

Personalised Learning: Can Governments Guarantee Diversity for Individuals?

(Ron) Kim Keamy, La Trobe University, Victoria, Australia
Howard Nicholas, La Trobe University, Victoria, Australia

Abstract: 'Personalised learning' as a term has been in use for slightly less than ten years. It appears to have first been used in the USA and was subsequently expanded and deepened through work in the UK and elsewhere in Europe. Personalised learning has become embedded in a wider argument for reformed public services that respond more directly to the diverse needs of individuals rather than impose uniform solutions on all people. The rationale of these principles is clear: to raise standards by focusing teaching and learning on the aptitudes and interests of pupils and by removing any barriers to learning. The operationalisation of personalised learning is still in its embryonic stages so that there is little evidence of its overall success. Nevertheless, there is substantial evidence that many of the components of personalised learning approaches have been successful in a variety of contexts around the world. The major challenges for governments and systems are recognised to different extents in various governments' policy statements – some shallow; some deep. The challenge will be for governments and their departments to create a financial, professional and operational environment so that all the aspects of deeper personalised approaches can be implemented in order to avoid the dangers of simply implementing shallower and incomplete 'cherry picking' of 'easy to implement' elements. In this paper, the authors argue that unless deep views of personalised learning are implemented, hopes of attending to the diversity of all students will be a chimera.

Keywords: Policies, Public Service Reform, Diversity in Teaching and Learning, Cultural Pluralism

WHEN THE MINISTER for Education and Training in the Australian State of Victoria, the Honourable Lynne Kosky made the statement '... we are endeavouring to establish an educational system which caters for every student and their different learning needs' (Kosky, 2005, p. 1), the term 'personalised learning' was not part of the mainstream educational discourse in Australia. 'Personalised Learning' is a term that is only slowly gaining traction in Australia, with the drive for an increase in the personalisation of learning having arisen from the awareness that "one-size-fits-all" approaches to school knowledge and organization are ill-adapted both to individuals' needs and to the knowledge society at large (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2006, p. 3).

The OECD's (2006) emphasis in relation to personalised learning is that learning is lifelong, which necessarily sees learning reaching beyond the traditional confines of schools. This is not a new perspective, as Fullan (1993) observed long before personalised learning made its way onto the global political stage:

What we don't know is how to achieve these goals for *all* [original emphasis] students locally, let alone nationally and internationally. The reason that this is difficult is that it requires

a prodigious and mobilized effort and collaboration among a number of constituencies – parents and community, business and industry (labour and management), government and other social agencies, and the education system. The education system cannot do it alone, but it must help break the cycle of disjuncture by helping to lead the way in its own right and through alliances (p. 136).

This way of thinking assumes at least two things: first, that there will be a beneficial relationship between general social re-organisation and the individual, and second, that restructuring wider social systems, such as education, will translate into greater control of life by the individuals who progress through those systems. While these are highly laudable assumptions, one of our questions is whether the assumed relationship is that automatic or unproblematic.

In this paper we trace the history of the concept of personalised learning along with the associated underpinning rationales to reveal some of the tensions surrounding the term. This tracing suggests that "personalising" the education and other systems will not automatically result in greater control of life options by individuals. In making this argument, we distinguish between deep and shallow forms of personalised learning, arguing that only deep forms of



personalised learning will encourage genuine diversity in the life pathways of individuals. We conclude that educational change in a pluralist society requires structural pluralism if the innovation is to succeed.

The Emergence of Personalised Learning as an Area of Interest

In 1983, *A Nation at Risk* was published in the USA. This report highlighted the United States of America's complacency towards public schooling, the acceptance of mediocrity and the growing achievement gap between disadvantaged students. This report prompted an 'educational awakening' amongst American educators and policymakers, and according to the US Secretary of Education, Roderick Paige (2001), this development triggered a range of educational reforms. One of the early attempts at educational reform was the publication of a report entitled *Breaking Ranks* (National Association of Secondary Schools Principals, 1999), in which the term 'personalise' in relationship to education was introduced for the purpose of providing '...reasonable and effective practice that can improve education for all of our children' (NASSP1999).

