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Abstract

This qualitative study addresses intercultural understanding (ICU) in NSW English entry programs to higher education, offered by Registered Training Organisations and universities. These preparatory programs or ‘pathways’ offer international students an alternative entry to university, predominantly through delivering additional English language support. The study entailed investigation into the nature and value of ICU in three institutes. Two of the institutes offered English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students, and the participants were enrolled in classes at the advanced level of ‘English for Academic Purposes’. The third institute also focused on academic English in offering English Communication classes. Pathway processes were explored through observations, curricula analysis, and interviews with administrative staff, tutors, and students. Throughout, the researcher gave recognition to cultural multiplicities (Deleuze, 1968/1994), with particular attention to pedagogical feminism. Critical discourse analysis was employed as the methodology. An additional dimension to the research is provided with auto-ethnographic reflections from the researcher’s own teaching experiences in pathway programs. The study locates methods for students and tutors to penetrate practices that may enrich ICU and clarifies areas where educational policy and pedagogical methodologies may be revised to facilitate deepening ICU.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the Chapter

This thesis is a focused investigation of the nature and value of intercultural understanding (ICU) in New South Wales (NSW) English preparatory Academic English or Academic Communication classes for international students who are aiming to enter higher education (HE). These preparatory classes are known as ‘pathways’ (Australian Qualifications Framework Council [AQFC], 2013, p. 77). In this chapter, I first explain the pathway contexts and the organisation of pathways to HE. I then discuss the values that are attributed to ICU. Within the tenets of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which is the methodological approach to the research, I then provide an outline of the identified significant problem of the lack of ICU that gives cause for investigation into pathway processes. I follow this with a brief explanation of the research purpose and research procedure and relate the significance of the research to pathway practices. Lastly, the key terms that I adopt throughout the thesis are defined.

1.2 Research Context: The Organisation of Pathways to Higher Education

The AQFC is the national governing body that integrates qualifications from all national post-secondary education and training bodies into a consistent and unified system, overseeing 10 levels of qualifications, from Certificate 1 to Doctoral Degree. The AQFC provides a Qualifications Pathways Policy (2013). The International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) (2019) defines pathways to include “award and non-award programs, foundation studies, [and] enabling and short bridging courses, with or without credit transfer to a principal course” (“Pathways”, para. 3). Australian Education International (2007) divides pathways into three main categories. The first includes “stand alone” English language courses (p. 8), which include Bridging English, General English, and English for
Academic Purposes (EAP). VET and HE providers may also run these courses. The second category includes pathway courses that address both academic and English language proficiencies; these include ESL Year 12 programs, Certificate IVs, Diplomas, Advanced Diplomas and Associate Degrees. The third category includes university programs, as universities are self-accrediting; these platforms may also incorporate English language and Foundation programs to facilitate articulation into a particular degree.

The preparatory English pathway programs for HE, the focus of this thesis, require further clarification. In Australia, international education occurs in four key sectors: government and non-government schools; English language intensive courses for overseas students (ELICOS); VET, such as Technical and Advanced Further Education (TAFE) institutes and private colleges; and HE, mainly through universities (International Education Advisory Council [IEAC], 2013, p. 7). To facilitate horizontal and vertical pathways between qualifications, pathway courses are available for host-national and international students who require additional support in English to qualify for entry into undergraduate degrees. The university that a pathway is affiliated with stipulates the English entry-level requirements for the various degrees that it offers. For host-national students with a low Australian Tertiary Admissions Rank (ATAR) and for international students, pathways provide an opportunity to attain the required English level for their chosen degree.

The Australian government began decreasing financial support to universities from the late 1980s (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2004); between 1995 and 2000 NSW’s percentage of GDP to HE fell by .2 per cent (Welch, 2013, p. 205). As educational facilities have become increasingly reliant on international students for revenue, the significance of

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\]

\textsuperscript{1} Page numbers are provided for quotes as well as for citations referring to particular content in a text.
pathway courses has swollen. International students have been able to utilise the AQFC Pathways Policy to gain university entry qualifications. Because the AQFC supports the pathways process, pathway structures are nationally adopted. Students without the required qualifications for entry into a specific course at undergraduate degree Level 7 and universities that are aiming to increase finances come together within the conditions of the AQFC’s Pathways Policy. In the 2017-2018 financial year, Australia’s education export industry provided approximately 32 billion in revenue (Department of Education and Training [DET], 2019a), and in 2019 remained the third leading destination for international students, behind the USA and Great Britain (DET, 2019b).

In academic English qualifying settings, students are typically identified in relation to their nation-state. Students of Asian-Pacific (East, South, and Southeast Asian) nationalities predominate in Australia (Productivity Commission, 2015a, p. 52). The DET’s end of 2018 international student data summary states that the five highest nationalities contributed 56.0% of enrolments in all sectors: China (29.2%), India (12.4%), Nepal (6%), Brazil (4.7%), Malaysia (3.8%) and other nationalities (44%) (DET, 2018). In higher education, Chinese (around 38%) and Indian (around 20%) commencements were the two highest source nationalities. In ELICOS, China was the main source nation (around 30%, followed by Brazil (11.6%) Colombia (9.4%) and Thailand (5.6%). In the VET sector, Indian enrolments predominated (12.2%), followed by China (9.1%), Brazil (8.4%) and Nepal (8%) (DET, 2018).

The recent decades of rapid globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education have brought about both new cultural and intercultural learning as well as considerable tensions. While many strategies have been employed to accommodate students from overseas, the understandings to be gained through these intercultural experiences require deeper clarification. To address what I identify as a social problem or “social wrong”
(Fairclough, 2016, p. 91) of a lack of ICU in pathways, it was necessary to determine what impedes or enhances ICU in the preparatory contexts. This study thus investigated the nature and value of ICU within three NSW education institutes (referred to as Paths 1, 2, and 3) that provided academic English classes for international students aiming to enter HE. The research sites were two ELICOS centres, one within a NSW regional university (Path 1), and the other within a NSW metropolitan university (Path 2), and a private VET (Path 3) that was affiliated with the same metropolitan university as Path 2.

These course providers must have approval and registration with The Commonwealth Register of Institutions and Courses for Overseas Students [CRICOS] (Australian Government, 2018a), which is the Australian Government register of all providers of courses to people studying on student visas. This ensures that registered providers will “have met, and [will] continue to meet, the requirements of the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS Act) and National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2007 (National Code)” (2018a, para. 1). Both ELICOS and Foundation Program course providers are also required to meet the relevant ELICOS or Foundation Program Standards.

ELICOS centres are determined on the basis of principally providing English language training (ESOS Act). They offer ‘non award’ courses that lie outside the AQF. ELICOS centres offer a number of courses but for this study, the relevant course offering was the final or highest level, English for Academic Purposes, which corresponds with the Foundation Program that was offered by Path 3. ELICOS courses generally run every five weeks. The Australian Government’s ELICOS Standards 2018 (2018b) stipulate that centres provide 20 face-to-face contact study hours a week (s. P1) and teacher-to-student ratios do not exceed 1:18 per class (s. P3). Within ELICOS, the International English Language
Testing System (IELTS) is adopted to assess language proficiency for either academic or general use; the former is adopted for student assessment.

Path 3 offered Foundation Programs, which are also ‘non award’ courses that lie outside the AQF. Foundation Programs are “nationally recognised courses that … provide an academic entry pathway to first year undergraduate study or its equivalent” (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency [TEQSA], 2018, p. 1). TEQSA’s National Standards Foundation Program (2010) stipulates that a Foundation program:

must reflect minimum entry requirements: a. successful completion of Australian Year 11 or a comparable educational level; b. attainment of English language proficiency comparable to an overall score of 5.5 in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) or equivalent. (s. 2)

Foundation Programs include “a minimum of 200 hours of scheduled course contact hours in formal English language learning and communication skills for students…[including] 100 hours of formal class contact time, as well as regular, supervised self-directed study of English” (s. 4.1). The offered subjects should span a diverse range of Key Learning Areas, and “include at least one subject in each of the following areas: Mathematics, Science and Technology, The Arts, Society and the Environment/Business and Legal Studies” (s. 3.2).

Universities create close affiliations with HE providers of pathway courses or establish their own, facilitating a continual flow of a predominantly international clientele. In Sydney, for example, these pathways include the University of Sydney’s ‘Centre for English Teaching’, the University of New South Wales’ ‘Institute of Languages’, the University of Technology Sydney’s ‘Insearch UTS’, and the Western Sydney University’s ‘UWS College’. Pathway options are available on HE websites, where entry requirements, including IELTS score levels, are set out.
For all students, pathways can develop confidence and promote social networks. For universities, they increase retention rates and gain the financial benefits of substantial enrolments. Socially, the culture achieves a more equitable distribution of avenues into higher income positions. In *Transforming Australia’s Higher Education System*, the federal government’s Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR), (2009) emphasised the AQFC’s role in developing “articulation and connectivity between the higher education and vocational education and training… [to] ensure that competency-based and merit-based systems talk to and value each other and that we improve pathways and movements between sectors” (p. 43). Similarly, the Universities Australia (2013) report, *A Smarter Australia: An Agenda for Higher Education*, expressed their aim for universities to “broaden pathways into university degrees” (p. 3) and to “maintain and strengthen their partnerships with schools, vocational institutions and communities supported by the Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program” (p. 20). The policy enables universities to create credit arrangements, based on outcomes, content, volume, and assessment (AQF, 2013, p. 79).

1.3 The Nature of Intercultural Understanding

While I conduct a robust discussion on various ICU models in Chapter Two, I provide here a general overview of the defining elements of ICU. How ‘culture’ is defined is foundational to interpretation. The term has been explained and defined in a myriad of ways. Throughout this thesis, traditional emphases on culture as national have been avoided to encompass multiple cultural differences and to acknowledge identities as constructed and continually changing. Abdallah-Pretceille (2006) employs the term ‘culturalities’ to capture the significance of the plurality and variety of cultural features or characteristics. Culturalities are perceivable as the variable processes of created shared meaning, “social constructions” (p. 477), which are a means of interpreting, organising, and giving value to the perceived and
imagined. Culturalities occur through multiple interrelating interpretive systems—individual, local, regional, national, and international. They are inconstant and span all created meaning, through external and internal symbolic representation. I have attempted to similarly employ the concept of culturalities throughout the thesis to give regard to the construction of multiple identities, beliefs, and knowledges and their impermanent condition, and thus further assist in the deconstruction of culture as inherently and predominantly national and embrace additional situated identities such as the local and glocal. I thus define the nature of ICU as effective interaction between people with identified different culturalities and as dependent on knowledge—learning about other culturalities or intercultural learning (IL)—and intercultural competence (ICC), which is the development of the skills and attitudes (or awareness) to interact with people with or of different culturalities (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

I give preference to the term ‘intercultural understanding’ over others because ‘understanding’ incorporates agency. ‘Understanding’ may be interpreted as less specific than ‘competency’, but I view this as an advantage, because it conveys a connotation of openness or consideration, which is appropriate since there is no consensus on definitive competencies or whether designated competencies can be applied across various cultures (Denson, Ovenden, Wright, Paradies, & Priest, 2017). The term ‘intercultural understanding’ is, therefore, an acknowledgement of the absence of a standardised favouring of particular competencies. In addition, ICU does not privilege the global over the national or the local in its application or claim to produce a global identity. ICU and ‘cosmopolitanism’ could be used interchangeably, as both are associated with an intrinsic concern for a shared humanity, and both may also be related to international, national, and particular localised contexts. The term ‘cosmopolitanism’, however, carries historical associations that are not consistently consonant so has not been adopted as a common term in this thesis.
Comparisons have been made between multiculturalism and interculturalism or intercultural dialogue (Levey, 2012; Meer & Modood, 2012). The *Multiculturalism NSW Act 2000* commits to the equal rights of all citizens regardless of their language, religion, and cultural heritage. Multiculturalism has been criticised, however, for enabling cultural co-existence without fostering cultural interaction (Mansouri, Elias, & Sweid, 2017; Moloney, 2000). Cultures have also been perceived as essentialist, fixed entities, rather than as fluid and relational, with cultural difference defined in the limited terms of ‘race’ and class (Cantle, in Girishkumar, 2015, pp. 730-731; Quijano, 2000). Within these constraints, inequalities may develop. The construction of ‘diversity’ and the ‘acceptance’ of multiculturalism can thus be interpreted as another product of the colonial ‘civilizing mission’, where ‘the migrant’ is subjugated into something Other.

While criticisms of the ineffectiveness of ‘multiculturalism’ have been challenged (Levey, 2012; Meer & Modood, 2012), others see the new emphasis on interaction as a positive change. The main issue, as Mansouri, Elias, and Sweid (2017) point out, is whether a shift from recognition and acknowledgement of cultures to their significant inclusion and “intercultural engagement for all” can be made (p. 4). As Kumaravadivelu puts it (2008, p. 237), “learning about other cultures may lead to cultural literacy; it is learning from other cultures that will lead to cultural liberty”. This study accepts that discourses surrounding ICU deepen and extend multiculturalism by promoting interaction between cultures in recognition of cultural similarities and differences.

**1.4 The Values Attributed to Intercultural Understanding**

Imperatives for promoting ICU have been explicated through multiple perspectives: demographic, technological, economic, pacific, religious or spiritual, and interpersonal (Jin & Cortazzi, 2013; Lustig & Koester, 2013; Nakayama & Halualani, 2010; Rizvi, 2009; UNESCO Office Bangkok and Regional Bureau for Education in Asia and the Pacific,
Emphasis within ICU discourses is orientated towards analysing power relationships at the international, national and local levels. Increasing religious and linguistic diversity within nations over the past two decades is attributed to demographic changes through globalisation (Lustig & Koester, 2013) and perceptions of the nation-state as, arguably, in transition (Burgess, 2004; Dawson, 2002). Technological developments have enabled distance communication in real time and across multiple cultures, rendering the necessity for ICU. Economic demands raise the need for ICU because business exchange, particularly through international trading and culturally diverse employment settings (Summers & Volet, 2008, p. 357), depends on successful communication in work environments. Globalisation is also accompanied with recognition of national interdependencies and thus the need to establish or maintain reliable, trusting and secure relations between nations (UNESCO, 2010). Lastly, the “interpersonal imperative” for intercultural competence refers to day-to-day interchanges in an intercultural world that challenge traditional cultural paradigms (Lustig & Koester, 2013, p. 10) and place expectations on individuals to recognise that their cultural preferences are constructed.

According to UNESCO, Leeds-Hurwitz, and Stenou (2013), ICU presents opportunities that may “lead to rediscovering one’s own identity under the deciphered forms of the ‘other’” (p. 6). ICU must be understood in relation to the environment, society (including politics) and the economy, with culture as the fourth underlying and interconnecting sphere (p. 1). The essence of education for ICU is preparing the student “for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin” (p. 9). Educators are, therefore, “responsible for strengthening the child’s cultural identity and values, while also promoting respect and understanding for the culture of others”
It is evident from the *National Strategy for International Education 2025* (DET, 2016) that the DET is projecting intercultural competency as an education outcome: “Our multicultural society, highly internationalised institutions and international outlook, along with programs that encourage foreign language learning and intercultural awareness, foster the acquisition of cultural competencies” (p. 15). The Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA, 2016) has assumed responsibility for deepening intercultural ties by integrating an ‘Intercultural Understanding’ program with the other six ‘general capabilities’ of the national school curriculum. The syllabus “focuses on sharing, creating and contesting different cultural perceptions and practices, and supports the development of a critical awareness of the processes of socialisation and representation that shape and maintain cultural differences” (p. 3).

Similarly, cultural, economic, and political global developments have led universities to promote internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC) programs. The University of Sydney’s School of Education and Social Work (2018), for example, states that the School:

- aims to produce graduates who work productively, collaboratively, and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries….Graduates of the Sydney School of Education and Social Work will become:
  - aware of cultural competency skills
  - conscious of diverse cross-cultural communication and interactions
  - able to engage with diverse communities by exercising the ability to adapt service delivery to best suit diverse cultural, social, ethnic and religious needs. (“Graduate Qualities”, para. 3)
Explanations for such IoC programs vary. Clifford and Joseph (2005) have outlined three main approaches to IoC. First, the economic rationalist position considers economic gains in recruiting international students to compensate for reductions in government funding. Second, in view of the need to address demands from global markets, the integrative approach (Knight, 2003) aims to incorporate IL into existing curricula. The aims are academic, with intentions to expand HE capacity, improve HE quality, and extend knowledge, while strongly emphasising intercultural goals to advance a deeper appreciation of cultural differences and promotion of global citizenship (P. Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006; de Wit, 2002). Third, the transformative approach (C. Mohanty, 2003) is inclusive of cultural features beyond ‘nationality’ such as diversity of gender, class, and religion. Knowledges are understood as constructed and analysed in terms of power positions, necessitating pedagogical revision.

This research has drawn out the main relevant stakeholder perspectives within the pathways to the HE sector –the administrators, tutors, and students – to determine ways in which existing preferences are educational, necessary, and just. While bearing in mind the many strategies that have been implemented in HE, including extensive orientation programs, mentors, and additional English support classes, this study predominantly focuses on the ongoing institutional processes that continue to inhibit ICU within the studied contexts.

1.5 The Problem: Fissures in the Development of Intercultural Understanding

Processes that impede or promote ICU require greater analysis. Current Australian mainstream, hegemonic cultural perspectives can mask insight into the Other’s (Said, 1978/2003) perspectives and needs that are not intrinsic to the Australian mainstream cultures. The DET and universities embrace multiculturalism and interculturalism in rich discourses on diversity, but at the same time, students are expected to conform to traditional, homogenising, educational processes (Hatoss, 2012; Marginson, 2012, p. 500; Rizvi, 2007; S.
Robertson, 2011; Tran & Vu, 2016), despite the increasing diversity of the Australian population. The achievement of effective intercultural communication has been continuously relegated to the international student (Koutlaki & Eslami, 2018). Assumptions that the international student needs to adopt the host nation’s cultures underlie students’ cultural learning. This means that students are not always encouraged to consider and express their individuality, their own cultural experiences and knowledges in relation to the course content (p. 101). Leask (2010) has been critical of how university internationalisation aims, as expressed in Graduate Qualities outcomes that intend to draw upon the cultural diversity of students, have failed to develop meaningful cross-cultural communication. Educational institute processes are predominantly causing “sociospatial segregation” (Fincher & Shaw, 2009, p. 1884) of transnational students at university in their accommodation choices and in their available social interactions. Recommendations for change include the development of spaces where transnational students can connect with other communities (Fincher, Carter, Tombesi, Shaw, & Martel, 2009).

In addition, the failure of education facilities to address ‘racial’ tension continues to have broad ramifications that can sometimes be extreme. The nature of racisms varies across contexts (S. Hall, 1978), because diversity is defined or interpreted in different ways (Meriläinen, Tienari, Katila, & Benschop, 2009). In addressing rising race hate in Australian schools, Hartung, Halse and Wright (2015) note that 70 per cent of “Australian school students have experienced some form of racism”. ACARA’s (2016) education focus on ICU, however, ends at Year 10, not Year 12, which contributes towards the gap in discourses of global ethics and diversity at the upper-secondary and post-secondary levels, despite the Australian HE system and workforce becoming increasingly more internationalised. In contrast, in her research in an Australian ELICOS centre, Hatoss (2006, p. 57) found that students wanted to learn about different cultures in their English classes: British and
European (62%), Asian (55%), American (52%), and they “showed great interest in Australian Indigenous culture” and in learning about Australian social values and attitudes (p. 60).

In her study of an Australian pathway institute, Mendan (2012) also found a gap between what she identifies as ideal institutional social engagement (with the institute addressing the academic, social, emotional, and living dimensions of a student’s life) and views of current student engagement (typically confined within a closed perception of academia) (p. 27). Evidence of either a clear understanding of aims and processes required for the achievement of fuller student engagement or efforts to develop student engagement through social discourses or relationships was not forthcoming in the study.

Knowledge of cognitive processes also underscore the need for pedagogical programs to acknowledge the cultural backgrounds of international students (Connell, 2013; Coonan, Fox, Ohi & Halse, 2017; Halse et al., 2015; Mendan, 2012), which are so clearly neglected in pathway contexts. The absence of intercultural learning (IL) in the preparation of students for HE is sustained through an underlying ontological assumption that the post-secondary age of 17 or 18 automatically equates with adulthood, independence and responsibility, and higher order thinking (and potential openness to interculturality). Based on the review of existing literature and the evidence gained, this research rejects this assumption. As Deardorff (n.d.) states:

Intercultural competence unfortunately does not “just happen” for most; instead, it must be intentionally addressed. Intentionally addressing intercultural competence development at the post-secondary level through programs, orientations, experiences, and courses – for both our domestic and international students – is essential if we are to graduate global-ready students. (p.2)

Constructivist theory, as conceived, for example, through Piaget (1936/1952; 1977), Dewey
(1917/1993), and Vygotsky (1978), highlights that new concepts are related to existing concepts or knowledge – our past has a significant bearing on how we interpret the present or the new. Constructivist pedagogy perceives the learner as actively involved in an “interpretive, recursive, nonlinear building process” (Fosnot & Perry, 2005, p. 34) through the acknowledgement of their past experience and knowledge and interactions with their environment.

Global neoliberal influence and a postmodernist tendency toward an emphasis on human multiplicity, without a core or essential self, over human commonality (Hutcheon, 1988; McHale, 1987; Sarup, 1989; Waugh, 1984) has also become a (neoliberal) means of justifying renunciation of responsibility to give emphasis to the social conditions of humanity, and brought an indifference that has permeated education (Connell, 2013; Hujo & Piper, 2010; Marginson, 2011). Postmodernist sceptical perspectives (Bacchi, 2010; Barry, 1995; Hutcheon, 1988; Waugh, 1984) have also unintentionally supported neoliberal dynamics in denigration of universal notions for their underlying uniformity and denial of difference. A further premise for rejection of universals has been the historically narrow European conception of humanity that underpinned the abhorrent practices of colonisation (Chakrabarty, 2000; Spivak, 1988). Hassan (2008) points out, however, that empiric universals abound across differences: “Languages; human emotions; marks of status; ceremonies of birth, marriage, and death; gods, spirits, taboos, and rituals ... Cultures and individuals not only vary infinitely; their variations also follow patterns; and even chaos seems to follow complex rules” (pp. 3-4). Such similarities do not suggest absolutes, and recognition of empiric commonalities does not negate recognition of difference.

Postmodernist influence, furthermore, has brought denunciations of the autonomous subject, that “vacate[s] the traditional [essential] self” (Hassan, 1987, p. 169), and reinforced rejections of traditional value systems and metanarratives (Lyotard, 1984). While insights
into humanity’s radical uncertainty may have deepened epistemologies of the subject, there have been no concomitant overarching stabilising developments originating from traditional power structures, the legal system, spiritual organisations, or education, for example, to challenge the decline of social concerns produced by neoliberal dynamics. Support groups have multiplied, such as religious and spiritual groups and non-profit organisations, which may compensate for this lack, but these groups are in continuous efforts to invest neoliberal practices with moral, humane concerns.

Regulation in Australia also seems caught between, on the one hand, becoming inappropriately controlling and unrepresentative of democratic structures, and on the other hand, continuing to function in passive denial, allowing economic forces to undermine the very fabric of libertarian democracy. While immediate and rigorous enforcement of democratic principles seems necessary to counteract student exploitation, it may at the same time cause the governments to appear restrictive and in opposition to neoliberal freedoms. Neoliberalism promotes individual freedom without many restrictions and thus appears to support democratic principles of equality and fairness, but economic processes upheld by moral support for individual choice override social concerns (Rizvi, 2009, p. 259). A different outlook is needed to consolidate attention to intercultural practices and to thereby open the way to addressing the current imbalance in power distribution. Such an approach could assist pathway participants in becoming cognisant of their agency in cultural interpretation and ICU.

Partly because of these wider global and national processes, the scope and intensity of methods to accommodate international students vary between institutions “from ad hoc to the highly systematic” (Qiang, 2003, p. 259), and highlight both the absence of adequate policy on ICU in pathway contexts and the unrealised value potential among education providers in developing ICU. Many of these strategies are underpinned by financial and Eurocentric
concerns, are indicative of a lack of strong non-Eurocentric perspectives or strategies and are not designed for in-class practices. Curricula content is focused on teaching from Eurocentric cultural viewpoints. Students’ perspectives, which may significantly differ from those of the tutor or classroom texts are not necessarily voiced. Pedagogical practices that integrate constructivist approaches, for example, may seem to lack educational value to international students (R. Chen & Bennett, 2012). International student interaction with host-national students, moreover, is limited (Besser & Cronau, 2015; Summers & Volet, 2008). The formal and informal networks that students establish will affect their identities and interrelationships and determine their abilities in ICU (Mansouri & Kiritchenko, 2016, p. 308). With NSW preparatory programs predominantly pertaining to curricula that are Eurocentric in orientation and content (Alatas, 2003; Hatoss, 2006; Macer, 2012; Rizvi, 2009), it is apparent that the IL taking place is monocultural and unidirectional. The result is an Australian HE system that is neither efficiently utilising presented diversities nor deepening appreciations of the varied perspectives that may work to extend or challenge current dominant epistemologies in Australian education. The true worth of ICU is unheeded.

This study focused on international students in pathways to higher education where, as within school and university contexts (Hartung et al., 2015; Leask, 2010; Tran & Vu, 2016; Udah, 2018), multiple cultural identities come together and yet are apparently given little acknowledgement or means of personal expression. Each pathway context case study comprised international students only.

1.6 Purpose and Research Outline

The aim of this research is to locate and promote strategies that may enhance and deepen intercultural relationships in pathway contexts. The study involved researching the nature and value of ICU within the pathway contexts. The study supports the broadening of a critical review of educational practices, particularly of power positions that perpetuate
inequalities and the suppression of creative and diverse expressions. Through insights into underlying ideological performances, the study contributes to the knowledge of effective methods for the development of ICU.

I conducted a focused ethnographic study within three NSW HE pathway contexts to locate behaviours and processes that either promoted or impeded the development of ICU. Attitudes and perceptions were collected from interviews with administrators, tutors, and students. The institutes’ curricula for each of the significant units, including sections of each unit’s main textbook, were gathered, and observations were conducted on out-of-class processes, activities and physical surroundings. To examine this data, I adopted critical discourse analysis as the methodology and embraced theories of constructivism, feminism and intersectionality, as discussed in Chapter Three. An additional dimension to the study was created through auto-ethnographic accounts. I have extensive tutoring experience within pathway contexts and offer experiential accounts as “a complete member-researcher”, a key feature of analysis within auto-ethnography (G. Anderson, 2008, p. 378). As both producer and product of pathway cultures, I provide personal perceptions of experiences to reveal successful and unsuccessful intercultural interactions and to uncover new socio-cultural insights.

1.7 Research Questions

The overarching research question to address the identified problem of a lack of address to ICU in pathway contexts and to find strategies to overcome the problem was: What is the nature and value attributed to ICU in NSW pathway contexts?

This main question was broken down into three sub-questions:

1: How do the identities in pathway institutions, those of administrator, tutor, and international student, promote or impede ICU?
2: How do pedagogical practices, including curricula discourses, promote or impede ICU?

3: How do the physical environments promote or impede ICU?

Through the interviews and text analyses, these research questions aimed to investigate the agents’ identities, their attitudes toward intercultural relations and practices that might promote or impede ICU. The out-of-class observations were designed to better understand how the physical spaces and objects might also serve to promote or inhibit ICU development.

1.8 Significance of the Research

ICU is assuming more importance, as globalisation increasingly interconnects people with different culturalities. The need for connectivity and the means to achieve it demand recognition of local and glocal interests. We need to base our new international relationships on current knowledge and interactions, not on stereotypical assumptions or images sustained from past histories (J. Ryan, 2016). Our perceptions of others must grow from the voices of those ‘Others’, with an understanding of their values and significant knowledges.

Worldwide, the research relates to the governance of migration and migrant civil rights (Marginson, 2012; Piper, 2010), with implications for equity issues that are currently politically intense in many countries, such as visa regulations, employment, access to education, and other basic needs. ICU embraces cultural diversity, and pathway contexts present a convergence of local, national, and global identities.

Although representative and not necessarily eliciting generalisations, the case studies presented in this thesis provide insight into intercultural experience and interpretation at social and personal levels, by identifying the cultural structures, practices, and values of ICU. Research into the nature and value of ICU within pathway contexts will be potentially beneficial in identifying educational practices that inhibit intercultural interactions and
locating effective strategies that further develop interactions in pathway contexts. Additional auto-ethnographic explications provide a personal and cultural critique. Guided by the social and political theories of constructivism, feminist pedagogy, and intersectionality, these discourses on intercultural interaction enrichment may inform orientations toward curricula development and delivery prior to and within HE. Recommendations for policy changes and teachers follow from the insights of this research.

1.9 Definitions of Key Terms

In providing the following list of definitions, I do not intend to suggest a privileged, static set of meanings; rather, I acknowledge that each of the definitions is highly contested and has multiple potential interpretations and uses in policy and practice. However, as I incorporate these terms in my data collection and analyses, I provide a reference for readers to understand my working definitions and current understandings of them. In addition, I have provided references to some but not all of the definitions given; this inconsistency is indicative of my provisional appropriation of the terms.

Acculturation—This term refers to the adjustments that an individual, community or society undergoes in connecting with new culturalities such as adopting values and behaviours of host cultures. Acculturation may be “unidirectional”, “a mutual process”, or “multidimensional” (Berry, 2003, p. 18).

Acculturation strategies—These approaches refer to the attitudes and behaviours that individuals draw upon during intercultural experiences (Berry, 2003, p. 21).

Asia—In an attempt to unsettle discourses pertaining to “the West and the Rest” (S. Hall, 1992/2018), the term ‘Asia’ is applied in the geographical context, with more specific cultural and national locations identified where possible.

