Invited Paper 4          | Professor Geoffrey Sherington and Associate Professor Craig Campbell  
‘The Australian Middle Classes and the Public Comprehensive High School’ |
| 3:00-3:45pm  | Invited Paper 5          | Professor Peter Freebody  
‘Teacher-centred, student-centred, and knowledge-centred: Beyond generic educational research’ |
| 3:45-4:00pm  | Afternoon Tea            | Dr Lindsey Napier, Associate Professor Jude Irwin, Dr Lesley Laing and  
Ms Cherie Toivonen  
‘Developing collaboration between mental health and domestic violence services’ |
| 4:00-4:45pm  | Invited Paper 6          | Dr Lindsey Napier, Associate Professor Jude Irwin, Dr Lesley Laing and  
Ms Cherie Toivonen  
‘Developing collaboration between mental health and domestic violence services’ |
| 4:45-5:30pm  | Invited Paper 7          | Associate Professor Jenny O’Dea  
‘Preliminary findings from the National Youth Cultures of Eating Study - Gender, social class and ethnic differences in childhood obesity’ |
| 7:00pm       | Conference Dinner - the Refectory | Ms Gillian Calvert  
NSW Commissioner for Children and Young People |
Day 1 – Keynote Abstract

9:30 – 10:30am

Professor Tony Vinson

‘The distribution of disadvantage in Australia and the role of education in remedying it’

The social-geographical approach to the understanding of social issues has a long history. Like every method of research it has its advantages and limitations, especially when ‘neighbourhood’ is equated with census unit boundaries. For example, a study of confirmed child maltreatment in Western Sydney indicates the importance of micro-social environments in this field. A recent national study of the distribution of social disadvantage has applied 25 social indicators to census units of different sizes to identify localities of marked disadvantage and to gain an improved understanding of the inter-relationships between the indicators. The study has confirmed the web-like structure of disadvantage, its durability in highly disadvantaged localities and the remarkable disparities between such areas and other communities with regard to a range of problems including long-term unemployment, child maltreatment, sickness and imprisonment. The task of reversing such circumstances is formidable making intervention before disadvantage becomes entrenched the preferable strategy. A number of tangible measures are suggested and evidence is adduced indicating the importance of social cohesion in dampening the ill-effects of many otherwise troubling social conditions.

Tony Vinson’s professional career has alternated between academic appointments and government and community positions. He has held professorial appointments in Behavioural Science in Medicine at the University of Newcastle and Social Work at the University of NSW and has held visiting professorships in Sweden and Holland. In the early 1970s, he was Foundation Director of the Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research within the NSW Department of Attorney General and Justice. From 1979 to 1981 he headed the NSW Department of Corrective Services during a period of intense reform following a Royal Commission into the state’s prison system. With assistance from the Victorian Department of Communities and the NSW Premier’s Department Professor Vinson has completed studies of the geographic distribution of social disadvantage designed, among other things, to monitor the impact of community level interventions instigated by his research. In 2007 he published a national study of the distribution of disadvantage (Dropping off the Edge) which will be featured in today’s presentation. In 2001 he was invited to chair a year long Independent Inquiry into Public Education in NSW, a contribution that resulted in his receiving an inaugural NSW Government Award for Meritorious Services to Public Education.
Day 1 – Invited Papers – Presenters’ Abstracts

11:00 – 11:45am  Professor Phillip Jones

‘Educational research and the challenge of world (dis)order’

Phillip Jones has pioneered much Australian interest in the international dynamics of educational policy and practice. His books on the educational work of the United Nations, World Bank and UNESCO have attracted widespread interest around the world. Phillip Jones is a former Assistant Director of IDP Education Australia, and has served on a wide range on national and international bodies fostering international collaboration. He has held visiting research positions at ANU, Auckland, Bristol, Columbia, London and Pittsburgh universities. Phillip Jones' teaching interests include international and development education, global poverty and education, and globalisation and education. Phillip Jones served as Pro-Dean of the Faculty 2001-2004, and in 2005 became Director of the Research Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences (RIHSS).

11:45 – 12:30pm  Associate Professor Tony Welch

‘Issues In South East Asian Higher Education: Finance, Devolution and Transparency in the Global Era’

Systems of higher education in many parts of SE Asia are facing something of a dilemma. On the one hand, a young demographic profile, combined with rising aspirations for higher education, is leading to unprecedented demand. On the other, public sector education systems cannot meet these sharp increases in demand. Hence the private sector, both domestic and international, is growing in many parts of SE Asia, including communist Viet Nam. At the same time, public sector institutions, also facing the tensions of rising demand, and falling public support (at least in per student terms), are also resorting to privatisation.

These twin phenomena raise several concerns, including key issues of governance. While all of the five states treated in this article (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, and Viet Nam) share the goal of extending access to higher education, as part of their wider social and economic development goals, few if any have extensive systems of quality control, and the growth of both domestic and trans-national private higher education, is stretching their capacity still further. A further problem is that of quality, which is highly differentiated within all of the higher education systems surveyed.

Against this backdrop of a potent mix of issues (quantity, quality, access and equity, governance and finance), the paper examines the dilemmas and options faced by SE Asian higher education systems in the first decade of the 21st century.

1:30 – 2:15pm  Professor Peter Goodyear

‘University students' interpretations of educational tasks: implications for rethinking educational design’

This paper reports some outcomes of research into the ways in which university students interpret the requirements of educational tasks. The research has been taking place in a selection of courses that make use of ‘blended learning’ approaches: in which the course design involves an integration of face-to-face and online activities. The research has
adopted a phenomenographic methodology, focusing on students’ conceptions of learning, their intentions and their strategies. Data has been gathered from several hundred students, using a mixture of in-depth interviews, open-ended questionnaires and rating scale instruments. It is clear that, in each course, students vary considerably in the ways they interpret the tasks set by their teachers. The paper summarises the main dimensions of variation in students’ interpretations. It then moves on to consider some of the implications for educational design methodology. Classic models of educational design assume a strong alignment between the tasks that are set and the students’ activity. More recent constructivist models, for the most part, shy away from setting specific tasks. This can leave teachers under-equipped when facing the complexities of designing and managing a supportive learning environment. Our approach simultaneously acknowledges the need for students to exercise autonomy in their learning and for teachers to be provided with appropriate tools and methods for educational design.

2:15 – 3:00pm

Professor Geoffrey Sherington and Associate Professor Craig Campbell

‘The Australian Middle Class and the Public Comprehensive High School’

This paper will argue that throughout the twentieth century the Australian state served the Australia middle class through the provision of public secondary schools. A system of differentiated secondary education at the beginning of the twentieth century had created state academic high schools which supported a middle class meritocracy. By the mid-twentieth century the growing extension of the public comprehensive school was seen as catering to the interests of all social classes while being based on the needs of local communities. For a brief period of about 20 years this ideal continued to serve the interests of the middle class particularly as the curriculum of the Australian public comprehensive school was overwhelmingly academic in nature. Despite this, by the early twenty-first century, the middle class was increasingly abandoning both the local comprehensive school as well as public education. How this has occurred relates to social, economic and public policy change in Australia over the past half a century.

At the end of the Second World War, the Australian middle class was united by common economic interests but also divided by issues of religious faith. An ‘old middle class’ of small businessmen and independently employed professionals constituted what the prime minister Robert Menzies described as Australia’s ‘forgotten people’. A ‘new middle class’ composed of white collar employees had been created often out of the extension of the public sector and government agencies. What united each of these groups was an attachment to the values of liberalism and Protestantism and thereby support for public education. This was the basis of a ‘moral middle class’ who supported the post-war Liberal Party, believing in the extension of state provided services. But there was also a growing Catholic middle class, more associated with the Australian Labor Party, and determined to reverse the educational settlements of the nineteenth century which had removed state financial support for Catholic schools.

The idea of the comprehensive high school in Australia emerged from a number of international and national influences. From the 1930s there the general consensus within the educational bureaucracies and in parts of the political system that the comprehensive school was the ‘wave of the future’ following in the wake of the United States and moving in a progressive and democratic direction. There was also the growing pressure of demography and the ‘baby boom’ generation. As elsewhere, for example in Britain, a differentiated and selective system of high schools, could not cater for the pressure for extended education that was becoming more universal but was particularly noted amongst middle children remaining longer at school. Private education remained expensive and out of reach of many middle class families. Selective state schooling as well as the private sector could thus not meet the post-war demands for extended education. By the late 1960s the comprehensive school had been established throughout Australia (with the exception of Victoria and South Australia where technical high schools held on for another decade). The introduction of the comprehensive school seemed to mark the apogee of Australian public education – the culmination of the process which had begun in the nineteenth century when the colonial state had intervened to ensure that all received an education which would be the basis of Australian citizenship.

Just as national and international events helped to create the Australian comprehensive school so they participated its decline. The challenge of the state provided comprehensive high school helped to mobilise the Catholic middle class
who now urged that they could only establish similar schools if they received the ‘justice’ and ‘aid’ due to them. While public schools remained the responsibility of the individual Australian states the nation state in the guise of the Whitlam Labor Government intervened to provide a compromise of ensuring that all schools, whether public or ‘non-public’ would be funded on the basis of need. From the perspective of the early 1970s it still seemed that this would ensure a universal provision based on equity. In effect, the new national policy had created the principle of state support for religious schools so abandoning a principle that had been maintained for almost a century. And almost simultaneously the ‘oil shock’ of the mid 1970s led to the economic crisis which would cripple these hopes of social and cultural equity based on this new principle. Growing youth unemployment and the ensuring economic recession led to disenchantment with the comprehensive school ideal coupled with beginnings of a new anxiety about schooling and labour market entry. More generally, the whole move towards universal services and the growth of the post-war welfare state came under question. The new focus on ‘neo-liberalism’ as espoused by Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan in the 1980s would have its supporters in Australia. Such policies affected policy directions of Labor and non-Labor governments from the 1980s, but comprehensive enactment awaited the election of the Howard Government in 1996 with its policy of school choice and a funding system that favoured the private sector.

These new economic and political circumstances have had a profound impact on the nature of the Australian middle class and the fate of the public comprehensive school. The erosion of the public and semi-government sector has meant that the publicly employed middle class has declined. In contrast, the self-employed middle class, including contractors who would have been previously been in employment, and those employed in the private sector in general, is growing. Of most significance, is the changing values and division with the Australian middle class which is more fractured than ever before. There is an ‘old’ middle class with its roots in the 1950s principally attached to conservative values in education and comprised now of those of different religious faith including Catholic and Protestant. There is also a ‘new’ middle class, often the products of the comprehensive school revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, ‘cosmopolitan’ in outlook and concerned principally for the social adjustment and success of their own children rather than the collectivist concerns of the ‘moral middle class’ which previously supported the old Liberal Party. There is also an ‘entrepreneurial’ middle class who have emerged out of what our current Prime Minister sees as the ‘aspirationals’ in the outer suburbs of Australian cities. Finally, there is a ‘marginal’ middle class, many of whom are anxious to gain or preserve middle class status.

For almost all of these groups, the local comprehensive high school has little appeal unless it is embedded in a middle class community and suburb. The choice has come down principally to a selective academic high school or, if one can afford it, a ‘private school’. The Australian public comprehensive school is increasingly seen as the domain of the ‘other’ – a place where no middle class parents would wish to be seen to send their children.