In 2000, the influential Carnegie Corporation of New York awarded planning grants to a number of urban school district-community partnerships nationwide to support them in revamping large comprehensive urban schools so that 'no student can be written off'. While the term personalisation was less prominent, the same concept can be seen in the references to student investment in their own learning. These planning grants from the Carnegie Corporation followed a \$US30 million investment in 2000 by a partnership consisting of the Carnegie Corporation, the Open Society Institute and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in another initiative, known as *New Century High Schools Consortium for New York City*. Echoing the same ideas of a commitment from the individual to learning and from schools to the individuals in them, the purpose of this funding was 'to help create effective high schools for all students and the implementation of small-school designs' because

Far too many failing high schools crush the aspirations of poor students of color, and serve as conveyor belts for the criminal justice system, not for the opportunity that is their birthright (LaMarche quoted in Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2001).

By 2001 in the USA, personalised learning was beginning to make it into the educational discourse. Murphy, Beck, Crawford, Hodges and McGaughy (2001), for instance, described how a personalised

academic high school could be supported and included a discussion on effective learning and teaching. They argued for a personalised school built on humanised, intellectual relationships for learning, (which was an endorsement for small schools); creative environments that develop a culture of enquiry within a supportive framework; and linked schools with home and family by encouraging increased parental involvement and school/family connections. Allen (2002) argued that personalisation and personalised learning were an integral part of the process of instilling a sense of belonging; more intimate learning environments; mentoring; and an emphasis on group projects. Approximately thirty contributors in a text by DiMartino, Clarke and Wolk (2003), including the founder of the *Big Picture Schools*, Elliot Washor, supported a rationale for personalised learning in which personalised learning plans were developed for each student, and which also included community-based learning; project-based teaching; and standards-based portfolios.

Although the literature trail does not permit a direct connection to be made between the developments in the USA and other countries, it is likely that the high profile commitments of bodies such as the Carnegie Corporation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the unequivocal support of the US Secretary of Education, Roderick Paige (himself a member of the Carnegie Corporation), would not have gone unnoticed in countries such as the United Kingdom. It is also possible that personalised learning emerged simultaneously in both the United States and the United Kingdom, though their contexts were not identical, as the comments that follow indicate.

In the 1997 *Labour Party Manifesto*, Tony Blair (1997) introduced the concept of 'customised, personalised services', in which he described an approach to the co-ordination of employment and career services, along with the utilisation of new technology to improve quality and efficiency. The term was reiterated six years later when Prime Minister Blair launched the principle of personalised learning at the Labour Party Conference, calling for:

At secondary school, personalised learning for every child in new specialist schools and City Academies (Johnson, 2004a, p. 2)

Blair's vision for the United Kingdom's personalisation within public services echoed comments made by David Miliband in 2003, who as Minister of State for School Standards (United Kingdom), had articulated the dual conundrums facing Labour's education policy. The first, he said, was how to combine excellence and equity; the second was 'how to ensure that a universal service responded to the particular needs of individual students'. Tailoring education to meet

the needs of individual students, he said, was 'personalised learning' (Miliband, 2003, p. 227).

Also in 2003 in the United Kingdom, the Working Group on 14-19 Reform was established to examine ways of improving educational offerings to people in the 14 to 19 year old age group. Chaired by Sir Mike Tomlinson, the Working Group made recommendations in 2004 that included the inclusion of 'core learning' and 'main learning'; improved vocational programs; changes to assessment; recognition of qualifications, and to alter the offerings for learners (Working Group on 14-19 Reform, 2004).

In 2004, Blair spoke at a summit on the public services and outlined the following:

Putting the public at the heart of public services also means services that fit the individual needs and preferences of each service user... a commitment to personalised services is beginning to reverse the decades old assumption that the task of public service delivery was to fit the user to the service.... In secondary education, future reform must have as a core objective a flexible curriculum providing a distinct and personal offer (*sic*) to every child. Through choice and personalisation our aim is ambitious and progressive; "services fair for all, personal to each". Public services that harness the drive of competition, and the power of choice to the public sector ethic of altruism and equality (Blair, 2004).