Assimilation—This term describes individuals who willingly adopt the cultural identities of the host culture (Berry, 2003, p. 24).
Cosmopolitanism—This term refers to a “transnational altruism” (Robbins, 1998, p. 2), or freedom from local, national or global identities, while the relative relationship to each, whether in some way located and embodied, remains questionable.

Cross-cultural communication—This is “a comparison of communication in one culture with communication in another culture” (Corbett, 2011, p. 307). The term tends to be adopted in discourses that homogenise cultural features according to national boundaries.

Culture—This term is sometimes associated with perceiving cultural characteristics as fixed and objectified and appropriated in discourses of nation. However, Leask and Carroll’s (2013) definition incorporates the notion of continuous construction and individual choice and diversity:

A very broad concept that encompasses the lifestyle, traditions, knowledge, skills, beliefs, norms and values shared by a group of people. Cultures are most often recognised by shared patterns of behaviours and interactions, cognitive constructs and affective understandings. These are learned through a process of socialization. However, within different cultural groups, individuals are unique. Meaning is continuously constructed through human interaction and communication within and across cultural groups. … (p.6)

In the absence of the notion of ‘culturalities’ in the literature, this definition is adopted throughout the thesis when cultures are discussed from the author’s perspective.

Culturality—Abdallah-Pretceille (2006) regards the diverse and fluctuating multiplicity of cultural characteristics and traces as ‘culturalities’, contextualised within political, social, and economic conditions. This term is also regularly adopted throughout the thesis to capture the shifting and intersecting nature of cultural characteristics.

Discourse—This term refers to meaningful language of speech, writing, and visual images, manifested through social practices; “it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge
and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 6).

Discrimination—In Australia, this term is described as occurring “when a person, or a group of people, is treated less favourably than another person or group because of their background or certain personal characteristics” (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2019, “Discrimination”, para.1). Protected attributes include “age, disability, race, sex, intersex status, gender identity and sexual orientation in certain areas of public life, including education and employment” (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2019, “Discrimination”, para. 5).

Ethnicity—Sáenz and Morales (2019) explain this term as a social construct that refers to the identification of people according to their cultural conventions, nationality, and/or claimed or assumed genealogies. As a construct, the identifications are fluid and contextual (p.166).

Eurocentricity—Eurocentricity refers to bias towards shared epistemological assumptions generally adopted across Britain, the central and western European nations, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand that are recognised in philosophy, religion, politics, science and the arts, including Christianity, secularism, democracy, and capitalism. It includes long-held positions of wealth and power over other nations through colonial operations and neoliberal aims.

Global competence—Global competence broadly speaks to skills applicable to a spectrum of difference, as in Brustein’s (2007) description, which includes “awareness of and adaptability to diverse cultures, perceptions and approaches; familiarity with the major currents of global change and the issues they raise, and the capacity for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries” (p. 383).
Global identity—Global identity suggests that the subject identifies particular issues as global and relates to transnational identities, although an interest in understanding various particular culturalities across the globe may not be consistently appropriated, as local and national values may be prioritised over global values.

Integration—This term refers to the sojourner who has “an interest in maintaining their original culture during daily interactions with other groups” (Berry, 2003, p. 24).

Intercultural competence (ICC)—There is no broadly accepted definition of the attributes of ICC but, as discussed in more detail in Chapter Two, numerous ICC models agree on kinds of awareness, skills, and knowledge as requirements for ICC (Alizadeh & Chavan, 2015).

Intercultural Dialogue—This refers to the “equitable exchange and dialogue among civilizations, cultures and peoples, based on mutual understanding and respect and the equal dignity of all cultures” (Mansouri, Elias, & Sweid, 2017, p. 12).

Interculturality/Interculturalism—These terms refer to people of identified different culturalities interacting with mutual respect. In this study, the terms are interchangeable with ICU.

Intercultural learning (IL)—This refers to the development of the awareness, skills, and knowledge needed for successful interactions with those of varying culturalities.

Intercultural understanding (ICU)—ICU is the ability and willingness to interact with others of different culturalities. ICU is considered to incorporate awareness, skills and knowledge for effective intercultural relations. I have maintained the use of ‘intercultural understanding’ as the main term for discussion because ICC emphasises individual skill, instigating criticism that the term is Eurocentric for not recognising the relational dimension of intercultural relations, which would be apparent in various ‘Asian’ epistemologies (Dalib, Harun, Yusofl, & Ahmad, 2017; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). In addition, ICC implicitly
suggests that competency is a final achievement, whereas ‘understanding’ suggests that comprehension is continually involved in the interaction.

Internationalisation at Home (IaH)—Beelen and Jones (2015) define ‘internationalisation at home’ as “the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments” (p. 69).

Intersectionality—This term is defined by McCall (2005) as “the relationship among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formation” (p. 1771).

Multiculturalism—As an official immigration policy, multiculturalism has been integrated into education since the mid-1970s. Past and present policies have upheld a liberal pluralist position towards “the Other”, in aiming to “enhance support and respect for cultural, religious, and linguistic diversity” (Department of Immigration and Citizenship [DIAC], 2011) and in referring to “ideological/normative” ideas on the methods for shaping Australian cultures (Lopez, 2000, p.3).

Neoliberalism—This is a philosophy in which social policy is dominated by market principles, privatisation, free trade and deregulation, and individualism (individual responsibility) (Welch, 2013, p. 193).

Other—This term designates the alternatively defined, as explained through self-identities; in recognition that the term is “essentialising and binarising” (Manathunga, 2014, p. 5; Said, 1978/2003), throughout this research, the awareness of the transience of self and of the external, the Other, is maintained.

Race—Race is a social construct (Sáenz & Morales, 2019; Sanchez & Garcia, 2012). The scientific, biological underpinnings that were once attributed to race hold no value (Kobayashi & Peake, 1994; Proudford & Nkomo, 2006). Attention to discourses of race and
racism are due to the ongoing social and political attribution of particular features of individuals, particularly physical, to be grouped together.

Segregation—This term describes individuals who are separated by the dominant social group (Berry, 2003, p. 25).

Separation—This term describes individuals who “place a value on holding on to their original culture and at the same time wish to avoid interacting with others” (Berry, 2003, p. 24).

West/Western—This term, which in this thesis generally arises in cited text, is contested and problematic. Like Eurocentricity, it may be used to signify shared epistemological assumptions and beliefs on long held positions of power and wealth over other nations through colonial operations and neoliberal aims. However, some scholars do not share these assumptions, and the elision of these diverse contexts can perpetuate precisely what critiques seek to redress. The “West” in most contexts refers to the hegemonic cultural discourses of the geographical areas mentioned above: Britain, Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

2.1 Introduction to the Chapter

In order to gain deeper understanding of the nature of ICU in pathway contexts, this study includes a review of relevant research on ICU, including academic perspectives and grey literature. I considered the research context as inherently interdisciplinary and, therefore, the rationale was to adopt an interdisciplinary approach in reviewing sources of interculturality.

Each of the different disciplines of psychology, philosophy, sociology and political theory have distinctive perspectives and emphases on the individual and their social, intercultural relations. Throughout the chapter, I explore how these link to my core inquiry. In psychology, I provide recognition of the possible role of age as an influence on student interculturality as well as the altered social and environmental influences on them, their identities, and their behaviours. Through educational philosophy, I offer an insight into the growing awareness of diversity among tutors and students and the increasing emphasis of the ethical need to incorporate intercultural understanding into classrooms. Through sociological perspectives, I focus on the organisational functions within the pathway context, how the institutional interpretations of race, gender, and religion sway intercultural relations and understandings. In political theory, I examine influential and conflicting political perceptions that have permeated pathway organisations. These different perspectives on the individual in culture and interculturalism raise issues in data analysis and in drawing inferences. They widen the scope of interpretation, deepening the complexity of the dynamics of interculturality and raise further questions on interpretative methods, denying the researcher or learner the notion of any static interpretations to rest upon.

The chapter begins with an overview of predominant ‘culture’ taxonomies and discussion on the apparent difficulty that educators have had in accommodating the various assertions of cultural difference. It follows with a summary of major intercultural
communication competency models along with posited assessment methods, highlighting problems that these models may present for Australian educators. Attention is then given to global and national dynamics affecting ICU. This section addresses global trends driving overseas student attendance to Australian universities, dominant national ideologies in Australia, government departments and policies that influence pathway practices, and, lastly, the ‘local’ or pathway ‘identities’ of administrators, teachers, and students. Each section draws attention to how intercultural understandings are affected either beneficially or detrimentally by the agents’ appropriated identities and concludes by stating how the research questioned the pathway processes involved.

### 2.2 Predominant Taxonomies

An overview of a selection of the main cultural taxonomies provides an insight into the various approaches that attempt to explain cultural differences and the reasons for them, how the different components of cultures may be variously construed and given different emphases. J. Martin and Nakayama (2010) have categorised approaches to intercultural research into four paradigms: functionalist, or postpositivist; interpretive; critical humanist; and critical structuralist. The functionalist, or postpositivist, paradigm is where culture is defined by group membership such as nationality, and cultural patterns (for example, individualism-collectivism), which are used to theorise and explain communication acts; the traditional culture taxonomies that are outlined below fit this category. The interpretive paradigm is where culture is recognised as constructed, but cultural constants are given emphasis to highlight how differences in cultural communicative codes cause misunderstandings. The critical humanist paradigm views the voluntary dimension of constructivism as essentially determined by cultural frameworks, while emphasising consciousness as the basis for critique; scholars investigate power positions, the navigations of identities, hybridity, and resistance to marginality. Lastly, the critical structuralist
paradigm largely places power within social structures (such as media and international trade), critiques the European domination of theory, and argues for greater recognition of collectivist perception, the feeling or spiritual dimension of self, and the philosophical or religious underpinnings of communication. Perspectives may fall into multiple categories. The following summary of a few of the main studies in this field exemplifies the kinds of attempts made to define cultural similarities and differences.

Taxonomies that embrace multiple cultural groups, including regional, professional, organisational, and religious have originated from a range of disciplines: social psychology and cross-cultural psychology (Hofstede, 2001; Schwartz, 1992), anthropology (E. T. Hall, 1976; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961), linguistics (Leech, 2007), business (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997), and language education (Byram, 1997; Crozet, Liddicoat, & Lo Bianco, 1999; Kramsch 1998). In education, multiculturalists (Banks & Banks, 2004; Noble & Poynting 2000) have also had a resonating influence, challenging the functionalist tendency towards essentialising cultural distinctions within multiculturalism and asserting a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between culture and academic performance. These authors argue for a stronger understanding of children’s home and school attributes to discern cultural diversity.

The social psychologist Hofstede (2001) researched differences across national cultures in their acceptance of power (or power distance); uncertainty avoidance; masculinity versus femininity; individualism versus collectivism; sense of threat to the unknown; the focus of efforts on present or future; indulgence versus restraint; and monumentalism versus self-effacement. The anthropologist E. T. Hall (1976) differentiated between high and low context cultures based on behavioural communication differences. Cultural contexts could refer to large national settings or to smaller corporate environments. According to Hall, non-verbal Latin American, African, South Asian and Arab cultures exemplify characteristics of high-
context cultures; they are said to strongly rely on the implicit meanings in context, tone, and gestures. In contrast, verbal Western and East Asian low-context cultures are purported to be more reliant on direct, explicit meaning. High context cultures are also described as more collectivist and engaged in interpersonal loyalties, while low-context cultures assume a more individualist and less demanding assumption of long-term commitments.

E. T. Hall (1966) is also noted for developing the notion of cultural proxemics. He argued that different uses of space influence personal and business relationships and cross-cultural communications. He (1989) also asserted national differences in the use of time. With an orientation towards problem-solving and the future, the monochronic time of the low-context cultures is said to be partitioned, promotes attention to one activity at a time, and gives value to respecting and fulfilling scheduled commitments.

Through analysing ethnographic studies, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) classified five fundamental demands of life that all cultures apparently address: orientation to the environment; relationships with people; mode of human activity; belief about basic human nature; and orientation to time. Developing from this study, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) advanced further dimensions based on cultural variation in approaches to given dilemmas, asserting that the dimensions may provide a useful business resource for better cultural understanding. The GLOBE Taxonomy (Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness) (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) also posited cultural dimensions according to present and idealised states. Geoffrey Leech, a linguist, compared behaviours of four languages and developed a ‘Grand Strategy of Politeness’ (GSP) framework (2007) of the differences in constraints that underlie language, as “exemplified in common linguistic behaviour patterns in the performance of polite speech acts” (p. 167). Leech neither fully accepts nor rejects universal or relativist explanations of his theory, describing
collectivism and individualism, or traditional designations of ‘East’ and ‘West’, as not absolutes but “positions on a scale” (p. 170).

Each of the taxonomies has drawn its own critiques, but when approached with speculation, they may offer additional avenues for further reflection on cultural dispositions and trends. They may also draw out particular features that are not necessarily applicable to local contexts, however, and unwittingly reproduce certain features as points of significant difference. This study remained open to the possibility that certain taxonomies could have relevance to the research data and there may be a need to give some weight to their particular positioning.

2.3 Intercultural Communication Competence Models

Intercultural learning (IL) may be defined as a process towards achieving competence in intercultural relationships and acquiring certain attitudes, awareness, skills, and knowledge that may contribute towards a better understanding of another culture(s) (Byram, 1997, 2003; Deardorff, 2006; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Hatoss, 2006; Leask, 2009; Liddicoat, 2002, 2005). Multiple models on the process of IL, as discussed in relation to intercultural communication competence, have been created, but there is no broadly accepted model for either the teaching or evaluation of intercultural competence (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 9). ACARA (2016) has also provided a model for the Australian Intercultural Understanding school education program. Leask (2015, p. 64) notes that the absence of a universal model may be partly due to a widely held assumption that IL occurs ‘naturally’ through interactions. It may also be partly because competence draws upon the affective, conative and cognitive dimensions, and is influenced by time and context. Much is still unknown of the different roles and interrelationships that these various, ascribed elements play in creating successful competence. The dynamics of ICU are extremely complex.
2.3.1 Model categories.

Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) discuss current intercultural communication competence models through five categories, which are described below, and provide a useful overview of the benefits and weaknesses of the various approaches. The summary serves to demonstrate how the nature of intercultural competence is diversely constructed. The models give varying emphasis to perceived or assumed components involved in successful communicative intercultural interaction. Hence, together, they provide a range of approaches to ICU.

First, the Compositional models of Deardorff (2006); Howard-Hamilton, Richardson, and Shuford (1998); and Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998) posit ICU components (within, for example, attitudes, awareness, knowledge, and skills) and their relationships. These models highlight the factors that are important in developing an intercultural communication competence theory (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 15). Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model, for example, asserts that certain attitudes (respect, openness and curiosity) will enable knowledge of culture and sociolinguistic awareness, which will in turn assist adaptability, flexibility and empathy, and they will then lead to effective intercultural communication.

The second category is the Co-Orientational models, including those of Byram (1997, 2003); Fantini (1995); and Kupka (2008), which are concerned with the comprehension level of intercultural competence, where interlocutors are able to agree on linguistic, nonverbal and sociolinguistic elements. Co-orientational models underscore the need to establish a basic way of understanding in any successful communication (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 24). This may be seen in Byram’s (1997) model, which has at its centre the rejection of the ‘native’ student as a standard, thus placing greater linguistic agency with international students. Byram emphasises developing in learners “the ability to see and manage the relationships between themselves and their own cultural beliefs, behaviours and meanings, as
expressed in a foreign language, and those of their interlocutors” (p. 12). The method facilitates critical analysis of a culture, ensures learners can penetrate the dominant elite of the culture, and enables learners to appreciate their autonomy in their intercultural interactions (p. 21).

The Developmental models of Bennett (1986, 1993), Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1962), and King and Baxter Magolda (2005), exemplify the third of Spitzberg and Changnon’s (2009) categorisations (pp. 21-24). These models present attribute development occurring in progressive stages. Developmental models have assisted recognition of IL as processual. Bennett (1993), for example, describes intercultural competence development as a six-stage process, reflecting the development of cognitive response to difference: stages 1 – 3 are ethnocentric: denial, defense/reversal, and minimization; and stages 4 – 6 are ethnorelative: acceptance, adaptation, and integration. At the final ‘integration’ stage, the individual, with a self-identity that is somewhat detached from any one culture, is able to assume various cultural perspectives. Similarly, the stages of culture shock, as proposed by Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1962), see the sojourner shift through seven progressions from arrival to return: honeymoon, hostility, humorous, in-sync, ambivalence, re-entry culture shock, and resocialisation.

According to Spitzberg and Changnon (2009, pp. 24-29), the Adaptation models of Y. Kim (1988) and Gallois, Franklyn-Stokes, Giles, and Coupland (1988) incorporate adaptation as an intercultural communication competency component. An interactant’s characteristics work in relation with the host context to moderate characteristics, facilitate adaptation, and achieve competence. Adaptation models emphasise the need for adaptation to occur either on the part of the sojourner or through moderations of both the sojourner and the host-national. Moderators may include the degree of host authority and of social tolerance. Berry, Kim, Power, Young, and Bujaki (1989) differentiate four modes of adaptation, depending on
attitude toward the host country and towards the ownership of one’s own culture: assimilation (adopting the host culture), integration (retaining the sojourner culture while merging with the host culture), segregation (separating from the host culture), and marginalisation (not accommodating the host culture and losing one’s own culture).

The last of Spitzberg and Changnon’s (2009) categorisations is the Causal Path models evident in those of Arasaratnam (2008); Griffith and Harvey (2000); Imahori and Lanigan (1989); and Ting-Toomey (1999), which approach intercultural competence development as a linear development, where variables along a linear path influence variables further along the path (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, pp. 29-33). For example, in Imahori and Lanigan’s 1989 model, the quality of the sojourner and host-national interactions is determined by the extent of each interactant’s motivations, knowledge, skills, experiences, and goals toward successful interaction. Effective communication is determined by the communication of an appropriately received message. Causal Path models thus advance clear connections between hypotheses and results.

2.3.2 The ACARA ICU model.

The ACARA (2016) model of ICU is relevant to the pathway context, for it demonstrates the DET’s recognition of the need for ICU education in schools, thus asserting a national educational position prior to pathway or university entry. ACARA’s curriculum has been developed with the aim of a cohesive approach to ICU. The nature of ICU as outlined by ACARA can be recognised as both a cognitive and affective orientation towards a just consideration of different cultural meanings. ACARA explains ICU as dependent on three main “organising elements”: “recognising culture and developing respect”, “interacting and empathising with others”, and “reflecting on intercultural experiences and taking responsibility” (“Key ideas”, paras 1–3). This collective approach is pedagogically progressive in terms of promoting teacher training, resources, discourse and speculation on
curricula content and student assessment, and involving and valuing student experience, perspectives and expression.

The ACARA (2016) curriculum focuses on developing perspectives and values within three dimensions: personal, interpersonal, and social knowledge and skills. On a personal level, ICU promotes the idea that students participate in becoming more aware of cultural elements as constructed, facilitating the skill to identify the outlooks that frame identities and ways of seeing. Interpersonally, attention is given to the similarities and differences in communication practices, to critically question their own and others’ interpretations of experience with the aim of cultivating empathy. Socially, ICU develops student awareness of the complexities of their own and society’s histories, traditions and values. Students become capable in reconciling cultural differences with a deepening understanding of their own power of responsibility in their interactions. The value of ICU, therefore, is in its ability to cultivate personal, interpersonal and social characteristics.

ACARA’s integration of ICU indicates an underlying assumption that ICU may be enhanced through making interpersonal identity behaviours explicit and conscious. This view of ICU incorporates self-reflection, which is also supported by numerous academics (for example, Owens, 2011; Reid & Sriprakash, 2012; Rizvi, 2009) in their arguments for attending to the complex and contradictory processes inherent in the construction of identities. The process commits the subject to cultural comparison and destabilises fixed assumptions pertaining to the actual. The procedure is useful for crossing conceptual boundaries and uncovering socio-cultural assumptions. In its appropriation of the self-reflective process, ACARA announces the need to accept difference and thereby suggests, on a social level, recognition of interdependency with the Other. In doing so, ACARA assumes a shift away from an individualist ontology and promotes an inherent social value of
interdependency of people and nations. This emphasis, however, is apparently not made explicit and points to a gap in the discourse.

2.4 Criteria for the Achievement of Intercultural Understanding

Given the differences across these various models, it is clear that there is no consensus on the requirements for ICU (Alizadeh & Chavan, 2015), on the relative significance or weight of each component in the development of ICU (J. Johnson, Lenartowicz, & Apud, 2006), or on the successful methodologies for the enhancement of ICU. Across the different ICU models, nevertheless, there is a propensity to emphasise the need to acquire certain awareness, attitudes, knowledge, and skills, though these are variously described across a wide scope of concepts.

Alizadeh and Chavan’s (2015) review found ‘cultural awareness’ to be one of three significant posited elements across ICC models, with knowledge and skills the other two main elements. Cultural awareness was generally defined as “an individual’s awareness of her/his own views such as ethnocentric, biased and prejudiced beliefs towards other cultures” (p. e120). The review also noted that awareness is often combined with knowledge within cognition. This may be seen in Howard Hamilton’s (1998) model, where awareness sits within attitudes, knowledge and skills: awareness of group values; awareness of knowledge of cultural similarities and differences and of the self in relation to cultural identity; and awareness of the skills involved in self-reflection and the ability to identify cultural similarities and differences. Byram’s (1997) model also includes awareness as cognition, as in the ability to make evaluations from different cultural perspectives.

In a summary of conceptualisations of ICC by Deardorff (2009, pp. 264-269), however, it is attitude, rather than awareness, which features with skills and knowledge in the models of Berry et al. (1989), Byram (1997), and Deardorff (2006). Attitudes (often discussed synonymously with motivations) toward communicating with those of other
cultures may be cognitive, conative, or affective, and defined in positive or negative terms. These models present parallels and contrasts. Byram’s 1997 model, for example, states necessary attitudes as “curiosity and openness”, “readiness to suspend disbelief re other cultures”, and “readiness to suspend belief re own culture” (p. 34). In contrast, Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model gives the necessary criteria of respect (valuing other cultures, cultural diversity), openness (to intercultural interactions and to people from other cultures, withholding judgement), and curiosity and discovery (tolerating ambiguity and uncertainty) (p. 254). Empathy is added as a later development. These two models thus share numerous similarities and differences within their incorporation of the main criterion of attitude.

Knowledge of other culture(s) is also emphasised in the literature as a means to achieve successful intercultural communication (C. Chen, 2013; Freeman et al., 2009; Gudykunst, 2003; Leask, 2009; UNESCO et al., 2013). This knowledge is discussed in extensive terms: understanding of customs, attitudes, and values; communication styles and the effects of them in interactions; and identities of self, such as individualist or collectivist, or self-reflective ability (Deardorff, 2006; Freeman et al., 2009; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Freeman et al. (2009), for example, present a taxonomy that outlines knowledge where the learner, first, “identifies: cultural foundations of own and others’ norms, values, experiences and interactions”; second, “analyses: how diversity influences interaction (and how culture manifests itself in interaction)”; and third, “reflects: and self-evaluates one’s own and others’ capabilities and limitations in interactions in varying cultural contexts” (p. 92). Within the different outlined parameters, knowledge of academic language conventions and sociolinguistic awareness are also of particular relevance for pathway contexts (Arkoudis et al., 2013; Arkoudis & Tran, 2010; M. Li, 2016).

The various skills involved in communications are also incorporated into models. The skills element generally addresses the “communication and behavioural ability to interact
effectively with culturally different people” (Alizadeh & Chavan, 2015, p. e120). UNESCO et al. (2013) list the following as the most commonly adopted skills for ICC: “observation, listening, evaluating, analysing, interpreting, relating (including personal autonomy), adaptability (including emotional resilience), the ability to be non-judgemental, and perform stress-management, [and] metacommunication” (p. 13). Theorists also draw from the cognitive, conative, and affective domains in their skill descriptions in ways that are difficult to compare. Where one scholar may identify a particular element as cognitive, another might identify the same element as affective, or place it in a particular relationship with another element. For example, King and Baxter Magolda (2005, cited in Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009) place the ability to “consciously shift perspectives” (p. 22) with cognition, whereas in Howard Hamilton et al.’s (1998) model (cited in Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 11), the ability to “take multiple perspectives” is defined as a “Skill” of “Understanding” (p. 11). Similarly, the ability to display respect is identified as a skill in Imahori & Lanigan’s model (1989, cited in Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 34) but Deardorff (2006, p. 254) identifies respect as a “Requisite Attitude”. Context and time factors also impact development (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 7) and may further obscure comparisons.

Thus, models share in incorporating attitudes, awareness, knowledge, and skills as a part of achieving competence, but they vary in the characteristics that they consider necessary and in the ways that they may interrelate with other ‘necessary’ characteristics. Based on her research, Israelsson (2016) asserts: “There is a need to concretize what knowledge, skills and attitudes an English language teacher should acquire in order to be able to support their pupils in developing IC” (p. 27). The models thereby serve to demonstrate that the ways that intercultural competence or ICU are interpreted and given meaning is still highly contested and open to further research.
The intercultural interactions in the models outlined here are articulated as various kinds of achievement and management for the individual, which draws attention away from the interaction in the intercultural relationship, placing it with the individual’s orientations, and can therefore be seen to assist in sustaining a Eurocentric character. Griffith and Harvey’s (2000) model, which concludes with “Relationship quality”, perhaps demonstrates the closest recognition of interdependency. Authors such as Ashwill and Du’o’ng (2009), Dalib et al. (2017), Deardorff (2009), and Nwosu (2009) criticise the Eurocentric nature of discourses on intercultural competence in their focus on the “individual as the locus of intercultural competence” (Dalib et al., 2017, p. 2). These authors share the ontological assumption that recognises the interrelatedness of all things, the epistemological assumption that meaning is thus relational, and the axiological assumption that interpersonal connections are needed. As Deardorff (2009, p. 266) emphasises, the need to more adequately incorporate the interrelationship dimension into ICC needs attention and has implications for assessment, which is often individualist.

Many of the models are alike in not explicitly addressing emotion as a relevant competency component. This may be read as indicative of patriarchal leanings toward the cognitive at the expense of the emotive or affective dimension, which is gendered as feminine in Eurocentric societies (de Coster & Zanoni, 2018; Elomäki, Kantola, Kolvunen, & Ylöstalo, 2018; Haynes, 2019; Irigaray, 1985; Kristeva, 1982; Oksala, 2016). A number of authors, nevertheless, do address ‘empathy’ (ACARA, 2016; Arasaratnam, 2008; C. Chen, 2013; Deardorff, 2006; Taylor & Cranton, 2013). Empathy has been identified as cognitive, understanding the other’s perspective, and as emotional, feeling concern for the other’s experiences (Stephan & Stephan, 2002, p. 137).

Significantly for ICU, empathy is broadly identified as a personality trait that can be learned or developed (O’Malley, 1999; Ridley & Lingle, 1996; Wang et al., 2003). C. Chen
(2013) identifies empathetic orientations as including: open-mindedness towards new concepts and experiences; recognition of the instability of self and others’ identities; description of unfamiliar behaviour as opposed to evaluative assessments; and recognition of social contexts as constructed and changing. These are familiar outlined traits among the literature (Rasoal, Eklund, & Hansen, 2011; Taylor & Cranton, 2013) that may assist with pedagogical development. Hence, empathy can enable acceptance of difference, and it may be viewed as significant to ICU (Broome, 1991). Eklund, Andersson-Stråberg, and Hansen (2009) also found that recognition of similar experience to another’s experience facilitates empathy, which also has implications for pedagogy, indicating that teachers need to draw out similarities among students and external identities. This study did not intend to analyse the scientific or psychological contestations surrounding empathy. Rather, the researcher considered ‘care’ as a significant pedagogical orientation, so that factors relating to ‘empathy’ were embraced without attendance to psychological or technical definitions.

Of particular significance for intercultural education are the views that cultural responses can be objectified through an intelligent recognition of their construction, and the need to experience new cultures in specific, spatial contexts may be considered unnecessary for competency development. Individuals’ and communities’ sense of place and belonging is created within chosen spatial dimensional parameters; in other words, local, national, or global identities may be understood as “imagined communities” (Bagnall, 2015, p. 2, following B. Anderson, 1991). Hence, from a constructivist perspective, respectful responses to cultural difference can be learned non-empirically, dependent on recognition of the construction and transience of cultural characteristics. This research investigated whether students believed that ICU could be learned independently of immersion in ‘Other’ cultural experiences.
Although the researcher aimed to avoid essentialist methodologies, in acknowledgement of the need for a guideline for ICU, Deardorff’s Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence, provided in Table 4, was adopted as a theoretical framework. The Model was viewed as a posited standard to identify positive and negative intercultural characteristics within participant responses. Further reasoning explaining the selection is provided in Chapter Four “The Research Methods”.

2.5 Philosophical Approaches to Intercultural Understanding

Differences in perspectives of interculturality are apparent across different disciplines. The Business School of the University of Sydney, for example, offers a cross-cultural unit (2018), which aims “to provide conceptual frameworks and evidence from practice that will develop an understanding of the ways in which cultures differ, how these differences can impact on management, and how cultural issues can limit organisational effectiveness” (“Cross-Cultural Management – IBUS6002”, para. 1). The language of the unit overview suggests essentialist perspectives. In contrast, within the University of Sydney School of Education and Social Work, an intercultural unit (2018) targets “concepts of culture, cultural diversity and inter-cultural communications …[and] the homogenisation and heterogenisation debate” (“Intercultural Ed: Principles and Strategy - EDPB5014”, para. 1), which suggests that conceptual frameworks are open to analysis. The difference in these approaches can be explained through an overview of significant social developments that underpin approaches to education.