3:00 – 3:45pm  
Professor Peter Freebody

‘Teacher-centred, student-centred, and knowledge-centred: Beyond generic educational research’

In this presentation, Professor Peter Freebody will make the case for a revitalisation of educational research that is conscious of discipline-specific features of teaching and learning. The ways in which psychology's influence on teacher education, teaching, and research came to privilege generic teaching and learning, in the first half of the 20th century, as key topics will be outlined. The effects of that on researchers' abilities to impact on teaching practice will be described, and current research projects informing discipline-specific forms of knowledge and pedagogy will be summarised.

Peter Freebody is a University Professorial Research Fellow based in the Faculty of Education and Social Work, joining the Faculty in 2006 from the University of Queensland. His research and teaching interests are literacy education, educational disadvantage, classroom interaction and quantitative and qualitative research methods. His recent books include ‘Schooling the child: the making of students in classrooms’ (Routledge-Falmer, London, with Austin and Dwyer), ‘Qualitative Research in Education: Interaction and Practice’ (Sage, London), ‘Australian Literacies: Informing national policy on literacy education’ (Language Australia, Canberra, with Lo Bianco) and
‘Difference, silence, and textual practice: Studies in critical literacy’ (Hampton Press, New York, with Muspratt and Luke). His work has appeared in journals such as ‘Reading Research Quarterly’, ‘Harvard Educational Review’, and the ‘American Educational Research Journal’. He has also contributed numerous invited entries in international handbooks and encyclopedias on literacy, critical literacy, and research methodology. He has served on numerous Australian state and national advisory groups in the area of literacy education, and is currently the Academic Advisor to the Queensland Minister of Education and the Arts and senior consultant on the national on-line curriculum program conducted by the Curriculum Corporation.

4:00 – 4:45pm

Dr Lindsey Napier,
Associate Professor Jude Irwin,
Dr Lesley Laing, and
Ms Cherie Toivonen

‘Developing collaboration between mental health and domestic violence services’

Domestic violence is a serious social problem in Australia, affecting twenty three per cent of women who have been involved in a heterosexual intimate relationship (ABS 1996). The connection between domestic violence and mental health has been firmly established with numerous studies showing that women who experience domestic violence are more likely to have symptoms of depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress. They are also more likely to attempt suicide and to misuse alcohol or other drugs. This indicates the importance of domestic violence and mental health service sectors working together to ensure that women receive appropriate support and intervention. However anecdotal evidence from both practitioners and women indicates that collaboration often does not happen, increasing the likelihood of women staying in abusive situations which may compromise their safety. This paper will describe and present some of the results from a three year research study which aimed to enhance collaboration between mental health services and women’s domestic violence services in five areas in New South Wales. The project, funded by an Australian Research Council Linkage Grant, is being undertaken by researchers at the University of Sydney with partner organisations, Fairfield/Liverpool Mental Health Service, Joan Harrison Support Services for Women, Education Centre Against Violence, NSW Health and the Transcultural Mental Health Centre. Undertaken in five locations in NSW it examines barriers and opportunities for collaboration from multiple angles and perspectives. A unique feature of the research is an action evaluation aspect in which locally based initiatives aimed at enhancing coordinated responses between domestic violence and mental health services are developed, trialled and evaluated.

4:45 – 5:30pm

Associate Professor Jenny O’Dea

‘Preliminary findings from the National Youth Cultures of Eating Study - Gender, social class and ethnic differences in childhood obesity’

Dr Jenny O’Dea is a nutritionist and health educator with a special interest in child and adolescent health and nutrition. She is involved in body image research and the prevention of eating disorders and child obesity.
Venue: Holme Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9am - 9:30am</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:30am</td>
<td>Keynote 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 - 12:30pm</td>
<td>Parallel Session 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 - 3:15pm</td>
<td>Parallel Session 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Policy - Confronting Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 - 5:15pm</td>
<td>Parallel Session 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Policy - Confronting Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15-5:30</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9:30 – 10:30am

Professor Gabrielle Meagher

‘What do Australians think about increasing inequality?’

Australia's national income has more than doubled since 1987. However, strong economic growth has been accompanied by increasing inequality in the distribution of income--and by debates about the meaning of poverty and about the roles of work and 'welfare' in redressing it. Drawing on data collected in major national and international surveys of social and political attitudes over twenty years, this address will explore how Australians responded to the widening income gap, examining how attitudes to inequality and redistribution have changed during the last two decades.

Gabrielle Meagher is an expert in the disciplines of social policy and research methods and researches in areas of ethics, economics and sociology of paid care work, public attitudes to social policy and unions and Australian social policy development. Gabrielle is the editor of Australian Review of Public Affairs and serves on the editorial boards of Feminist Economics and Australian Journal of Political Science. Gabrielle joined the Faculty of Education and Social Work from the Faculty of Economics and Business in 2007.
## Social Policy Strand – Program

**Venue:** Refectory, Holme Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Title/Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9am - 9:30am</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:30am</td>
<td><strong>Keynote 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professor Gabrielle Meagher</strong></td>
<td><em>What do Australians think about increasing inequality?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45am</td>
<td><strong>Morning Tea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.15am</td>
<td>Session 1 Violence Abuse &amp; Oppression</td>
<td><strong>Dr Fran Waugh</strong></td>
<td><em>Children and Violence</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-11.45am</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr Zita Annette Weber</strong></td>
<td><em>Mental Health and Violence</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45-12.15pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ms Denise Lynch</strong></td>
<td><em>Violence and the State: Refugee Children and their Families</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15-12.25pm</td>
<td><strong>Chair Dr Phillips</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30-2.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Session 2 Practice research to confront disadvantage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dr Margot Rawsthorne</strong></td>
<td><em>Community sector/academic partnerships: making them work</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-2.30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ms Suzanne Egan</strong></td>
<td><em>Research for practice in small human service organizations: doing and disseminating small scale research</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30-3.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ms Annette Michaux</strong></td>
<td><em>From research to the field, from the field to research: Knowledge transfer and the Benevolent Society</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.10pm</td>
<td><strong>Chair Dr Sue Goodwin</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Afternoon Tea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30-3.45pm</td>
<td><strong>Session 3 Schools as Sites of Social Intervention</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dr Rob Simons</strong></td>
<td><em>Schools as communities -- driving innovation for improved dual generational learning and social outcomes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45-4.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ms Dianne Nixon</strong></td>
<td><em>Schools and social welfare organizations: Not such strange bedfellows?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00-4.15pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assoc Professor Debra Hayes</strong></td>
<td><em>Putting learning first: the key to social inclusion in high poverty, high difference schools</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-4.30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assoc Professor David Evans</strong></td>
<td><em>A tale of two interventions: the opportunities and challenges of working in disadvantaged schools</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30-5.10pm</td>
<td><strong>Chair Professor Gabrielle Meagher</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15-5:30</td>
<td><strong>Plenary - Refectory</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professor Barbara Fawcett</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10:45 – 11:15am Dr Fran Waugh

‘Children and Violence’

Violence against children is prevalent and increasing in all countries. It has a devastating impact upon children’s health, welfare, emotional wellbeing, life chances and safety. This knowledge is not new to democratic capitalist countries as evidenced over the past forty years by a plethora of agencies, policy and practice strategies, reports, research, training and community education, in attempting to understand and be responsive to this social problem. However, this is a highly sensitive and political issue, where non-accidental deaths of children are to be prevented at all costs. Parents’ and governments’ responsibilities for children’s rights to provision, protection and participation outlined in the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child (1989), are compromised by limited resources. In addition, incorporating lessons learnt from recent research and practice about the complex, multidimensional nature of violence, abuse and oppression against children and how this can be addressed remains a challenge.

This presentation, based on material prepared for a forthcoming book chapter in Addressing Violence, Abuse and Oppression: Debates and Challenges, focuses on violence against children within the family in democratic capitalist countries, in particular Australia, United Kingdom and the United States of America. The family continues to be a main site for abuse and neglect of children. Key concepts related to risk, protection and resilience often feature in practice, policy and research discussions about violence against children in the family home, the subject of this presentation.

Debates related to risk, protection and resilience, focus on definitional issues, rights and responsibilities. Challenges include developing policies and practices which are evidence-based and are cognizant of the complexities of children’s and parents’ lives; poverty and social disadvantage; gender issues; the need for meaningful participation of children and parents and the development of effectual partnerships between key players, including children, parents, practitioners, policy makers, researchers, educators and politicians. These debates and challenges are framed in terms of the underlying discourses, namely, human rights, public health, risk, ecological and feminists’ perspectives.

11:15 – 11:45am Dr Zita Annette Weber

‘Mental Health and Violence’

Zita Weber was a social work practitioner for twelve years in various health and welfare settings before entering academia. From 1986 to 1989 Zita was consultant to and social work practitioner in the then Community Medicine General Practice Unit of The University of Sydney. Zita co-ordinated and taught in the Counselling unit of study of the Reproductive Health Sciences course within the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Sydney from 1996 to 2000. In 2003, Zita was granted a Domus Hungarica Scientiarum et Artium scholarship by the Hungarian government to conduct research into community-based mental health services in Budapest.
Ms Denise Lynch

‘Violence and the State: Refugee Children and their Families’

Denise Lynch joined the School of Social Work and Policy Studies in 1995 following some part time work for the University. Denise worked for thirteen years with the NSW Department of Community Services in service provision, middle management and senior management in the area of child protection and more broadly child welfare. Before working at the university, she conducted consultancy work with a number of welfare and welfare related areas. At the university, Denise has developed curriculum around interpersonal violence and social justice and has taught in the areas of family violence, social justice and skills workshop at undergraduate level. She has coordinated Field Education in Years 3 and 4 and has taught and supervised students on placement. She has co-developed and taught postgraduate courses in supervision.

Dr Margot Rawsthorne

‘Community sector/academic partnerships: making them work’

This paper explores how academics and the community sector can work more collaboratively. The paper will draw on research undertaken in relation to the development of the Working Together for NSW compact; the impact of contracting on government/non-government relations; and meeting complex needs of young people through collaboration. Lessons from this research and international scholarship will be used to explore community sector and academic collaboration. The author will also reflect on her own short history of academic/community sector collaborations.

Most practitioners and writers are aware of and acknowledge that working collaboratively is ‘a notoriously difficult enterprise, and many attempts at it fail’ (Riccio 2001, p. 340). Bardach (1998) notes that it is not only difficult but it can also be time-consuming and divisive. Given its difficulty we need to be asking not only ‘is it worth it’ but also how do we make academic and community sector collaboration work?

Like so many other issues in applied social sciences, there is considerable confusion and no agreed definition of ‘partnerships’ (Clement et al, 1996). Similar to concepts such as ‘community development’, the meaning and practice of partnership is contested. Whilst this lack of clarity creates some problems the argument in this paper is that this contest arises from normative claims – what partnerships should be or look like.

The paper draws on a typology to provide greater clarity about the types of research being undertaken in universities:

- Current proactive practice of academically driven research initiatives with a sole academic(s) inquirer
- A more reactive practice for designing research in response to the needs and input of community agencies. Community members have limited involvement but academics still define the methods of inquiry
- The development of interactive research practices that involve both academic researchers and the community as equal partners in all phases of the research project.