Blair went on to make an observation about the inter-relationship of services, saying:

So, our strategy for continuous improvement through giving power to people involves greater choice, greater voice and more personalised services. But there is one more element. As you all know, public services are a partnership. Parents are key partners in the education of their children. The cooperation of local communities is vital to tackling crime and anti-social behaviour. Employers are key to finding the right jobs for the right people. We can only make real strides in improving the nation's health if citizens themselves lead healthier lifestyles (Blair, 2004).

Background to Personalised Learning: Global Perspectives

American Rationale for Personalised Learning

Long-time activists in the area of personalised learning, Littky and Allen (1999) provided the following perspective when they looked at the co-oper-

ative nature of the context that is required to support personalised approaches:

Truly personalized teaming requires reorganizing schools to start with the student, not the subject matter... A school that takes personalized education to its full potential is less concerned with what knowledge is acquired and more interested in how knowledge is used. The priority at such a school is to know students and their families well enough to ensure that every teaming experience excites the students to learn more. The school that looks at one student at a time truly prepares students for lifelong learning (p. 3).

Clarke (2003) provides an insight into both personalised learning and personalised teaching. In doing so, he highlights the need to provide education that draws on individual experiences, but does not make as explicit as some, that this principle is not the same as allowing everyone to do what they want:

To be effective for all students, we must begin to apply what we know about how individual students construct their learning to the design of educational processes. Rather than suppressing individuality, we should create opportunities for students to express their knowledge. Rather than confining 'choice' to a narrow range of courses in the subject areas, we should design experiences that help students assess their situations, understand their choices, explore options, test their skills, and express their growing confidence in particular directions they have set for their own lives. Rather than confining high school students to only one kind of learning, we should connect them to activities in their communities where learning does make a difference. We should develop programs that let students personalize their learning. Learning is always personal. Denying that maxim condemns us and our students to a frustrating cycle of oppression and rebellion (p. 82).

The distinguishing features of the *Big Picture* model referred to previously emphasise (but only slightly) more the sense of the curriculum being shaped by BOTH the students' needs and the insights/values of the school, and include the following:

- Individualised learning plans that not only meet rigorous educational standards, but which are developed through the student's personal interests;
- An integrated internship in which students go into the community for two days per week and

- do work based on their learning plans, but in relationship with their professional mentors;
- Groups of up to 15 students work with the same teacher while in school, constantly developing relationships between the teacher and the students;
 - Instead of tests, students participate in quarterly dissertation-style defences – exhibitions – before a panel of teachers, parents, mentors and peers;
 - Strong partnerships with families and community organisations, and
 - Recruitment and training of principals and advisors while consistently reinforcing a culture of lifelong learning (Littky, 2004).

The absence of explicit reflection within the US on the nature of the relationship between the individual and society, leaves open two contradictory possibilities: 1) that ANY choice made by an individual student will be accepted, or 2) that students have no basis for negotiating choice because the purpose of personalisation is to make more palatable the acceptance of the (externally determined) inevitable. The presence of a more explicit discussion of the relationship within the UK makes this issue clearer.

The UK's Rationale for Personalised Learning

In 2003, David Miliband, Minister of State for School Standards provided the following definition that explicitly identified the need for negotiation between teachers and students:

Personalised learning does not mean each student learning on their own. It must involve work in classes and groups. But it does mean rigorous determination to ensure that each student's needs are assessed, talents developed, interests spurred and their potential fulfilled.... It means designing the teaching, curriculum and class organisation of schools to reach as many pupils as possible for as much of the time as possible (Miliband, 2003, p. 228).