The abundance of various models along with additional socio-cultural developments complicates the pedagogical approaches to ICU. As theories have developed, educational discourses have also emerged in contestation to government decentralisation and the accompanying loss of traditional educational values, reflecting unease for the subject in a disempowered global, national and local landscape (Connell, 2013; Leask, 2009; Rizvi,
Concern for the subject has remained broadly humanitarian, with notions of a global citizenship developing, as well as a growing avoidance of identifying cultural traits or culturalities as pertaining to nation or in any way fixed (I. Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; Piller, 2011; Rizvi, 2009; Soong, 2018). Within these developments, some scholars (Hujo & Piper, 2010; Marginson, 2011) have argued that international student rights should be similar to those of the citizens. Such discourses continue to point to a need to cultivate a global consciousness that is neither universalist nor culturally specific (Gargano, 2012; Kumaravadivelu, 2012; Osler, 2011; Rizvi, 2009; Soong, 2018), as Nakayama and Halualani’s (2010) question indicates:

How do we take the larger collection of critical intercultural communication research, informed by multiple theoretical and perspectival traditions and spread across various fields of communication scholarship and outside disciplines, and engage these works in meaningful and productive dialogue around insights, conclusions, and question-probing and provide these with a deeper, integrated focus to have important metacritical conversations that characterise the continual development of perspectives and forms of scholarship (as even in the case of critical theory, cultural studies work, postcolonial perspectives, feminist studies, among others)? (p. 10)

The aim in developing ICU is to assist individuals to recognise their connections with the fluid histories of cultural creations or ‘constants’ and agency in cultural creation, but so far in the field’s evolution the methodologies for doing this are disparate and unguided.

Research based on national comparisons has become increasingly criticised for its essentialism and binarism: emphasising the nation-state and stereotypical assumptions and ignoring national cultural heterogeneity (Abdullah-Pretceille, 2006; Piller, 2011; Rizvi, 2007; Rizvi & Beech, 2017; Sanderson, 2007a); failing to recognise power positions in analyses (Moon, 2010; Ono, 2010; Piller, 2011); and sustaining hegemonic power relations (Fougere
& Moulette, 2007; McSweeney, 2002; Ono, 2010; Piller, 2011). As Coonan et al. (2017) aptly state, “Intercultural education in schools can easily be reduced to essentialised content about the ‘food, flags and festivals’ of different ethnic groups” (pp. 132-133). Cultural border leaching is a further foregrounded point that questions the need to define national-cultural traits in an increasingly globalised, de-nationalised world (Connell, 2007, 2013). An underlying tension therefore exists between identifying cultural traits as either fixed or as transient paradigms.

In contrast to culturalist interpretations, intercultural study has come to focus on heterogeneity, or paradigmatic disparity (Holliday, 2013), which entails: subject agency in recreation (van Dijk, 2008); contextual creativity (Leeman & Ledoux, 2003, p. 286); and border permeation and hybridity (Bhaba, 2004; Spotti, 2005). By adopting a humanist investigation of interpretation through self-reflection, differences of the Other are viewed within diversity’s universality, as “singularities of culturality” (Abdallah-Pretceille, 2006, p. 479).

Interculturality implies a common global ‘culture’ or condition of diversity creations, occurring in perception and able to co-exist with and despite homogenous interpretation. Beck and Levy (2013), Delanty (2006), Rizvi (2009), Rizvi and Beech (2017) and Soong (2018) are among those who have analysed the ancient and once universalist philosophy of cosmopolitanism within contemporary global, national, and local settings. Rizvi (2009) promotes a new approach to cosmopolitanism:

interpreting it not so much as a universal moral principle, nor as a prescription recommending a particular form of political configuration, nor indeed as a transnational life-style, but as a mode of learning about, and ethically engaging with, new social formations. (p. 253)

Andreotti (2014) also sees critical global citizenship education as imperative to prevent a
universalist “civilising mission” (p. 22) as destructive as the colonialists. McCloskey (2014) asks: “how development education can demystify social, economic and cultural relations within the neoliberal system that perpetuates inequality and contribute to the debate on alternative, transformative paradigms that are sustainable, equitable and just” (p.2). Soong (2018) similarly looks towards “rethinking the relationship between cosmopolitanism and education” (p. 26) to develop students’ abilities in conversing across borders with those of different cultures.

For many educationists, ICU relates to a transnational concern for humanity, which presents a sound orientation to learning because it is congruent with higher order thinking, “developing knowledge about knowledge; how knowledge is organised, relayed, evaluated, and how it is contingent and relational” (Reid & Sriprakash, 2012, p. 26). Non-essentialist perspectives acknowledge the disparate and diverse nature of cultures as well as intersecting cultural practices, as complex and ever-changing “‘process’ geographies (areas of ‘action, interaction, and motion’)” (Appadurai, 2001, p. 7) that “vary according to context and to time” (DoE, 2005, p. 31). The local and global are interconnected (Beck & Levy, 2013). With cultural meaning and value reinstated, albeit as transient phenomena, personal and social mores can once more gain acknowledgement. Whereas multiculturalism emphasises cultural difference within a national framework, ICU addresses an ephemeral, pluralistic self in relation to an ephemeral, pluralistic Other, with recognition of local and global interconnection and interdependence.

Theorists who posit a need to enhance ICU also seek active, effectual constructionist methodologies. Reflexive strategies are strongly reliant on cognitive development, which places a time limitation on the potential to actualise change. Furthermore, such strategies are essentially individualist, and individual students simply do not have the power to initiate significant transformations. These issues are problematic for theorists interested in more
immediate avenues for social change. As Connell (2013) concludes: “Education needs coalitions of social groups able to create the spaces in which educational invention will work. Those requirements are clear enough. How they can be turned into practice, we still have to discover” (p. 109). Approaches to initiating change are undeveloped. Students and staff function within inequitable power relations, with unrealised agency in the production of change. Pathway pedagogical policy and practices do not necessarily foreground the recognition of international students’ experiences; academics note the absence of a global ethics or cosmopolitan citizenship (Osler, 2011; Rizvi, 2007; Rizvi & Beech, 2017; Soong, 2018), and perceive both national and international students and staff as situated within a neoliberal dynamic, without educational encouragement to develop ICU.

Concerned with the need to consider issues of ‘race’, ‘ethnicities’, gender, and sexuality in their specific contexts, because of both historical and current discriminations, solidarity has replaced universalism as a driving support for change (Weatherall, 2019). Authors (for example, Connell, 2013; Hickling-Hudson, 2006; Holliday, 2013; C. Mohanty, 2013; Sanga & Niroa, 2004; Thaman, 2003) argue for the creation of coalitions against hegemonic economic and political powers. The many differences between women in their beliefs and strategies have led to a plethora of feminist groups and organisations such as market feminism, governance feminism (Elomäki et al., 2018) and post-feminism. Nevertheless, many feminists have found common ground in the acknowledgment of multiplicities (Deleuze, 1968/1994). The inattention to identify multiplicities can be traced to Modernism’s emphasis on the autonomous nature of the individual (de Fina, 2011; Hassan, 1987; Hutcheon, 1988; Klages, 2003; Waugh, 1984). In contrast, transnational feminist theory (TFT), for example, “advocates for coalition-based politics that privileges multiplicity without essentializing any categories of identity” (Bhattacharya, 2013, p. 36), and aims to
penetrate binarisms, while not excluding attention to subjectivity (Tambe, 2010; Varga-Dobai, 2012).

Consonant with Deleuze’s (1994) notion of multiplicity as a substantive form, much of the literature is concerned with situated knowledges and context-specific power structures (Tambe, 2010), as Connell’s (2014) Southern Theory has foregrounded. The literature expands upon the identities of nation, class and gender such as those of “family, policy, discrimination, agency, violence, and motherhood” (Schmidt & Mestry, 2014, p. 1) and “place” (Massey, 1994, p. 5). The aim of such approaches is to locate individual and group authoring to detect similar concerns of social and economic inequalities and investigate methods to unify these discourses so that hegemonic powers can be overtly challenged (Conway, 2012, p. 382; Dempsey, Parker & Krone, 2011). Specific local and personal contexts are thus related to global trends (Connell, 2014).

In relation to place, which in this research was an academic context, gender assumptions influence the nature of intercultural dynamics. The Western binary of rationality as male and emotionality as female has been widely documented (Irigaray & Guynn, 1995; hooks, 1994, 2003; Jaggar, 1989; Kristeva, 1982; C. Mohanty, 2013), but de Coster and Zanoni (2018) also posit that the academic subject is newly masculinised and idealised through an imagined “individualism, entrepreneurship, competition and performance [which subjugates] academic collegiality, collaboration and trust” (p. 412). The researchers position institutional accountability as masculine and relational accountability as feminine (p. 421). Designating emotion as irrational maintains the myth of objectivity, which vanquishes the female as constructors of knowledge and “denies any understanding of the interconnectedness of emotions, values and knowledge” (Elomäki et al., 2018, p. 826). Therefore, as detailed in Chapter Three, while embracing multiplicity as fundamental in cultural interpretation, particular emphasis is given to a feminist approach in this research to
contribute towards shifting current practices.

Related to the masculinised nature of academia, and significant to the power positions of international students, is the commodification of education, which is seen as governing multiple processes within current educational facilities (Connell, 2013; Marginson, 2012; Rizvi, 2009; Welch, 2013). Ruth (2018) challenges this process, discussing education as a gift, an acquired wisdom, intrinsically relational, social, and political (p. 206). It is not the receipt of employability or a set of transferable skills. Education’s value lies in its ability to “desocialise its students” (p.208), foster evaluation skills for the purpose of undermining passive learning and promote the student’s abilities to enhance society for themselves and others (p. 208). Given education’s ability to promote socially enhancing culturalities, the commodification of education may be seen as strongly contributing towards stifling ICU developments.

2.6 Educational Assessment Methods

The absence of consensus on the attributes of ICU and clear policy outlines is evident in the array of assessment practices in pathway contexts and HE (Denson et al., 2017, pp. 233-234; Gu, 2016, p.254; Schulz, 2007, p.10). Without relevant policy implementation at post-secondary level, the choice of integration of IU and assessment procedures remains with each educational institute. Schulz (2007, p. 10) asserts: the profession of foreign language learning “has no tradition of assessing cultural understanding … either at the pre-collegiate or collegiate level”. Similarly, Yu (2012) states: “It is possible that we are helping students develop these [IU] qualities [such as respect, open-mindedness, empathy, and curiosity], but as a field, we have not consciously and critically examined how we teach and assess them” (p. 170). One view is that intercultural competence cannot be summatively assessed and “should be abandoned” (Intercultural Competence in Communication and Education [ICCED], 2015).
Many do seek concrete assessment methods, however, and there are many devised external assessment tools available (cf. Fantini, 2009, pp. 466–474; Sinicrope, Norris, & Watanabe, 2007, pp. 1–27), though they vary in their targeted measurements. For internally devised assessments, the model of ICU that is adopted will naturally determine the assessment method. Fantini (2009) notes that educators may attribute the four dimensions of intercultural competence (knowledge, attitudes, skills and awareness) with different weightings (p. 459). Further, while teachers are accustomed to testing knowledge and skills, attitude and awareness are not typically assessed. In addition, outcome or transparency demands can cause educators to emphasise knowledge over skills (J. Johnson et al., 2006, p. 539). Language proficiency will also strongly influence competency, which further complicates assessment measures (p. 459).

It is important that educators ensure that their assessment approach aligns with their unit content and definitions (Deardorff, 2009; Fantini, 2009). Apart from questionnaires and tests, direct assessment methods that are suitable for the classroom may include performance techniques, portfolios and interviews. Deardorff (2009) provides a number of other methods, including: “self-report instruments”, “observation by others/host culture”, and “developing specific indicators for each component/dimension of ICC and evidence of each indicator” (p. 478). Each requires a large degree of preparation and delivery time, and each has numerous variables that may affect method success; for example, students vary greatly in their commitment to performance; portfolios are often pursued in individual and various ways; observations can be difficult to monitor or record; and interviews are time consuming and demand additional analysis. The ACARA (2016) ICU Levels 5 and 6 (years 7-10) assessment methods currently include critical reflection, description, role-play, analysis of representations, and assessment of the use of stereotypes. It is not clear from the texts how these various assessments are managed in the classroom.
For English teachers who are integrating ICU into their classes, the methods need to be clear and uncomplicated. Denson et al.’s (2017) study culminated in a teacher ICU instrument with a four-factor structure: “culturally inclusive teaching strategies, reflexivity, adaptability/flexibility and openness to cultural diversity” (p. 243), and a student ICU instrument with a two-factor structure: “intergroup skills and openness to cultural diversity” (p. 243). These developments sound promising in their apparent practicality and suggest confident steps towards integrating ICU into classroom practice.

2.7 Global, National and Local Influences

This section examines global and national current trends that may enhance or hinder ICU development and that international students may be influenced by in their appropriated identifications. Pathway contexts pertain to global, national and local dimensions: globally, through the students’ mobility and displacement from their ‘home’ culturalities, within broad international social, political, and economic movements; nationally, through government legislation and ‘internationalisation at home’ (IaH) policies (the educational policies and practices that a nation employs toward internationalisation); and ‘locally’, through the student, administrator, and tutor identities within the pathway setting. These three dimensions, though approached individually, are recognised as inextricably interconnected (Bagnall, 2015; C. Mohanty, 2003; Rizvi, 2009).

2.7.1 Global influences.

While traditional borders through global policies and trade and media channels are disappearing, public interactions with local and national networks are still active (Held & McGrew, 2002, p. 56; Robbins, 1998) and local identities are often far stronger in people’s minds than global identities, as Ignatieff has emphasised in interview (West, 2018). The imagined ‘nation-state’ is made possible because it is based on homogenisations of people and their social relations (Quijano, 2000, p. 223). Robbins (1998) states that a global identity
cannot be assumed, for individuals and communities pertain to “actual historical and geographic contexts” (p. 2); identities are localised and embodied. Rizvi (2009, p. 262) additionally argues that it is not feasible to separate local, national and global processes, since global processes alter the subjectivities of communities. Direct and indirect expansions of social relations may be attributed to “a global imagination” (Bagnall, 2015, p. 2; Rizvi, 2009, p. 257). Emerging modifications such as ‘glocal’, ‘multi-local’, or ‘pluri-local’, further exemplify the imaginative role in spatial identity (A. McCormick, 2017). This phenomenon gives further justification to this research, for notions of identity that associate with place are clearly open to external influence and change.

Within a global context, determinants of students’ perceptions of themselves may be categorised as economic, social, political, and spiritual. From an economic perspective, with most overseas students in Australia originating from East Asia, student mobility is strongly driven by the rise of a new middle-class. China’s large population has also meant that their own universities are quickly filled, while overseas qualifications have also gained in prestige, along with a growth in knowledge-based economies (Brooks & Waters, 2011, p. 47). English has also become a global currency, raising students’ national employability to international status. Social interpretations of international student mobility look at the mental and physical effects of relocation on international students and the availability and quality of services (Bagnall, 2015; Chavan, Bowden-Everson, Lundmark, & Zwar, 2014; Garrick, 2013; Poljski, Quiazon, & Tran, 2014; Roberts, Boldy, & Dunworth, 2015). Political interpretations address national and local dynamics, and student agency, including the institute’s functions, media discourses, and local council involvement in multicultural or intercultural affairs (Marginson, 2011; Paltridge, Mayson, & Schapper, 2012, 2013; Rizvi, 2009). Research into what may be broadly classified as the spiritual concerns of international students include investigations into the quality of student life and student engagement (Burdett & Crossman, 2012; Soong,
Students provide a variety of reasons for studying abroad. Motivations for student mobility include: the experience of living in a foreign country and to study internationally in order to learn about new cultures (Gargano, 2012; Yang, 2007), the belief that a Western education system is higher in quality than their own (Soong, 2018; Yang, 2007); the notion that a Western education and English language skills could lead to improved employment prospects (Gribble, Blackmore, & Rahimi, 2015; Rafi & Lewis, 2013; Sánchez, Fomerino, & Mengxia, 2006; Zwart, 2012); the hope that the education abroad could lead to emigration (Sánchez et al., 2006; Yang, 2007; Zwart, 2012); and the provision of access to financial aid (Roy, Lu, & Loo, 2016, p. 8). In addition, in a radio interview with Mackenzie (2018), Soong stated that students’ parents hope their child will accommodate “Western” ways of thinking and achieve a “balanced education”, where their child will “enjoy themselves”, suggesting a strong sense of security and freedom.

Factors influencing a student’s choice of nation for their study include the suitability of the education degree offered to their desired learning; the institute’s reputation; and the institute’s location (Roy et al., 2016, pp. 6-8; Sánchez et al., 2006). Financial factors, like study fee costs, the exchange rate, and grants and scholarships, do not have a marked impact on decision-making, though financial difficulties are often cited as a major cause for dissatisfaction with a location choice, perhaps an indication of a gap in pre-departure information (Roy et al., 2016, p. 7).

Visa policy settings set by the Australian Department of Immigration and Border Protection (DIBP) also have a significant influence on student choice (DIBP, 2013; Productivity Commission, 2015a, p. 4). A student visa is granted on grounds of “English language aptitude, academic performance and acceptance into a course of study, proof of
sufficient financial support and a health assessment” (Productivity Commission, 2015b, p. 31). From 2014, the DIBP has simplified the Student Visa Assessment Level (AL) framework, with Streamlined Visa Processing (SVP) for students enrolled in endorsed courses within approved HEPs identified as “low immigration risk providers” (DIBP, 2016), and reduced evidentiary requirements to obtain visa approval, including English language proficiency, financial capacity and previous study. As with the Australian government’s National Strategy 2025, the DIBP reforms demonstrate recognition for developing IaH policies.

Even though programs are available for Australian students wishing to study overseas, the imbalance between in-bound and out-bound migration points to Australia’s historic dependency on White, nationalist performance and is noted here as relevant to attitudes that may continue to pervade pathway contexts. The New Colombo Plan, initiated in 2014, intends to deepen Australia’s relationships in the Indo Pacific region, providing mobility programs for “both short and longer term study, internships, mentorships, practicums and research” (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade [DFAT], 2018, para. 2). ‘OS-HELP’ loans, available for Commonwealth-supported students, are similarly designed to promote students’ overseas experience. Cross-border education is also developing with increasing numbers of branch campuses as well as virtual learning platforms. The instigating reasons for cross-border education include gaining collaborative developmental support, increasing public diplomacy relationships, promoting academic exchange, and furthering financial gains (American Council on Education [ACE], 2016, p. 38; Madafiglio, Fletcher, & Smith, 2016).

These policies may be viewed as sitting within “regionalization” or “harmonization” policies, which involve strategies designed to align with other national systems to attain shared gains (ACE, 2016, p. 32). Areas that are targeted include the development of branch
campuses, research, assessment and quality assurance, timetabling, and technological collaboration (Sakamoto & Chapman, 2010). Aligning academic calendars and acknowledging qualifications, for example, are strategies implemented in various Australian NSW pathways. Both the University of Sydney’s Centre for English Teaching and Taylors College, for instance, stagger their programs to facilitate a few intakes annually, which also enable them to address various ability levels. Similarly, Navitas colleges (Sydney Institute of Business and Technology and Newcastle International College) run 13-week programs, which maximise their intakes. Such strategies harmonise with the desires of overseas governments and agencies, while simultaneously providing wider choices for students, and facilitating Australia’s own economic targets.

2.7.2 National influences.

Because international students live outside their nation-state, their entitlements come under the UN’s 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but within nations, they are subject to various treatments, depending on how they are received socio-politically. In Australia, reception of international students is ambivalent; on the one hand viewed as potentially furthering revenue, enriching culture and promoting international goodwill, while on the other considered a possible economic and security threat (Marginson, 2012, p. 500; Rizvi, 2007; S. Robertson, 2011). Much research is critical of nationalist-based student identifications that align nationality with class status. Marginson (2011) argues that international students in Australia are identified as neither global nor citizen, but “located in a ‘gray zone’ of regulation, with incomplete human rights, security, and capabilities” (p. 497).

Australian uncertainty towards Otherness rests upon colonialist habits of homogeneity. Rizvi (2007, p. 18) identifies a new Orientalism arguing that an Australian shift from the European project towards postcolonial framing has faltered. Racism is still masked through a politics of difference, a binary distinction that separates East from West (Said,
1978/2003). Piller (2011) similarly draws attention to ‘culturism’, the ‘Othering’ discourses that obfuscate racist beliefs and perpetuate assertions and practices of inequity. Cross-cultural research has exacerbated binarisms, through the adoption of polarised terminologies, for example, feminine/masculine and collectivist/individualist. Rizvi (2007) points to the weakness in divisive, stereotypical notions that are frequently associated with ‘Asia’ and Australia. Traditional family values, work ethic, authority, and social cohesion are not just ideals of Asian nations, he argues, they are also found in Australian politics, along with social democracy and collectivist expressions. Similarly, individualism and concern for human rights are evident in various Asian nations. Benzie (2015) also notes that students in pathways are homogenised through cultural assumptions: they are said to lack interest in developing English skills and have a passive learning style. Conversely, Martinez and Colaner (2017) assert that Chinese students present an “openness and flexibility” in their international education classroom experiences, which they explain through the students’ “Confucian values of harmonious integration, virtuous behaviour, and respect for authority” (p. 19). Such detailed narratives help to undermine stereotypical assumptions.

The homogenisation exposes the extent to which current interest in international education is driven by an instrumentalist logic (Rizvi, 2007, p. 19; Takayama, 2016), and the gaining of an internationally competitive economic edge, without regard for developments in social and cultural relationships, which are “the moral and political dimensions of global connectivity” (Rizvi, 2009, p. 260). In an interview, Ignatieff (in West, 2018) describes ‘ordinary’ moral virtues of society, the “moral operating system of society”, as including civility, politeness, and forgiveness. The arena of these everyday virtues, however, is local: “Despite advanced globalisation, we remain very local…Australians have a preference for Australians, so strangers, visitors, refugees, come second, or third, or fourth in people’s moral prioritisation”. Dong (2012) draws upon Foucault’s ‘Abnormal’ (2003) to note that migrant
identity can be presented as aberrant in bringing disorder to multiple cultural paradigms: “social class, regional background, ethnicity, religion, language and … everyday aspects of behaviour…” (p. 242). The apparent neutrality of the normalising attempts, which are often framed in advisory or supportive discourses, can be understood through the aim to maintain an ordered or known world. Educators need to recognise and challenge this limited ‘moral’ tendency because they have an obligation to acknowledge their students’ own moral standings (Dewey, 1916/2009) as well as their ‘global’ futures (Deardorff, n.d.; Leask, 2015).

It is apparent that institutional moral and ethical foundations are under threat and understated in the international student classroom. It is from a moral standpoint that our education actually functions. In pathways, this moral ground begins with acknowledgement of others’ perspectives. This research investigated the presence of homogenising assumptions and discrimination by asking staff and students of their perceptions of others and investigating the cultural assumptions embedded in curricula materials and the physical pathway settings.

Global developments also strongly influence national identities. Bagnall (2015) explains: “non-place migrant identity is a philosophical perspective that reduces the significance of place (and nation) by centralising the individual as the nexus of meaning” (p. 55). Gargano (2012) found that for international students, a “global nomad” identity endowed students with “positionality in the world and on campus” (p. 151). Conversely, Rizvi (2009) states that neoliberalism “sees the world as a single global sphere of free trade” (p. 259) that emphasises economic exchange, individual freedom, competition and economic efficiency. International students thus assume power, “responsibilisation” (Hartung, 2017, p. 20), through an economic global identity, but the neoliberal basis of that world functions through “generic globalisation” (Sklair, 2005, p. 485) or “corporate cosmopolitanism” (Rizvi, 2009, p. 261), without addressing social needs. Critics accuse government of constructing “an elite economic subject” (Sidhu, 2006, p. 175) or victimised “cash-cows” (Nyland, 2008, para. 1; S.
Robertson, 2011, p. 2192), echoing claims that colonisation is dehumanisation (Césaire, 1955/2000). The new imperialism is a manifestation of the ‘development’ paradigm but differs from neo-colonialisms; the economic elite is transnational and not bound to one territory (Tikly, 2004, p. 176). In their new ascription to Australian cultures, international students are commodified (Marx, 1867/2012, p. 60), in a fetishisation that dissimulates the superficiality of capitalist attributed values and the actual means of production.

The governance of pathway contexts and international students also influences how ICU is produced. Although it was beyond the scope of this study’s research methodology to explicitly incorporate textual analysis of Australian policy documents or interview government personnel, a review of the main policies relevant to pathway institutes in order to gain contextual understanding is consistent with the critical discourse analysis the study adopts. The following paragraphs outline some of the major influences on policies affecting international student education and the organisations that are responsible for its regulation.

**Policies and regulation.**

Public policy can be generally defined as “a system of laws, regulatory measures, courses of action, and funding priorities concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or its representatives” (Kilpatrick, 2000, para. 1). Policies relate to social values, such as “equity, efficiency, welfare (in the sense of well-being, not government aid), liberty, and security” (Stone, 2012, p. 14), and ostensibly provide the methods for those values to be upheld. Far from reflecting linear configurations, policy processes comprising text and discourse are systematic and ad hoc (Ball, 1993, p. 10), fluid, contextualised, manifold and contingent, encompassing discourses and power positions regarding values, socio-political analysis, strategic manoeuvring and implementation procedures (Welch, 2013, p. 188), each open to public interaction and influence. Epistemologies and ontological assumptions shift within and between social contexts under the weight of current
interpretations, public debate and contest. Analysis requires understanding “the changing
top-down, masculinist, decisionistic executive delivery, with a government acting as a
relationships between constraint and agency” and awareness of epistemologies in their
modern interventionist state, controlling management: “there is no policy process, there is
production, and deployment within discourses of “truth” (Ball, 1993, pp. 13-14).
only policy” (p. 23), with an economic rationalist concern for private interests, and market
decision-making replacing government intervention (p. 25). In contrast, policy as a process
would function to facilitate participant involvement. As a multi-dimensional practice, this
promotes administrators, staff and students to participate in the policy-making process, with
regard for common interest and the provision of a more democratic service delivery.
Recognition of policy as a process is a possible step towards achieving a “partnership model”
(p. 21). However, for many scholars (for example, Connell, 2013; Marginson, 2012; Rizvi,
2009; Welch, 2013) the normative executive power practices within and connected to
education contexts continue to stultify such progressive change. Yeatman (1998, p. 27)
recommends three procedural changes to give participants greater agency: (1) a more
representative bureaucracy; (2) direct participation by citizens in the policy process; and (3)
localisation of program delivery. The process is contingent on appreciating and acting upon
the decisions that arise from dialogic collaboration with all participants, who, in the pathway
context, mainly comprise the administrators, the teaching staff, and the students. The
realisation of such a community asset, Yeatman concludes, is dependent upon government
investment in social capital and the citizen’s agreement to share in the policy process.

The main legal structure overseeing international student services is the ESOS Act
and associated legislation, including the Australian Government’s (2018c) National Code of
Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (National Code
The aim of the ESOS Act is to safeguard overseas students on student visas, maintain the quality of Australian education, and ensure security within the education system (p.3). The aim of the National Code 2018 is to ensure nationally consistent standards of delivery by registered providers of education and training courses. Legal requirements address matters regarding marketing (s.1), recruitment (s.2), formalisation of written agreements (s.3), student support services (s.6), visa requirements (s.8), and complaints and appeals (s.10). The interests of overseas students are to be safeguarded in terms of Consumer Law (s. 3.4) and student support services (s.6.1.) that assist with issues such as course progress and attendance (s.8.9) and provision for an “age and culturally appropriate orientation program” (s.6.1).

The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) (2018) is a significant national agency that oversees internationalisation activities and a designated authority through the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 and under the ESOS Act. TEQSA is the independent national regulator of HE providers, ELICOS providers that have entry arrangements with a registered HE provider, and Foundation Program providers. TEQSA is responsible for quality assurance through course and delivery practice assessments. Providers must gain TEQSA approval to deliver education to overseas students on a visa. The Higher Education Standards Panel is also an independent body under TEQSA that provides advice to both the Commonwealth Minister(s) responsible for tertiary education and research and to TEQSA, particularly relating to possible variations in The Australian Government’s Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015.

The Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 does not directly address the development of ICU. The requirements stipulate that each governing body:
takes steps to develop and maintain an institutional environment in which freedom of intellectual inquiry is upheld and protected, students and staff are treated equitably, the wellbeing of students and staff is fostered, informed decision making by students is supported and students have opportunities to participate in the deliberative and
decision making processes of the higher education provider (s.6.1 para. 4)
However, unless evidence is requested in these areas, the methods for performing these practices can be superficial. The conception of what constitutes “free intellectual inquiry” (s.6.1), for example, is left open to interpretation. Intercultural learning in education is dependent on conscious discussion of difference. Recognising differing cultural interpretations by “acknowledging different frames of reference” (DEST, 2005, p. 31) is not an automatic skill.

Education policy at the pathway level does not necessarily recognise and integrate international students’ cultures either into pedagogical content or methodology. Policy is intrinsically orientated towards individualism and independence, whereas successful ICU depends upon recognition of human interconnectivity (Ashwill & Du’o’ng, 2009; Dalib et al., 2017; Deardorff, 2009; Nwosu, 2009). If democratic principles are worthy of safeguard, TEQSA has a responsibility to be stronger in its protective processes. To extend its current power is to become unacceptably authoritarian in the Australian democratic context. To maintain its contemporary position, however, is to border on accepting its own superfluity in the midst of economic forces that are beyond its influence. One problem is that stricter standards may discolour the democratic nature of TEQSA’s role, whereas leaving the guidelines open apparently enables abuse of the system from any of the stated economic influences. The absence of tight regulation enables international students to be manipulated for monetary gain, and this is likely to continue unless changes are implemented (Besser & Cronau, 2015).
Another significant regulator is the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA, 2016), which is the ESOS agency for ELICOS program providers that do not fall within school or HE provision. As the national regulator of the VET sector, ASQA manages provider and systemic risks to the quality of VET programs. The predominant provider risk includes RTOs incorrectly certifying a student with competencies that do not reflect the student’s abilities. Systemic risks include threats to the industry more broadly. Risk potential is investigated through the various stakeholders and market research. ASQA authorities collaborate with state, territory and federal funding regulatory and program agencies in their address to rectifying risk issues (ASQA, 2016).