It identifies a range of barriers to building more effective research partnerships between the community sector and academia. It argues for the application of community development skills in building more productive, equal, relationships between the community sector and academia. Working collaboratively is in essence about relationships built on trust, respect and sharing power; it is about building the capacities of individuals and organisations as well as bridging social divides. Working collaboratively does not just ‘happen’ but requires conscious commitment, time and resources.
2:00 – 2:30pm  Ms Suzanne Egan

‘Research for practice in small human service organizations: doing and disseminating small scale research’.

2:30 – 3:00pm  Ms Annette Michaux

‘From research to the field, from the field to research: Knowledge transfer and the Benevolent Society’.

3:30 – 3:45pm  Dr Rob Simons

‘Schools as communities -- driving innovation for improved dual generational learning and social outcomes’

3:45 – 4:00pm  Ms Dianne Nixon

‘Schools and social welfare organizations: Not such strange bedfellows?’

UnitingCare Burnside is a member of the children, young people and families services group of UnitingCare NSW/ACT and part of the Uniting Church in Australia. Our concern for is for social justice and the needs of children, young people and families who are disadvantaged.

All of Burnside's services are inclusive and based on achieving just, safe nurturing and healthy life experiences for children, families and young people. We aim to protect children from abuse and neglect by breaking cycles of disadvantage and building on strengths. We achieve this by providing services across the continuum of care that support healthy family relationships, encourage positive change through education and learning and build strong connected communities. Our out-of-home care services provide children and young people who cannot live with their families, with safe and stable environments where they can flourish.

Our work is informed by research and evaluation, and we actively advocate with our service users with the aim of making positive social change and influencing government policy.

Since our beginnings in 1911, where children were housed in group homes on land in North Parramatta, we have grown to become one of the largest child and family agencies in New South Wales providing services in Western Sydney, South West Sydney, the mid North Coast, Central Coast, South Coast and Orana Far West.

Burnside has had a long commitment to providing education as a major strategy to support positive life outcomes. The Burnside School was built in 1922 and here all ‘Burnie’ kids were taught skills that supported them into a normal life outside care, a life with options and potential. Burnside was one of the first children’s homes in NSW to
provide this focus. As Burnside has grown and diversified, it has retained this early commitment to education. The Education Program in Western Sydney (funded by DoCS) has been providing educational support to children and young people in our care for over a quarter of a century. This Program, of which I am the Manager, has the major carriage of leading and resourcing the whole-of-agency focus towards achieving the priority area of Education and Learning in Burnside’s Strategic Plan 2006-2009.

The vast majority of our service users live in poverty and/or in areas of high social disadvantage. This is where Burnside has chosen to focus its services, and it is with this group of service users we have chosen to make a difference. What does the research tell us will support positive educational outcomes?

Guo & Harris (2000) cite the findings from a range of studies to support their statement that ‘childhood poverty is correlated with dropping out of school, low academic achievement, teenage pregnancy and childbearing, poor mental and physical health, delinquent behaviour, and unemployment in adolescence and early adulthood……The longer children live in poverty, the lower their educational achievement and the worse their social and emotional functioning’.

So how does poverty affect educational outcomes? Is it simply a matter of giving people more money or is there more to it than that? Again, Guo and Harris cite evidence that poverty, income loss and unemployment can reduce parents’ responsiveness, warmth, and supervision, while increasing inconsistent disciplinary practices and use of harsh discipline. Guo & Harris’s analysis of the data from the large US National Longitudinal Survey of Youth found that poverty itself has no direct effects in children’s intellectual development, but the mediating effect of poverty on the ability of parents to provide cognitive stimulation is very important. The researchers found that where parents provided stimulating activities and environments, where they did not move to harsh parenting styles but remained open with their children, the effects of poverty on learning was negligible. The provision of cognitive stimulation in the home was not dependent on house size or physical setting: it’s not what you have, but what you do with it.

Burnside therefore sees its responsibility in working with families experiencing poverty and disadvantage to ensure they can identify education as an important part of their lives, and provide the best parenting and home environment for their child’s needs. We do this in many and varied ways across the agency and across the life cycle.

Acknowledging the importance of the early years for educational outcomes, Burnside has an Early Childhood Project Officer who provides input and quality assurance guidance to the many supported playgroups we run across the State. For varied reasons many of our service users are unable or unwilling to use mainstream early childhood services. We acknowledge this and are working towards the best ways we can support a positive transition to school for these children and their parents. Our supported playgroups are focused on early language and literacy, as well as social skills, and we work with local bookshops or use the Smith Family Let’s Read programs to ensure all our families have access to books.

In the Ermington Family Learning Centre, where we focus on the middle school years, we provide 1:1 tutoring for children with high academic needs. The model is not just for the children but includes the parents in the tutoring session, modelling to them ways of supporting their children in tackling learning and homework issues.

From this beginning the teachers have worked with our internal trainers to develop two parent training packages:

- Helping Your Child with Early Learning, and
- Helping Your Child with Primary School (One Step Ahead)

which can be implemented across the agency and within schools with parent groups.

In the practical arena, children and families need supports to attend school and get the best out of their learning. We provide various groups for middle school age children such as Breakfast Groups, social skills groups, and for their parents we offer a connection with our partners in The Smith Family to provide Learning for Life scholarship money for school expenses.
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While the adolescents we deal with are often very disengaged with their learning, all the programs that work with them understand the importance of keeping the love of learning alive through difficult times. For those young people in our care we can offer tutoring if they are still engaged with learning, and support them in their interests if they are not, such as art or music. We provide an internal scholarship for older young people and those in After Care, which provides financial support for those wanting to progress to TAFE or University. This fund has the added benefit of being available when young people come back after a difficult adolescence and start seeing a reason for getting their School Certificate or HSC. We must do something right in keeping things alive, as an increasing number are coming back. We don’t give up, and sometimes waiting is important.

In the Central Coast we work with several other agencies to provide a program called ‘Babes with Babes’, which is similar to the D.A.L.E. program in Newcastle. Young mothers are provided with childcare, computer access and TAFE workers to access support for their TAFE studies, often their HSC. This is an immensely popular program with a waiting list of young mothers who are keen to do their best for themselves and their young children.

Locally based services provide a wide variety of training programs for parents, from our own internally-developed parenting programs to access to TAFE courses. A group of women at our NEWPIN program in Mt Druitt, for example, completed a TAFE Certificate on public speaking and then several of them addressed a symposium for politicians at Parliament House, advocating for more supports for women experiencing family violence. This is one way we can include our service users in our advocacy work and also encourage them to pursue education and learning.

In all this work we seek to work with local schools, with varying success. We are often working with the children, young people and families who are problematic for school systems, the young people who have been expelled from Behaviour Schools, the children who cannot read in High School because of inconsistent school attendance and family chaos. We often find ourselves advocating for these children and young people, advocating for their right to learn, and this meets with varying success. However, we firmly believe that the research evidence tells us that this is the way to break poverty cycles, to provide a lifeline for people living in disadvantage and poverty, and we will therefore keep getting into bed with schools, from the local level to advocacy with the Ministers, until it is seen that education is so important that systems must be flexible enough to catch those children, young people and families that fall through gaps. To catch these children welfare and schools must work together creatively and with an understanding and respect for each other’s work.

Reference


4:00 – 4:15pm  

**Associate Professor Debra Hayes**

*‘Putting learning first: the key to social inclusion in high poverty, high difference schools’*

*Debra Hayes is a co-author of Teachers and Schooling Making a Difference: Productive Pedagogies, Assessment and Performance (Hayes et al., 2006) and Leading Learning: Making Hope Practical in Schools (Lingard et al., 2003). She has extensive experience as a researcher on large scale longitudinal studies, including being a core member on the Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study 1998-2000, and Chief Investigator on two ARC Linkage projects conducted in collaboration with NSW DET (Changing Schools Changing Times, 2005-7 and the effects project 2002-4). Her research interests primarily relate to achieving more equitable outcomes from schooling for young people who benefit the least from education by working with school-based educators to understand and improve how schools function as sites of learning for teachers and students. Debra is a former secondary school science teacher.*
4:15 – 4:30pm  
Associate Professor David Evans

‘A tale of two interventions: the opportunities and challenges of working in disadvantaged schools’

David Evans is the Coordinator of MEd (Special Education) and Director of Centre for Early Interventions, University of Sydney. He is an expert in the disciplines of:

- special education
- curriculum - primary

David Evans researches:

- Effective literacy and numeracy programs for students with difficulties learning
- Early intervention for young children with autism
- Curriculum design and adjustments for students with disabilities and additional learning needs

David Evans is also interested in:

- Students with chronic illness
- Inclusive education practices
- Students with brain injuries
- Learning support for students with special education needs
## Policy and Professional Practice Strand – Program

**Venue:** MacCallum Room, Holme Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9am - 9:30am</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:30am</td>
<td><strong>Keynote</strong> 2  Professor Gabrielle Meagher ‘What do Australians think about increasing inequality?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.10 am</td>
<td><strong>Policy and Professional Practice Session 1</strong> Dr Lesley Scanlon ‘”The theories make you pay more attention to how things happen”: the impact of theory on the practice of pre-service teachers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10-11.35am</td>
<td>Ms Angela Fenton ‘Caution Children Crossing Ahead: Child Protection Education with Pre-service teachers using a Strengths-Based Framework. Findings to date’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.35-12.00pm</td>
<td>Dr Janette Bobis ‘Learning to Teach: Teaching to Learn’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.25pm</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30-1.55pm</td>
<td><strong>Policy and Professional Practice Session 2</strong> Dr Chris Kilham ‘From lived experience to on-line policy formulation for autism practitioners’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55-2.20pm</td>
<td>Ms Kay Munyard, Mr Jason Skues, Ms Lyndall Sullivan and Dr Everarda Cunningham, ‘Engaging and Empowering Students with Learning Disabilities’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20-2.45pm</td>
<td>Professor Susan Groundwater-Smith ‘Practitioner Researchers: Today’s Children of Mother Courage’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45-3.10pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30-3.55pm</td>
<td><strong>Policy and Professional Practice Session 3</strong> Dr Di Bloomfield &amp; Dr Tony Loughland ‘Continuities between professional learning agendas of in-service and pre-service teachers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.55-4.20pm</td>
<td>Dr Nattavud Pimpa ‘Transformation in Education Policy and Teacher Performance Appraisal in Thailand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20-4.45pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45-5.10pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15-5:30</td>
<td>Plenary - Refectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Barbara Fawcett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10:45 – 11:10am

“‘The theories make you pay more attention to how things happen’: the impact of theory on the practice of pre-service teachers”

The paper is positioned within the contemporary debates on pre-service teacher education. Teaching is a community of practice which has undergone significant change in the past decade. One of these changes is the way pre-service teacher preparation has addressed the theory/practice dichotomy that has long bedeviled the professional preparation of teachers and other professionals. The paper examines, from a student perspective, the way in which structured using specific, embedded theories in a pre-service course enables students to bridge the theory/practice divide. The paper examines concepts of reflection and the way in which structured reflection is imbedded in student learning experiences in an attempt to provide authentic learning experiences which bridge the theory/practice gap in professional preparation. The paper explores examples of how students use theory to interrogate their practice as mentors and teachers and the insights into practice that this reflection engenders. Students are encouraged to investigate contemporary social change using a phenomenology framework and to engage with contemporary theories of post-modernity, ‘individualisation’ and risk. Students position their professional reflections within this wider context of societal change. The paper makes extensive use of students’ voices, captured in semi-structured interviews, as they engage in reflective practice. The paper raises questions about the efficacy of reflection in professional preparation. It also addresses the issue of the extent to which reflection informed by theory is a significant adjunct to professional preparation. The research findings have implications for the preparation of professionals within academic institutions.