Two years later Bentley (2005) described personalisation of learning as:

Personalisation is therefore a strategy both for drawing on wider resources and influences for learning beyond the formal organisation of schooling, and for making more of the existing organisational ingredients by creating new flexibilities in tandem with new demands. The difference is that the demands are being fuelled from within – by teachers and students – as much as they are from without, by parents or

policy makers acting through external choices and channels (Bentley, 2005, p. 5).

Charles Leadbeater (2004) outlined an interpretation of personalised learning that was consistent with a more reflective and engaged approach to education when he described it in the following way:

Personalised learning does not apply market thinking to education. It is not designed to turn children and parents into consumers of education. The aim is to promote personal development through self-realisation, self-enhancement and self-development. The child/learner should be seen as active, responsible and self-motivated, a co-author of the script that determines how education is delivered (p. 70). Schools would have to form networks and federations which shared resources and centres of excellence. An individual school in the network would become a gateway to these shared resources (pp. 72-73).

If this approach is to be realised, then it must involve a view of the relationship between the individual and society as something other than combative. Johnson (2004b), in a critique of personalised learning, made the following observation that highlights some of the tensions between the focus on the individual explicit in personalised learning and the need to foster a shared and negotiated sense of the community, which contextualises the learning:

...personalised learning ... can be seen as the apogee of a discourse which has been developing for a quarter of a century, but one which offers at best a partial understanding of the purposes of mass education in modern society and which speaks to a radically neo-liberal agenda (p. 227).

A number of perspectives on personalised learning were provided in the OECD's report entitled *Schooling for tomorrow: personalising education* (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2006), with Ischinger highlighting the nuances of personalised learning:

...the personalisation agenda is also about promoting lifelong learning and of reforming public services more broadly. The reference to "learning" is important because the agendas reach out well beyond the institutional confines of the places called "schools" (Ischinger, 2006, p. 3).

At the system level, the UK's Department for Education and Skills (2006) reassured educators that personalised learning was not a top-down initiative, but

highlighted the imperative for personalised learning to be embraced in all schools:

Personalised learning is not a new DfES initiative, it is a philosophy in education. Many schools and teachers have tailored curriculum and teaching methods to meet the needs of children and young people with great success for many years. What is new is our drive to make the best practices universal across all schools, particularly for children whose needs can be the most challenging to meet.

Personalisation in education reflects a larger idea of customer service applied in the educational domain (Bentley & Miller, 2004), which is probably why

there is little critique of the social context that might occasion such explicit attention to the need for personalisation and might therefore reduce reflection on the circumstances that are needed to support kinds of personalisation that will encourage students to reflect on their own circumstances and to actively engage with rather than just respond to those circumstances. It calls into question the extent to which the negotiation implied in some of the earlier quotations is a genuinely shared aspect of the concept.

How much of this is New?

The themes that characterise personalised learning can be summarised thus:

Table 1: Summary of Themes that Characterise Personalised Learning (Keamy & Nicholas, 2006).

- The student is central and will sometimes work independently, but at other times will work in groups;
- It involves physical re-organisation of schools;
- It involves administrative re-organisation of schools;
- It involves re-organisation of the curriculum;
- The professional practices of teachers are supported by the removal of lower-level administrative and clerical activities so that the teacher is freed to concentrate on the core learning and teaching processes for diverse students and to guide and support students to make appropriate choices;
- There is a concern for lifelong learning;
- There is a mix of academic and vocational learning;
- Engagement occurs in a nurturing environment, including a connectedness with the community;
- There is a community of learning, with strong relationships between adults and students;
- Schools exist not in isolation but as part of networks;
- There are strong links between the classroom and home (including ICT);
- Assessment is related to meaningful tasks;
- ICT will allow each pupil greater diversity for learning to allow for enhanced interactivity between individual students and individual teachers and a more immediate presence inside the classroom of resources from outside the classroom.

Much of what is embraced by personalised learning is neither new nor radical and many of the proponents of personalised learning readily acknowledge this (for instance Department for Education and Skills, 2006; Kelly, 2005; Miliband, 2003). Personalised learning draws on the vast array of literature on inclusive models of education, but in addition to these, capitalises on innovations in technology and explicitly addresses employment-related issues in the new economy. Tensions exist in the move to personalised learning, and these tensions, argues Johnson (2004b) stem from personalised learning being politically rather than educationally driven:

...personalised learning is more important as a political idea than an educational plan. (p. 227).