As evidenced in Australia’s past and present cultures, policy development in relation to non-Australian citizens has been significantly influenced by national identities. Korostelina (2007, p. 186) discusses national identity in relation to the power positions of the nation’s various groups, and designates three interpretations of identity: ethnic, multicultural and civic. Since claiming the land from the Indigenous inhabitants in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Australian state’s political stance toward migrants has assumed an ‘ethnic’ position, promoting a British ethno-cultural identity selective of Northern and Western Europeans, British, and US citizens. In this position, cultural assimilation was expected. Beginning in the 1970s, a multicultural stance was promoted, whereby the cultures of ‘ethnic’ groups were increasingly recognised as having the right to maintain their cultural identity, within “a voluntary bond of dissimilar people sharing a common political and institutional structure” (Australian Ethnic Affairs Council, 1978, p. 17). It is relevant here to add to Korestelina’s (2007) outline that the notion of ethnicity was rarely applied to the White majority at this time. Meer and Modood (2012, p. 181) also note that multiculturalism was still viewed in this era as a means to facilitate migrant assimilation, and Indigenous Australians were still not embraced in the multicultural ethos until the Galbally Report in
1978. Korostelina (2007, p. 186) explains that with increasing postcolonial and postmodernist discourses questioning subject identities, particularly of race, a civic conception has emerged. In this view, the individual is regarded as a national citizen with legal obligations, while ethnic identities are irrelevant.

All three interpretations – ethnic, multicultural, and civic – may still be found among contemporary Australian citizens, with varying emphases and explanations. A rise of racial tensions with anti-Muslim sentiment in the post-9/11 era, for example, and growing anti-Chinese rhetoric in 2019 reveals the vulnerability of the civic conception (Hegarty, 2017). This social hostility suggests an underlying failure on the part of successive Australian governments to effectively embrace minority groups.

**Racial discrimination.**

As reflected in educational procedures, government literature articulates significant concern about discriminatory practices, but the principles of social justice are consistently distorted in the neoliberal political context (Connell, 2013; Rizvi, 2009). International students constitute one of the six equity groups outlined in both the *A Fair Chance for All* paper (Department of Education, Employment and Training [DEET], 1990) and the 1994 L. Martin and DEET report, *Equity and General Performance Indicators in Higher Education*. Current recruitment practices, nevertheless, disregard equity principles (Sellar & Gale, 2011). With international students’ study fees typically three times higher than domestic fees, fiscal exercises are denigrated (Nyland, 2008; S. Robertson, 2011; Rodan, 2009). Employing casual staff, increasing student-to-staff ratios and accepting a high international student intake are among university survival strategies, and all are simultaneously undermining the quality of education (Besser & Cronau, 2015; Connell, 2013, 2019).

The governments’ stance towards international students as well as university enactment of IaH policies may be more in line with ‘ethnic’ identification than multicultural
or civic: the international student’s absence of full citizen status and lack of equal rights has been variously questioned (Hujo & Piper, 2010; Marginson, 2012). Although the biological foundations of race have been discredited (Kobayashi & Peake, 1994; Proudford & Nkomo, 2006), racial and ethnic constructions are sustained through the “Euro-centered capitalist colonial/modern world power that is still with us” (Quijano, 2000, p. 218) and racism and racist stereotypical views are evident throughout Australia (Baak, 2018; Blair, Dunn, Kamp, & Alam, 2017; Dandy, Dunn, Jetten, Paradies, Robinson, & Ziaian, 2017; Haines, 2015; Lee, 2017; Mansouri, Jenkins, Morgan, & Taouk, 2009). The 2018 Mapping Social Cohesion: The Scanlon Foundation Surveys (Markus, 2018) states that in that year around 85 per cent of Australians viewed multiculturalism as beneficial for the nation, and that immigrants enhance Australian society economically and “by bringing new ideas and cultures” (p. 2). However, around 50 per cent conveyed concerns regarding immigration’s influence on city overcrowding, housing costs, and population increase, thereby indicating a degree of blame and rejection.

Racism includes “social exclusion, discrimination, and/or subjection” (Brons, 2015, p. 72). Assumptions of scientific objectivity and the normalisation of inequalities are integral to Whiteness as a hegemonic power position. Researchers note that the tasks that are required to become “a legitimate subject of diversity discourse” (Ahonen et al., 2014, p. 275) vary across contexts, as do the selections of identified diversity features (such as gender and age), because “relations to difference vary across societies” (Meriläinen et al., 2009, p. 240). That is, racism intersects with other culturalities and occurs within regular social dynamics to create complex experiences of disadvantage and/or White masculine privilege, determined by relations to Whiteness (Bryan, 2012; Limki, 2017; Sang & Calvard, 2019).

Linguistic discrimination is common. Migrant discourses of culturalities that are identified as Other are not welcome. Labels, namely ‘migrant’, ‘refugee’ or ‘CALD
(culturally and linguistically diverse), may be ostracising, and tend to quash youth expression and hence youth potential to become active citizens (Mansouri & Kirpitchenko, 2016, p. 309). Baak (2018) argues that by understanding the “experiences of exclusion”, inclusionary methodologies may be realised and thus asserts the need to “provide students with a sense of belonging” (p. 137). This entails awareness of the nature of interactions within the institution, because racism manifests in particular ways according to the context, and this, as Forrest, Lean, and Dunn (2016) point out, places responsibility with teachers, administrators and with pre-service educators (p. 618). As Moses (2017) stated, in a university seminar promoting diversity, “everyone has a leadership role” (2017). In a pathway environment, where students are generally older than school students, it also places responsibility with the students, if given the avenues to express their concerns.

Integral to coloniality is the notion of hierarchical work, which is distributed in relation to identities of gender, race, and sexuality (Weeks, 2011). Essential to this capitalist process, modes of production were once created and upheld through the homogenisation of ‘Whites’ and ‘non-Whites’. Quijano (2000) also points to Eurocentrism to explain the split that colonialism creates between Europe and the Other, “in which ‘race’/work was articulated so as to appear ‘naturally’ associated” and delineated with “the division of labour and the control of resources of production” (Quijano, 2000. p. 216). Quijano’s (2000) descriptions of early capitalist domination and exploitation are reminiscent of Rizvi’s (2007) discussions on a new Orientalism; both point to underlying assumptions in the management and commodification of international students, evidenced, for example, in their excessively high student fees.

Interaction with new cultures may raise an individual’s awareness of their ‘racial/ethnic’ identities, with these axes performing as axes of social disadvantage. Lovett (2018) found that students come to Australia expecting to develop “positive and enduring
friendships” (p. 3), but Australian national students have been noted for their lack of interest in interacting with international students (Limki, 2017; Soong, 2018). In addition, host-national and international students, even when living near each other, continue to interact within “separate circles” (Dunn & Olivier, 2011, p. 36). This is in line with Burdett and Crossman’s (2012) research findings from 14 reports by the Australian University Quality Agency (AUQA) published between 2006 and 2010. AUQA expressed concerns that international students inhabit “different worlds”, do not “readily mix” and have an absence of opportunities to create friendships with domestic students (p. 213). International students find it difficult to know the ways to interact with domestic students. Australia’s drinking culture, for example, does not generally provide a ‘way in’ to domestic circles (Burdett & Crossman, 2012, p. 213).

The responsibility to ‘adjust’ to cultural difference is thus left with the international student. Mansouri and Jenkin’s (2010) Australian national research project found widespread intercultural tensions manifesting as verbal and physical abuse; 70% of participants had experienced racism as either victims or perpetrators; 80% of immigrants and 54.6% of Anglo-Saxon Australian-born youth experienced discrimination, and the majority of these experiences (66.7%) occurred in Australian schools (p. 104). These students are entering universities and international students are assumed to ‘naturally’ be able to intermix with them.

Despite racial discrimination being unlawful in Australia, dissipating racism is difficult, as racist practices are entrenched in economic, political and social structures (Ahonen, Tienari, Meriläinen, & Pullen, 2014; Bryan, 2012; Halse, 2015; Young, 2016) and point to the need for changes in pathway administration policy. Halse’s (2015) secondary school focus group study addresses a gap in research into the ways that student discourses “convey, legitimate, deflect or deny responsibility for racism” (p. 3) which is attributable to
the universalisation of racist performances. Young’s (2016) interrogation of student teacher discourses of race, language and disability similarly reveals deeply embedded discriminatory assumptions that manifest through deficit theories, classism, and silence; these discourses and silences serve to mask the underpinning inequality of White privilege, veil deficit modelling, and conflate race and culture (Young, 2016, p. 86).

Ahonen et al. (2014) emphasise that race as object and as a subject attribute is contextually determined and this necessitates the “interrogation of knowledge production” (pp. 269-270). Following Foucault’s explanations on biopolitics and externalising ‘population’ as an entity that could be managed through “calculation, analysis, and reflection” (2007, p. 72), Ahonen et al. (2014) point out that differences in institutional contexts are managed from a distance to achieve the desired result. Diversity management thus created a business function from the original liberal intentions of social equity principles. This neoliberal process effectively “denies and violates difference… through its technologies, taxonomies and specific practices …[and] categorizes and often commodifies sameness rather than enables difference” (p. 271). In this objectified portrayal, diversity is disconnected from historical associations of social justice and is a manageable everyday entity. Researchers are thus underscoring that the production of racism is ongoing and embedded in language and in institutional processes.

The notion that student mobility and study abroad programs on their own are equivalent to internationalisation is increasingly criticised for its nationalist perspective (Connell, Collyer, Maia, & Morrell, 2016; Leask, 2015) and for its lack of integration of international perspectives into the curriculum (Brewer & Leask, 2012, p. 246; Leask, 2015; Mestenhauser, 1998). In the neoliberal narrative, these procedures are seen as natural, as Limki (2017) explains: colonial, ontological and ethical perceptions rested on defining difference on the basis of gender, sexual and racial features, which legitimated and
naturalised discriminatory and exploitative behaviours (p. 327). It is significant that the
pathway economy is colonialist in targeting the traditionally designated racial Other,
Otherness that is further articulated in “religious and cultural difference and then a general
backwardness” (p. 329).

Transitions.

In view of positive changes occurring in international education, nevertheless, it is
clear that attitudes are shifting. With regard to student intake, transformations are occurring
in governance, operations, curricula content, increased online networks, and support services,
including English and mentoring programs, scholarly collaboration, extra curricula activities,
and external relations and services (Qiang, 2003). Many now consider that
internationalisation of the curriculum demands consideration of the nature of cultural
epistemologies and the way they inhabit educational practices. Scholars (for instance, Leask,
2009, 2015; Mansouri & Kirpitchenko, 2016; Mendan, 2012) argue for greater support for
migrant youth networking through a diverse range of activities, for example, including
engagement with volunteering prospects, diversified curricula perspectives, events,
celebrations, and forums that identify with the youth’s ‘home’ cultures to provide an
“increased sense of self-worth, belonging and wellbeing” (Mansouri & Kirpitchenko, 2016,
p. 320).

ACARA (2016) is now stressing intercultural competencies within the school
curriculum, as are universities, for instance, the National Centre for Cultural Competence
(2019) at the University of Sydney, and consulting centres such as Cultural Transition
Consulting (2019), the American Field Service (AFS, 2019), and the Centre for Cultural
Competence (CCCA, 2019), which is devoted to reconciliation and the education of
individuals and organisations in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures. de Wit,
Hunter, Howard, and Egron-Polak (2015) underscore the value of digital expertise and
international links through technologies that universities and schools have embraced. Hence, international student intake is attributed with expanding the traditional concept of culture, envisaged through acknowledged diversity across a range of cultural characteristics: regional, professional, organisational, religious, political, gender, socio-economic, familial and performative.

In 2016, the DET’s initiation of *The National Strategy for International Education 2025* (NSIE 2025) indicated progress in attention towards internationalisation within the education sector. The Australian government has now allocated AUD12 million to the National Strategy’s implementation from 2016–17 to 2020–21. The NSIE 2025 is founded upon three pillars: “strengthening the fundamentals – across Australia’s education systems”; establishing “transformative partnerships – across the breadth of linkages between people, institutions and governments”; and “competing globally – strengthening our brand, coordination and reputation” (DET, 2016). The strategy’s aim is to integrate intercultural learning, to listen to international students and work with them at the national, state, and institutional levels (Action 2.1).
2.7.3 ‘Local’ influences – the identities in pathway institutions.

Pathway students.

The construction of young adult identity is a principal focus in the literature. Identity may be defined as “an understanding of ourselves as continuously existing persons with certain complexes of traits and self-perceptions which are experienced in the context of our social roles and our social experience” (Willemsen & Waterman, 1991, p. 1203). The age group is one of vulnerability, known for its psychological and biological complexities (Arnett, 2000; Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1966, 1980; Steinberg, 2008), which intensify the importance of addressing ICU at the pathways level. Globalisation or transnational cultural experiences, such as through media, production, and travel, also have profound influences upon this age group (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). What the student’s sense of self is, the psychological factors that influence that sense of self, may be viewed as a significant part of the students’ chosen ‘local’ context, because students bring these influences with them into the institutional setting.

The cognitive and affective dimensions of adolescent and young adult behaviour are significant to this research, as they impact on self-identity and adjustment to change. Longitudinal studies indicate that personal identity develops progressively through adolescence and into adulthood; a mature identity is defined as one that shows “high levels of adjustment” (Meeus 2011, p. 75). Erikson’s (1968) epigenic theory of psychosocial development is one approach in human development (see Table 1 below). This theory describes ego development as progressing through eight predetermined stages, each stage characterised by a crisis where the individual’s psychological needs conflict with social needs. Achievement through each crisis results in the development of a virtue, which can support future crises. The majority (43.0%) of international students in Australia are in the age range of 20 to 24 years, with 6.0% 35 years or over and 3.7% under 18 years (DET,
2015b). The age levels for Erikson’s (1968) Stages 5 and 6 is applicable to the international students of this study. Stage 5, “Ego Identity versus Role Confusion”, is relevant to adolescent formulation of values and aims at an understanding of their individuality. Stage 6, “Intimacy versus Isolation”, consolidates self-identity as friendships are formed through self-expression. These processes influence the individual’s level of commitment to the external world.

Table 1: Erikson's (1968) Epigenic Theory of Psychosocial Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Psychosocial Crisis</th>
<th>Basic Virtue</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trust vs. Mistrust</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Infancy (0 to 1½)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Autonomy vs. Shame</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Early Childhood (1½ to 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Initiative vs. Guilt</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Play Age (3 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Industry vs. Inferiority</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>School Age (5 to 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ego Identity vs. Role Confusion</td>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Adolescence (12 to 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Intimacy vs. Isolation</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Young Adult (18 to 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Generativity vs. Stagnation</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Adulthood (40 to 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ego Integrity vs. Despair</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Maturity (65+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Based on whether the individual has formed a commitment to an occupation and an ideology after exploring alternatives, Marcia (1966) elaborates on such identity statuses through four categories: diffusion, those who lack commitment; foreclosure, those who, without experiencing a crisis, express commitment based on the adopted values of others; moratorium, those who are actively struggling to make a commitment; and achievement, those who have resolved identity issues and, following their search, have made a commitment.
The instability of commitment to ideology among this age group makes an explicit educational address to ICU all the more valid. The various expressions of students participating in this research spanned Marcia’s four categories.

Predominant personal identities include age, race, nationality, gender, sexuality, moral values, and spiritual beliefs, recognised as interrelated. Relevant local factors that may influence student identity choices and their attitudes towards others in pathway contexts include: the immediate environmental (historical, economic, social and political) settings; curricula and pedagogy; youth culture symbolism and interactions with peer groups (Best, 2011, p. 908); and the student’s psychological development, their “generational transformation in the life course” (p. 908).

Sociological influences on identity formation.

Sociologists (Best, 2011; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) explain identity as formed through the interactions between the internal self and their external world and through social relations, which position individuals across a range of identities and roles. Identities are thus processes or performances. Within this definition, numerous studies emphasise the young adult period as inherently insecure (Arnett, 2000; Marcia, 1980; Steinberg, 2008), echoing Erikson’s theoretical descriptions of adolescent development as a preoccupation with identity formation, and noting the positions of limited power that students hold, exemplifying insecurity, subordination, and negotiation. Hence, this research aimed to investigate the “categorisations”, “identifications” and “comparisons” (Tajfel & Turner, 1986, pp. 13-20) that students and their teachers make as they come to terms with the different cultural elements that confront them.

Various causes are ascribed to young adult identity choices. In distinguishing the ages 18 to 25 as one of emerging adulthood, as “neither adolescence nor young adulthood but … theoretically and empirically distinct from them both”, Arnett (2000, p. 469) attributes early
adult instability to social changes that have arrested other responsibilities, such as marriage and child rearing. With the individual relatively free from commitment to such traditional social roles, adolescent experimentation is extended in unrestricted exploration of possibilities. This view is questionable in relation to international student responsibilities. Typically, the international student cultural shift is fraught with challenges (Mansouri & Kirpitchenko, 2016); culture shock (Arthur, 2004; Blomfield & Maynard-Dias, 2005; Bochner, McLeod, & Lin, 1977; Patron, 2006; Townsend & Wan, 2007; Xia, 2009); loneliness (Doyle, Loveridge, & Faamanatu-Eteuati, 2016; Harvey, Robinson, & Welch, 2017; Sawir, Marginson, Deumert, Nyland, & Ramia, 2008); issues regarding finances, accommodation, and safety (Bagshaw, 2015; Marginson, 2011, 2012; Nahidi, Blignault, Hayen, & Razee, 2018; Ramia, Marginson, & Sawir, 2013; Rodan, 2009); power imbalances between Australian citizens, tutors and international students (Marginson, 2011, 2012; Paltridge et al., 2012; Pan & Wong, 2011); and concerns with language and assimilating academic content (Dunworth, 2010; Hellstén & Prescott, 2004; Owens, 2011). Enrolling in an overseas course, where the nation’s language is not the sojourner’s first language and travelling to set up a home within new culturalities indicates a high degree of independence, even if driven by parent demand. The unstable nature of these experiences may easily challenge previously established identity signifiers. This research addressed these issues as their relevance to the students’ ICU manifested through particular pathway processes.

Many students speak of their difficulties with adjusting to their new cultural experiences; adjustment stress, which may or may not be part of a ‘culture shock’ experience (Dorato & Roignan, 2019), needs to be taken into account in their educational experiences and output. Behaviours may include simple physical adaptations, for instance, changes in dress and food choices, or more complex and problematic (Berru, 2003, p. 21) adjustments. As stated above, acculturation is attributed with various strategies (Berry, 2003; Berry et al.,
Some students may be aiming to assimilate, to willingly adopt the cultural identities of the host culture (Berry, 2003, p. 24), while others may be more resistant to the host culture’s values and behaviours, thus choosing to integrate, to “operate in a multicollective system” (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 27). The student’s attitude towards their adjustment naturally has a significant influence on their acculturation and, arguably, therefore, on their academic performance, which is further reasoning that supports the adoption of ICU in English units.

Friendships or positive relationships can have a strong impact on a student’s acculturation (Belford, 2017; Hendrickson, Rosen, & Aune, 2011). Belford (2017) found that students appreciated the intercultural relationships that they established during their classes, and supported Rienties and Nolan’s (2014) claim that social friendships are beneficial for academic performance. However, the students generally felt that cultural differences of “values and expectations” (p. 510) made it difficult for them to establish friendships with host-national students. The students also claimed that there was a need for more peer support in creating closer relationships with others outside their usual international student and co-national friendship groups (pp. 510-511). Forbes-Mewett and Sawyer (2016) also found that students complained of the absence of a common lunch hour, the overwhelming amount of information at Orientations, and confusions over the medical system. The need to develop ICU in pathways is reinforced by these findings, as students would clearly benefit socially and academically through greater intercultural competence.

‘Adjustment’ and agency.

In relation to overcoming strangeness and experiencing acculturation, Starr-Glass (2016) distinguishes feelings of “strangerhood” from cultural alienation. He challenges the perception of strangerhood as negative:

Strangerhood is not an inherent property – positive or negative – of the individual. It
is an experienced relational difference, and within this experienced difference we can learn more about ourselves, just as the Other can better define his or her own identity. Being recognised as a stranger—by both the individual and the Other—provides a starting point for exploring difference. It provides an opportunity to compare, contrast, and develop a growing discernment about how we are different, and from what we are different. (p. 315)

It is apparent, therefore, that student identity choices need to be made explicit in pathway contexts, to give students greater prospect in understanding, shaping and sharing their global and local contexts. Students would benefit from assistance in deconstructing the Other, which occurs through understanding self-identities as appropriated. As Abdallah-Pretceille (2006, p. 476) points out, emphasis on cultural differences can result in reaffirmation of cultural groups and stereotyping. Developing understanding of diversities might be achieved by discussing various subject identities of culturalities, where “training dwells less on culture as a determinant of behaviour than on the manner in which individuals use cultural traits in order to speak, to express themselves verbally, bodily, socially, and personally” (p. 480). More open attitudes towards diversity that authors of ICU models speak of (Bennett, 1993; Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006) may develop from such an approach.

The nature and degree of young adult power is approached through investigating the ways that young adults are described or constructed (Gordon, 2009; Harris, 2013; Hartung, 2017; Stasiulis, 2002). Harris (2013, p. 5) asserts that young adults have no agency in modelling urban spaces and cultures. Rather, they are imagined as socially destructive or, in relation to transnationalism, as victims or winners, either trapped between cultures or benefiting in hybridity through technological communications. Gordon (2009) also investigates age as an “axis of inequality” (p. 7), as a hidden substantiation for perpetuating inequitable practices and emphasises that young people’s agency must be investigated to
avoid reifying their “political passivity and silence” (p. 7). The growing number of global citizenship education resources in Australia that “are based on partnerships between the state, the academy and various national and international NGOs” (p. 21) have also been criticised for positioning young adults as concerned with individual and economic needs as opposed to social needs (Hartung, 2017, p. 25). The perpetuation of connecting youthful desire with national economic needs subjugates alternative knowledges.

*Hybrid spaces, identity, and language.*

International students’ displacement and multicultural and bi-lingual learning experiences feature strongly as elements that destabilise identity constants. The basis for disorientation is often implicitly related to a sense of nationalist belonging. This is contained in positions of hybridity and third space considerations. Predominant conceptualisations include types of hybrid identity spaces (transnational, double consciousness, gender, diaspora, the third space, and the internal colony) (Akhtar, 1999, pp. 103–104; Iyall Smith, & Leavy, 2008). Iyall Smith (2007) emphasises the impure and complex dynamism of hybridities emerging through globalisation. Rogers (2006, p. 476) details four broad cultural dynamics that have varying social impact: first, cultural exchange, the reciprocal exchange of cultural elements maintaining equal power positions; second, domination, where one culture imposes its elements on another; third, exploitation, where the dominant culture appropriates the elements of another without mutuality; and fourth, transculturation, which acknowledges the multiplicity of cultures and their interconnectivities such that the singularity of culture is indiscernible. These varying conditions in turn point to how inhabitants within these processes can be affected to appropriate ‘national’ and ‘non-national’ paradigms in diverse ways. Nomnian (2018), for example, found three tiers of identity amongst Thai PhD students in Australia: “assumed identity as Asian people, imposed identity as ‘Non-Native-English’ speakers (NNES), and negotiable identity as Thai ethnic people” (p. 99).
Studies on bilingual students suggest that the performance of bilingualism can affect identity formation with indications of “continuous negotiation across national and/or ethnic borders … switching between the two ‘socio-cultural’ spaces that they inhabit” (Spotti, 2005, p. 2172), emphasising that bilingualism is a considerable currency in a globalised economy (Fahrutdinova, 2014; Liang, 2012). The freedom to communicate through home languages assists students to learn new language practices and contributes towards development in ‘sociocritical literacies’ (Gutiérrez, 2008). Digital cultural exchanges may also further widen the scope of the hybrid identity. Machado-Casas (2012) argues that migrants are like chameleons in adopting social networking platforms to use host identities to secure physical and social survival, and home identities to secure cultural survival, creating “lives marked by multiculturality and multisituationality” (p. 546). This is asserted as empowering: local and global “intermixture makes it [the hybrid] unique” (Iyall Smith & Leavy, 2008, p. 3).

The “idealized native speaker” (Flores & Aneja, 2017, p. 443) dissipates with the embrace of bilingual, translingual, or multilingual activities. Benzie (2015) adopts Bhaba’s (2004) notion of a hybrid third space to foreground international students’ agency in their ability to “adapt to and influence the institutional discourses they encounter as they make sense of their transition to the higher education context” (p. 18). This is a manifestation of language as heteroglossic (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 291) and textuality as always potentially intertextual (Kristeva, 1967/1980). Candace, a Chinese student of English (as cited in Flores & Aneja, 2017) adopts Mandarin expressions and metaphors to give depth to her English writings: “I am kind of in the middle of two languages. Because of these two reasons, I choose to retain this Chinglish version of the language to show my identity as a multilingual and an English language learner who wants to preserve her Chinese identity” (p. 451). The growing research into the many literacies of Asian nations in Australian education (for example, Halse & Cairns, 2018; Peterson, 2018; Singh, 2018; Soong, 2018) also challenges
traditional notions of English privilege, with emphasis on “humility and open mindedness” (Soong, 2018, p. 48) in addressing global citizenship. Within academia, there is a gradual recognition that translingualism can work in and for academic contexts, which may invest the public arena with far stronger understandings of the nature of equity and diversity. From a feminist perspective, this development breaks through the invisible binarism of patriarchal walls that sustain academia as objective, non-emotive pure intelligence. The relevance of these elusive, often sliding, identities – non-nationalist, nationalist, and hybrid – for the participants of this research was sought through investigating how students defined and explained their intercultural experiences and their sense of recognition and belonging within the pathway.

In view of student positioning, the study investigated whether or not students knew of any unions or organisations where they could seek support or advice. A number of student bodies are available for international student support, including the National Union of Students (NUS, 2019) and the Australian Federation of International Students (AFIS, 2019), which is involved in promoting multicultural awareness through community events. The Council of International Students (Australia) (CISA, 2019) also holds strong membership as an independent organisation and aims to achieve political change, currently demanding concurrent surveys, focus groups and consultative forums.

This study aimed to locate dominant intersecting constructs in the researched pathways that influenced attitudes towards transnational student engagement with each other and with others in the pathway setting. The ways that identities are created and positioned in pathways were examined through interviews, observations, and the analysis of curricula and adopted textbooks. Additionally, students’ power positions and their freedom to make changes were investigated, as well as their perceived options for achieving those changes. These possibilities were assessed through the pedagogical approaches, curricula documents,
the possible changes that staff and students envisaged, and the assumptions about their ability to initiate those changes within their environment.

Pathway administrators and administrative processes.

Increasing administrative power in university and pathway governance has marginalised academics and affected the growth of intercultural relations. University and pathway administrations have become identified with the professional, managerial class (Aronowitz, 2006, p. 24; Jiang, 2007; Macfarlane, 2011, p. 57; Welch, 2013), with academic boards under administrative control holding no formal power and being “key site[s] of struggle over the role and function of the multinational corporate university and academic work” (Rowlands, 2013, p. 1283). The modern university is viewed as an enterprise or corporation, with strong financial targets (Connell, 2019; Jiang, 2007; Marginson, 2011; Miles, Verreynne, McAuley and Hammond, 2017), impacting affiliated institutes. With demand-driven funding between 2012-2017, universities became increasingly competitive with each other and educational corporations, diminishing social value and intercultural values in the drive to achieve immediate economic success. In contrast, at faculty and department levels the aim is to achieve “quality teaching, research training, and research results, and contribute to knowledge and discipline development” (Jiang, 2007, p. 232).

Demand-driven funding ended in December 2017, but competitive processes remain. In Australian pathways, the neglect of faculty has become a major issue, with many sessional staff complaining of a decline in educational standards (L. Davies, 2019; Hunter, 2019; MacDonald, 2018; Shroder-Turk, cited in Worthington, 2019).

The financial emphasis in governance is evident in ongoing imperialist academic practices, including the “cultivation and application of various disciplines … research agendas, the definition of problems areas, methods of research and standards of excellence” (Alatas, 2003, pp. 602-603). As the borders of states, markets and culturalities have become
increasingly blurred (Nowotny, Scott, & Gibbons, 2001), knowledge is no longer universalised through the production of universities, institutes and industries (Newman, 2007). Rather, knowledge is a market commodity (Barendt, 2010; Connell, 2013, p. 108; C. Mohanty, 2013; Ramsden, 2012), where standardised testing determines the nature of teaching, learning and curriculums (Mockler, 2013, p. 154). J. Baird (2006) describes effective governance as:

> a strong relationship of trust among a group of people who have varying degrees of knowledge and commitment, and who hold divergent views on both ‘ends’ and ‘means’. It also requires this group to frequently disrupt norms of group solidarity by making critical comments, while not undermining the authority of the chief executive officer. (p. 298)

In contrast, misplaced emphasis on materialist wealth over humanitarian values perpetuates binary constructions of self and Other and hinders the development of social and cultural interconnectivity.

This is not to say that neoliberalism and ICU are antithetical. Sklair (2001), for example, has described the transnational capitalist class as committed in their international, cross-cultural experiences. Similarly, the capitalist intent of much student mobility internationally exemplifies how neoliberal aims and ICU may coalesce. However, there is a gap in educational leadership to foreground inherent problems of such merging.

Contextualising intercultural relations internationally, with regard to education policy, Levine (2012, p. 13) questions how the reflexivity of theoretical traditions and research programs of international relations is stifled. He locates the essence of the problem in the reifications of international relations, which, he argues, are inherently dangerous and require a scholarly monitoring system to offset the theoretical depth of any particular reification against others. Similarly, in relation to extending international relations beyond the
commercial approach to international HE, Welch (2016) posits a “regional knowledge network” (p. 5) comprising Australia, ASEAN and China to foster HE and research, deepen university quality, and establish and strengthen research collaboration. Byrne and Hall (2013, p. 420) argue that the commercial nature of the international education sector creates fragmentation that negates a unified public diplomacy trajectory. They urge that efforts be made to enhance all stakeholder inter-communications to create a complementary network. Hence, the sector’s success in realising the soft power potential of international education is dependent on public diplomacy leadership (p. 436).