11:10 – 11:35am

‘Caution Children Crossing Ahead: Child Protection Education with Pre-service teachers using a Strengths-Based Framework. Findings to date’

Child abuse is recognised as the single most important factor in the success or failure of children to ‘thrive’ (McIntosh and Phillips, 2002) and initial teacher training programs could therefore be expected to prepare pre-service teachers for this area of the curriculum. McBlain (2006) however suggests that this need has not been met. Encouragingly, Hodges and Clifton (2006) claim that using a Strengths-Based framework in the education sector has potential that is just beginning to be realised.

Although widely used in social work and therapeutic situations, the strengths based framework is relatively unknown within the education sector. Review of the literature, however, would suggest there are interdisciplinary possibilities with the framework and that education students particularly may find it a useful tool in teaching child protection education. In alignment with the conference focus, this paper will examine the interplay of research findings with the significant practical and moral demands of child protection education for pre-service teachers. Intrinsic to the research are the possible collaborations and partnerships between social work and education presented by the application of a strengths based framework.

This project has arisen from both author connection with the subject and literature in the field that asks how knowledgeable and confident are pre-service teachers in working with children ‘at risk’, experiencing or recovering from child abuse (Walsh, 2002); whether there is a need to enhance current pre-service teacher education in this area
or develop a new model (McCallum, 2002) and; more specifically, what a strengths-based framework may have to offer (Scott & O’Neil, 2003).

This paper will examine issues raised relating to child protection education for pre-service teachers and outline findings to date, from the doctoral research of the author, into the use and potential of a ‘Strengths-Based Framework’ (McCashen, 2004) in this area. The research will collect data in three phases from a cohort of pre-service teachers who have studied over a semester an Early Childhood Education subject, integrated with a strengths based child protection module. Participants will be asked for feedback immediately after the subject; after a school practicum and approximately twelve months after the initial subject implementation. The paper will outline the findings from phase one and the additional implications for the author in endeavouring to also research using a strengths based approach.

Angela Fenton is completing a PhD with James Cook University where she also currently lectures with the School of Education in the area of Early Childhood Education. She has previously worked substantially in England and Australia as a classroom teacher, Director of Early Childhood services and Manager with the Queensland Indigenous Children’s Services Unit. Significant projects have included the development of the publication ‘Our Place...Our Dreaming’ an Indigenous child care resource book and the ‘Building Blocks, a child protection resource kit’ (QCOSS, 2003). Most recently her work has been focused in adult education as a facilitator, particularly in the area of child protection. Her work has frequently crossed education and social work boundaries and has led to a specific interest in the potential of strengths based frameworks for education.

11:35 – 12:00pm

Dr Janette Bobis

‘Learning to Teach: Teaching to Learn’

This paper examines a practice-based component of a primary teacher education program to gain insight into the type of experiences which assist beginning teachers translate theory-based knowledge to their teaching practices. Eighty-six prospective teachers participated in the study. Data was collected from (a) weekly lesson plans; (b) researcher field notes; (c) reflective journals; and (d) interviews with four participants. A theoretical rationale for various aspects of the practice-based component is provided and the implications for teacher education programs are discussed.

1:30 – 1:55pm

Dr Chris Kilham

‘From lived experience to on-line policy formulation for autism practitioners’

This research examines the development of a group of ten teachers/counsellors faced with the task of translating their individual practical experiences into a common policy for school aged students on the autism spectrum. The policy formulation was thus a bottom-up approach and was designed to guide the introduction of particular autism interventions by teacher/counsellors, parents, and administrators.

The teachers/counsellors had all participated in an intensive hand-on workshop in which they explored structured, practical methods to assist diagnosed students. Following the workshop the participants implemented the strategies in their workplace, namely the classroom, the home or a leisure facility. This experience of implementing a new approach was used to inform the next process: constructing a policy document about how to introduce good practice changes in the current environment.

To facilitate communication amongst the group members, a blog site or shared online journal was established so that members could chronicle their weekly progress. The actual policy document was written using a complementary
wiki format. A wiki is a group editing tool, which enabled an analysis of the process of policy formulation through an examination of the document revisions.

The final policy document recognised the need for stability across multiple settings and people, including the family. Professional experience and on-site visits by as many people as practicable were recommended. This would not only further a consistent approach which would benefit the child. The practitioners also felt that a collective understanding would help to break down their perceived isolation.

Further analysis of the finished document and its preceding revisions, comments, and blogs suggest that the authors tended to emphasise their own work setting but to downplay the importance of their lived experience, and they did not find the online collaboration an easy task.

Possible strategies to promote a shared understanding among the broader community are suggested. For those considering online “bottom-up” policy formulation, a number of procedures are recommended. These include the demarcation of roles, topics and subtasks; interweaving online and face to face communication, and mining the personal experience data through explicit instructions to analyse and evaluate its content.

Chris Kilham is a senior lecturer and head of the Educational Support and Inclusion Program at the University of Canberra. In addition to being an experienced researcher Chris has worked as an educator and has extensive experience as a “professional in the field” across a variety of settings in Australia and overseas, including a diagnostic clinic, hospital ward, health and disability services, schools and tertiary institutions. Chris’ research interests include autism spectrum disorder, communication, early intervention and the inclusion of people with disabilities.

1:55 – 2:20pm

Ms Kay Munyard, Mr Jason Skues,
Ms Lyndall Sullivan and Dr Everarda Cunningham

‘Engaging and Empowering Students with Learning Disabilities’

Numerous debates surround reasons for lack of school performance. One commonly-held belief by some educators is that seemingly intelligent students who underachieve in key academic areas such as reading, writing, spelling and mathematics lack motivation or are lazy. However, many of these students are likely to have unrecognized learning disabilities. The phenomenon of learning disabilities, a neurological and therefore permanent processing problem, is estimated to occur in approximately 10 percent of the population and is widely misunderstood by many Australian teachers and the Australian community at large. In fact, it is our contention that lack of knowledge about learning disabilities within the teaching profession and amongst the educational policy makers is the critical missing piece of the jig-saw puzzle in attempts to improve learning outcomes and retention rates across school communities. While understanding and assessment of learning disabilities in students is lacking in our school system, negative outcomes including early school drop out and higher incidence of juvenile delinquency, unemployment, depression and anxiety continue to grow.

This study examines feedback from over 200 primary and secondary teachers in response to a professional development program that was designed to build teacher capacity for understanding and responding to students with learning disabilities. The 12-15 hour program, Engaging and Empowering Students with Learning Disabilities, provides mainstream classroom teachers with knowledge of the phenomenon of learning disabilities and also screening tools for detecting the presence of possible language processing problems in students. The program stresses the importance of inclusive classrooms where teachers build strong relationships with students who in turn experience a sense of belonging and control over their learning. Evidence-based pedagogical strategies and use of
assistive technologies as means of supporting the different expressions of learning disabilities are demonstrated and practised such that the educational opportunities for all students are maximized.

The program is consistent with the policy framework of the Victorian Department of Education’s Blueprint for Government Schools which specifically states that it is incumbent on schools to provide optimum learning opportunities for all students, including those who are not able to learn in the traditional way. Teacher feedback about the program indicates that such policies must be accompanied by capacity-building professional development that addresses significant student learning issues faced by those with learning disabilities. By developing such teacher pedagogy, teachers are actually empowered to improve the learning outcomes of all students.

Kay Munyard is an English and literacy teacher with twenty years’ experience in secondary and primary schools. Her main areas of interest are language acquisition and the reasons some students encounter problems with this. Her overall aim is to complement the academic research with pragmatic suggestions and strategies to help classroom teachers maximize learning outcomes for students with learning disabilities. Kay has previously worked in schools with Dr Cunningham and is part of the Learning Disabilities Project Team at Swinburne. She is a co-author of the professional development program for teachers: Engaging and Empowering Students with Learning Disabilities/Dyslexia.

Jason Skues is conducting doctoral research with Swinburne University of Technology’s Learning Disabilities Project Team, with a particular emphasis on assessments and classroom accommodations for those with learning disabilities. He has previously completed research in schools on mobile phone use and bullying behaviours. Jason has published in a national journal and is a co-author of the professional development program for teachers: Engaging and Empowering Students with Learning Disabilities/Dyslexia. In the United States of America recently he completed Susan Barton’s course on “Diagnosing Dyslexia”.

Lyndall Sullivan has a background in education policy and research and also clinical psychology. She is interested in how research in education and psychology can inform school practice to promote positive experiences of learning and social development for all students. She has contributed to many resources to support schools’ capacity to deal productively with such interlinked areas as student behaviour and learning, bullying, social competence and partnerships with communities and families. Lyndall is part of Swinburne University’s Learning Disabilities Project Team and is a co-author of the professional development program for teachers: Engaging and Empowering Students with Learning Disabilities/Dyslexia.

Dr Everarda Cunningham is the Associate Dean of Research in the Faculty of Higher Education at Swinburne University, Lilydale, Victoria. She is an experienced teacher and an internationally published researcher in Educational Psychology. Her specific research interest is in maximizing the potential of students at risk in the school system through whole school approaches. Together with Cathy Brandon, she is co-author of the Bright Ideas program that builds resiliency skills in young people and has been implemented in Australian schools for over 30,000 students. Dr Cunningham is a significant author of the program: Engaging and Empowering Students with Learning Disabilities/Dyslexia.

2:20 – 2:45pm Professor Susan Groundwater-Smith

‘Practitioner Researchers: Today's Children of Mother Courage’

Bertolt Brecht sought the answer to Lenin’s question “Wie und was soll man lernen?” (How and what should we learn?) Academic researchers also need to find some answers to this question in relation to practitioner research - how and what can we learn from those who investigate their own practice in the field. Is it, and can it be, truly transformational? Practitioner research requires courage, courage to confront social problems rather than escape them. This is particularly challenging for today's teachers who work within the established order of the various education systems who employ them. It requires rational reflection and critical insight in contexts that are often muddled by short term pragmatic policies. Furthermore, we need to ask ourselves can practitioner research be truly
reflexive, taking account of the social and historical circumstances that spawned those policies? This presentation will explore recent initiatives in practitioner research in education in England, Europe and Australia and seek to identify what is to be learned that can support the academy in more deeply informing its own knowledge base with respect to practice.

3:30 – 3:55pm

Dr Di Bloomfield and Dr Tony Loughland

‘Continuities between professional learning agendas of in-service and pre-service teachers’

The field of Professional Experience presents opportunities as well as challenges in terms of the necessary collaborative work of universities and schools supporting pre-service teachers’ professional learning within school sites. Tensions traditionally arising from such work include those associated with differences in priorities and practices between universities and schools, time and resource pressures, discontinuities between the roles of school and university-based educators as well as difficulty for the university in ensuring quality of learning for student teachers within Professional Experience placements. Additionally, there are challenges in incorporating appropriate systems of acknowledgment and reward in particular for supervising and mentor teachers within these programs. In a climate of increasing pressure and competition for sufficient numbers of quality Professional Experience placements as well as accommodating additional practicum days within programs, there are indications that schools and teachers are becoming more reluctant to service the growing Professional Experience needs of universities within existing models of exchange. Instead of continuing to rely on the altruism of the profession and the limited attractiveness of low levels of supervisory payments to teachers, universities need to consider ways in which they can work with schools so that more productive continuities can be established between the teachers’ own professional learning needs and their involvement within the University’s Professional Experience programs.