Despite personalised learning building upon inclusive models of education in which

Inclusiveness is a relationship of diversity to access. Inclusiveness necessitates treating the knowledge and experiences of people from all groups in society as valid and relevant. Teaching, learning and assessment cater for a variety of styles and values (Kalantzis & Cope, 2000, p. 36), not all these aspects are included in approaches to personalised learning. In particular, those aspects of diversity that could be attributed to socio-cultural groupings are not evenly acknowledged in writings about personalised learning unless they overlap with issues of technological or educational access. Perhaps more worrying, is that where socio-cultural groups are mentioned, they are considered as a category, which '...ignores individual characteristics and fails to account for people's multiple realities as well as the thorny issues of conflict and unequal power' (Bottomley, 2000, p. 112).

As noted by Johnson (2004b), when personalised learning 'is taken to extremes it undermines collective values which are necessary for a healthy society' (p. 228). Johnson is commenting here on the unmediated relationship set up by personalised learning between the individual and the State, as can be seen in the quote cited previously and associated with the introduction of personalised approaches in the US:

Far too many failing high schools crush the aspirations of poor students of color, and serve as conveyor belts for the criminal justice system, not for the opportunity that is their birthright (LaMarche quoted in Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2001).

In this example "color" is not a dimension of identity to be celebrated and utilised. Rather, it is an almost incidental attribute of poor individuals on pathways described in the most negative of terms. Unlike productive approaches to multicultural education that would seek to build on the diversity available through individuals' relationships to groups as a positive resource, LaMarche's view of the problem isolates the individual from group resources. This creates a direct relationship between the individual and the State with the corollary that since the State has created the opportunity it is the individual who is at fault for not capitalising upon the opportunity.

Ramifications: Linking Personalisation to a Wider Political Agenda

The comparison between US views of personalised learning and UK-based views of personalised learning indicate differing relationships with the context. US views work within the context of schools as they are currently understood to increase the overall performance of students who may be underachieving. UK-based views reflect an assumption that there is something that needs to change in the ways that schools, their members, their surrounding communities and the wider society relate – looking for ways in which the wider society can be more actively engaged in responding to the needs of students in schools rather than just ways of encouraging students to perform better on pre-determined measures.

Lest the arguments for alternative conceptions of space and teacher authority be taken to imply that teachers should not be seen as having pedagogic expertise and authority, personalised learning approaches also indicate that the core roles of teaching should be allowed to flourish by freeing teachers from the ancillary administrative functions that currently take much of their time. This implies different levels of staffing in schools and, probably, an expansion of schools' operating budgets to enable them to employ additional administrative staff as well as

supplementary teaching staff who would work in a more 'tutorial' role with students needing more or alternative forms of support. The more specialised expertise in teaching that this would call for would also imply a greater attention to professional development, which, in turn would call for a re-negotiation of teacher career structures to better incorporate and reward the professional development required to move from a beginning teacher to an advanced expert teacher able to oversee the negotiation of personalised learning plans with the students, other teaching staff and members of the community from outside the school.

Looking for ways to work productively with wider communities is pivotal when considering how personalised learning might be introduced in contexts that overtly associate themselves with multiculturalism, such as the Australian State of Victoria.

In *A fairer Victoria: progress and next steps update* (Department of Premier and Cabinet, 2006), the Victorian Government indicated:

Victorians come from more than 230 nations; we speak 180 languages and dialects; we follow more than 116 religions. One in four Victorians were born overseas. The next wave of migration may lead to people from up to 150 new language groups coming to Victoria (p. 38).