Education policy at pathway level does not necessarily recognise and integrate international students’ culturalities either into pedagogical content or methodology. Such policy emphasises individualism and independence, but ICU depends upon recognition of shared humanities and interdependence. The Higher Education Standards Framework (2015) is too general in its guidance, as the specific interests or needs of international students continue to point to social inequities that ultimately mock the long-held values of Australian HE education and its aim of “free intellectual inquiry” (s 6.1). The absence of a more ethical foundation in administrative processes necessitates ideological reorientation. This study aims to locate institutional administrative practices that inhibit ICU as well as methodologies that cultivate deeper interaction between student and tutor voices within administrative and government contexts.

**Pathway teachers.**

The following section provides a summary of processes and ideologies that affect pathway teachers and their pedagogies, while recognising that these practices are also contextualised within national and global dynamics. The section discusses the nature of significant pathway knowledges; the limitations to teacher agency imposed through neoliberal practices and underlying assumptions; the way that language is adopted in the
classroom; and the significance of classroom literacies. Attention is then given to posited effective pedagogical methodologies for ICU development. Last, an overview of issues surrounding the nature of care in education is provided.

*Sustained and delivered knowledges.*

There is an absence of address to interculturality in teacher education (Byram, Nichols, & Stevens, 2001; Halse & Cairns, 2018; Hatoss, 2006; Leask, 2009, 2015). A significant hindrance to the development of ICU is the widespread delivery of curricula that gives precedence to Eurocentric cultural unit content (Bell, 2008; Fahey & Kenway, 2006; Hickling-Hudson, 2003, 2006), and “imparting this knowledge to their students in a teacher-directed fashion” (Sanderson, 2007a, p. 7). Inherently valued semantic dimensions of knowledge enhance comprehension, for they relate to pre-existing knowledge schemata (Dewey, 1902/2008; Inhelder & Piaget, 1958; Kovarova, 2006; S. McCormick, 1995; Owens, 2011; Piaget, 1936/1952; Sikkema & Sauerwein, 2015; Vygotsky, 1978). International students, therefore, need explicit recognition of their prior (cultural) understandings (R. Chen & Bennett, 2012; Le, Koo, Arambewela, & Zutshi, 2017). For example, Chinese students may not relate to constructivist pedagogical techniques preferring “new content knowledge, explicit teaching procedures and explicit evaluative criteria” (R. Chen & Bennett, 2012, p. 688). Opportunities to responsively foreground diverse culturalities should facilitate comprehension. Omitting to recognise cultural experiences and heritages sustains Eurocentric dominance, monoglossic language ideologies, and disempowers students’ cultural understandings. Students are culturally, and therefore personally, silenced, and their learning becomes passive (Channa, Gilhooly, Channa, & Manan, 2017).

In their research into Australian school education, moreover, Hayes et al. (2017) point to a gap between recommended and adopted evidence-based classroom practices, as designated by researchers, and teacher professionalism. As a result of this lack, “the nuances
of what works in different places, at different times, with different children and families, are missing” (p. 92). The researchers found some teachers engaged in “uncommon pedagogies” that were serving to bridge this gap. In a summary of the research recommendations, Hayes (2018) includes:

- recognising the knowledge and experiences that students have, and connecting these to school learning;
- actively and positively connecting classroom practice to families and communities;
- designing learning tasks that were open ended and that demanded complex thinking and language; and
- providing opportunities for students to think about significant personal and social issues, for example, loneliness, hope and relationships, by engaging with relevant texts. (“Use of uncommon pedagogies”, para. 2)

These actions support extending student’s interests beyond the classroom context. The focus is on developing social value by extending the knowledge significances into home life: connecting classroom activities with family and community, relating to students’ own experiences through textualities, and trusting students to participate in complex, higher order, or critical thinking activities.

Many academics are incorporating indigenous and pre-colonialist epistemologies as a way of affirming their relevance to particular contemporary societies and dissipating colonist ideological influence. Researchers and educators are locating alternative systems of thought and indigenous scholars are sharing their cultural knowledge. Academies have made concerted efforts to explore ‘non-West’ culturalities and to achieve a “more critical, inclusive and ‘cosmopolitan scholarship’ that will actively incorporate and develop an ‘ex-centric’ perspective, the perspective outside of the Anglo-American orbit, that will challenge mainstream theory-building” and provincialise Western hegemonic ideologies (Alacovska &
Gill, 2018, p. 196). There has thus been strong development in the decolonisation of teacher education and student curricula over the last decade (Liyanage, Singh, & Walker, 2016; Reid & Sriprakash, 2012; Y. Zhang, 2017).

Noting that both Northern and Southern feminist critiques of Nigerian women are inclined to sustain the colonialist essentialist binary paradigm of Self and Other, Uchendu, Roets, and Vandenbroeck (2019) emphasise the need to regard the situated knowledges and heterogeneity of people. They call for “historically, geographically, contextually and culturally grounded forms of knowledge [to be] produced, exchanged and imagined” (p. 509). Pointing to the potential for improving interrelations, the authors allude to intercultural development through the adoption of such an orientation (p. 521).

Speaking from her experiences as indigenous to Papua New Guinea, Reta (2010) writes of the cultural anxieties that people of different upbringings experience as they enter “the Western formal school context” (p. 137), asserting that glaring contrasts between different cultural knowledge schemas and their varied educational aspirations must be acknowledged in order to improve the quality of education experiences. In comparing Chinese and American, British, and Australian universities, J. Ryan (2016) points to the need to also acknowledge similarities across cultures, because there are common objectives across cultures that can foster deeper mutual understandings. The author thus places responsibility with academics to pluralise knowledges and expand curriculums.

Adely (2019), critiquing neo-colonial interactions with Arab Muslim communities, reveals projections of gender biases, such as the gendering of maths and science that do not reflect those communities’ gender issues. She advocates: “decolonizing educational knowledge [by] recentering the actors engaged in the pedagogical process—students and teachers—and their experiences” (p. 456). Similarly, Shah and Khurshid (2019) explain that context-specific displays of Muslim Indian and Pakistani women’s empowerment are often
homogenised and misread, with “Western colonialist and imperialist paradigms” (p. 460) tarnishing interpretations. Islam is not seen in its rich and complex relations to social, political and historical processes, but as ‘backward’. The authors point to experiences where women have sought empowerment within male-dominated systems, approach Islam through modernity, and wear a hijab as a means to show their freedom of choice as “modern Muslim women” (p. 460). The women reveal that education is not automatically empowering or a “universal experience” (p. 471) but occurs through context-specific constructions of gender identities that are often ambiguous and contradictory.

Connell (2007) likewise criticises the structure of global divisions of knowledge, citing an intellectual depth of work from a diversity of perspectives that provides alternatives to hegemonic positionings.1 Milner (2008) states:

The ability, will, and fortitude of Whites to negotiate and make difficult decisions in providing more equitable policies and practices might mean that they lose something of great importance to them, including their power, privilege, esteem, social status, linguistic status, and their ability to reproduce these benefits and interests to their children and future generations. (p. 334)

Academic positions taken at a Penang conference, “Decolonising Our Universities” (Ramani, 2011), similarly provide alternative perspectives: providing space for multiple cultural voices to realise a universal sociology; initiating indigenous African psychotherapy; adopting

1. Jamal ad-Din Al-Afghani, a key 19th century Muslim intellectual and critic of empire; Suor Juana Inés de la Cruz, an early Mexican feminist; He-Yin Zhen, an early 20th century Chinese socialist feminist; Anibal Quijano, a Latin American de-colonial philosopher; Paulin Hountondji, an African philosopher on forms of indigenous knowledge; Bina Agarwal, a feminist economist who has promoted women’s land rights; and Syed Farid Alatas, who has written extensively on the decolonisation of knowledge.
indigenous psychotherapeutic methodologies; de-theologising mathematics and natural sciences; indigenising law syllabi; and the de-professionalisation of the university system. Ramani’s commentary notes exaggerated nativism and complete rejection of “western knowledge” (p. 1), suggesting a need to maintain openness towards multiplicity, but the researchers’ shared thematic in the radical functionality of their arguments is evident.

*Pedagogical concerns.*

An issue that emerges in regard to classroom literature content is that foregrounding national cultural differences can be problematic. Jogie (2015) criticises the Australian English curricula in schools as outmoded, static, and lacking in contemporary culturally diverse texts. Teachers have also been found to feel lacking in expertise or resources to realise the value in promoting the “deep learning and understanding” (Gauci & Curwood, 2017, p. 163) that may be gained through intercultural communications. These failings lead students to disconnect from learning due to their inability to identify with the “content or themes” (p. 287). Concerned with culturally diverse students’ ability to discuss current issues, Jogie argues for a post-colonial approach, which she describes as “a method of selecting and comparing literature of any genre that engages with historical and contemporary issues, with particular focus on race, social class and gender” (p. 287). A post-colonial approach, Jogie argues, can “enhance student engagement in deep and meaningful discussions about identity and culture” (p. 74).

With the development of globalisation, texts that are published for English language teaching have become increasingly more global in their content, but the weighting or balance of diverse cultural content varies, which has ramifications for students’ learning and understanding of culturalities. There are many criteria to assess the suitability of a textbook (Karamifar, Barati, & Youhanaee, 2014), for example, comprehension level and presentation, but in reference to text selection on the basis of relevant cultural content, students’ source
cultures or culturalities may be rarely mentioned (Al-Sofi, 2018). However, multiple benefits may result from selecting topics that are culturally relevant to students. Namaziandost, Sabzevari, and Hashemifardnia (2018) compared listening comprehension results of students given different cultural stimulus materials and found that students with source culture materials scored better than the other groups. Lombardo (2011) found that texts that foregrounded cultural differences increased cultural awareness more than traditional textbooks. The writers chose topics that appropriately negated hegemonic discourses. These findings indicate that students’ learning can be strongly supported through careful textual choices. While acknowledging that teachers need to provide for students’ English learning needs, the additional capacity for teachers to incorporate diversely cultural texts, that relate to students’ source culturalities and Other, is clearly possible and strongly recommended (Al-Sofi, 2018; Khan & Rahaman, 2019). These aims are applicable to each of the modes of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, as they each entail topic selection.

Following Campano and Ghiso (2010), Faughey (2019) adopts the term ‘cosmopolitan intellectual’ to define her pedagogical orientations, where cosmopolitanism is the emphasis on “global citizenship as a form of moral responsibility toward humanity” (p. 75). Faughey found that students developed cosmopolitan intellectual identities through “engagement in a series of culturally relevant and multimodal literacy-building activities, involving reading, drawing, questioning, discussing, and writing” (p. 74), for example, student-student interviews and written reflections on the interviewee’s commentaries. As Ommundsen (2012) states: the transnational turn has initiated investigation into “global, national and local interconnectedness which feeds into the literary experience both at the point of creation and the point of reception […..] it is not just the ‘Asian’ in ‘Asian Australian’ that comes under scrutiny, but ‘Australian’ as well” (p. 2). The heritages and myths of home cultures can be foregrounded to give avenue to student perceptions (Pearson,
2012). Such investigations can expose shallow, stereotypical representations (Noma, 2009) such as Islam interpreted as a homogeneous religion and Muslims as not belonging to particular societies (Zecha, Popp, & Yasar, 2016).

In their study of 341 Foundation Studies students, Phakiti, Hirsh, and Woodrow (2013) found that the negative effects of perceived difficulty of learning content is dissipated through the “power of motivation, self-regulation, and self-efficacy” (p. 251), factors that significantly affected English language learning and academic success. The researchers recommend teachers to assist students in their academic achievements by integrating “the roles of socio-cognitive factors on learning as part of the content teaching” (p.251). The authors do not elaborate on how this may be done. An inference could be that the students may be simply informed that these factors are effective, but this may not be enough. Intercultural communications instigated through inspiring personal reflections as discussed above, however, is one transformational strategy that may encourage such positive factors.

The concern for decolonisation is related to the loss of regard for the social dimension of societies with the rise of neoliberal influences (Connell, 2019; Ignatieff [in West], 2018; Rizvi & Beech, 2017). ‘Western’ efforts to ‘resurrect’ pre-colonial ontologies may be seen in the context of Eurocentric societies searching for localised meanings as a way of replacing the loss of grand-narratives, as Brooks (1999) asserted in his review of Australian narratives set in various Asian locations and contexts.¹ Against these considerations, however, are the

---

¹ In his analysis, Brooks (1999) uncovers a number of telling motifs. The leading manifestations include: first, a story is commonly sought after; second, there is the presence of death, which the story may be an attempt to fend off; third, the stories that are told mirror the protagonists’ own stories. The author relates the recurring expression of need for story to the collapse of metanarratives, both master (religious, imperialist) and secondary (Marxian, Freudian psychoanalysis). The story-telling is the act of fending off
very real student attitudes and interests that are not centred in the histories or ontologies of their parents’ or their parents’ parents, especially given the influences of globalisation and the degrading of education as a step in the employment process (Ruth, 2018). Students may not be forthcoming in eliciting “ex-centric” perspectives (Alacovska & Gill, 2018, p. 196). Students of Chinese education systems, for example, which are closely based on the American model, without the incorporation of “academic and intellectual freedom” (Yang, 2010, p.41), may be more interested in learning what they perceive as ‘Western’ ways than referring back to their heritages.

The important task, nevertheless, is to invite and accept the stories that are told. Citing Adichie (2009), Dorato and Roignan (2019) assert: “It is vital to hear different stories”. They ask “How can you find other stories with all these annoying people around that may help you see them differently or approach them in a different manner? They emphasise that teachers need to learn ways to find other stories in and for their own contexts, and by ensuring the inclusion of multiple voices, media, and perspectives, teachers can help to break down stereotypes and communicate that countries are far more complex than what may be recognised. Finding a balance between thought-provoking context-specific meaningful loss of meaning or death; existence without narrative is akin to death, since “fictionality is our condition” (p. 232). To be known by another culture is also to be absorbed into another's way of seeing, so is to be, “in the sense of one's own being, ‘dead’ within it” (p. 237). The mirrored stories evidence our own ‘killings’: “that much of what we may think we are seeing or knowing about some other place or culture is our own story being fed back to us”. Finally, Brooks relates the 'knowing' to patriarchy, where the woman 'known' is made absent and, further, to the “perception of a cultural Other and perception of Woman as the Other of one’s culture, in such a way as leads to the representation of the cultural other as woman, as feminine” (p. 237).
retellings and students’ own narratives appears to be fundamental in the decolonising twenty-first century pedagogical aim. Stepping-stones appear in the form of providing curricula activities that challenge traditional assumptions to develop “an ex-centric perspective” (Alacovska & Gill, 2019, p.196), progressing through discussions on aspects of students’ home culturalities, and these progressions may be enriched through students having agency in topic selection (Faughey, 2019; Hastie & Sharplin, 2012; Noma, 2009; Ommundsen, 2012).

Rizvi (2011) highlights that communication technologies, global networking practices, and strong alternative knowledges to the scientific rationalism of European cultures are undermining the free market fundamentalism of neoliberalism, and these increasing global relationships are demanding changes in the ways that higher education approaches knowledge and learning. Increasing acknowledgement of multiple perceptions brings a shift in values. As Piller (2001) puts it: “The question [of] who makes culture relevant to whom in which context for which purposes is ever more important to gain an understanding of the interested nature of communication” (p. 73). The issue lies at the heart of educational and humanitarian concerns.

Numerous scholars (Crisp, Epstein, Rojan, & Taket, 2018; Gill, 2016; Ramsey, 2000) emphasise the need to provide opportunities for students to share the value that they hold to their religious beliefs and religious complexities. Baerlocher (2019) asserts that according to studies across 120 countries, 80 per cent of people place their religion or spiritual identity above all others—above gender and above nationality. Baerlocher (2019) rationalises the passionate dimension of belief systems through their development from family and life experiences. Nevertheless, secularisation has become normative in workspaces. Many companies uphold the view that religion and spiritual belief is part of an individual’s private life and has no place at work (Baerlocher, 2019).
Conversely, the above scholars argue that understanding the details of religious beliefs can help to dissipate stereotypical views and assumptions of students and conceivably develop stronger empathetic ability. Religious and spiritual literacy undermines attitudes that identify religion or spirituality as a cause for dissent and violence. Religious diversity inclusion would give freedom for students to feel more fully accepted in the pathway context. Gill (2016), for example, argues the need for training, detailing methods to produce intercultural encounters that are conscious and within the trusting space of the classroom. Through educational training and support, students can develop peaceful acceptance of their differences, while benefiting from the freedom of expression.

The physical elements of learning environments, for example, how a facility welcomes and accommodates their students, are another important aspect of context knowledge that influences student engagement and interaction. The physical elements that create context determine the nature of interactions that occur within that context, either “enabling or impeding rich intercultural education” (Moss, O’Mara & McCandless, 2017, p. 970). Moss et al. (2017) explore ‘visual microaggressions’, the physical manifestations of cultural racial discrimination, through examining school foyers. These “deeply symbolic spaces” (p. 962) are perceived as exhibiting social meanings that delineate who may share in the codes and standards of the school. The choice of item and the manner of display are relevant. Art, furniture, honour boards, display cabinets, student work, mission statements, and framed certificates communicate messages of acceptance and expectation. The internal assertions simultaneously reflect the school’s connections with the external. Moss et al. note an overall lack of expression of diversity and that student work was generally undemonstrative and confined; individualist ideology also predominated, even though it was framed in terms of community. Baerlocher (2019) offers a number of measures for the workplace, some applicable to the pathway context, including: unworn symbols (such as
nativity scenes); worn signs (such as the hijab); an allocated room for prayer or for simply gaining a sense of quietness; and foods that incorporate religious or belief need (such as vegetarian recipes). The current study has also examined the nature of the physical spaces and objects in the three pathways, observing the relationships between practices and materialisations, how spaces and internal objects were organised to assert and sustain power positions, and how those positionings affected the nature of ICU.

Brewer and Leask (2012, p. 250) note that numerous universities are appointing staff from various national, cultural and linguistic backgrounds as a strategy to internationalise the curriculum. They explain that studies indicate that the method is limited, however, predominantly because international teachers are not necessarily cognisant of their role in internationalising the curriculum; this is because professional development is lacking, and intentions are not made explicit. Cloonan, Paatsch and Wells (2014) distinguish between professional learning (p. 40) and professional development, where, in the former, teachers commit to “exploring the complexities of teaching … by talking, listening to and collaborating with one another” (p. 38) on issues of their daily practice. Such forums require clear participatory aims and guidelines, and incentives for collaboration. Moon (2008, p. 134) includes the development of epistemological beliefs among teachers as a necessary prerequisite for assisting their students to develop in critical thinking. Brownlee’s (2001) findings (cited in Moon, 2008, p. 134), that teachers are not necessarily epistemologically developed in their discipline, however, signifies how important discussion and sharing varied understandings of interculturality must be for developing not only teachers’ epistemologies but also their students’ critical thinking abilities.

Education facilities will interculturally benefit when staff members are engaged in professional development in ICU (Halse et al., 2015; Hatoss, 2006; Prabhakar, 2014). Watkins, Lean, and Noble (2016) highlight fissures in NSW preservice schoolteacher training
and professional education relating to multiculturalism. The NSW Institute of Teachers (NSWIT) and the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) both stipulate that teachers must acquire the knowledge to adequately respond to students of diverse backgrounds, but the specific skills are not explained and nor is any requirement for training in ESL (p. 53). In addition, 20% of teachers had no instruction in various aspects of multicultural education and 5000 teacher respondents (46%) had not read the NSW Department of Education and Communities’ 2005 Multicultural Education Policy (p. 54).

The adequacy of TESOL training in preparing teachers for the diverse classroom (Farrell, 2019; Peercy, 2012; Richards, 2014) has received criticism, including a mismatch between theory and practice (Farrell, 2019; M. H. Nguyen, 2013, 2014), a lack of support for new teachers, and no interaction between the educators and the pre-service teacher in the latter’s first years of appointment (Farrell, 2019). Further, as A. McCormick points out (personal communication, May 17, 2019), accountability reporting and standardised requirements can still impose on available time. Staff members need incentives through motivated, shared discourse to initiate pragmatic practices that may lead to deeper inquiry, interaction and understanding between students from different cultures (Cloonan et al., 2014a; Halse et al., 2013; Israelsson, 2016).

Through interviews and curricula analysis, this study has aimed to locate the nature of knowledges in the curricula and how knowledges are circulated within the pathway context among staff and between staff and students. This includes how course and unit content are selected and delivered and how interculturality is integrated in curricula documents and selected textbooks.

*Teachers’ voices.*

Teachers’ limited influence in pathway workplaces is a further restraint to ICU development, because it means that tutors have little power or incentive to initiate change.
Many English language and academic communication tutors have no central or collective philosophical source to reference and thus function without a strong power position. Centralised education disseminated value outcomes for students and maintained principles of teacher’s rights through stipulated working hours, pays, and conditions, but these fought-for working conditions in NSW have collapsed with the onset of neoliberal policies (Connell, 2013, p. 101).

While acknowledging that casualisation affects male and female teachers in post-secondary education, feminist researchers (for example, Dubois-Shaik & Fusulier, 2017; Ivanceva et al., 2018; Lynch, 2010) have also highlighted how the masculine character of neoliberalism in its scientific, positivist, competitive performance model, carelessness in its disconnection from emotive expression, and address to an autonomous rational individualism (Lynch, 2010, p. 54; Lynch, Grummell & Devine, 2012) creates additional burdens for female teachers, who, as females, will often assume caring responsibilities (childbirth, child raising) as an integral part of their culturality. Universities, however, have failed to address labour precarity produced by short-term and part-time contract work that often leaves women having to choose between career and caring commitments. Women are also less represented in the higher management positions (Lynch, 2010), often fulfilling the softer responsibilities of education and receiving lower acknowledgement for publications.

The awareness of equity issues and increasing awareness of responsibilities of care have also grown avenues for new masculinities, which challenge hegemonic masculine assertions (local and universal) that have sustained colonialist divisions of race, ethnicity, class and gender (Connell, 2014, 2016; Lund, Meriläinen, & Tienari, 2019). This is thus indirectly relevant to pathway students; their preparation into university is also preparation into a particular form of patriarchy, which needs to be explicated within the pathway context. Teachers’ personal experiences are also unacknowledged in these officious settings. Many
teachers have been affected by their own national upbringings, overseas travel, and external events (Shih, 2017) and could provide additional insights into intercultural understanding if their histories were given free expression.

The widespread adoption of part-time contract work has undermined tutors’ ability to influence workplace functions, which means that administrative decisions are implemented without consultation or debate. Tutors are less likely to express dissatisfaction with any aspect of work because their positions are provisional; job loss is a constant fear (Besser & Cronau, 2015; Evans, 2016; Nakar, 2013; Rea, 2017). Unionism in Australia has also diminished, and contract work has further undercut the potential for a united voice (Connell, 2013). Contract positions limit tutor interaction: tutors who share teaching on the same unit may not necessarily see each other at all during a semester, as they may be programmed on different days. Unless the institute specifies that meetings must be held and require compulsory attendance, tutors are likely to find a lack of support structures to enable their sharing of professional issues. Hence, the reduction of fixed-term employment contracts diminishes cultures of care in the pathway community (Ivanceva et al., 2018; Lynch, 2010; Mariskind, 2014), for without communication on student needs, little change is made. This research questioned tutors on their conceptualisation of agency within the institution, on who determines the content of ‘knowledge’ taught, the modes of delivery, and the degree to which they perceive their role as implementers of change.

Commercial influence on academic values.

Tutors’ diminishing power is contributing to a decline in academic education values and an increase in economic exploitation of international students, thereby expanding the intercultural communications gap. Media responses to the question of international students’ language and assessment has presented substantial evidence that commercial prioritisation is replacing academic concerns (Besser & Cronau, 2015; Independent Commission Against
Corruption [ICAC], 2015; Productivity Commission, 2015a; L. Davies, 2019; Hunter, 2019; National Tertiary Education Union [NTEU], 2018; Shroder-Turk, 2019). ICAC (2015, p. 28) has reported tutors claiming that they have been deterred from giving students low grades due to administrative pressures, which is underpinned by a fear that their future work could be placed at risk. At the same time, corruption among overseas agents was also reported to be problematic, with students allegedly gaining entry on fabricated qualifications. This exacerbated an already existing difficulty, where students graduating from pathways programs were not at the equivalent level as the direct entry university student, thus “widening the gap between the capability of the student cohort and the demands of the university” (p. 29). A 2017 an NTEU (2018) survey found that 28.3% of “academic staff felt pressure to pass full fee paying students whose work was not good enough” (p. 20), a figure that may indicate similar trends in pathways as well. In 2019, in a Four Corners interview with reporter Elise Worthington, Academic Gerd Shroder-Turk stated:

> I've got very serious ethical concerns about the way the practices that we're applying in the international student recruitment space. I'm concerned both about the welfare of the students and the wellbeing of the students, as well as about the academic integrity, or the problems related to academic integrity that result from this.

Similar complaints reported students who simply could not understand instructions or class material and were not able to satisfactorily use a computer. Because of time constraints, these issues place tutors in a moral dilemma, torn between caring for the students’ needs on the one hand and maintaining focus on fulfilling the unit aims on the other.

How teachers appropriate agency may determine the nature of future pathway contexts. Hence, also of relevance for this research is how trade unions play a role in gathering local voices for local agendas in support of pathway tutors. Aronowitz (2006) looked to the possibility of “unions of professional staff, clericals, graduate students, and
maintenance employees” (p. 26) to reverse faculty disempowerment. Recognising that members may not find governance of particular consequence, he argued that faculties should work to convince them (p. 27). Numerous unions are available for academic membership, including the Independent Education Union (2019) and the NTEU (2019). While both have strong national membership, the latter is more active in advocating on contentious political issues. Of importance to this research is whether tutors looked for union support to instigate change in their workplace.

This study investigated the nature of decision-making in each pathway, the tutors’ involvement in decision-making processes, and how hierarchies of power were established, perpetuated, and penetrated. Investigation included the regularity and attendance of staff meetings, the coordinators’ attitudes towards other staff and the degree and nature of the staff’s interactions with their coordinator/s. The auto-ethnography in Chapter Six also aimed to provide a deeper experiential dimension to the research through a tutor’s voice.

*Language and pedagogies in pathways.*

Cultures and language are inextricably linked: “Culture shapes what we say, when we say it and how we say it from the simplest language we use to the most complex. It is fundamental to the way we speak, write, listen and read” (Liddicoat, 2002, p. 5). Significant to the function of cultures in language use is the growth of English as a global language. Many students have been drawn to study in Australia because English has become associated with international employment success, wealth, and prestige. At the same time, English may be perceived in other ways. Languages are “inventions” (Piller, 2011, p. 53), which disguise the heterogeneity of linguistic use. Kumaravadivelu’s (2012) explication provides insight into such heterogeneity:

Indians learn English to meet their educational and institutional needs and they keep it separate from their cultural beliefs and practices (Krishnaswamy & Burde, 1998). For
Pakistanis, English reflects Islamic values, and embodies South Asian Islamic sensitivities (Mahboob, 2009). Turks have no difficulty whatsoever in privileging “their Turkish and Muslim identities over the Western way of existence presented during English-language courses” (Atay & Ece, 2009, p. 31). (p. 19)

The role of language variations across changing contexts is highly significant for the way that cultures are understood. English acquisition in Australia can be confusing for transnational students not only because they are immersed in the conventions of everyday English and academic English but also because students bring preconceptions, or “language ideologies” with them (Piller, 2011, p. 166) that may not be consonant with the institute’s academic expectations, its language ideologies. By foregrounding the linguistic and social dimensions of communication, social injustices within language learning can be interrogated (Norton, 2016, p. vii; Piller, 2011, p. 173). With its focus on academic English, it is important in this study to analyse how language is taught and enacted in order to penetrate methods that open avenues for diverse cultural expressions and their recognition.

Intercultural perceptions recognise ‘linguistic relativity’, in line with the much-debated Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (1929), that language determines (and thus creates avenues and parameters for) perception: “different languages offer different ways of expressing our perceptions and experiences of the world around us” (Piller, 2011, p. 39), so terminology can restrict or confuse intercultural understanding. Piller (2011) exemplifies through a difference between European kinship terminology, restricted to marriage conventions and relatives, and that of Western Desert indigenous Australians where terms also relate to the spiritual connections to the land. What is clear is that the language expressions of culturalities are intrinsically different in meaning and function and often in quite complex ways. For Australian educational contexts, the consequences are immense if culturalities ‘Other’ than inherited Eurocentric perceptions are to be acknowledged and integrated into curricula.
English, as the language of instruction, is privileged over the exclusion of other languages (Benzie, 2015; Dagenais, 2013; Kaktins, 2013; Ninnes, Aitchison, & Kalos., 1999). Teaching international students has been strongly influenced by a ‘cultural-deficit’ model, where students’ prior learning experiences are considered inadequate for Australian academia, assumed to be reliant on “rote, reproductive, surface, teacher-centred, and dependent” approaches (Ninnes, Aitchison, & Kalos, 1999, p. 323). Students may be considered as lacking analytical and critical thinking skills, with academics viewing critical thinking as indicative of the ‘Western’ elite (J. Ryan, 2016). This perspective has been challenged by more nuanced understandings of learning processes (Ballard & Clanchy, 1997; Biggs, 2003; Ninnes et al., 1999; J. Ryan, 2016; Sanderson, 2007b; Tran, 2008; Wang, 2013). Additional explanations for some students’ reticence include respect for the teacher; problems with English oral expression (Gray & Murray, 2011; M. Robertson, Line, Jones & Thomas, 2000); teachers failing to create a communicative environment (Bao, 2014; Harumi, 2011; Xie, 2010); variation in philosophical orientation to discussion in learning (Yates & Nguyen, 2012); possible inexperience with collaborative learning styles, challenges of acquiring particular academic conventions, and unclear understandings of the classroom speaking requirements (Benzie, 2015; Dagenais, 2013; Khawaja & Stallman, 2011; Ninnes et al., 1999; Piller, 2011).