The increasingly insistent accreditation agendas of professional bodies such as the NSW Institute of Teachers, offers new opportunities to concurrently address learning needs of in-service and pre-service teachers. The Professional Standards Framework for the Graduate Teacher as well as that for later stages of professional development provides a common language and rubric through which the teacher at various stages of professional development is described and assessed. The increasing requirement for teachers both pre-service and in-service to work within this more explicit accreditation climate indicates the need to develop common pedagogical approaches appropriate to the professional work associated with all stages of this Framework. Such pedagogies need to support the work of professional documentation within portfolio structures, the reflective annotation of artefacts of practice, appropriate mentoring practices as well as ways of working critically within the insistence of such institutionalised accreditation agendas. It is this work which provides an explicit link across pre-service and in-service professional development and which offers opportunities for the University to work collaboratively with teachers in new relationships.

This paper seeks to develop our thinking around these new orientations and possibilities as well as outlining collaborative projects that link schools with the University in ways that seek to productively attend to the professional learning of our student teachers at the same time as more effectively meeting the professional development needs of teachers.

3:55 – 4:20pm

Dr Nattavud Pimpa

‘Transformation in Education Policy and Teacher Performance Appraisal in Thailand’

Education policy on teacher performance appraisal has been widely criticised in schools and the Ministries of Education all over the world. It is one of the most complex activities in education human resource management. The criticism is not so much the concepts of appraisal or evaluation that is at issue, but rather the ways in which they
have been implemented. Although some schemes report positive outcomes, negative aspects from stakeholders are mentioned frequently. Incompetent teachers are reported to remain unidentified and/or receive consistently inflated evaluations of their teaching competence. Some schemes are described as ritualistic and largely a waste of time (McLaughlin, 1990) while others are judged to have "little influence on decisions about personnel, staff development, or the structure of teaching" (Darling-Hammond, 1990).

Similar to most countries in the world, Thailand has attempted to improve various aspects of its education policy, including performance appraisal system. In 2004, the Ministry of Education issued The Government Teacher and Educational Personnel Bill 2004. This bill aims to reform teacher performance appraisal system by strengthening the role of community, teachers and schools. The implementation of this bill, however, has been criticised by various stakeholders for perceived inadequacies in determining the quality of teachers.

This research focuses on the interplay between education policy from the Ministry of Education, the current national performance appraisal system, and education decentralization. It highlights major problems of the practicality of the current performance appraisal system by delineating the weaknesses and pitfalls of the system. A focus group interview was carried out with each of two groups of key participants. The first group consisted of ten primary and secondary teachers, and the second group of ten stakeholders involved in the steps of the performance appraisal process. The findings indicated problems to three major types; problems from the mismanagement of the system, problems arising from the local and national evaluators, and problems arising from the teachers. These problems are the major constraints in accelerating education decentralization and development. The improvement of teacher performance appraisal is an urgent issue for the Thai Ministry of Education, if they aspire to see an optimal result of the national education management.

Nattavud Pimpa is a lecturer in the School of Education, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT). He worked as a researcher and policy analyst at the Ministry of Education (Thailand) from 2003-2006. His research interests include marketing international education, international education policy, leadership and management in international education, and performance appraisal.
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Development and Learning in Children and Young People Strand – Abstracts

10:45 – 11:10am  
Associate Professor David Evans and  
Dr Iva Strnadova

‘Examining the Range of Coping Strategies Mothers Use in Caring for a Child with an Intellectual Disability’

David Evans is the Coordinator of MEd (Special Education) and Director of Centre for Early Interventions, University of Sydney. He is an expert in the disciplines of:

- special education
- curriculum - primary

David Evans researches:

- Effective literacy and numeracy programs for students with difficulties learning
- Early intervention for young children with autism
- Curriculum design and adjustments for students with disabilities and additional learning needs

David Evans is also interested in:

- Students with chronic illness
- Inclusive education practices
- Students with brain injuries
- Learning support for students with special education needs

11:10 – 11:35am  
Dr Jacqui Roberts,  
Dr Susan Colmar and  
Ms Libby Maher

‘Sharing information (referencing and commenting) in young children with autism: Can targeted intervention designed to change caregiver interaction style positively change the quality and quantity of referencing and commenting in young children with autism?’

Preliminary findings will be presented from a this project being run jointly with the Giant Steps program, which seeks to develop intensive individual therapeutic and educational programs to ensure that each individual with autism has the opportunity to reach their potential, and to provide support to families, improve the understanding of autism in the wider community and to develop best practice amongst carers and professionals.

The research project, which is funded by a Telstra Community grant, involves the implementation of an intervention program designed to increase commenting and referencing in young children with autism. Caregivers (5 parents and 5 teachers) have been trained to change their interaction style by increasing the amount of declarative communication and decreasing imperative communication (verbal and nonverbal) and focusing facilitating referencing. A comparison group of 5 children receive the usual program at the centre. In addition a non-treatment control group x 5 children and their parents (recruited from another EI/autism study or from the waiting list for Giant Steps) are included.
The ratios of imperative:declarative and questioning communication experienced by and used the children have been measured pre and post intervention, in addition to referencing, communication development, cognitive development and independent functioning in children. In addition parent stress, quality of life and coping will be measured pre and post for all participants.

11:35 – 12:00pm

Associate Professor David Evans, Dr Jacqui Roberts and Mr Mark Carter

‘The range of treatments and interventions Accessed by young children with Autism’

1:30 – 1:55pm

Associate Professor David Evans

‘Effects of Chronic Illness on the Education of Primary Aged Students’

1:55 – 2:20pm

Dr Linda Graham

‘Drugs, labels and (p)ill-fitting boxes: ADHD and children who are hard to teach’

This paper provides a critical examination of the practice of diagnosing and medicating children for “Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder”. An extensive review of the literature is presented to contrast dominant perspectives on ADHD offered by medicine and psychology. The aim is to show how medical and psychological research, drawing from different theoretical and empirical bases, comes together to constitute a powerful interdependent discourse that has gained legitimacy amongst educators and the general public. This is despite internal contradictions and important points of dispute.

An examination of the cultural politics within and around the ADHD phenomenon prompts two important questions. First, whose interests does the ‘medicalisation’ of child behaviour serve and second, what effect does this have within the educational context? This paper attends to both these questions by assessing what is offered by the two main players in the game: medicine and psychology. I look at what they say and what they offer to each other - as well as the institution of schooling. Drawing on Foucault, I argue that the concept of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder reflects a combination of medical and psychological knowledges, which:

- brokers an awkward alliance between the fields of medicine and psychology, that
- serves as a condition of possibility for the expansion of the concept of child behaviour “disorder,”
- benefiting the satellite industry surrounding the disorderly child, whilst
- colonising the domain of the school.

In this way, “ADHD” effects a menage-a-trios; a prism of power that has three locus points each managed by medicine, psychology and schooling. In the three parts of the paper, I chart these diagrammatically, and contend that it is between these angles of scrutiny within a tight network of power, that the colourful child comes to attention. Moreover, I argue that the convergence of collusive yet competing knowledge-domains around particular kids displaying particular kinds of behaviours serves to underpin a flawed concept - benefiting some more than others. The potential effects upon children who come to be described in these ways is illustrated via a case study of 10 year old Randle.
2:20 – 2:45pm  
Dr Ilektra Spandagou

‘Inclusive Education: In the search of meaning(s)’

This paper starts from the view that the main appeal and peril of inclusion is that it defies definition; the more one tries to understand what inclusion is, the more mystified becomes from the lack of an ‘entity’ that can be called inclusion. In order to explore this thesis I will use a number of different methods.

Firstly, my own reflective and personal account of working in the field of inclusive education in different countries and roles will be the starting point for the exploration of inclusion.

In order to contextualize this reflective account different models of approaching inclusive education, including those that define it as an international discourse, as a social movement and as complementing/conflicting to special education, will be discussed. Examples of influential definitions of inclusion that are used internationally will be presented and analysed in an attempt to map ‘inclusion’.

Finally, it will be argued that the quest of defining inclusion –even if it is futile– is inescapable; since it provides the context in which our ethical responsibilities as educators are shaped. In this context defining inclusion is not an intellectual exercise but rather a framework of practice. The small but growing literature that discusses teacher education in the field of inclusive education will be presented. “How to prepare teachers for inclusion?” is a question that cannot be easily answered without having a definition of “what inclusion is”.

Ilektra Spandagou is a lecturer in inclusive education at the Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Sydney. She worked as a special teacher and completed her PhD at the University of Sheffield, United Kingdom, in the area of inclusive education. She worked as a researcher at the University of Sheffield and as a tutor and lecturer at the University of Athens and the University of Thessaly, Greece. Her research interests include inclusion, disability, classroom diversity, and curriculum differentiation.

3:30 – 3:55pm

Mr Andrew Chodkiewicz and Dr Liam Morgan

‘The Early Literacy Practices of Mothers and Carers with Young’

Supporting the development of early literacy is important – especially in the years before children start school. Yet a significant proportion of children, living in disadvantaged communities, and outside the formal early childhood system (pre-school, long day care or occasional care), start school with little exposure to any significant level or range of early literacy practices. This paper reports on a qualitative study with Aboriginal and CALD mothers and carers in an inner city part of Sydney, who attended mothers groups or supported playgroups. Taking a socio-cultural approach the study explores the views of front-line community workers and the experiences of mothers and carers with early literacy in a range of informal community based settings and programs.

Liam Morgan is a Senior Lecturer and former director of the Centre for Language and Literacy, course coordinator of the Graduate Diploma in Language Teaching, and International Students coordinator in the Faculty of Education, UTS. He has contributed to the development of K-12 language curricula, has vast experience in working with international students and is currently engaged in research into first language maintenance in Arabic and Chinese communities in Sydney and supporting early literacy practices among Aboriginal and CALD communities in the inner suburbs of Sydney.
‘Socio-cultural Issues in Motivation’

Until recently motivation has been considered to be an individual phenomenon with theories of motivation conceptualizing key constructs in individualistic terms. Recently this individual conceptualization has been questioned as theorists (e.g. Walker, Pressick-Kilborn, Arnold & Sainsbury, 2004; Pressick-Kilborn, Sainsbury & Walker, 2005) have suggested, after Vygotsky, that motivation is social in nature. Sociocultural researchers have consequently attempted to explain how motivational goals, values, standards and interests are socially constructed, and how they emerge and develop from social interactions and are manifested in collaborative and individual action.

The understanding of motivation as social in nature involves complex issues concerning the relationship between the social world and the world of the individual. Sociocultural theories endorse a social epistemology and accord analytical or theoretical primacy to the social world over the individual world, while recognizing that these worlds are closely interlinked and interdependent. According primacy to the social origins of motivation does not, however, mean that explanations of individual motivation can be reduced to social explanations or that social processes determine individual motivation. Sociocultural reductionism (Martin, 2006) and social determinism are avoided in sociocultural theories of motivation through theoretical notions which explain how the social world is internalized and externalized by individuals, and which assert that while there is a dynamic interdependence between the social and individual worlds, they are distinguishable and qualitatively different from each other. Taken together these sociocultural theoretical ideas avoid the reduction of personal phenomena to social interaction or social processes at large and recognise the agency of the individual. They explain how individual motivation can have social origins yet the individual’s intrapsychological motivational functioning is still relatively autonomous from the social world.