The diversity that is acknowledged above is mirrored by other levels of diversity within the community involving Indigenous communities, students at risk of various forms of harm, students with varied degrees of engagement with education, students of varied abilities, including gifted students. This diversity of population in a State the size of Victoria makes more challenging than for some other Australian States the idea of negotiating with community and of engaging with difference in ways that challenge and grow the society as a whole. As noted previously by Johnson (2004b):

Personalisation as a principle speaks to the desire for individuality. While this is an understandable emotion, when taken to extremes it undermines collective values which are necessary for a healthy society (p. 228).

Addressing the challenges will involve recognition that personalised learning involves not only recognition of individuals, but of the varied and multiple groups with which those individuals are associated. For personalised learning to be able to engage with the challenges of diversity will require some major investments in the infrastructure, the personnel and the professionalisation of schools and teachers. However, personalising education does not, of itself,

solve the issues of the gendered, cultural or socially stratified influences on educational achievement.

As Leadbeater (2004) pointed out:

... the more that personalised learning promotes self-provisioning, the more it could widen inequalities. As more learning would be done in the pupil's own time, the state will have to work harder to equalize the conditions for learning outside school. Personalised learning will promote equity only if the resources for individualized, home-based learning are also more equally available. Personalised learning encourages us to focus on the totality of resources available for learning, at home and at school (p. 74).

The implications of Johnson's and Leadbeater's comments are that even a principle of negotiation with individuals and communities should not be seen as implying that all options are open. There is a clear and enduring role for the system in fostering shared values. The implications of personalised approaches are that these shared values are not imposed but consistently and repeatedly negotiated.

Recommendations for educational implementation of personalised approaches do not always take full account of the wider social agenda. As an approach, personalised learning clearly attends to the individual. However, it has also been linked to agendas for wider social reform. As described previously, when the United Kingdom's Prime Minister, Tony Blair, spoke at a summit on the public services, he made it clear that personalised learning meant more than simple changes to educational practices when he said:

Through choice and personalisation our aim is ambitious and progressive; "services fair for all, personal to each". Public services that harness the drive of competition, and the power of choice to the public sector ethic of altruism and equality (Blair, 2004).

In the same year, personalised aspects of learning were embedded within the *Tomlinson Review* where mention was also made of the use of 'extended projects', which, amongst other things, would '...provide a personalised "space" within 14-19 programmes for young people to pursue areas of particular interest to them' (Working Group on 14-19 Reform, 2004, pp. 32-33).

In the *Tomlinson Review*, the rhetoric of 'personalised space' features as a further re-constraining of personalised approaches. This, we consider with reference to the work of Jean Martin, is a situation in which cultural pluralism is being advocated without authentic regard being paid to the structural implications (Bottomley, 2000, p. 112) of a move-

ment towards personalised learning. Elements of diversity such as ethnic background, class, gender, regional differences, religious beliefs and socio-economic status have an impact on access and participation (Kalantzis & Cope, 2000), and also act as structural impediments to equitable access to services, including education, for many within most Western societies. If the structural impediments are to be addressed, they must be recognised at the deeper, structural level.

Concluding Comments

Nair (2006), in discussions with the Victorian Department of Education and Training's *Schools in 2020* strategy, gives some indication of what needs to be provided in order for this repeated negotiation to be realised. The needs encompass infrastructure, the professional roles of teaching (including the relationship between professional development and career paths), the specification of 'teaching' and its relationship to ancillary administrative and 'learning support' roles as well as the content of the curriculum and specification of whose voices are listened to in defining the curriculum.

A corollary of this is recognising that teachers are not superhuman and that the work of educating students is necessarily a team enterprise. Different expertise is required for English as a second language, mathematics, innovative uses of information and communication technologies, visual and performing arts and responding to students with specific learning difficulties, backgrounds of torture and trauma or coming to schools with high abilities. There are overlaps and general principles that unite these different domains of knowledge, but those general principles are insufficient. As a team activity, a central part of the professional work of teachers is time for the team to work together. Rather than seeing meetings of staff as adjunct to the teaching process, time, space and support for teachers to work together with one another to share their expertise is an increasingly important component of work that adopts even only partially personalised learning approaches. Re-addressing the workloads of teachers so that the sharing of expertise is central to their professional activity and so that the necessary meetings (with other staff, with students and with members of the extended community) are seen as central rather than squeezed in at the edge will be a major challenge (intellectually and financially) for education systems and schools. It will involve substantial professional development, but professional development alone will not suffice. It will involve re-thinking how time is valued in the profession of teaching. Each of these issues is 'structural' in the sense of Jean Martin rather than merely 'cultural'.