Authors (Fantini, 2009; Hatoss, 2006) emphasise the need to incorporate both cognitive and experiential learning; the former is passive, “learning about culture content”, while the latter is active, “acquiring knowledge through experience” (Hatoss, 2006, p. 51). Cognitive learning includes recognising the nature of various cultural characteristics, which may be recognised as in flux. Experiential learning includes such activities as discussion, reflection, conducting interviews, and giving presentations.

The suppression of international students’ linguistic expression may inhibit cognition.
As the dominant medium for communication, language places particular pressures on ESL speakers. Language is “the central means and medium by which we understand culture” (Machado-Casas, 2012, p. 541), so international students may struggle with comprehending academic English unit content and with the particular nuances of the discipline. Students’ language readiness is met and assisted with peer interaction, (Krashen, 1981; 1982), however, so student discussion with the option of home language use when needed can be particularly beneficial. Identity communication is also language dependent, so transnational students may have difficulty with communicating their identities, becoming part of their new environment and making themselves stand out as individuals (Prabhakar, 2014, pp. 2-5). Such difficulties can lead to discriminatory misunderstandings of student abilities among staff and a sense of disempowerment among students. As stated, recognition of students’ prior learning is essential for understanding, communication, and developing intercultural relations.

*Standardisation in language instruction.*

International students’ interactions are further problematised because the English language can be appropriated differently across pathways. IELTS (2019) states Band 7 as “probably acceptable” for “linguistically demanding academic courses” (p. 15). As stated, however, universities accept lower Band results, which means that pathways also will, and this is TEQSA endorsed. Furthermore, despite the adoption of IELTS standards as a guide for pathway entry, significant variation appears to occur in students’ abilities (L. Davies, 2019; Hunter, 2019), and some students find IELTS entry levels insufficient for their study (Ingram & Bayliss, 2006).

The provision of equitable standards for NESB students in accessing Australian universities is an unresolved issue (NCSEHE, 2017). Recent government and TEQSA interest in a review of academic English instruction at tertiary level (L. Davies, 2019; Hunter, 2019) underscore the necessity for a unified and integrated approach that acknowledges
international students’ needs. TEQSA’s chief executive has shared the view that universities may need to “record, in detail, the basis on which a student met the required English language entry standard” (McClaran, in Hunter, 2019, para. 9). The nature of the “detail” has not yet been provided.

In line with the DET’s (2018b) National Codes 2018, additional language instruction is accommodated in pathway institutions. The National Codes 2018 stipulate: “Services must be available to help students meet course requirements and maintain attendance. Examples of such services include: a study skills centre, supervised study groups and tutorial support assistance” (s. D.6.2.). Considerable difference exists, however, between making a service available and ensuring functional use. Scholars have noted a lack of arrangements for students to improve their English skills once enrolled in preparatory programs (Andrade, 2006; B. Baird, 2010; Dunworth, 2010). Institutions may only provide limited additional English support classes, for instance, one per week, due to their relative cost. Students may also not necessarily be able to attend these classes due to timetabling conflicts, or they may simply be reluctant to attend additional classes when they carry no credit points (Owens, 2011). There is a need for institutions to prioritise the delivery of intensive English programs and to ensure that all students meet specific criteria in English expression as a prerequisite to undergraduate studies.

*Authentic learning.*

One of the most effective ways of building students’ confidence to communicate in English, many argue, is through establishing authentic need, which is reliant on a student’s freedom of cultural expression. Based on her research findings, N. Kim (2016) advances critical international language pedagogy (CILP) where the teacher adopts critical teacher talk (CTT) to establish “transnational culture building, critical caring, and authentic learning” (p. 967) that featured “Comfortable, Dialogic, Mediated, and Purposeful Dimensions” (p. 971).
From their research observations, Ting and Patron (2013) posit “intercultural connectivity” (p. 227), intercultural conversations in the classroom, and to “remain constantly vigilant in order to avoid cultural dissonance in our personal and group discourse” (p. 226). They call on universities to commit to build frameworks that will enhance cultural conversation. Gill (2016) and Ramsey’s (2000) support for interreligious dialogic encounters, as earlier mentioned, is also concomitant with authentic communication. Allowing students to express their views gives students the opportunities to eradicate prejudicial assumptions. Both approaches rely on developing students’ trust in themselves and other students. Relatedly, Moon (2008) emphasises that critical thinking involves “dealing with, or reasoning about emotions in relation to an issue”, rather than not noticing, or, as in situations of avoiding religious discussion, pretending not to notice. Pedagogical strategies need to incorporate critical thinking development in specific relation to tolerance to political and religious difference.

Numerous researchers (Amos & Rehorst, 2018; D. Chen & Yang, 2017; Pandian, Baboo, & Mahfoodh, 2016; Tan, Yough, & Wang, 2018; Thurgood, 2018; Vani, 2016) similarly argue that opportunities in the classroom for critical dialogue about real events and processes need to be expanded because of the increasing power of technologies and the increasing diversity of student cohorts in age, social experience, and position. Units require reshaping to place students in a context where they are actively involved in adopting a critical perspective of society and its social controls, and to reflect on their personal attitudes and biases.

For example, critiquing discriminatory masculinity discourses, Morinaga-Williams (2018) notes that whereas Japanese women in the USA are acceptable partners for White Americans, Japanese males are subject to prejudicial stereotyping in regard to their sexuality. Discourses essentialise discriminatory and marginalising identities, asserting Japanese men as
motohen, physically unattractive to Western women and failing in their social skills. Race and masculinity intersect to enable Western men to access Japanese women while exteriorising Japanese men. The author concludes by emphasising the need for these discriminatory discourses to be challenged “not only through research but also through shifts in popular culture” (p. 1587). To these we could certainly add “through curricula and pedagogical methodologies”. As Rizvi and Beech (2017) argue within their descriptions of non-universalist cosmopolitan learning, a student’s interpretation of diversity should be “made explicit, understood and be the object of reflexive pedagogic practices” (p. 130).

Zhetpisbayeve, Mun, and Shelestova (2012) assert that multilingual speakers are able to “maintain and change ethnic group boundaries and personal relationships, and construct and define ‘self’ and ‘other’ within a broader political economy and historical context” (p. 124). The study thus indicates that incorporating multiple literacies, which is here seen as actualising authentic learning, can promote interculturality. In a study on multiliterate students, however, Marshall, Hayashi and Yeung (2012) found that students are creative in their use of multilingual and multiliterate competencies informally but far more restrained and conformist in academic contexts. Informal, intercultural interaction promotes ontological and axiological dimensions of understanding. An overemphasis on the epistemological and methodological dimensions of critical and creative thinking (Brodin & Frick, 2011, p. 134), however, may leave students without acknowledgement of their own experience, past or present. ¹ This has evident implications for authentic learning and intercultural experience.

¹ Skerrett (2013) explains that there are four components to multiliteracies: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformed practice. Situated practice involves students sharing their cultural interpretations in authentic literacies. Overt instruction focuses on developing student
Transformational pedagogies.

Innovative pedagogies are evolving. August (2018) linked transnational students with a domestic Sociology class that involved sharing novels and movies to develop “academic vocabulary acquisition, critical thinking, and authentic communication in a sheltered environment” (p. 33). S. Lu (2017) argues for the incorporation of global varieties of English, like comics, in addition to their academic texts, to promote students’ sense of comfort in their use of English. Experiencing diverse cultural sites, as a means of “sentient decolonization” (Garbutt, Biermann, & Offord, 2012, p. 62), is a form of cultural understanding that embraces performance theory. Additional recommendations are posited towards instigating teacher involvement in collective platforms to trigger authentic interaction between cultures (Halse & Baumgart, 2000, p. 455), with interactions of culturalities not previously experienced referred to as a ‘cultural plunge’ (Cochran-Smith, 2003; Nieto, 2006).

A turn to the aesthetic and the performative is conceived as utilising language context to advance intercultural communication, uniting body and mind and thus dissipating the rupture between “the subject (self) and object (other) of culture” (Cooks, 2010, p. 123). Poetry is adopted as a means of helping students to learn about and appreciate other cultures, to develop analytical skills and to motive sharing of feelings and beliefs (Dymoke, 2012; Freyn, 2018; Iila, 2016). Ma (2017) recommends collectively painting on a jointly chosen topic to simply relax and talk. Weber’s (2010) feminist strategies similarly include “serious awareness and use of an analytical metalanguage. Critical framing aims to enable students to critically approach the complex constructions of culture and recognise how they influence their own constructions. Transformed practice facilitates students to invest their new meanings with their own aims and values (pp. 324-325).
play” through dance, poetry and drawings, “in order to approach and create knowledge systems with difference” (p. 131). In-class group games, for example, building representative cultural processes and/or objects with given materials, are said to stimulate the imagination and learning through exploration, allowing students to share experiences in a concrete way (Merk, 2019). Collaborative activities and paired work is regularly posited in fostering “student cohesiveness and relatedness, and … opportunities to improve communication skills, competence and confidence over time” (Tan, Yough, & Wang, 2018, p. 439).

A multitude of technological activities present opportunities for students to interact and deepen their intercultural connections. D. Kim and Kang (2017) found that students working together on a given task or problem within the classroom but connected through cyber space improved their written performances. Asynchronous technological activities provide classroom variation and an element of individual creativity within group work. Forums similarly provide interactive platforms (Li & Liu, 2018). Visual literacy development is also posited as a vital learning skill due to the plethora of images that are daily consumed (Jean, 2018). Augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) developments also offer “portability” and “social interactivity” activities, such as treasure hunts or creating a campus tour (Bonner, 2018, p. 37), providing interactive stimulating activities. E-Pal exchanges (Patton, Hirano, & Garrett, 2017) can promote collaborative learning between students, pre-service teachers, and teachers across local, national, and global space.

Appiah (2006) states: “Conversation doesn’t have to lead to consensus about anything, especially not values; it’s enough that it helps people get used to one another” (p. 85). While some may argue that deeper participation is required, recognition of the need for students to be assisted in the ‘getting used to’ must at the very least be acknowledged because tutors can scaffold learning to feel safe and expressive among cultural differences. Through aesthetic realisation students can assume the agency to question education’s political cultural
dimensions. Despite the limitations in their implementation, these options provide transformative pedagogical approaches that may further facilitate ICU.

Narrative also features strongly in the literature as a means to foster cultural expressions and a sense of belonging (Genova & Stewart, 2019; Gillman, 2013; Rizvi & Beech, 2017; Weatherall, 2019), extend student imaginings, discover new relationships that had been previously unrecognised, and to be both an author and imagined character (Gillman, 2013, p. 647). Listening and reading narrative is to recognise each other and the self as “embedded in history, place, and community rather than as disembodied individuals” (Weatherall, 2019, p. 8). Students carry multiple culturalities where understandings of powers—of land, gender, ethnicities, class, and the Other—vary. The traditional academic persona that aims to be ‘objective’ through positivist methodologies identifies itself with “emotional detachment”, “rhetorical neutrality”, “formal writing styles”, “technical terminology”, and “time-and context-free generalizations” (R. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 14). This can become problematic, since the demand for academic convention can create a self-contradictory or conflicting dynamic within the semiotic dimension (Fairclough, 2009). Narrative can undermine the patriarchal notion of objectivity and contribute toward decolonisation (Adely, 2019; Lugones, 2010; Manion & Shah, 2019; Weatherall, 2019), giving voice to those who have been marginalised and silenced.

Enabling opportunities for students to connect with actual social events has also been found to enhance student participation and agency (Ponder, Vander Veldt, & Lewis-Ferrell, 2011; Schultz & Oyler, 2006). Research indicates that even initial student inquiry into community needs and community interactions intensifies interest in writing (L. Johnson, Sieben, & O’Neill, 2016; Hayes et al., 2017). Connection with real-life needs is a critical pedagogical strategy (Freire, 1970, 1993; Giroux, 2011), which points to developing
equitable power positions. It is essentially intercultural, cutting across class, gender, age and identities of place by embracing students in shared projects.

The supremacy of English is problematic in the pathway context, where the aim is to develop familiarity with academic English conventions. Studies indicate that many international students have multiple difficulties with meeting classroom and academic requirements, possibly due to a lack of standardised practices in developing and assessing conventions (Dunworth, 2010) and an absence of attention to students’ prior learning (D. Chen & Yang, 2017; Dimitroff, Dimitroff, & Alhashimi, 2018). Creative instructive methodologies, including authentic learning, discussion, artistic modes, excursions, narrative, and community interaction, may promote the student’s personal engagement and result in intercultural connectivity. This study sought evidence of the treatment of students’ ‘home’ languages within the context of an English teaching facility, the language mediums that tutors provided to students for learning through, and the nature and role of the appropriated textbooks. The research investigated teacher-student interactions to gain insight into the use of methodologies that may personalise classes, as well as the degree and manner of discussion opportunities; the nature of routines; and activities that related to and/or interacted with the external environment. The study also included whether additional English classes were made available, and how they were presented and attended.

*Teacher orientations to care.*

With positivist methodologies dominating pedagogy, teachers may continue to *deliver* content rather than allow for at least some degree of negotiation and discovery within the lesson. Collett (2007) argues that tacit agreement to avoid offending anyone in the classroom allows silence about difference to dictate. In describing her experiences at the University of Sydney’s Centre of English Teaching, Indelicato (2014) reveals that such silence is ineffective and ultimately damaging:
We were not even asked about our previous educational experiences and study skills already accumulated … in class, we were all the same and all equally assumed to be unprepared to university life. … Our attempts were not only assessed as diverging from the model we were taught but also judged as being non-academic. For us, it was then impossible to consider this judgement as limited to our writing skills, as the very epistemologies underpinning them were also assessed as inadequate by default. As a result, most of us became disaffected from the learning context. (pp. 11-12)

Indelicato’s recollections of unanswered enthusiasm elucidate the misconceptions of the ‘cultural deficit’ perspective (Ninnes et al., 1999; Wang, 2013) and highlight the absence of support. Mendan’s (2012) research revealed similar complaints: “There is no time to enjoy ourselves” and “you are far away from your family…homesick” (p. 24). Without recognition of a need to attend to ICU, pathway courses to HE may be maintaining discriminatory practices.

Australian educational institutions provide welfare support via mentoring programs, social activities, sporting venues, and counsellors, for example, but classroom tutors, given their part-time or casual status, administrative and teaching load requirements, accountability, plus increasing pressure relating to grant applications and publication requirements are neither expected nor provided the time to give social support to students (Ryan, 2012); teachers leave the responsibility of socialisation to the student and the institution. Y. Zhang (2017) also found that ESL teachers are deficient in the ability to communicate with students of varying cultures because they are lacking in both episodic competence and relational competence. They explain this lack to inexperience in intercultural contexts. Hence, there may be a degree of hesitancy among staff to promote socialisation. Unaware of these issues, international students have expectations that the teacher will provide some level of social support, as indicated by Hellstén and Prescott’s (2004) research participant: “So, I want
teacher to encourage that, and like mum or dad ... yes, to take care of them (other IS) a lot because they are really shy and they sometimes they don’t understand ... Just to say ‘OK’…” (p. 347). International students can thus feel heavily reliant on their own resources to overcome emotional and psychological stresses that interfere with a smooth passage through academia.

An ample body of scholarship within feminist pedagogy (for example, Acker & Wagner, 2017; Gillman, 2013; H. Lu, 2018; Tsouroufli, 2018) is concerned with the interpretations and applications of care, which is highly significant to interculturality because it addresses the enrichment of student–student and student–tutor interactions. Although students entering pathways to HE are largely considered to be autonomous, pathway institutions, functioning under government legislation, accept that both pastoral care and pedagogical care are a part of their responsibilities (H. Lu, 2018; O’Brien, 2010). Pastoral care is generally provided through social and psychological support. This can occur through mentoring, student and academic advisors, and extra-curricular activities. Pedagogical support is generally provided in the classroom, but additional classes and academic advisors are also available.

Nevertheless, there is a clear need for greater research into the complex nature of care and its effects on teaching and learning at pathway level. The nature and amount of care that classroom tutors provide can significantly vary because, beyond mandated Occupation and Health and Safety policies, care is not emphasised as integral to their position or pedagogy. On the contrary, pathways may be operating in a neoliberal self-absorbed “entrepreneurial individualism” that is “antithetical to care in deep and profound ways” (Ivancheva, Lynch & Keating, 2018, p. 449). Mariskind (2014) argues that deeper understandings of care may challenge gender stereotypes if care is approached as a practice, rather than as a “disposition or an ethic” (p. 308). Identifying the notion of care as cultural and varied among cultures,
Tronto (1993) outlines that caring practices occur in four phases with corresponding values: “caring-about” (acknowledging the needs of others); “taking care of” (p. 106), (assessing identified need requirements and accepting responsibility for them); “care-giving” (p. 109), (fulfilling needed requirements); and “care-receiving” (p. 109) (accepting the recipient’s response to the care). Care becomes gendered, however, as “caring about” (p. 109) and “taking care of” (p. 106) are aligned with the masculine traits of intelligence and assessment, whereas care-giving and care-receiving are considered inferior, emotional and weak feminine traits.

Neoliberal influence on caring.

Recent neoliberal trends in HE, including “discourses of performativity and managerialism” (H. Lu, 2018, p. 87) also override consideration for teachers supporting students emotionally. Lu found that all four teachers in her study assumed responsibility for pedagogical care but varied in their acceptance of “pastoral care responsibility for students’ emotional well-being” (p. 87). The students also gave more credit to the teachers who demonstrated pedagogical care than those who gave pastoral care. Like Mariskind (2014), H. Lu (2018) questions whether care might be able to be de-gendered in HE contexts. She suggests that care was and still is associated with the feminine, to mothering, and to emotion, and she found female teachers to be more forthcoming with pastoral care. After witnessing students who were not content with the level of care they were receiving and who were choosing to negotiate their relationships with (male) teachers, she concluded that student agency suggests the possibility for de-gendering of care in HE contexts.

H. Lu’s (2018) arguments seem to exemplify one of the pinpointed problems of neoliberalism, as explicated by M.T.N. Nguyen, Zavoretti and Tronto (2017), that in many institutions of the global South, care is utilised by neoliberal state and market players as a moral explanation for “marketization, deregulation and exploitation” (p. 201). M.T.N.
Nguyen et al. do not only describe the independent neoliberal, self-choosing, self-providing, economic subject as an “economistic fantasy [that] creates the illusion of self-determination in the face of growing precarity and widespread uncertainties” (p. 206). They further argue that the ideal of the autonomous subject is sustained through the rejection of the (feminine) dependent and caring. The fantasy is also practically sustained through the placement of responsibility of social problems with the individual and the family. Hence, care is utilised for neoliberal purposes through a strengthening association between the autonomous, independent individual and ideology of the female carer (p. 209).

Care is implicitly marketed in presenting the quality education and services that students hope for. The processes of caring, according to Cantini (2017), are largely related to controlling student behaviour, both on campus and in dormitories, with time and space both rigidly organised: “The representation of the ideal student-consumer at [the researched university] portrays absence of politics as care, as avoiding ‘trouble’ and as focusing on the main goal of this kind of private education, namely obtaining a degree” (p. 272). Following Tronto (2010), Cantini points to the commodification of care as problematic, for it robs people of the freedom to take responsibility for assessing their own needs.

Tsouroufli (2018) found that the conceptions of professionalism among Greek women academics embodied the affective dimension in pedagogic performances, which challenged the neoliberal paradigm of care rejection. The women drew on Greek heroism and on a neoliberal discourse of choice to construct the female academic subject as “an amalgam of intelligence, hard work, sacrifice, love, gendered ethics and virtue” (p. 52). The women related to a model gendered academic subject that fostered knowledge through “sharing, giving to students and influencing them” (p. 52). Emotional work and understanding legitimated their academic identities. Participants envisaged academic professionalism to encompass “humility and humanity”, “relatedness, responsiveness”, and “empathy” (p. 54).
These affective practices validated and gave value to gendered professional identities within the neoliberal higher education context. These findings exemplify hooks’ (2003) argument that “Caring teachers are always ‘enlightened witnesses’ for our students. Since our task is to nurture their academic growth, we are called to serve them… It is a counter-hegemonic, liberatory practice taking place within a dominator context” (p. 89). Although these practices challenged patriarchal and neoliberal structures, the women worked within the patriarchal structures, accepting of the choices that were presented to them.

In a TED delivery, M. Parker (2012) explains that emotions are taboo in workplaces because emotions are not understood. Reducing the spectrum of emotions down to love and fear, based on psychoanalytical findings, Parker discusses how love and fear manifest in the workplace. Love, she argues, manifests as employees and employers seeking loyalty; fear manifests as anxiety, which is uncertainty multiplied by powerlessness. The way to improving workplace contexts, Parker argues, is for employers to be radically transparent; we need to blur our personal and professional selves, to be more authentic.

This study looked at the nature of care in the pathways and whether differences existed between the different pathways’ approaches to care. It also sought to identify whether care appeared to be commodified, as identified in Cantini’s (2017) findings. Tsouroufli’s (2018) findings were also considered as the study aimed to locate similar feminine acts of resistance. The research examined each pathway to determine whether or not personal expressions were freely expressed or not, whether class content was deliberately depoliticised, and the teacher’s attitudes towards depoliticisation. It also assessed whether or not students and tutors felt more should be done in recognition of diversity in the pathway context and sought suggestions on how such ideas could be implemented. This was achieved through analyses of the interview data and curricula material and observations of the physical environments.
2.8 Conclusion

This literature review demonstrates a gap in the application of strategies to develop ICU in pathways to HE. There is a need to extend knowledge of self and others by prioritising communication channels. The main targeted areas suggested the inclusion of modifications in curricula (cross-cultural studies; intercultural studies) and pedagogy and the initiation of tutor and student avenues to create new relationships and extend existing methodologies. Developing a strong voice for diplomatic purposes and refusing binarism (Ichiyo, 2003; Kristeva, 1982; C. Mohanty, 2013) through a pluralist ontology that continually penetrates hegemonic reconfigurations are current socio-political needs that depend on a clear overview of political power positions and established relationships between and among national and international voices. Analysing ICU from a multiplicity perspective entails investigating various cultural discourses, particularly in relation to nationalism, neocolonialism, ‘race’, class, religion, and gender, in order to locate how each is positioned and to expose dominant structures that hinder intercultural development and learning.

Challenges to neoliberal administrative functions are sought in varying contexts: some seek potential leadership through public diplomacy, some look toward internal university powers, the boards and professoriate, and some consider tutor and student ‘unionism’. Mendan (2012) asserts that the student engagement literature provides limited guidance on how educational institutions can develop the capability for implementing successful strategies. Guidelines for procedures to incorporate interculturality are also underdeveloped or “ad hoc” (Qiang, 2003, p. 259). Hence, practices that are deemed effective need to be ascertained.

The following chapter provides a detailed explanation of the research methodology. Through this analysis, this study aimed to obtain insights into the nature and value of ICU within the studied pathway contexts. A concomitant intention was to discover the limiting
patriarchal assumptions hidden within the multiple identities of pathway contexts, as perceivable through feminist, intersectional, and multiplicity theories.
3.1 Introduction to the Chapter

I first explain the reasoning behind my theoretical positioning to the research and analysis, where I have predominantly drawn on theories of social constructivism and feminist pedagogy to interpret the pathway structure and content dynamics and also, occasionally, a lens of intersectionality where interconnected and interdependent social identities are evidently affecting perspectives and power positions (Chikwendu, 2013; Crenshaw, 1989; Parent, DeBlaere, & Moradi, 2013; Shields, 2008; Stewart & McDermott, 2004). As the research involved three case studies, I then provide a brief overview of the various traditions of case studies. This is followed by a discussion on the nature and values of the selected methodology, critical discourse analysis (CDA).

3.2 Theories

3.2.1 Constructivism.

A perception that may underpin approaches to ICU is that cultural categories are constructed. ICU relates to subject identity, and the subject’s interpretation of the identities of others and their environments. Constructivism emphasises knowledge as a process of construction and consequently gives value to the learner’s current understandings (Fosnot & Perry, 2005; Johnson, 2019), dependent on their accommodation of new understandings. The process is unique to each individual due to cognitive schemata and interpretive variation. Cognitive constructivism, based on Piaget’s research (1936/1952), sees new learning occurring through curiosity and the need to understand new information as a way of correcting a sense of disequilibrium when confronted with new concepts. Social constructivism posits and emphasises that learning occurs through social interactions (Johnson, 2019; Pritchard & Woollard, 2013; Vygotsky, 1978). The nature of the social context is thus exceptionally significant in influencing how a learner will construe given
knowledge. In this research, analysis was often situated in the social context, particularly in the perceptions of institutional dynamics and their influence on the identities in the pathway case studies.

The construction of cultures has also been the focus of much literature, though the acts of construction are contested and not foregrounded broadly across the Australian education syllabus (Thanosawan, 2012, p. 2). Moon (2008) states: “The fully developed capacity to think critically relies on an understanding of knowledge as constructed and related to its context (relativistic) and this is not possible if knowledge is viewed only in a dualistic or absolute manner (i.e. knowledge as a series of facts)” (p. 126). Constructivist theory thus challenges essentialist, positivist assumptions. “Reality” is viewed as “a text, an idea, a cultural construction” (Birch, Schirato, & Srivastava 2001, p. 4), a “complex structure of a weaving, an interlacing” (Derrida, 1982, para. 2). Identity formation is integral to con-structural complexity.

In compressing time and space and tearing space from place (Giddens, 1990, p. 18), globalisation fractures position identities and obfuscates traditional boundaries. Interpretations of cultural spaces, which may be seen as open and in flux, are complicated by preconstructions of spatial and temporal boundaries, which have been historically viewed as fixed (Burgess, 2004; Perera, 2004). This research thus questioned the identifications that are variously projected and internalised within pathway contexts, recognising their historical social, political, economic and personal complexity.

In adopting CDA as a methodology, the study incorporates an emphasis on power positions and emancipatory measures; from this perspective, the research also sits comfortably within a transformative paradigm (Creswell, 2003). However, Romm (2015), following Mertens (1999), distinguishes between constructivist and the transformative paradigm, asserting that the latter’s researcher consults with the significant participants in
deciding on methods that should be appropriated in the research design. I did not give participants that choice. The research is thus viewed as constructivist in that participants were considered as creating their contexts, and also transformative in that the contexts that were created were viewed in terms of power. In addition, transformative pedagogies are given attention as they are relevant to the development of cultural awareness. Hence, the ontological positions do not conflict; the variance occurs in the research methodologies.

3.2.2 Feminist pedagogy.


Power positions between student and teacher are imagined as equitably situated. This is to dissolve patriarchal notions that justify hierarchical power structures and to shift decision-making responsibility to students. Teachers seek to dialogically accommodate students in their learning, to provide space for student voices, to encourage greater student agency, which may assist in deconstructing hegemonic, patriarchal knowledges. Students and teachers collaborate
and pursue understandings of each other’s cultural interpretations, working together on shared projects, where power is constructed as “creative community energy” (Shrewsbury, 1993, p.10). With emphasis on discursive constructions, and how they function within a particular context, feminists avoid positing gender equality strategies as means to success.

Feminist pedagogy aims for students to locate social needs and functions, to provide “a framework for pedagogies that aim for social justice” (Ylostalo & Brunila, 2017, p. 4). Drawing upon critical pedagogy and theory, in which CDA also has its basis, feminist pedagogy challenges interpretations of knowledge as fixed, unquestionable, and universal. Knowledge is recognised as constructed, and in the classroom, this occurs “through negotiation and interaction between teacher and student” (McClure, 2000, p. 53). ‘Reality’ is viewed as self-constructed, and not definable by an external source, such as through teachers or textbooks. The underlying philosophical explanation for seeking knowledge lies in exposing the power positions of knowledge sources and their ‘ownership’, recognising knowledge as a means to understand current positionings—political, social and economic; the temporal orientation is the present. This is acceptance of epistemological uncertainty within a ‘post-Truth’ world. In contrast, as Naskali and Keskitalo-Foley (2017) point out, conventional pedagogical practices aim to achieve successful learning results, and are thus always situated in the future (p. 2).

Feminist pedagogy incorporates the notion of multiplicity (Deleuze, 1968/1994). Acknowledging “multiplicities” places strong emphasis on the socio-cultural and socio-historical construction of the human subject (X. Zhang, 2008, p. 37), dissolves the patriarchal notion of an autonomous subject, which in turn disables ‘knowing’ the Other, controlling the Other. The subject is transient and diverse. Linnehan and Konrad (1999, in Proudford & Nkomo, 2006, p. 12) have argued that such approaches to diversity may draw away from inequalities and discrimination, so power dynamics must be continually noted.
In view of these various perspectives, this study of ICU required my identifying patriarchal structures that withhold and work against feminine expression in order to locate avenues for liberating feminine manifestation. Because patriarchy permeates traditional cultural assumptions, I have aimed to locate gender articulations within pathway processes. I have also questioned whether feminine expression that is culturally removed or subverted may be released by challenging phallogocentric practices (Derrida, 1978) within the preparatory education contexts of my research. This release may function towards the freeing of expression and the recognition of multiplicities. My pursuit has thus been to identify structures that stultify ‘feminine’ (creative and personal) expression in pathway contexts, seek occurrences of liberated feminine manifestations that challenge the phallogocentric, and locate further avenues for the release of feminine expressions.