This paper, based on an invited chapter to appear in E. Baker, B McGaw & P. Peterson (Eds-in Chief) *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd Ed), examines meta-theoretical and theoretical issues relating to the social construction of motivation and presents several debates that have taken place in this literature. This will examination will be presented in the context of research studies which have investigated the social nature of motivation.

Richard Walker teaches in educational psychology at the University of Sydney. He has had a long standing interest in interrelationships amongst motivation, learning and academic achievement. In this regard, he has co-authored articles in international journals on self-efficacy, self-concept, causal attributions and academic achievement. More recently he has been interested the application of Vygotskyian sociocultural understandings to student motivation and learning. With research students and colleagues, he has published a number of book chapters and journal articles on sociocultural approaches to self-regulation, interest, textbook use, and tertiary learning and assessment. He is currently researching schooling for marginalised and homeless youth from a sociocultural perspective.

‘Language Interventions Using Pausing and Open Questioning in Community Contexts’

A small-scale experimental study was conducted aiming to enhance child language skills. The parents and early childhood workers of a group of young children with language delays were trained to use key strategies within a book-reading context and in everyday communicative interactions, using a program developed by the author.

There are four key elements to the training program:

1. The intervention technique of pausing to allow the child an opportunity to talk first, that is, to initiate the topic of interest to them (Colmar, 1999, 2005);
2. The technique of asking the child to say more on the topic s/he has initiated, using an open question or request for elaboration, as occurred in the original format of the first milieu language intervention technique of incidental teaching (Hart & Risley, 1982);

3. Children’s picture books as the stimulus for language teaching and learning (Colmar, 1999);

4. The encouraging of parents to use the same key strategies of pausing and conversation building in everyday settings as often as they are able.

Importantly the training was simple to implement and parents rapidly understood and used the strategies with positive outcomes. In a four-month intervention period the intervention group made significant gains over the control group, and with very large effect sizes. A waiting list control design was utilised and thus the parents of the control group children were also trained and their child received the program. Comments from parents about the program included the following: “Giving Brian control and choice has made an enormous difference - a much more effective way for him to learn”; “It unlocked him”; “Paul was anxious, now happy and confident”; “Behaviour has improved - fewer tantrums”; “Josh has had a language explosion”; “Fergus uses longer sentences and has a better grasp of more abstract concepts”.

The four key strategies of the intervention program will be described with accompanying video examples. The wider implications of this research work will be discussed.
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Open Strand – Abstracts

11:10 – 11:35am

Mr Tim Marchant and Mr Peter Howard

‘Enhancing participation – new possibilities for disadvantaged Australians’

This paper explores recent collaborative research into an innovative educational program working with Australians facing disadvantage. The program, Catalyst-Clemente, is based on an international model and has been delivering university-level humanities education in a community setting in Australia since 2003.

In the second half of 2006, Mission Australia, The St Vincent de Paul Society and Australian Catholic University conducted a small-scale study of participants’ perceptions of the impact of Catalyst-Clemente. The research was conducted at three sites across three points in time with the four participant groups: lecturers, learning partners, community agency staff and students.

Catalyst-Clemente students often face significant life challenges which might include amongst others drug and alcohol misuse, mental health issues and the risk of homelessness. Preliminary research findings indicate that the program, a genuine inter-sectoral collaboration, has significant impact on the participant groups, especially the students, beyond traditional measures such as course completion. This paper reports on these findings outlining some of the impacts, most particularly in relation to self, social interaction, relationships with others, learning, community participation and the future. The research indicates that participation in the Catalyst-Clemente course at an appropriate point in the life-course can affect real transitions resulting in enhanced social and economic participation.

10:45 – 11:10am

Dr Kathy Edwards

‘From Deficit to Disenfranchisement: Rethinking Youth Participation’

The current discourse around youth participation is characterised by concern regarding young people’s perceived declining participation in political, civic and community life. Young people are considered in this discourse to be politically apathetic and to possess a ‘civic deficit’. Using empirical data from studies of youth and voting this paper focuses on youth electoral participation. International organisations such as the Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) have identified declining youth electoral participation as an international concern. The Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) has identified, despite voting being compulsory in Australia, that significant numbers of young Australians are not enrolled to vote. The roots of this perceived deficit in electoral participation have been considered by the policy literature to stem from a lack of democratic knowledge. Thus youth electoral participation has been addressed primarily in the context of education policy and in the provision of Civics and Citizenship education, in Australia comprising of the Discovering Democracy curriculum.

This paper discusses some of the barriers that young people, and particularly marginalised, socially excluded and disadvantaged young people, face to accessing the franchise. In doing so it seeks to reposition youth electoral participation in a social justice context and as a problem for social policy. In particular it explores a paradox: in contemporary Australia youth are castigated for a lack of electoral participation while at the same time a shrinking welfare state contributes to their disenfranchisement. Whereas angst is expressed over a youth deficit in participation, and youth participation is lauded as a social good, neo-liberal social policies emphasise individualism and have shrunk the welfare state, effectively exacerbating barriers to youth electoral participation. Whilst these policies construct electoral participation in liberal language as a ‘choice’ they at the same time erode the conditions necessary for young people to have the capacity to ‘choose’ to vote.

Kathy Edwards is currently a Senior Research Associate in Child and Youth Studies in the Faculty of Education and Social Work at the University of Sydney. In this role she researches youth and participation, young people’s
understandings of social class and marginalised young people. Dr Edwards’ career highlights have included working as a Senior Research Associate on the Youth Electoral Study (a major national project that explored youth, voting and political attitudes in Australia) and as a Research Associate on the Gender Equity in Public Institutions Project (this project aimed to explore gender equity in the NSW Public Sector).

11:35 – 12:00pm  
Ms Ebeny Wood

‘From ‘Lads’ to ‘Losers’: The new discourses surrounding ‘anti-school’ young people and their impact on school outcomes’

‘Lads,’ ‘legends,’ ‘anti-school students,’ ‘bogans,’ ‘youth at risk.’ Throughout the history of mass secondary schooling there exists a group of young people for whom school doesn’t work. This group almost always come from the same background. However, as reflected in the changing language used to refer to these young people, the way in which we as researchers, teachers, social workers and policy makers have conceived of this group of young people has changed. In particular new policy and research paradigms based on ideas of futurity and human capital centre young people’s school outcomes within an economic framework. This means that young people are valued in accordance to their potential future economic contribution. Recent work in the Sociology of Education has identified the way in which this discourse has marginalised issues of social justice and disadvantage in policy and research. However this research agenda has not been extended to the school level. Given the well documented disparity between policy discourse and school implementation, this is a significant gap in knowledge. This paper reports findings from in-depth interviews with grade ten students and teachers of a district high school in Tasmania. At this school, discourses of social disadvantage and human capital discourses exist in competition with each other. Contemporary external pressures, such as a large working class student constituency, and an emphasis on post-compulsory school retention have contributed to a school agenda to re-engage students alienated by traditional forms of schooling. However the human capital discourse is hegemonic and ultimately undermines the social justice agenda of the school.

12:00 – 12:25pm  
Ms Kerry Russo

‘Communities@work - “Engaging Gen Y in community work studies through blended distributed delivery”’

The paper will address the significant learning opportunities, trials and tribulations, of working on a program of collaborative educational delivery to Gen Y using a Blended Distributed Delivery (BDD) teaching model. For the past three years, Kerry Russo and her team have been delivering Certificate II in Community Services Work to secondary school students and individuals at risk of disengaging. Students currently enrolled in the program are from the four north Queensland communities of Ingham, Townsville, Charters Towers and the Whitsundays, which encompasses an area of 36 000²m.

The paper will discuss and identify certain rules, tools and considerations, that when applied to a BDD program greatly increases its chance of success. See below for the BDD model used by BRIT.
The engagement of secondary school students in community work through the use of the new technologies will be the main focus of the paper. Illustrated below are the blends used in the program. The course uses video conferencing, video streaming, web activities, a blog, online conferencing, project-based assessment, toolbox (a software learning object), industry placement and tutorial support.

The new technologies successfully engage secondary school students and especially those at risk of disengaging from the school system. The appeal of project based team assessments have involved the students in learning communities and introduced them to community services. Students have run public awareness campaigns on alcohol and drug abuse, sexual harassment issues and youth issues. Students place their campaigns on a course weblog for other learning communities to view and comment.

The paper will demonstrate how pedagogy, technology and collaborative learning engage Gen Y and promote a career pathway into community services.

1:30 – 1:55pm

‘Colouring the Rainbow because wellness is about connection’

"Colouring the Rainbow because wellness is about connection" a group program run on a Community Development Action research model. The program aimed to engage participants in the evaluation and operationalisation of WHO social health determinants, for the purpose of exploring real world impacts on client health.
Participants of the group brought a range of personal experiences, these included; chronic poverty, isolation, drug and alcohol dependency, loneliness, personal and social violence sequel and generalised marginalisation resulting from the rural setting.

The presentation will include a description of the "social health rainbow" -a WHO tool, adapted during the research, to visualise the links between the individual, the local, the state, the national and the international social health spheres.

Community Development is said to have taken place when participants of this group not only successfully connected global living conditions to individual experiences of poor physical, emotional and social health but also responded to invitations to responsibility and collective action by developing a resource kit filled with strategies tested and developed during the life of the group.

Presenters will share how the tools for intervention, such as the rainbow, were developed and introduced to highlight existing social injustice and engage group participants in thinking about strategies for bringing down the walls between countries, states, towns, neighbourhoods, people and families.

The inspiring nature of this project derives from the personalised experiences of social injustices, how these are mirrored at the global and national level and how these contribute to poor physical, emotional, social and spiritual health. Presenters will conclude by engaging the audience in a short "forward thinking" brainstorming exercise that (with their permission) would then become part of the on-going action research project that is "Colouring the Rainbow: because wellness is about connection".

Cara Pullen BSW (Social Worker, Ravenswood Community Health Centre) - 9 out of 13 years of Social Work practice with Community Health. She is passionate about social justice, equity and resilience, which has seen her involved in community development and group programmes focussing on improving people's social health. She believes in challenging self and recently has engaged in learning theatre skills for community education. She is passionate about our community's resilience and ability to contribute knowledge, skills and experience. She is thankful and privileged to contribute to the world in this way, because with the community's contribution, together, we have and will continue to make a difference to the face of Tasmania.

Michelle Nicholson BSW Hons (Acting Team Leader Family Violence Counselling and support service, Launceston TAS) - 7 years experience as coordinator of sexual assault services in Launceston she has also conducted research on the effects of abuse on the elderly who suffer from dementia. She has contributed to IT projects aimed at linking remote rural settings such as King and Flinders Island to essential social health services. More recently, she has had the opportunity to work with emerging refugee communities in Launceston whom formed part of the piloting action research project in social health - "colouring the rainbow". She hopes attending the "communities and change" festival will enrich and facilitate the sharing of ideas "colouring the rainbow" has brought to the Launceston community and to her social work practice.