A profound distinction exists between shallow views of personalised learning, which equate it with no more than providing individual choice between predetermined options or total choice with no view of what is valued other than the choice itself, and deeper views of personalised learning that call for space, time and facilities to support a negotiation between multiple parties in shaping the most valued curriculum. A simple rhetoric of choice and attention to individuals is easy to provide, but it results in choice being reduced to a contract that commits students to learn identified elements of a pre-set curriculum. A deeper and more meaningful commitment to personalised learning requires that the system make public its commitment to valuing the time, experience and views of the people who are central to this process (teachers and students) and to fostering their communication with other members of the community who will be involved in the lifelong learning processes of all concerned – these require the ‘system’ to make its structure transparent and open it up to critique.

A challenge for a system that seeks to develop a more personalised approach is how distinctive

strengths can be identified in ways that are co-operative rather than competitive – to build networks of strengths so that the best possible solutions can be offered to the widest range of students. Given that patterns of student needs will repeat across regions and contexts, any education system must both ensure that specific strengths are supported in particular contexts and also ensure that similar strengths can be accessed across the system as a whole. What will be required in order that deep version of personalised learning are accessible by all students, is what Martin (1981 quoted in Bottomley, 2000, p. 112) refers to as a form of robust pluralism that:

...acknowledges that cultural pluralism is dependent on some kind of structural pluralism and recognises ethnic structures as forming one subsystem of roles and relations, among many others, through which individuals in our kind of society try to secure the matching of their inner selves – their identity – with lifestyle and behaviour.

References

- Allen, R. (2002). Big schools: the way we are. *Educational Leadership*, 59(5), 36-41.
- Bentley, T. (2005). *Personalised learning in the UK: from vision to strategy?* Paper presented at the Personalised Learning: High Expectations Symposium, Sydney.
- Bentley, T., & Miller, R. (2004). Personalised learning: creating the ingredients for system and society-wide change, *IARTV Occasional Paper No. 87*. Melbourne: Incorporated Association of Registered Teachers of Victoria.
- Blair, T. (1997). New Labour because Britain deserves better. Retrieved 30/07/06, from <http://www.labour-party.org.uk/manifestos/1997/1997-labour-manifesto.shtml>
- Blair, T. (2004). The future for public services. Retrieved 30/07/06, from <http://society.guardian.co.uk/futureforpublicservices/comment/0,,1134531,00.html>
- Bottomley, G. (2000). Jean Martin and the exploration of (in)difference. *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 1(2), 102-116.
- Carnegie Corporation of New York. (2001). Whole-districts school reform. *Carnegie Reporter*, 1(2), Retrieved 28/07/06, from <http://www.carnegie.org/reporter/02/urban/reform.html>.
- Clarke, J. (2003). Personalized learning and personalized teaching. In J. DiMartino, J. Clarke & D. Wolk (Eds.), *Personalized learning: preparing high school students to create their futures*. Lanham (USA): Scarecrow Press.
- Department for Education and Skills. (2006). Personalised learning: adding value to the learning journey. Retrieved 30/07/06, from <http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/personalisedlearning/about/>
- Department of Premier and Cabinet. (2006). A fairer Victoria: progress and next steps. Retrieved 03/07/06, from [http://www.dpc.vic.gov.au/CA256D800027B102/Lookup/SocialPolicyActionPlan/\\$file/fairer%20vic.pdf](http://www.dpc.vic.gov.au/CA256D800027B102/Lookup/SocialPolicyActionPlan/$file/fairer%20vic.pdf)
- DiMartino, J., Clarke, J., & Wolk, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Personalised learning: preparing high school students to create their futures*. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: probing the depths of educational reform*. London: Falmer.
- Ischinger, A. (2006). Foreword. In *Schooling for tomorrow: personalising education*. Paris: OECD.
- Johnson, M. (2004a). Personalised learning - an emperor's outfit? Retrieved 01/06/06, from www.ippr.org.uk/uploaded-Files/projects/PL%20paper%20for%20publication.PDF
- Johnson, M. (2004b). Personalised learning. New directions for schools? *New Economy*, 11(4), 224-228.
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2000). Towards an inclusive and international higher education. In R. King, D. Hill & B. Hemmings (Eds.), *University and Diversity: Changing Perspectives, Policies and Practices in Australia*. Wagga Wagga: Keon.
- Keamy, R. K., & Nicholas, H. (2006). *Learning is always personal - but it shouldn't be left to the individual. A review of the concept of personalised learning. Report prepared for the Research and Development Branch of the Department of Education and Training*. Melbourne: DE&T.
- Kelly, R. (2005). UK Government White Paper: higher standards, better schools for all. Retrieved 22/05/06, from www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/publications/schoolswhitepaper/