3.2.3 Intersectionality.

In this study, intersectionality, which originated as a feminist sociological theory specifically related to race (Crenshaw, 1989), was applied to interview responses at selected points to deepen understanding. Shields (2008) states that intersectionality is where “social identities which serve as organising features of social relations, mutually constitute, reinforce, and naturalize one another” (p. 302). In this study, the intersections that were addressed included “a range of material and symbolic dimensions (e.g. age, ethnicity, gender, nationality, class, ability and sexual orientation) that are not just incremental but compound one another” (Knights & Omanović, 2016, p. 7). Intersections can be both advantageous and disadvantageous, and function individually and socially. Intersectional theory acknowledges cultural interconnections through the multiplicity of identification features and responds to the connections created between axes of identity.

Numerous authors have criticised researchers for failing to satisfactorily delineate the terms of intersectional analysis, (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Shields, 2008; Walby, Armstrong,
Interpretation is problematised by the sheer number of identifiable features and the ways that intersections can be read, as discourses of multiplicity have become embedded in intersectional theory. Intersectional analysis may be conducted through three main approaches: additive, multiplicative or interactionist, and as intersectionality perspectives (Moradi & Subich, 2003; Parent et al., 2013; Szymanski & Moffitt, 2012). Additive perspectives view minority identities as combining additively to determine social positioning. Multiplicative or interactionist interpretations view minority identities as conceivably separate but functioning multiplicatively, where one affects the other. The intersectionality perspective asserts that multiple identities are not separable and lead to distinctive experiences. In this study, the researcher adopted the latter approach and was guided by Mansour’s (2012) advice to select identification features based on social context and focus on how those features interconnect with social classifications of lower status. Focus was given to dominant identification features in interview discourses, texts, and observations. Implications of these co-occurring identities on the pathway’s ICU development were considered.

Thus, the three theoretical approaches of constructivism, feminist pedagogy and intersectionality provided multidimensional viewpoints in analysis, and each analysis was chosen because of its ability to operationalise the critical aspect of the use of CDA in data analysis. The constructivist lens focused on both individual and institutional identities in the pathway case studies and how they created, sustained, or challenged established power dynamics within the pathways’ institutional social context. Feminist pedagogy overlaid the individualist, constructivist viewpoint through interpreting particular power constructs as gendered. This perspective may be dismissed as essentialist and not concomitant with constructivism. However, both perspectives give emphasis to the liquid, mutable nature of knowledge and the freedom of creative interpretation and expression. This freedom raises concerns for equity principles in education. Hence, while tension occurs between the feminist
and constructivist positionings, both are intrinsically concerned with challenging power hierarchies that inhibit and obstruct creative expression. The feminist perspective helped determine the nature of relationships between the different identities that were functioning within the pathways and thus gave insight into how creativity, intrinsic to constructivist learning, was either given avenue or stifled. The intersectional lens addressed both the bonding and segregation of identities, transpiring through the social contexts. This perspective also created tensions with the constructivist and feminist lenses, as both tend towards discussing the individual’s identities as singularities. The intersectional lens, therefore, disturbed this more traditional practice and revealed how prevailing identification features intersect with organizational categorisations. Hence, as with the constructivist and feminist lenses, the intersectional perspective could address the creation and retention of conditions of lower status.

3.3 Methodology

Before discussing the methodology of CDA, an overview of the case study process as part of the research approach is provided.

3.3.1 Case studies.

Case studies involve systematic research of a unit such as an organisation, person, or event. Harrison, Birks, Franklin, and Mills (2017, p. 17) include the following in their outline of case study elements: “bounded”, “studied in context”, “in-depth”, and selective in scope, breadth, methods and sources of evidence. Case study analyses can draw upon a range of data such as documents, interview, observation, and physical objects.

Significant varying theoretical frameworks have led to contrasting traditions in case study method: positivist, postpositivist, interpretivist/constructivist, critical/feminist, and poststructuralist (Hatch, 2002, p. 13). Positivist research is deterministic; there is one reality that the researcher is separate from - objectivity is readily achievable. Testing theory and
hypotheses, positivists draw on quantitative research approaches, developed during the mid-
twentieth century, featuring number-orientated methods based on measurement and analysis
of statistics, surveys, correlational studies and experiments (Hatch, 2002, p. 13), with
emphasis given to rigour and replicability of the research. Postpositivists view reality as
existent but elusive. Knowledge, nevertheless, is attainable through data collection (Hatch,
2002). Objectivity is an understood aim, but the complexity of the natural sciences is
acknowledged; hence, triangulation is adopted to strengthen the validity of the findings.
Research is deductive and theory driven (Steenhuis, 2015).

Qualitative methods that gave greater importance to human viewpoints and social
context developed to address the lack of human perspective in quantitative methods. In the
interpretivist/constructivist worldview, reality and knowledge are co-constructed. There is no
separate, one reality, but many. Research draws upon both quantitative and qualitative
methods, but inquiry is focused on the participant’s viewpoint and interpretations are arrived
at inductively (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006, p. 196). In the Critical paradigm, reality is an
outcome of the relationships of power. It is created through the tensions of power positions
through such qualities as gender, class, and race and is intensely political in the interest of
social justice. Research is focused on socially transformative strategies that challenge
hegemonic power structures. The poststructuralists view meaning as individually and socially
created to make sense of the world which is essentially chaotic and meaningless. Research is
focused on specific contexts and the discourses functioning within them. Poststructuralists
draw upon phenomenology and ethnography in their analyses, often engaging in
deconstructions and reflexivity, with focus on “the textual frame within which the
participants speak, rather than the participants themselves” (Fawcett, 2008, p. 670). The
pragmatic paradigm focuses on the research question. The methods are adopted on their
pragmatic ability to answer the research question with the researcher’s philosophical stance of no import (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006, p. 197).

Three main qualitative case study approaches are highlighted in the literature (Boblin, Ireland, Kirkpatrick & Robinson, 2013; Harrison et al., 2017, p. 12; Steenhuis, 2015), those of Robert Yin (2009, 2014), Sharan Merriam (1998, 2009), and Robert Stake (1995, 2006). Each emphasises that the methodology should align with the researcher’s “philosophical position, their research question, design, and methods to be used in the study” (Harrison et al., 2017, p. 12).

Yin’s methodology is postpositivist (Boblin, Ireland, Kirkpatrick & Robinson, 2013; Steenhuis, 2015), adopting a “realist perspective” (Yin, 2014, p.17). Yin (2014) defines a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the ‘case’) in-depth and within its real-world context” (p. 16), where the researcher is detached and independent of the research context (Boblin et al., 2013). Influenced by the development of grounded research theory, which combined qualitative and quantitative methods (Harrison, Birks, Franklin & Mills, 2017), Yin’s research design, nevertheless, blended the positivist, experimental approach, testing theoretical postulations, with a qualitative, inductive approach. While aiming for objectivity and generalisability, research interpretation is acknowledged. According to Yin (2014), the case study design must have six main elements: plan, design, preparation, data collection, and analysis. Reporting, reliability, generalisability, validity and rigour are underscored elements of his research.

Merriam and Tisdell (2015) define case study as “an in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system” (p.37) and “the unit of analysis, not the topic of investigation, characterises a case study” (p. 38). The authors distinguish the case from other studies such as ethnography, phenomenology, grounded theory and narrative, as these are the focus of the research, not the unit of analysis; these study forms can thus be combined with case study
research. Merriam’s early (1998, 2009) approaches to case study are clearly constructivist, in viewing meaning as created through social interaction, while also indicating pragmatic leanings, according to Harrison et al. (2017) in ensuring “research is manageable, rigorous, credible, and applicable” (p. 14). Merriam and Tisdells’ (2015) pragmatism is also evident in the broad scope of qualitative strategies that they discuss; they are flexible in the way that the case study should be designed, noting that it is dependent on the theoretical framework and purpose of the study.

Stake’s (1995, 2006) approach is also qualitative, and his ontological persuasion is constructivist/interpretivist (Harrison et al., 2017). Stake emphasises the contextuality of meaning and the researcher’s own subjective interpretations (Boblin et al., 2013), as significant in the research, an acknowledgement of the multiplicity of meaning construction: “qualitative understanding of cases requires experiencing the activity of the case as it occurs in its context and its particular situation” (Stake, 2006, p. 2). Together with the participants, the researcher discovers and interprets the context and its internal functions. Research insights are achieved inductively. Vignettes and thick descriptions are among his approach recommendations (Harrison et al., 2017).

In this study, the constructivist approaches to the case studies have been influenced by both Merriam and Stake. Merriam’s direction is evident in aiming to maintain the study of each institution as bounded. Pragmatism is also apparent in the adoption of multiple qualitative strategies. However, the stronger observable influence is from Stake in the emphasis on multiplicity and description.

3.3.2 Critical discourse analysis.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was the adopted methodology for the research. Throughout, the term “discourse” refers to meaningful language of speech, writing, and the visual dimension. Discourses are “practices that systematically form the object of which they
speak; they do not identify object, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention” (Foucault, 1972, p. 49). Discourse theories are abundant and have evolved across multiple disciplines (Bacchi, 2005, p. 199); they include discursive psychology, rhetorical psychology, speech act theory, critical discourse analysis, and Foucauldian forms of discourse analysis (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 1), and variously employ conversational, textual and visual analysis. The different applications address specific purposes of particular disciplines.

Discourse analysis has value as an epistemology, ontology and methodology (X. Zhang, 2008, p. 51). As an epistemology, the identification of discourse modes and relationships provides insight into subjects’ transient actual worlds. An ontological position is acquired in drawing upon constructivist theory, where culturalities and the subject are deeply embedded in meaningful contexts through textualities that subjects create, perform and respond to. As a methodology, discourse analysis is concerned with interpreting the forms, functions, and attributed values of texts (Geertz, 1973). Therefore, literary analysis, interviews, and observations were all appropriate choices for research through discourse analysis and these are discussed in detail in the following chapter. As Tikly (2004) has enunciated, it is in the area of discourse that “shared understanding about the nature and implications of economic, political and cultural change are constructed and contested” (pp. 177-178), and thus discourse analysis gives recognition to the multiple and contesting voices of various social groups and leads to questioning ‘knowledge’, subjectivities, social practices, and the power positions that they uphold (A. McCormick, 2012; Tikly, 2004; Vavrus & Seghers, 2010).

CDA is a specific form of discourse analysis with antecedents in critical theory. The critical aspect of CDA draws upon a number of theories (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000, p. 451-52). Predominant theories include: Foucault’s (1971, 1977) formulations of “orders of
discourse” and “power-knowledge”, Gramsci’s (1971) notion of “hegemony”, Althusser’s (1971) concepts of “ideological state apparatuses” and “interpellation”, Gidden’s (1984) theory of structuration, and Bakhtin’s (1973) theory of discourse. CDA thus appeals to various approaches that share similar theoretical and research orientations (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 27). Its view to exploration of multiple expressions of power, subjectivity, identity and agency made it an effective methodology for critically analysing the pathway case study contexts.

CDA differs from discourse analysis in its identification of language with social practices. The aims of critical discourse analysis, as outlined by van Dijk (1995), relate to the critical aspect of CDA, which lies in its adoption of an interdisciplinary approach to social problems and occurs through the analyses of both the grammatical and semiotic dimensions in discourse. Analyses of the associations of power, “the structures and strategies of dominance and resistance in social relationships” (p. 18), aim to reveal embedded, hidden ideologies. The accompanying intent is thus to challenge controlling power positions, the “strategies of manipulation, legitimation, the manufacture of consent” (p. 18) and other influences over minds and actions. Wodak and Meyer (2009) state:

Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s), and social structure(s), which frame it … discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned – it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. (pp. 5-6)

CDA provides a framework for de-mystifying ideologies and power through semiotic analysis (Wodak & Meyer, 2009), examining spoken, written, and visual (image and object) language as social practices, with a particular focus on locating political and social structures,
in both their concrete and abstract forms. The positioning is toward destabilising dominant power structures and initiating reform.

Ideology and power are significant concepts in CDA. The ideology that is of interest to CDA researchers is the “hidden and latent type of everyday beliefs which often appear disguised as conceptual metaphors and analogies…. Dominant ideologies appear as ‘neutral’, holding on to assumptions that stay largely unchallenged” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 8). Power is generally applied in a Foucauldian sense, as a “systemic and constitutive element/characteristic of society” (p. 9). Foucault focuses on the functions of power, how power is employed to achieve and maintain control.

Subject identity is problematic in power attribution, as Giroux’s (1991) effort to reclaim a subject power position indicates: “In the absence of a unified subject, we can rethink the meaning of solidarity through a recognition of the multiple antagonisms and struggles that characterise both the notion of the self and the wider social reality” (p. 467). The dual function of discourses further problematises the subject and power position; as Bacchi explains (2010), emphasis can be given to the use of discourses, where the actor is seen as in control of discourses, and to the effects of discourses, where the actor is seen as constituted in discourses (p. 51). Bacchi warns against assuming politically powerful groups in control and subordinate groups to be without control, as this leads to an unbalanced approach to analysis. Rather, Bacchi argues, the “space for challenge” (p. 55) requires greater theorisation from policy-as-discourse analysts.

Rafanell and Gorringe (2010) interpret acts of insurgence against authority as evidence that disproves the argument that unequal power roles are perpetuated through the naturalisation of conventions. They posit (after Freire, 1970/1993) that dominating conventions rely on the “unwilling, but knowing, collusion of the oppressed. As such, they [the oppressed] are inherently mutable and always susceptible to change” (p. 605). In this
way, the authors enable subject resistance and shift their identification of subordinated classes as victimised to recognise their role in sustaining unequal power dynamics. Emphasis is thus given to the nature of the subordinated as ultimately determining actors in their subject positions. This research included investigation into how students and staff perpetuate their own and group identity perspectives by examining discourses and the reproduction of social structures.

In accepting an empowered subject within cultural multiplicities, the researcher recognised the student and staff members as potentially both a discourse user and as constituted in discourse, illuminating methods for the subject to reclaim power to change culturalities, avenues for associative discourses that might resist or contest the status quo, methods that students and tutors might be able to initiate or access to initiate change. Each context of power position (administrator, tutor, and student) was investigated in relation to its associations with other significant contexts. This included relations between the conditions of discourse construction and their dissemination, which have been underexplored (Bacchi, 2010, p. 51). Context is central to CDA (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). The focused ethnography anchored contextualisation details, because the data was institutionally contextualised and the subject positions socially delineated (Foucault, 1971). In poststructuralist ontology, language arguably seems to assume an omnipotent persona, having control over human perception: “The writer writes in a language and in a logic whose proper systems, laws, and life his discourse by definition cannot dominate absolutely. He uses them by only letting himself, after a fashion and up to a point, be governed by the system” (Derrida, 1967/2001, p. 1825). In contrast, the acceptance of a knowing subject ultimately provided (the potential for) choice in the use and control of language constructs. This research thus departs from deconstruction in giving acknowledgement to the author’s intentions. The objective is political and social analysis (Bacchi, 2010), deconstruction with
social purpose and value. Agency is significant to the research because it relates to the degree of power that the subject may access to perpetuate or contest hegemonic structures.

In order to achieve clear and differing insights and to frame investigation systematically, five varying CDA conceptual approaches were adopted for analysis in this study: the dialectical-relational approach (Fairclough, 2009, 2013), the discourse-historical approach (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009), the dispositive analytical approach (Jäger & Maier, 2009), social practices approach (van Leeuwen, 2005, 2009) and the socio-cognitive approach (van Dijk, 2008). The following explains the guiding principles in applying CDA to focused ethnography and describes the five conceptual approaches within CDA that were adopted in the study. An overview of the five approaches is provided in Figure 1 below.
Figure 1 provides the five CDA lenses that were adopted for the analysis. Each lens was applied to the data type that the researcher viewed as most appropriate for the analysis.

### 3.3.3 Guiding principles in applying CDA to focused ethnography.

With forbears in Marxism, neo-Marxism, and the Frankfurt school of critical theory, the application of CDA to focused ethnographic experience is both hermeneutic and emancipatory (May, 1997, p. 197), with interest in the conceptualisation of text, including...
discourse and meaningful action, while aiming to locate and analyse the assumptions that sustain and perpetuate social inequalities, and reveal methods for overcoming those limitations. Brinkmann and Kvale (2015, p. 60) note that the approach echoes pragmatism, in seeing knowledge as a means of dealing with a shifting reality and recognising conversation and social practice as integral in knowledge creation.

Talmy (2010) distinguishes between conventional and critical ethnography in the latter’s sustained effort toward the critical project:

A critically-located ethnographic methodology highlights the interplay between social structure, material relations, and agency; addresses the ways that social structure is (or is not) instantiated, accommodated, resisted, and/or transformed in the micropolitics of everyday life; contends with issues of ideology, hegemony, and culture; critically addresses its own historically, materially, and culturally-specific interpretations; works toward change; and does so with the collaboration of research participants. (p. 130)

Atkinson, Okada and Talmy (2011) also emphasise the valuable contribution that conversation analysis (CA) offers research and addresses emicity through its acknowledgement of participant subjectivities in interactions. Conversely, a focused ethnographic study may contribute rich social descriptions full of contextual details to CA that enables informed interpretation of “social class, power and culture” (p. 89). Cause and effect are notably unclear in intercultural misunderstandings, whether the situational paradigms, for instance, intonation, have caused confusion, or whether pre-existing assumptions have led to negative interpretations (Corbett, 2011, p. 308), resulting in a claim of power over the other. In its political orientation, CDA provides a means for locating the contributing developments and performances occurring as a result of such power imbalances.
Applying CDA to a focused ethnographic approach thus invests the research process with social value and a strong political orientation.

3.3.4 Conceptual approaches within CDA.

This section explicates the five different CDA approaches that were adopted for the data analysis and explains their theoretical foundations. Table 2 below provides an overview of the adopted CDA approaches, how they were related to the research questions, and the particular pathway aspect that they were applied to.

Table 2: Application of Methodological Lenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Methodological Lenses</th>
<th>Focus of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairclough’s Stage 1: Focus upon a social wrong</td>
<td>Fairclough’s Stage 1 fell within the study’s overarching research question: ‘What is the nature and value of ICU in NSW higher education pathway contexts?’ Each of the five CDA approaches was adopted for the analysis: DRA, SCA, SPA, DHA, DAA</td>
<td>Fairclough’s DRA, van Dijk’s SCA</td>
<td>Identity constructions, Context creation – curricula delivery and events management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairclough’s Stage 2: Identify obstacles to identifying the social wrong. Each CDA approach was adopted to address Fairclough’s Stage 2.</td>
<td>Qu. 1. ‘How do the identities in pathway institutions, those of administrator, tutor, and international student, promote or impede ICU?’</td>
<td>Fairclough’s DRA</td>
<td>Pedagogical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>van Leeuwen’s SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reisigl &amp; Wodak’s DHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qu. 2. ‘How do pedagogical practices, including curricula discourses, promote or impede ICU?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qu. 3. ‘How do the physical environments promote or impede ICU?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Fairclough’s Stage 3: Consider whether the social order ‘needs’ the social wrong</td>
<td>At the end of each research question’s analysis, Fairclough’s Stage 3 is posed, with further analyses ensuing through intersectional and feminist perspectives, and evaluation of the insights’ significance to Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Intersectional perspective b. Feminist perspective c. Applicability to Deardorff’s Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairclough’s Stage 4 is addressed in Chapter Seven’s Recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 presents the study’s analytical outline. Fairclough’s Stage 1 (‘focus upon a social wrong’) correlates with my identification of a lack of ICU in pathways. This made the Stage 1 an appropriate critical approach to the study’s overarching research question. To address the three research questions, each of the five CDA approaches was applied to Fairclough’s Stage 2. Each of these analyses was followed with a review through Fairclough’s Stage 3. Each analysis includes intersectional and feminist perspectives, and an explicit address to how the insights relate to Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model. Fairclough’s Stage 4 was then expounded in chapter Seven’s Recommendations.

**Dialectical-relational approach (DRA).**

Fairclough (2009, 2013, 2016) explains the dialectical relational approach (DRA) as concerned with the dialectical relations between the semiotic dimension of social elements with others in the social process such as issues, problems, or changes. Semiosis is defined as “meaning-making as an element of the social process” (2009, p. 162). As with other CDA approaches, the underlying aim is political. Specifically, in this case, DRA clarifies the semiotic relationships that work toward creating and perpetuating ideological processes and power imbalances.

Fairclough (2009) describes social reality as comprising three levels: structures, which in this study were designated as the pathway organisations; practices, which mediate between structures and events, and in this study were identified as pedagogical practices; and events, which are a form of text that include written, spoken and visual modes, and in this study were identified through textbooks and curriculum documents. There are also three major ways in which semiosis relates to other elements of social practices and to other elements of social events: as action, as representation, and as identities. Actions (ways of acting and interacting) manifest through genres, for instance, job interviews and advertisements; in this study, genres were discussed in relation to social events management.
and curricula delivery. Representations manifest through discourses, which are identifiable through the different perspectives that people communicate, and these were accessed through the pathway texts and interview responses. Identities are “styles” or “ways of being” (2009, p. 164); in this study, the assumed identities of staff and students were analysed in relation to each other and to their contexts.

Fairclough specifies methodological steps for application, and the research analysis occurred through these four stages:

Stage 1: Focus upon a social wrong, in its semiotic aspect.

Stage 2: Identify obstacles to identifying the social wrong.

Stage 3: Consider whether the social order ‘needs’ the social wrong.

Stage 4: Identify possible ways past the obstacles. (2016, p. 91)

The core analytical categories include:

- **semiosis** (and other social elements)
- **discourse/genre/style, order of discourse** [large networks] (and **social practices**)
- **text** (and **social event**)
- **interdiscursivity** (and interdiscursive analysis)
- **recontextualization**
- **operationalization** (enactment, inculcation, materialization). (2009, p. 171)

Analyses were both procedural and interactional in constructing the research thesis. The approach was applied to the three case studies in relation to the first research question (‘How do the identities of pathway institutions, those of administrator, tutor, and international student, promote or impede ICU?’) to analyse connections between identities and ICU and to

---

1 Fairclough’s spellings are adopted throughout the thesis.
the second research question (‘How do pedagogical practices, including curricula discourses, promote or impede ICU?’) to analyse pedagogical practices in relation to ICU.

The first three stages of the DRA became the framework through which each of the other four CDA approaches (outlined below) was addressed. The fourth stage was given focus in Chapter Seven’s ‘Discussion’. To avoid repetition, this process is explained in more detail in Chapter Five.

_Socio-cognitive approach (SCA)._ 

van Dijk (2007, 2008, 2016) has devised the socio-cognitive approach (SCA), a context theory founded upon cognitive psychology, “in order to know how power is related to text and talk, and more generally how discourse reproduces social structure” (van Dijk, 2008, p. vii). The theorist is critical of the use of “context” as “some kind of social, cultural or political environment for an event or action” (2007, p. 284). He argues:

There is no direct causal or conditional relationship between social characteristics (gender, class, age, roles, group membership, etc.) of participants and the way they talk or write. Rather, it is the way participants as speakers (writers) and recipients subjectively understand, interpret, construct or represent these social characteristics of social situations that influences their production or understanding of their talk or text.

(p. 289)

In van Dijk’s theory, contexts are “participant constructs” (2008, p. x), unique, mental models (cognitive representations of experience, opinion and emotion [p. 63]), schematic, determine discourse and text production, and are social in nature and function.

SCA adds a cognitive interface to CDA, viewing contexts as “subjective participant representations of communicative situations and not as communicative situations themselves” (p. 22). Situation models (or semantic models) signify the situation that a discourse refers to (2016, p. 67). They explain personal interpretations of discourses, and their local and global
consistency. Context models (or pragmatic models) continuously signify the changing communications that language users are involved in. They are determined through subjective interpretation and select the appropriateness of discourse, the suitability of information in a situation model, and the acceptable manner for its communication (p. 67). For example, teachers in a staff meeting (the context model) who are discussing particular students in a classroom (the situation model) will draw on more formal items than the same teachers on a lunch break in their staffroom (a different context model) when discussing the same particular students in the same classroom (the situation model) such as a student’s topic of discussion for ‘News’. SCA features a discourse-cognition-society triangle, or a triangular sociocognitive approach, which incorporates: first, the cognitive component of contexts, involving discourse processing, knowledge, attitudes, and ideologies; second, the social component of contexts, which looks at power and domination; and third, the discourse component of contexts, which incorporates structures of discourse and the ideological structures of discourse (pp. 64-74).

The specific context processes selected for investigation, based on their relationship to ICU, were the contexts of curricula delivery and social events management. Analytical questions to address this approach included:

1. What are the significant cognitive representations evident in the contexts of curricula delivery and events management?

2. What are the significant micro and macro social interactions (structures and relations) that create contexts of curricula delivery and events management?

3. What ideological structures do the context’s discourse components of curricula delivery and events management comprise?

4. How do the three context components (cognitive, social, and discourse) interrelate with the broader dominant culture?
The SCA application addressed the first research question by identifying the contexts of curricula delivery and events management as manifestations of the subject(s), which pointed to how processes that either enhanced or impeded ICU were reproduced and sustained.

**Social practices approach (SPA).**

van Leeuwen (2009) defines discourses as “socially constructed ways of knowing some aspect of reality” or “context-specific frameworks for making sense of things” (2009, p. 144). He argues that discourses and knowledge are modelled on social practices, what people do, but discourses also selectively modify and transform knowledge. Texts (spoken or written statements) provide verification of discourses. The SPA aims to deconstruct multiple texts that contain similar content in the same context. This involves reconstructing discourses through text analysis and analysing occurrences of transformations. van Leeuwen (pp. 145-152) provides a schema or “sociosemantic inventory” (1996, p. 32) of fundamental elements for locating recontextualizations of social practices within discourses, “representations of social actors in discourses” (p. 33). He consistently targets sociological categories (1996; 2009) such as nomination or agency (1996, p. 34) through linguistic analysis, for example, clauses, nominalisations, process nouns; and semantic analysis, including actions, performance modes, actors, role allocations, legitimations, times, spaces, resources, exclusions, suppressions, substitutions, and additions. The schema includes analysis of actions, performance modes, actors, presentation styles, times, spaces, resources, eligibility, deletion, substitution, and addition. The social action network includes analysis of actions and reactions, material and semiotic action, objectivation and descriptivisation, de-agentialisation, generalisation and abstraction, and overdetermination. The social action network provides the following two questions:

1. “What kinds of actions are attributed to what kinds of participants?” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 151).
2. “What kinds of actions tend to be objectivated, de-agentialized and so on?” (p. 151).

The approach was applied to the second research question in relation to the three institute’s academic English or EAP curricula documents to discern how staff and student identities were constructed within them.

**Discourse-historical approach (DHA).**

Reisigl and Wodak (2009, 2016) outline the abductive discourse-historical approach (DHA), which perceives context as predominantly historical. Links are found between “genres, discourses, and texts” (2009, p. 26) and fields of action, described as “a segment of reality which constitutes a (partial) ‘frame’ of a discourse” (p. 90) and is defined by its discourse functions. The theory employs an essentially pragmatic approach for analysing social problems, with a particular focus on the political. The DHA focuses on ideological positions (worldviews) to decipher how they “establish, perpetuate or fight dominance” (p. 88). Language is the means to power, which is “legitimized or de-legitimized in discourses” (p. 89), so attention is focused on the way linguistic forms function in power dynamics.

Heuristically, the analysts identify the nomenclature of the study, the characteristics attributed to the elements, the arguments of the discourse in question, the perspectives and the respective articulations (p. 93). The analytical questions addressing this approach were drawn from Reisigl and Wodak’s (2016) strategic plan:

1. How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?
2. What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?
3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?
4. From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?
5. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, intensified or mitigated? (p. 32)
The DHA entails downsizing the corpus for analysis based on specific criteria, including “representativity, (proto) typicality, intertextual or interdiscursive scope, salience, uniqueness and redundancy” (p. 39). On this basis, three discourses from the three main textbooks adopted in the three institutes’ academic English classrooms were analysed. The approach addressed the second research question to discover ideological assumptions in the chosen textbook discourses, to deconstruct the semantic stability of the targeted contexts.

**Dispositive analytical approach (DAA).**

In examining the distinction between discourse analysis and dispositive analysis, Jäger and Maier (2009) state:

> By *dispositive* (building on Foucault, 1980: 194), we mean a constantly evolving synthesis of knowledge that is built into linguistically performed practices (i.e. thinking, speaking, writing), non-linguistically performed practices (vulgo “doing things”), and materialisations (i.e., natural and produced things). (p. 56)

Caborn (1997) further explains that dispositive analysis has “an explicit intention of analysing not just texts, but actions and objects, and crucially the links between them and the power relations that these strategically linked texts, actions and objects create” (p. 116). Hence, non-linguistic behaviours and objects, which are humanised in the act of defining, relate to the foregrounded epistemologies of contemporary society. DAA invests analysis with a view to the heterogeneity of contexts (Foucault, 1977), incorporating discursive practices with actions and physical objects (Foucault, 1977; Jäger & Maier, 2009, 2016). Discourse practices entail discourse analysis; actions necessitate discovering the meanings underlying behaviours; and objects require locating the meanings associated with the artefact, which also incorporate its limitations. Semiological analysis is applicable to these three ‘texts’, with the three categories identified as the signifiers and their attributed meanings identified as the signified (Caborn, 2007, p. 117).
Furthermore, the three texts must be understood in their heterogeneity, as a dispositive unit. Following Foucault (1977), Jäger and Maier (2009) state that dispositive analysis involves identifying the “knowledges contained in discourses and dispositives, and how these knowledges are connected to power relations in power/knowledge complexes…uncovering the techniques through which discursive limits are extended or narrowed down” (p. 34). Secondly, it entails critiquing these power dynamics, to understand how knowledges are validated in a particular time and place, through their limitations and contradictions. DAA was applied to the significant pathway identities: the administrators of the three selected education institutions, the tutors, and the students. Analytical questions that were asked included:

1. What influence do the broader environments have on the upheld knowledges?
2. How do the dominant objects and environments carry the knowledges of each group?
3. In what ways do the knowledges that are upheld within the environment and objects of one group connect with significant knowledges held within the environments and objects of other groups?