Joselynn Sweeney BA Hons BSW Hons (Social Worker, Ravenswood Community Health Centre) - Migrated to Australia as a teenager, has worked with refugees, asylum seekers and migrants since then. Her Community Development Action Research project with the Sierra Leonean community was recently presented at the 7th Annual Conference on Diversity held in Amsterdam. She was awarded the AASW student of the year and is particularly proud of the Cross-Cultural Awareness workshops that resulted from her research. These workshops were piloted in Ravenswood Community Health centre and are now offered to organisations across the Tasmanian community, to academics, university staff and students of social work at the University of Tasmania. Her passion includes social health and wellbeing, self determination and freedom, social justice and equity. She envisions the growth of "colouring the rainbow" through the research festival and hopes the sharing of practice generated knowledge and ideas will deliver a broader understanding of primary health and well being.
Mrs Cheri Yavu-Kama-Harathunian and Mrs Denise Tomlin

1:55 – 2:20pm

‘Bringing It Home: An Indigenous Research Model that Supports Indigenous Researcher’s Aspirations’

This paper articulates those conceptual and enacting notions of research excellence from within a framework of Aboriginal Terms of Reference (ATR). It will reflect those methodologies that incorporate Indigenous ‘ways of knowing’ within a proposed Indigenous Research Model. Indigenous ‘ways of knowing’, not only identify ATR principles, but they also communicate an Indigenous position toward a way forward. Therefore, current significant methodologies of research will be explored to extrapolate those elements that resonate as Best Practice. Does ATR suggest that Indigenous researchers require their work maintain a cultural perspective? And, does ATR also maintain research integrity when applying principles of ATR within a cross-cultural context?

The heritage of Aboriginal peoples spans eons back in history, time, space and place. It is fair to suggest that Indigenous Australians practiced ‘ways of knowing’, conceptualised and enacted notions of excellence within knowledge frameworks that were culturally contextualised and culturally transferable across the diverse tribal groups. Their creaturely existence ensured their connectedness to the past and their connectedness to a role in the present. How did the first producers of the boomerang and didgeridoo or other instruments for survival discover aeronautics, medicine, nutrition, spiritual practices, socio-economics, education, art and law? How did this knowledge and this ‘ways of knowing’ transfer across a continent that can fit the first non-Indigenous researcher’s countries into its heartland? How did Aboriginal peoples develop complex relationship systems such as kin, skin and blood relations and these systems still maintain a spiritual understanding?

What Indigenous researchers are saying is that it is time for them to find ‘ways of knowing’ that articulate ATR for the purpose of cultural integrity and cultural valuing in the research they do on behalf of their peoples. To date, Indigenous researchers continue to use the historical models that have existed for the last two hundred years. Are there alternatives?

Indigenous academics in the 21st Century recognise the significance of developing ‘ways of knowing’ or what is identified as methodologies and/or a research model/s. Is it critical that these ‘ways of knowing’ resonate within an ATR framework? Is it an urgent need? Is it time that the wealth of Indigenous knowledge about Aboriginal Australia be channelled or directed into research studies by Indigenous academics? And can Indigenous academic’s research studies articulate cultural wisdom, knowledge and cultural value to “Bring it Home” to the Indigenous peoples?

2:20 - 2:45pm

Dr Frank Tesoriero

‘Change and resistance to change – community development in a rural caste community in South India’

This paper describes a community development project in rural south India and analyses it in terms of its processes and outcomes, and the forces at play which facilitated change and which resisted change. The project is named ‘Healthy Districts Project’ and is based on the World Health Organizations’ settings approach to health promotion and a social view of health which acknowledges the structural contributors to health and well being.

The approach used was a strengths-based approach, Appreciative Inquiry. The project was a partnership between Australian social workers, a local Indian NGO, an Indian School of Social Work and the local community.

The term ‘local community’, when examined, serves to hide great diversity, power differentials and forces which exclude. In this local community, comprising 450 households, as well as eight villages and hamlets, there are two dalit (outcaste, untouchable) communities. These two communities are physically segregated and experience exclusion which manifests itself in many forms.
The community development project, based on principles of social justice and human rights, challenged the exclusionary practices of this caste community and so built in significant tensions which had to be addressed constantly throughout the process.

The gains, losses, learning and implications that emerged from the project, and the processes and complex array of forces which interplayed to produce a multifaceted and contradictory set of outcomes are examined.

Caste, gender and hierarchy, so endemic in rural India, have been constant and powerful dynamics; and these have been active, alongside strategies of participation, local decision making and inclusion. This interaction of competing forces has led to changes and resistances to change; and has resulted in the maintenance of traditional practices and power relations, as well as the discontinuation of some of these in the same form.

The project has also created new opportunities to further engage in processes of discovery to generate new knowledge for social and community development in communities of exclusion.

Frank Tesoriero has 33 years’ experience as a social work practitioner, manager, researcher, author and academic since graduating in social work at the University of Sydney.

His major area of expertise and experience include community development, cross cultural social work, social development in primary health care and community health settings. He has 12 years’ experience working in local communities in south India, as well as experience in Kenya, South Africa and Fiji.

He has co-authored a major Australian text on community development with Professor Jim Ifé and has published widely in his areas of expertise.

He worked and taught in south India for twelve months in 2006 and continues with his action research/community development project in rural south India. He was instrumental, with the Madras Christian College Department of Social Work and university partners in Taiwan, Philippines, USA, Canada, north Europe and UK, in establishing the Centre for International Social Work, based on an international perspective and a human rights foundation.

Prof Phillip Jones,
Dr Elizabeth Cassity and
Ms Alexandra McCormick

‘AusAID at work: the design, delivery and impact of Australian aid to education in Asia and the Pacific’

The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) administers an expanding aid program, for which poverty alleviation remains the core objective. AusAID and the University of Sydney are partners in an ARC Linkage Project investigating the dynamics of Australian aid to the education sector. The starting point for this investigation is 1996, when the Australian Foreign Minister last approved a policy framework for education and training aid.

Embedded poverty in low-income countries makes heavy policy demands. This project brings together two major strategies that are taking on increasing policy weight. The first strategy is to expand and make more effective the provision of bilateral aid from high-income countries. The second is to obtain better results from education systems in low-income countries. More equitable provision, high quality learning outcomes, and greater relevance to
economic and social objectives are key strategies for AusAID’s support of educational development in the Asia Pacific region.

This presentation explores howAusAID is responding to a rapidly changing environment for education sector aid. Foreign aid worldwide has no dearth of sceptics who question its effectiveness in terms of alleviating poverty. At the same time, there are an equal number of supporters who are firmly committed to the potential for aid to provide sustainable and equitable development. Aid to education is at the centre of this debate.

Several lines of investigation frame the research approach, which examines AusAID’s policy effectiveness in aid to education, and its support in assisting regional governments to improve educational outcomes. The first concerns the internal dynamics of AusAID and how policy is negotiated and formulated. The second examines AusAID’s influence on and interaction with the wider donor community, including NGOs and the private sector. Of crucial importance are the third and fourth lines of investigation, which consider the working relationships between AusAID Canberra and its overseas posts. The fifth line of investigation focuses on the governments of recipient countries and how the international Education for All (EFA) norms influence impact their policymaking processes. Profoundly significant is the sixth line of investigation, which explores collaboration and cooperation among a wider range of stakeholders and recipients, a trend that has been gathering support over the last decade.

The presenters will focus on how the research partnership between AusAID and the University of Sydney will endeavour to examine the lines of investigation highlighted above; and, importantly, how it will contribute to a better understanding of the design, delivery, and impact of aid to education.

3:30 – 3:55pm

Ms Leigh Burrows

‘The knight with the magic sword: how a therapeutic story provided a connection point for child, family, school, human service agencies and the community: an integral approach’

This paper describes and discusses the development of an innovative approach to working across systems and agencies in a regional centre. This co-constructed dialogic methodology was developed in response to a crisis situation for a child and family caught in the midst of competing perspectives from within and across Education, Human Service and Health systems. This extremely challenging situation was seen to require a holistic approach, involving working on individual, group and system levels. Integral theory (Wilber, 2000) was therefore seen as a highly useful theoretical perspective both to guide the process and to evaluate the efficacy of the model. The unique context of a regional centre in relation to mental health services is discussed. This paper presentation describes through a case study approach how a therapeutic story was written for the child who was then invited to illustrate the text and develop a book with his mother’s assistance. The child increasingly was able to draw on the metaphoric story as a resource to assist him to manage his anxiety levels, and to strengthen his self esteem and self efficacy. The story was then used as a vehicle to develop a sense of shared meaning in all those involved in his care by drawing them together in part through attending a book launch. The opportunity presented for positive and creative communication through the sharing of the book is shown to have led to changes in behaviours and attitudes and the development of stronger networks across and within education, welfare and health networks. The story became a symbol of the new web of support that began to form cohesively around the family and school. Feedback in relation to this approach from the child, parent and a range of human service and health workers and educators at school, district and system and community levels level is shared and highlights the value and potential of this deeply therapeutic approach. This approach is now being evaluated for its efficacy as part of the author’s PhD in relation to other cases and is already showing clear signs of being able to facilitate deep change at an individual, group and system level.

Leigh Burrows has a long interest in working across boundaries in education, social work and health. She has worked in a variety of settings including a women’s refuge, Steiner and government schools, universities and the Department of Education and Children’s Services as a project officer with a policy focus. Her PhD research is focused on a co-constructed, dialogic and holistic methodology she has developed to respond to highly complex
cases involving schools, families and human service agencies. She has published and presented nationally and internationally in the areas of emotional intelligence, wellbeing, spiritual wellbeing and parent-teacher relationships.

3:55 – 4:20pm  

Dr Sue Nichols and Dr Lana Zannettino

‘Integrated early childhood services: towards an interdisciplinary perspective on the ‘double partnership’ move’

The landscape of early childhood education and care is changing. Institutions and services that have traditionally been separate are moving towards greater cooperation and integration (Haddad 2001). It has been recognised, both nationally and internationally that social and health problems that are interrelated and overlapping need joined-up policy solutions - hence the popularity of multi-agency partnership responses. The integrated service model represents a shift from the transmission model which positions service providers as expert givers, and families as receivers, of information and knowledge. At the core of this model are two kinds of partnerships – partnerships with parents/carers and partnerships between agencies involved in the integrated service setting – a move which we are referring to as ‘double partnership’ (Nichols & McInnes 2006).

The challenges of this ‘double partnership’ are beginning to emerge as are examples of good practice in this area, based on research conducted in the UK. For instance, the entrenched nature of institutional ‘business as usual’ has impeded the development of the mutual understanding essential to effective collaboration (Maclure & Walker 2000). Milbourne and colleagues investigating a partnership program for families of children excluded from school concluded: ‘Recognizing the value of diverse models for multi-agency working’ is crucial (2003 p. 33). Applying this insight to research on integration and partnership, we argue that this diversity of approaches will be best supported by a multidisciplinary approach.

In Australia, while there has been considerable emphasis on policy formation and institutional change, there has been to date less emphasis on shaping a research agenda focused on this complex new social initiative. In this paper, we identify key issues for research and consider the contribution that social work and education, as distinct fields of research and practice, might make to building knowledge so that the social goals of integrated services are supported. We focus on one example of integrated services, the Children’s Centres recently established in South Australia. Drawing on a pilot study of integrated centres in the early establishment phase, and on our engagement with practitioners in our roles as professional educators in Education and Social Work, we discuss the challenges and promise of collaboration at multiple levels. Considering that each of these fields draws on multiple theoretical and methodological resources, we ask: Which ‘Education’ and which ‘Social work’ perspectives are most generative?