- Kosky, L. (2005). *Keynote Address*. Paper presented at the Schooling for the 21st Century: Unlocking Human Potential, Conference of the Australia and New Zealand School of Government, University of Sydney, September 28 & 29.
- Leadbeater, C. (2004). Personalisation through participation: a new script for public services. Retrieved 05/06/06, from www.demos.co.uk
- Littky, D. (2004). *The Big Picture: in focus*. Paper presented at the USDE High School Leadership Summit.
- Littky, D., & Allen, F. (1999). Whole school personalization: one school at a time. *Educational Leadership*, 57(1), 2-6.
- Miliband, D. (2003). Opportunity for all: targeting disadvantage through personalised learning. *New Economy*, 10(4), 224-229.
- Murphy, J., Beck, L., Crawford, M., Hodges, A., & McGaughy, C. (2001). *The productive high school: creating personalised academic communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Nair, P. (2006). Schools in 2020: a middle years perspective. Retrieved 30/06/06, from www.det.vic.gov.au/edulibrary/public/publ/research/publ/Schools2020MiddleYears-prs-20060223.pdf
- National Association of Secondary Schools Principals. (1999). Breaking Ranks: changing an American institution. Retrieved 28/07/06, from http://www.greaterexpectations.org/briefing_papers/BreakingRanks.html
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2006). *Schooling for tomorrow: personalising education*. Paris: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD.
- Paige, R. R. (2001). The Back Page: no child left behind. *Carnegie Reporter*, 1(2), Retrieved 28/07/06, from <http://www.carnegie.org/reporter/02/backpage/index.html>.
- Working Group on 14-19 Reform. (2004). 14-19 curriculum and qualifications reform: Final Report of the Working Group on 14-19 Reform. Retrieved 29/07/06, from <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/14-19/documents/Final%20Report.pdf>

About the Authors

Dr. (Ron) Kim Keamy

Kim co-ordinates the activities of the School of Educational Studies (SES) at the Albury-Wodonga Campus of La Trobe University, having previously taught in a variety of educational settings that include primary education, physical education, drama, special education, prison education, adult education and Aboriginal education. Kim's research interests are in the area of masculinity/ies, leadership, and inclusive pedagogies (notably in the middle years of schooling). Kim's most recent research in 2006, in conjunction with Dr Howard Nicholas, was in relation to personalised learning as an emerging area of interest for the Department of Education and Training in Victoria, Australia.

Dr. Howard Nicholas

Howard works in the areas of bilingualism and second language acquisition on the Bundoora Campus of La Trobe University. His research work has focused on second language development and policy frameworks for languages education and language teacher education. His interests include both child and adult language development. In 2006 he worked with Dr Kim Keamy on a report about personalised learning for the Department of Education and Training in Victoria, Australia.