Sue Nichols is an educational researcher with the interdisciplinary Hawke Research Institute for Sustainable Societies at the University of South Australia. Her research interests include families’ relationships with education, literacy practices across diverse contexts and practitioner inquiry. She has published widely in international journals including the Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, Early Years, Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood and Early Childhood Development and Care. She is currently in receipt of an ARC Discovery Grant with Helen Nixon for the project ‘Parents networks: the circulation of knowledge about children’s literacy and learning’.

Lana Zannettino is a research fellow in the Hawke Research Institute for Sustainable Societies at the University of South Australia. Lana has a background in social work practice and research and has conducted several research projects concerned with the development and evaluation of collaborative models of intervention within and between the areas of child protection and welfare, domestic and family violence, and schooling and student support. She has published in national and international journals including Gender and Education, Women against Violence and Journal of Student Wellbeing. She is currently co-writing the SA government Action Plan for the Prevention of Elder Abuse.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9am - 9:30am</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:30am</td>
<td>Keynote 2</td>
<td><strong>Professor Gabrielle Meagher</strong> <em>What do Australians think about increasing inequality?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45am</td>
<td>TESOL Session 1</td>
<td><strong>Dr Brian Paltridge</strong> <em>Academic literacies and changing university communities</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:10am</td>
<td>TESOL Session 1</td>
<td><strong>Dr Lesley Harbon</strong> <em>Transitions into graduate study: An intercultural perspective</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10-11:35am</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr David Hirsh</strong> <em>English and international students: What the IELTS can (and cannot) tell us</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35-12:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr Marie Stevenson</strong> <em>Identifying students with writing problems: issues and implications for academic staff</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:25pm</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-1:55pm</td>
<td>TESOL Session 2</td>
<td><strong>Dr Aek Phakiti</strong> <em>Strategic reading in a second language: implications for international students</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:55-2:20pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jen Tindale</strong> <em>Classroom discourse and participation in diverse university classrooms</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20-2:45pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr Wei Wang</strong> <em>Academic writing practices of Chinese ESL graduate students in Australia: A textography</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45-3:10pm</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr Lindy Woodrow</strong> <em>Students researching the academy: An ethnography of academic writing</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15-5:30</td>
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<td><strong>Professor Barbara Fawcett</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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11:10 – 11:35am  
Dr Brian Paltridge

‘Academic literacies and changing university communities’

James Duderstadt, in *A University for the 21st Century*, says there is no question that universities will change in the new millennium. It is simply a matter of how they will change and who will change them. The 20th century saw dramatic changes in academic values and disciplinary knowledges, especially with has been termed the 'postmodern turn' in the new humanities and social sciences. Student populations, further, have also changed. Today’s students are often more diverse in terms of race, gender, nationality, linguistic, economic, and educational backgrounds than the people who teach them. They often have different intellectual objectives and think and learn in different ways. Even the notion of academic literacy is being contested. This presentation discusses these issues and suggests ways in which we might meet the literacies needs of this new and different student population.


11:10 – 11:35am  
Dr Lesley Harbon

‘Transitions into graduate study: An intercultural perspective’

As someone travels to another culture to live for an extended period of time they often experience a kind of transformation. This transformation requires them to look at the world from a different point of view – a point of view that is often in conflict with their current values and beliefs. A person who is successful at working through and learning from these kinds of cultural experiences, has the potential to become interculturally competent within the new culture and develops a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrative perspective on the world. Mezirow’s theory of transformative learning has been suggested as a way of helping to understand how people develop intercultural competency in new and different cultural settings. It may also be useful in helping to understand the process of learning to become interculturally competent in new and different academic settings. This presentation describes a project that was carried out with students in China who were studying in an Australian university offshore graduate academic program which examined just these issues. The project examined the issue of transformative learning as the students ‘learned to become’ graduate students in the new and different academic environment.
11:35am – 12:00pm Dr David Hirsh

‘English and international students: What the IELTS can and cannot tell us’

What is the relationship between English language competence and academic performance? What can IELTS test scores indicate? This paper will examine important issues regarding admission of international students, academic needs assessment, and the provision of appropriate forms of academic support and early interventions for students identified as in need.

David was introduced to the field of language teaching in Thailand in the late 1980s, and went on to teach on a range of TESOL programs in Thailand and New Zealand. His doctoral studies examined the reasons for the presence of an academic vocabulary in English. David teaches on the Master of Education in TESOL (MEd TESOL) and the Graduate Certificate in TEFL in the Faculty of Education and Social Work at the University of Sydney, and periodically teaches on the off-shore MEd TESOL in Shanghai, China. He also provides academic support to students in the Faculty.

12:00 – 12:25pm Dr Marie Stephenson

‘Identifying students with writing problems: issues and implications for academic staff’

For many students enrolled at the university, writing academic texts is fraught with difficulties. Many students are novice writers, meaning that they have had little experience writing academic texts – or, in some cases, writing any kinds of texts at all. Compounding this problem is the fact that an increasing proportion of students come from contexts that are very different, educationally, culturally and linguistically, from the local Australian context. Given these factors, it is hardly surprising that the texts that student writers produce do not always meet the expectations of the academy.

This paper will discuss practical and theoretical issues surrounding the identification of students with writing problems – particularly in relation to the MEd TESOL program offered by the faculty. It will also consider implications that student writing problems have for academic staff in terms of the support, feedback and assessment with which they can provide students.

1:30 – 1:55pm Dr Aek Phakiti

‘Strategic reading in a second language: Implications for international students’

Reading English in a second language (L2) is a multifaceted construct which comprises a complex interaction between L2 linguistic knowledge (e.g., vocabulary knowledge, morphological knowledge, syntactical knowledge, discourse knowledge, text-structure knowledge), human information processing (e.g., working memory, long-term memory, control process, skills versus strategies), textual variables (e.g., types of text, genres), task demands, and individual characteristics (e.g., first language [L1] and cultural backgrounds, world knowledge, age and L1 literacy). This presentation will first provide a general framework to understand academic reading (e.g., purpose of reading, nature of text, cognitive complexity) and second discuss problems NNS (non-native speakers) of English, international postgraduate students experience when reading academic texts based on survey research. This paper will then discuss the nature of strategic reading as part of human information processing. Strategic reading, unlike automatic word recognition or other unreflective reading, can be defined as conscious, intentional processing readers
engage in during reading. Readers tend to be strategic when difficulty such as comprehension failure arises. Strategic reading hence involves the use of metacognition (thinking about thinking which involves self-monitoring and assessment) and a range of reading strategies (cognitive, metacognitive and affective strategies) that people employ to assist comprehension and reading to learn when difficulty arises in an academic context. This presentation will reports on a synthesis of previous research on strategic reading which provides a number of implications to assist international, postgraduate students to optimise their cognitive capacity when reading academic text.

Aek Phakiti has been teaching English at Maejo University in Chiang Mai, Thailand. He received his PhD in Applied Linguistics from the University of Melbourne. His thesis examined the relationships of state-trait cognitive, metacognitive and affective strategy use to EFL reading comprehension test performance through the use of a structural equation modelling approach. Aek’s research interests focus on second language acquisition, aspects of strategic competence or metacognition and language testing. In particular he is interested in understanding the nature of learning strategy use and its effects on second language learning and performance. He has published his research in Language Testing and Language Learning journals.

1:55 – 2:20pm Ms Jen Tindale

‘Classroom discourse and participation in diverse university classrooms’

In 2006, 45% of the total Macquarie University student population indicated that English was not their main language spoken at home (Macquarie University 2006). The Master of Accounting program at Macquarie University attracts a significant proportion of the University’s international non-English background students, with dramatic increases in the size of this cohort over the past 6 years. A recent series of focus groups with Master of Accounting students revealed a degree of frustration among non-English background students with a lack of opportunities to participate in class. Feedback from some lecturers in an email survey earlier this year indicates a similar level of frustration: ‘my experience so far is that it is very difficult to get the Chinese students fully engaging in [discussion]’. This issue has significant implications for teaching and learning within the program, given that ‘[t]eaching and learning are largely conducted through talk’ (Wells 1996:74). This presentation reports on preliminary findings of a study of student participation in Master of Accounting seminars designed to address this issue. The research has included observation and recording of weekly seminars in two subjects over the course of a twelve-week trimester, as well as interviews and focus groups with lecturers and a number of students from classes observed. This approach has yielded access to students’ perspectives on the impact of language proficiency and previous academic experience on their participation, but has also provided an insight into the ways in which student participation is shaped over longer cycles of teaching and learning through lecturers’ talk and the schematic structure of curriculum.

2:20 – 2:45pm Dr Wei Wang

‘Academic writing practices of Chinese ESL graduate students in Australia: A textography’

This presentation reports on a project investigating academic writing practices of Chinese ESL graduate students in Australia. By conducting detailed textual analyses of students’ assignments and in-depth interviews, this project aims to provide insights for both academic staff and ESL graduate students in an attempt to improve students’ academic writing achievements.

Dr. Wei Wang is a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Sydney. His research focuses on contrastive rhetoric and discourse studies between Chinese and English from perspectives of systemic functional linguistics, critical discourse analysis and genre studies. His academic interests also include second language acquisition, discourse
analysis, translation and academic writing. Now he is conducting a research project on investigating academic writing practices of Chinese ESL students in Australia.

2:45 – 3:10pm
Dr Lindy Woodrow

‘Students researching their writing: An ethnography of writing’

In recent years there has been a dramatic increase in the number of students from non-English speaking backgrounds studying in Australian universities. For these students there are often cultural differences concerning academic communication, particularly writing, which may disadvantage them in their studies. Current views on literacy take a pluralistic view. That is there is not one ‘academic literacy’ that students need to learn in order to function effectively in the academic community but rather literacy varies according to the context in which it is located.

This paper describes an approach to teaching academic writing at a graduate level that is informed by a socio-literate view of academic writing with the focus on students becoming ethnographers of writing. Students are trained to ‘act as researchers' (Johns, 1997) as a way of helping them write texts that consider the institutional and audience expectations of their particular field of study. They learn how to unpack the knowledge and skills that are necessary for membership of their academic community. Students are encouraged to explore not just the nature and character of the texts they are writing, but also the values that underlie the texts, and the role the texts play in the particular academic setting.

Reference


Lindy Woodrow has taught English as a second and foreign language in Italy, Greece, Sweden, U.K., China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Australia. She teaches on the Master of Education in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (MEd TESOL) in the Faculty of Education and Social Work at the University of Sydney where she specialises in English for academic purposes. She also provides academic support to students in the Faculty. She is a frequent visitor to Shanghai where she teaches on the Faculty’s off-shore MEd TESOL.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 9.20am</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30 – 10.30am</td>
<td>Opening Keynote Address</td>
<td><strong>Jonathan Neelands</strong> University of Warwick, UK Professor <strong>English</strong>, ‘Drama and Creativity: Innovations, Interplay and Possibilities’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 10.45am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 – 12.30pm</td>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td><strong>Panel discussion</strong> ‘The State of English: Where have we come from, we are now and where are we going?’ Chair: <strong>Michael Anderson</strong> Panel: <strong>Paul Brock, Peter Freebody, Roslyn Arnold, Don Carter, Jackie Manuel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Keynote Address</td>
<td><strong>Brad Haseman</strong>, Queensland University of Technology ‘Research Futures in English and Arts Education’</td>
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<td>Symposium</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 – 3.45pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 – 5.00pm</td>
<td>Symposium</td>
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See Separate Program for Day 3