The DAA addressed the third research question: ‘How do the physical environments promote or impede ICU?’ by giving focus to the nature of significant knowledges in relation to the environment and objects that were significant to one group and their connection with significant knowledges and objects of other groups.

3.4 Transparency

The researcher was committed to transparency in reporting throughout the study, because the researcher was a part of the research “…as an actor, designer, interpreter, writer, co-constructor of data, [and] ultimate arbiter of the accounts proffered” (Clarke, 2005, p. 12). Social investigators are intersubjective in their research, as observers and participants, and thus work within a restricted social framework (Vidich & Lyman, 1994, p. 39), clearly
influenced by their values. The author recognised the impossibility of bracketing the self from the research (M. Fine, Weis, Weseen & Wong, 1998). The integration of auto-ethnographic writings aimed to assist in disintegrating any created ‘objective’ persona.

In seeking ways to better understand and overcome a lack of intercultural perspectives in pathway contexts, I have aimed to locate the nature and value of ICU in those contexts and drawn upon the above outlined theories and methodologies. The research’s ontological lens guiding these various theories was that current cultural paradigms are predominantly patriarchal, but through challenging these structures, ‘feminine’ expressions of diversity and creativity may be released. While aiming to address multiple identifications, cultural paradigms, and their intersections, therefore, the research focus gave particular emphasis to gender articulations within social, political and economic processes under study to identify masculine structures that withhold and work against feminine expression. This would enable the location of avenues for liberating ‘feminine’ or diverse creative manifestations. The following chapter details the methods that were adopted to fulfil the research purpose of gaining insights into the nature and value of ICU in pathway contexts.
4.1 Introduction to the Chapter

This chapter provides a detailed elucidation of the research design in the investigation into the nature and value of ICU in pathway contexts. Two approaches were taken to the study. The first approach was through focused ethnography in three different pathway contexts. The second approach was the researcher’s auto-ethnographic reflections on her experiences in three different pathway contexts to those of Approach 1. The chapter concludes with comments on the study’s validity, reliability, and generalisability and an explanation of the ethical considerations that were made in conducting the research.

4.2 Approach 1: Three Focused Ethnographic Case Studies

Through investigating the perceptions of administrators, tutors, and international students as well as the academic English curricula programs and pathway institutional settings, the first approach sought to identify and analyse the nature and value of ICU in the selected pathway contexts. This investigation was seen as fundamental in addressing the problem of a lack of ICU in pathway contexts. The reasoning behind the selection of the contexts and populations for the case studies is outlined. The interview procedures are then explained; this includes the questionnaire, the repertory grid process, and the research questioning. Lastly, the data analysis procedure is explicated. An overview of Approach 1 is provided in Table 3.

4.2.1 Data collection.

To answer the study’s overarching research question, ‘What is the nature and value of ICU in NSW higher education pathway contexts?’, the research design triangulated three case studies of pathway dynamics. While the focus was on depth and not breadth in this study, the selected population reflected aspects of current non-school pathway enrolments. A DET report (2015a) provides a breakdown of international students’ direct and indirect articulation
to higher education. Of the 81,164 international students who entered Australian universities in 2015, 43,710 (53.9%) entered without prior Australian education. ELICOS programs supported 28,887 (35.6%) students for entry. VET provided for 6,195 students (7.6%); these would be mainly students completing Diploma, Advanced Diploma and Associate Degrees. Non-award programs, such as Foundation, supported 6,309 students (7.8%); and School education provided for 3,410 (4.2%). In adopting a focus on two ELICOS pathways and one in VET, the research related to elements of the actual international student non-school entry choices.

Investigation into the nature and value of ICU proceeded through, firstly, the administrators’, tutors’ and students’ own interpretations of their pathway experiences; secondly, the pathway curricula outlines for each selected unit and selected texts from the main textbooks; and thirdly, the pathway physical settings. A two-question survey was included on the students’ and tutors’ questionnaires, asking participants to designate the percentage of discussion in classes and the percentage of their contribution in these discussions. Apart from these two questions, each of the research design methods was qualitative. Immersed in the everyday (Vidich & Lyman, 1994), qualitative methods involve continual and rigorous questioning to gain dense descriptive interpretations (Geertz, 1973) of systems of relationships (Becker, 1996, p. 54), a wide breadth of the topic (p. 65), as well as additional often unpredicted data for analysis. The methods enabled the researcher to read the participants in their natural setting (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 2), perceive participant perspectives (Becker, 1996, p. 58), witness changing attitudes and behaviours, and attain a close “understanding of the beliefs, motivations, and behaviours of their subjects” (Tedlock, 2008, p. 190).
Institute and participant selection.

As the study’s focus specifically concerned students who were intending to enter university, the most appropriate choice for the sample population was with institutes that were closely affiliated with the HE sector. Three NSW institutes with international student enrolments in 2016 were sought on the basis of each having a pathway arrangement with a HE provider and having a high percentage of international student enrolment. Restricting the selection to NSW institutes provided a further demarcation to the study. The institute choice was also based on including two different pathway sectors of current international student enrolments to higher education. A combination of ELICOS and non-ELICOS academic English classes was pursued, as a combined focus was envisaged to provide additional comparative material. The government classified pathway sectors are: HE, VET, ELICOS, Schools, Non-Award (DET, 2018). One pathway offering Foundation and Diplomas into the HE sector and registered with TEQSA was chosen as representative of the pathway HE sector. This pathway was the researcher’s own employment context. The decision to include my own employment setting was considered as a way of incorporating more intimate staff and student perspectives, which I was unable to feature in my auto-ethnography (that focused on three different pathways) or perhaps gain through the other two settings. While recognising that the choice may be perceived as imposing limitations, therefore, it was seen as a way of enriching the study. Two institutes offering ELICOS programs and delivered in a pathway arrangement with a HE provider were also selected, one in a regional district, the other in a major city. The approach to the research in each of the pathways was systematic and consistent, as this was viewed as an imperative strategy for maintaining rigour, validity and reliability. The pseudonyms for the three institutes are Path 1, Path 2 and Path 3.

ELICOS centres include programs in English for Academic Purposes (EAP), which coincides with the Foundation stages of non-ELICOS centres. In addition to satisfactory
IELTS (or equivalent test) results, acceptance for a university placing can occur through either completion of the ELICOS EAP program or completion of an academic English skills program. In preparing students for tertiary study, the two pathways share the same aims of developing ability in various essay structures, report writing, discussing perspectives in tutorials, note-taking and listening in lectures, accessing databases and researching, and providing oral presentations.

Path 1’s student participants were at IELTS EAP level 3; the program’s IELTS overall entry score level was 5.5 (Path 1 Curriculum Document, 2015, p. 6). Each level was a 10-week program at 25 hours per week. Path 2’s student participants were enrolled in the EAP Advanced program, conducted over 10 weeks at 20 hours per week. The IELTS entry level was an overall score of 6.0. In Path 3, the Foundation program consisted of two units of thirteen weeks each at four hours per week of formal in-class contact time. The student participants were enrolled in either of the two Foundation units, incorporating students at IELTS levels between 5.5 and 6.0.

The two categories of education centres, therefore, are comparable in terms of their hours overall though not on a weekly basis. I had initially been concerned that the selection may be unfair because of the difference in weekly hours. I also imagined that differences in the employment status between the ELICOS and company staff would have some influence; some of the ELICOS staff were employed full-time (20 hours), whereas all of the company staff were casual employees, though two of those staff often worked up to 20 hours a week. However, based on my own experience and supported by research (Halse et al., 2015; Leask, 2015), I believed that ICU would be most effective if incorporated across all areas of an educational facility and across all disciplines, particularly English units as they are readily able to draw on actual events and circumstances selectively or thematically. This conviction influenced my decision not to judge the difference in the amount of weekly time that the
different institutes offered within their English programs as a determining factor in their approach to developing ICU. Both the ELICOS and non-ELICOS staff and contexts had ample time to demonstrate both enhancing and impeding processes towards developing ICU.

The availability of academic English classes with a predominance of international students eighteen years of age or older was ascertained. Approval was first sought from each institute’s Principal to undergo the research, and timetabling was discussed. Within each institute, two administrative staff, five academic staff of academic English units, and ten students that were enrolled in the selected units were to be interviewed. However, while this occurred for Paths 1 and 2, only two of Path 3’s tutors were available at the time of the study. The researcher could have assumed a position as a third participant but chose not to.

Curriculum programs for the EAP and academic English units, including each unit’s main textbook, were additionally requested for analysis. Based on the researcher’s own experiences in pathways, this amount of literature and number of staff and students was considered adequate for the provision of a small population selection.

All administrative staff, tutors, and students who were tied to an academic English unit were informed of the research via an administrative email, with a request to volunteer to participate in the research. Administrative staff members were invited to attend an individual interview. Academic staff members were invited to attend an individual interview and/or a focus group interview. Students were invited to attend an individual interview and/or a focus group interview. Table 3 below provides an overview of the research approach. Details of the procedures follow.
Table 3: Overview of Case Studies Research Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Data and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1:</strong> How do the identities in pathway institutions, those of administrator, tutor, and international student, promote or impede ICU?</td>
<td>Semi-structured 40-minute individual interviews with administrators.</td>
<td>Two administrative figures purposively selected from each institute (n = 6).</td>
<td>Data from 40-minute semi-structured individual interviews, using notes &amp; recordings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Semi-structured 40-minute individual interviews with tutors. 2. Semi-structured 40-minute focus group interviews with tutors.</td>
<td>1. Five tutors (n=5) by simple random sampling from each institute’s academic English classes. 2. Tutors of all academic English classes were invited to attend a forty to sixty-minute focus group interview. Five tutors randomly selected from volunteers for each focus group.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Data from 40-minute semi-structured individual interviews, using notes &amp; recordings. 2. Data from one 40-minute tutor focus group interview, using notes &amp; recordings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Semi-structured 40-minute individual interviews with students. 2. Semi-structured 40-minute focus group interviews with students.</td>
<td>1. Students 18 or older enrolled in academic English classes randomly selected (n=10) from volunteers. 2. Students invited to attend a forty to sixty-minute focus group interview. Each group had five students randomly chosen from volunteers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Data from one forty-minute semi-structured individual student interview. 2. Data from two forty-minute student focus group interviews within each institute using notes &amp; recordings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2:</strong> How do pedagogical practices, including curricula discourses, promote or impede ICU?</td>
<td>Literary analysis of curricula documents</td>
<td>Documents of three institutes purposively selected on significance to key concepts of research questions.</td>
<td>Printed curricula document texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary analysis of significant textbooks</td>
<td>Purposive selection of unit material and distributed literature.</td>
<td>Printed textbooks and visual images where included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3:</strong> How do the physical environments promote or impede ICU?</td>
<td>Institute observations.</td>
<td>One hour per week for three weeks in each institute (n = 9).</td>
<td>Data collected (field notes) from observations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative staff—individual interviews.

Two administrators (n=2) were purposively selected from each institute for a 40-minute individual semi-structured interview. The criteria for selection were based on the participant’s degree of authority within the institute’s administrative processes and their interactive role with the academic staff on the academic English units.

Academic staff recruitment—individual interviews.

Tutors of academic English classes, Foundation or ELICOS at EAP level, were invited to attend a 40-60 minute semi-structured interview. In Paths 1 and 2, the volunteer population of teachers numbered either four or five, so further selection was unnecessary. (The need to apply Excel’s random selection facility had been considered a possibility.) Only two teachers were available in Path 3, the researcher’s own location of employment, because the available date for the focus group coincided with the end of trimester, when two tutors were absent, and the researcher chose not to assume the position of a third tutor participant. When tutor numbers had been determined, timetabling arrangements for interviews were settled.

Academic staff recruitment—focus group interviews.

Tutors from academic English classes, Foundation or ELICOS at EAP level, were invited to attend a forty to sixty-minute focus group interview. Again, the volunteers numbered five in the two ELICOS centres, and only two volunteers were available in Path 3 because the available date for the focus group coincided with the end of trimester. The researcher chose not to assume the position of a third tutor in the focus group.

Student recruitment—individual interviews.

Students from each institute’s academic English classes, Foundation or ELICOS at EAP level, were invited to attend an individual interview. Students who chose to attend an individual interview could also choose to attend a focus group interview if they wished.
Students were required to be aged 18 or over to participate in the individual interview and to be enrolled in an academic English unit. Selection from volunteers was random.

*Student recruitment—focus group.*

Students from each institute’s academic English classes, Foundation or EAP level, were invited to attend a focus group interview. These students did not have to have attended an individual interview. Students were required to be aged 18 or over to participate in the focus group interview and to be enrolled in one of the academic English classes. In Path 1, ten students in two groups of five, attended one focus group meeting each. In Path 2, four students attended one focus group meeting. In Path 3, one group of four and another group of five students each attended one focus group meeting. In total, therefore, five focus group meetings took place. As reimbursement for time provided, a $15 voucher from the local coffee shop was given to each student at the end of each individual interview and focus group meeting.

*Interview procedures.*

The first data collection strategy was through interviews. Participant identities of self and Other, their categorisations, and the comparisons that participants made served to provide information on how they constructed and interpreted the nature and value of ICU. The individual interviews for the administrative and academic staff and students included three sections: a questionnaire, repertory grid completion and responses to given questions in an interview. The academic staff and student focus group interviews included the completion of a repertory grid and questionnaire and responses to research questions. In the following, I explain the questionnaires, repertory grids, and the interview questions. I then describe my approaches to the individual interviews and the focus group interviews.
**Questionnaires.**

The questionnaires were included in the research to gain brief knowledge of participants’ international experience, the extent of their study, and their experience of different languages. A two-question survey was also included to ascertain the degree of discussion in class and the general degree of personal involvement in the in-class discussions. This latter request was a simple quantitative data method. Responses to each of the two quantitative research questions, the discussion percentages and the participation percentages, were averaged for each of the pathways 1, 2, and 3. The questionnaires are provided in Appendix A.

**Repertory grids.**

After participants had completed or submitted their questionnaires, in both the individual interviews and the focus group interviews, participants were asked to complete a repertory grid. Repertory grids originate through George Kelly’s (1955) theory on personality, Personal Construct Psychology (PCP). The underlying premise of personal construct theory is “constructive alternativism” (p. 153); individuals have a unique (though historically influenced) way of interpreting the world, which they use to map or anticipate and interpret further events: “A person’s construction system is composed of a finite number of dichotomous constructs” (p. 59). Reality is not a direct experience but rather is determined by subject constructions. This creative interpretation of the world is open to change. Not all interpretations have equal value, however, for they vary in their predictive efficiency, their degree of usefulness for the anticipation of similar occurrences in the future: “A person anticipates events by construing their replications” (p. 50). Kelly defined a personal construct as “a way in which at least two elements are similar and contrast with a third” (p. 61). While the ‘Role Construct Repertory Grid Test’ is discussed as scientific and may therefore appear as a contradictory choice for this study, it is a constructivist assessment method and has been widely adopted in psychological and educational research. It offers a technique for
researchers to elicit participant associations to concepts without influencing the participant’s responses. The most common repertory grid is a rectangular matrix of “elements”, attributes of a construct in the columns and the constructs in the rows. The repertory grids are provided in Appendix B and are described in more detail below.

The following outlines the repertory grid procedure that was adopted for the study. In the individual interviews with academic staff and students, participants were asked to provide two experiences within the pathway institute that depicted a positive intercultural interaction and one experience that depicted a negative intercultural interaction. The participants were then asked to explain in what way the two positive experiences were similar but different from the negative experience.

An alternative method was adopted for the Focus Groups. For this approach, participants were provided with a set of numbered cards to shuffle. The numbers were equivalent to the number of elements on the repertory grid. The researcher provided eleven elements. Six elements were drawn from a range of pedagogical practices that the literature review presented as variables that may foster ICU. These six elements were: student discussion, intercultural topics for writing, intercultural material for reading, intercultural topics for discussion, personal expression in writing (to be later read), and in-class artistic expression (such as role-play, art, or poetry). An additional five elements were selected from responses participants provided during the individual interviews. These were: classes with mixed ‘national cultures’, small classes, multicultural groups working together on one project, students discussing their home country in multicultural classes, and English practice in class. The focus group participants were then asked to pick up three cards and find the corresponding numbered elements on the repertory grid. They were then asked to write how two of the corresponding elements were similar to each other (in relation to ICU) and
different from the third. The similarity was provided in the ‘positive’ left hand column and the difference placed in the ‘negative’ column, on the right side of the grid.

Through these methods, data describing the nature and value of ICU was obtained directly from the participants’ explanations, without the researcher positing descriptive concepts that could have led the research. As well as the participant’s own opinions of the concepts relating to ICU, the language choices that they used to describe concepts were captured. The repertory grid thus reduced the risk of researcher bias, with the researcher influencing participant responses, such as through given vocabulary, offered examples, or responses to participant answers.

Interview questions.

The interview questions to determine the nature and value of ICU arose out of the literature review and were formulated from consistent thematic perspectives on in-class activities and curricula that were claimed to either stimulate or inhibit ICU. The interview responses enabled assessment of whether or not the participants and contexts supported the assertions found throughout the literature. The questions related to the integration of the following: writing, reading, group discussion, artistic expression, personal expression through any mode, and support for interculturality through the textbook content and institutional environment. The interview questions are provided in Appendix C.

Interview approach.

Throughout the individual interviews, the researcher was sensitive to the subtleties of the interview process, for how the research is defined in the context of the interview is of significance to the research method (Adler & Adler, 1987; P. Rose, 1985). The interview context has a strong impact on the interview’s aesthetics, whether the researcher is an active participant ‘insider’ or an ‘outsider’ to the content. The interviews were conducted incorporating an auto-ethnographic approach, where the researcher interacted with the
participant(s) openly, responding from personal (cultural) perspectives, with the intention to initiate sincere interactive dynamics. The approach had a strong impact on the interview tone and process.

Because the interview is not neutral but “inextricably and unavoidably historically, politically, and contextually bound” (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p. 695), the researcher adhered to the pre-determined interview questions consistent with a semi-structured interview approach. Open-ended, straightforward questions (Thompson, 2000) aimed to avoid influencing the informants’ attitudes and steer against participant social desirability bias (Fielding, 1993, p. 149). The scheduled questions were maintained, filling known gaps in the research, while allowing for relaxed conversation that acted to elicit previously unconsidered data and reflections on past and present experiences, which revealed various subjectivities.

Supplementary questions, utilising multiple question types—introductory, follow-up, probing, specifying, direct, indirect structuring, and interpretative (Kvale, 2007)—were employed throughout to further elucidate explanations.

Within the focus group interviews, the researcher aimed “to enable both exploration and explanation of social phenomena” (Minichiello, Aroni & Hays, 2008, p. 148). Focus groups are particularly useful to facilitate participants to relax and be more forthcoming in their personal beliefs and feelings as their peers accompany them. The groups, as ‘tutors’ or as ‘international students’, were broadly pre-existing. As such, they “provide[d] one of the social contexts within which ideas are formed and decisions made” (p. 104) and were thus more likely to have been responsive to the present participants. The introduction was standardised across the focus groups (Sarantakos, 1997, p. 183); the discussion was then less structured, as free as the researcher was willing to allow, encouraging debate (p. 183). Various levels of prompting were adopted to maintain momentum, to guide the discussion direction (p. 183), and to clarify ambiguity (Fielding, 1993, p. 141).
Curricula documents.

Data collection also included the curricula programs for the academic English units from each institute, as well as the main textbook adopted for each unit. Each pathway integrated numerous resources, but the following texts, which were the main resources of each pathway, were chosen for analysis: Path 1: *Making Connections 3 (3rd ed.)* (Pakenham, McEntire & Williams, 2013); Path 2: *Unlock Level 3 Reading and Writing Skills* (Westbrook, 2014); and Path 3: *Academic Culture: A Student’s Guide to Studying at University* (Brick, 2009). Adopting a particular CDA approach, each text’s overall themes and structure were to be examined in relation to addressing and promoting ICU. Following this, one section from each text was chosen for further analysis.

Observations.

To add validity to the research, out-of-class (public space) observations were conducted for one hour a week for three weeks in each institute. Attention was given to organisational use of space and the way that physical contexts defined interactions. Systematic observation of set time-blocks aimed to avoid bias and incorporate representative sampling (Denscombe, 2007, p. 211). Environmental features contributing to aesthetic style was addressed within various public spaces, including the library, café, and staffroom. Small features, for example, menus and wall posters, were also included in the data sampling. The observation guide is provided in Appendix D.

One of the advantages of observation as a research strategy is that it intensifies or heightens researcher perception, and this can lead to insights into multiple viewpoints. It also has the potential to dissipate preconceptions such as those culturally perpetuated. Marginalised groups, for example, are typically homogenised. The researcher has the opportunity to observe different personality expressions and attitudes, and perhaps enter into diverse social settings and thus locate new perspectives on the research topic.
All out-of-class observations occurred in public spaces. Field notes were taken throughout all observation sessions, and both impressions and experiences were recorded with the aim to adhere to an antilogocentric approach. Tedlock (2008, pp. 189-190) emphasises that ethnographers need to challenge the logocentric: “Feminist ethnographers today, although they exist within what has been described as a patriarchal discipline, are practicing an antilogocentric or antiphallocentric approach to writing by speaking “otherwise” – against, even outside, paternal truth, reason, and phallic desire.” Tedlock’s perception of feminist ethnography as fundamentally disruptive to the logocentric needs qualifying, however, for “truth”, which is patriarchal, and “vision” may be made synonymous, a continuing ontological assumption since ancient Greece:

This return to itself—this interiorization—of the sun has marked not only Platonic, Aristotelian, Cartesian, and other kinds of discourse, not only the science of logic as the circle of circles, but also, and by the same token, the man of metaphysics. The sensory sun, which rises in the East, becomes interiorized in the evening of its journey, in the eye and the heart of the Westerner. He summarises, assumes and achieves the essence of man, “illuminated by the true light”. (Derrida, 1982, p. 268)

A feminist focused ethnographic account needs to demonstrate recognition that a search for meaning is not a search for patriarchal validation.

Data collection also included casual conversations with administrators, tutors and students, in line with maintaining “focus on naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings, so that we have a strong handle on what ‘real life’ is like” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10). Without the participants’ informed consent, the research was justified on the basis that ethical standards would be maintained, no harm would occur to any of the observed, and no participant would be identified (Denscombe, 2007, p. 220).
In summary, in adopting a focused ethnographic study, my aim was to adopt a critical participant perspective that would facilitate insight into the deeper, concealed processes within the pathway contexts. The triangulated approach addressed the overarching research question – “What is the nature and value of ICU in NSW pathways to HE?” – in targeting multiple contexts through various participant and environmental channels. The following outlines the chosen methods for analysis of the collected data.

4.2.2 Data analysis.

The focused ethnographic research aimed to describe the layers of contexts that staff and students were creating and functioning through. CDA does not focus on topics per se, though topics are significant in relation to social practices; rather, the supporting structures of ideologies and powers are foregrounded. Attention was given to levels of signification in both image and text, through denotation and connotation, to explicate cultural knowledges (Penn, 2000, pp. 230-231). From the data, categorical themes that related to the research were identified. Overlap in categories (Bryman, 2012; Miles & Huberman, 1994) was avoided, but items were coded in multiple ways (Bryman, 2012, p. 577). To achieve validity and replicability, coding categories aimed to be comprehensive, “exclusive” (not overlap), and “enlightening” (G. Rose, 2001, p. 60). Coding was manifest, based on visible surface content, and latent, based on deeper semantic content (Wilson, 2014).

Analysis of the interview, text, and observation data focused on how each sector (institute administrators, tutors and students) constituted and was constituted in discourse, the subject positions that were assumed through the discourses, how discourses were disseminated, and the meanings that discourses carried. This was a two-stage process. At first, the interview responses elicited fourteen themes that correlated with the interview questions. These fourteen themes were then reduced to five themes through categories based on pedagogical association and explicit cultural content:
Theme 1: Positive and Negative Intercultural Experiences (Repertory Grids)

Theme 2: Identity Changes

Theme 3: Classroom Strategies: a. Writing Styles; b. Subject Selection; c. Classroom Seating;
  d. Artistic Expressions; e. Classroom Interaction

  Integration of Cultural Perspectives; c. Reflecting on Cultural Experiences

Theme 5: Pathway Impacts: a. Influence of Pathway; b. Ideas for Deepening Intercultural
  Understanding in Pathways; c. Degree of Agency

Analysis could then begin on the data within each of these five main themes. The researcher selected one of the five CDA approaches to analyse the data, following the set of questions that accompanies each CDA approach as provided in Chapter Three and again in Appendix E. The various authors provided different CDA methodological approaches to the data. Their selection was based on gaining a range of perspectives on the data and the relevance of the particular CDA to the selected data. Further reasoning behind the choice of each CDA approach is briefly provided at the outset of Chapter Five and in the introduction to each CDA analysis. Throughout the CDA applications, identity intersections were also considered to draw out new perceptions. In addition, feminist perspectives were applied to the CDA insights to foreground the power structures and patriarchal nature of processes in pathways that were either promoting or inhibiting the development of ICU. The insights achieved through analyses were then applied to Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model, as explained in the following.

Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model (see Table 4) was chosen as a theoretical framework because three of the commonly identified requisite characteristics—the attitudes, knowledge, and skills—that are said to lead to desired internal and external outcomes, and the ability for effective intercultural communication “to some degree” (Deardorff, 2006, p.
254), are similar to numerous cognitive models (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 13); the factors were also agreed upon by 23 intercultural experts (Deardorff, 2006). Furthermore, Deardorff’s model neither specifies any necessary component relationships nor particular instigators for change in the developmental process (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). It is flexible and adaptable to changing views (Anand & Lahiri, 2009, p. 401). The model thus provided an indication of characteristics to identify in collected data, without narrowing the specifications for identification; this meant that interpretation of related processes to ICU was unrestricted, open to the researcher’s analysis.
Table 4: Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired External Outcome</th>
<th>Behaving and communicating effectively and appropriately (based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes) to achieve one’s goals to some degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired Internal Outcome</td>
<td>Informed frame of reference/filter shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adaptability (to different communication styles &amp; behaviours; adjustment to new cultural environments);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flexibility (selecting and using appropriate communication styles and behaviours; cognitive flexibility);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ethnorelative view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Comprehension</td>
<td>• Cultural self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deep understanding and knowledge of culture (including contexts, role and impact of culture and others’ worldviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Culture-specific information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sociolinguistic awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>• Listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requisite Attitudes</td>
<td>• Respect (valuing other cultures, cultural diversity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Openness (to intercultural learning and to people from other cultures, withholding judgement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Curiosity and discovery (tolerating ambiguity and uncertainty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From “Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalisation” by Dr Darla K. Deardorff, 2006, *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3), p. 254, and from *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, Darla K. Deardorff (Ed.), 2009, Thousand Oaks: Sage. Table 4 provides an overview of intercultural competencies developing from attitudes, knowledge and comprehension, and skills to achieve internal and external outcomes. The model was adopted as a theoretical framework for this study as a further dimension in the analytical process.*
The research did not assess IL signifiers in terms of their position along a progression towards competency, but instead noted the various signifiers as an indication that IL was taking place. There was also no attempt to assess individual participants on their achievement or otherwise of a final outcome of intercultural competence: in Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model, intercultural competence is always in development. The model’s characteristics served as a guide to locate evidence of ICU and difficulties in its manifestation. The main focus was on how the students identified and negotiated culturalities in the pathway contexts, whether students learned about cultural characteristics, and what value they placed on their intercultural experiences. The nature and value of ICU as it was conveyed through the collected data was thus determined, taking into account how the implicit and explicit meanings associated with these topics would influence the classroom context, the student interactions, and learning. From these investigations, some assessments on the nature of ICU and the effectiveness of the approaches to IL could be provided. The triangulated method has given strength to the validity of the analysis.

Table 5: Analytical Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDA Analyses</th>
<th>Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Knowledge / Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Approach 2: Auto-Ethnography

This section of the chapter outlines the researcher’s second approach to gaining insight into the nature and value of ICU. Through recollecting past employment experiences, the researcher aimed to locate further ways of alleviating the problem of a lack of address to ICU in preparatory programs to HE. The pathway contexts were different to those researched in Approach 1, and could, therefore, reveal new material that would be valuable to the research.

Autoethnography has been defined as “an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyse personal experience in order to understand cultural experience” (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011). Autoethnography questions and critiques the processes of cultural production and socialisation, providing commentary on the self as a socio-cultural construct, and disrupts the pretence of a unified subject or of a solitary reality through incongruous characterisations, multiple identities and provisional, unstable contexts. Autoethnography thus gives acknowledgement to the “death of the author” (Barthes, 1968/2001), in recognising the impossibility of escape from cultural paradigms, but self-referentially asserts subjectivity as an honest expression, which welcomes the reader’s deconstructive capability. This reflexive standpoint reinvests the writer with a voice, writing with moral assertion, and thus the individual (and, therefore, cultures) with value, albeit transient.

Patton (2002) states that the central auto-ethnographic question is: “How does my own experience of this culture connect with and offer insights about this culture, situation, event, and/or way of life?” (p. 84). My experiences pertain to multiple identities; those that may influence my interpretations include association with being a spiritualist, female, Australian, White, a student, a partner, an ex-school teacher of high-school and K-6 students, and now an academic English tutor, each identity relating to and largely governed and shaped
by a different set of cultural authorities and conventions. My spiritualist interpretations, for example, are evident in my interpretations, as I locate the mythic within neoliberal processes.

The auto-ethnographic approach was suitable as a methodology for discovering or giving voice to multiplicities through an unstable, transitory multiplied I, functioning as “both the subject and object of research” (Ellingson & Ellis, 2008, p. 451), reflecting both an outsider and insider perspective. The approach gave the researcher the flexibility to relate personal data to cultural elements, extend interviews and conversations through “subjective” response, and explore connections between identities and ideological and physical cultural constructs.

Ellis, Adams & Bochner (2011) describe numerous auto-ethnographic forms. Those that were relevant for this research included: narrative, where the researcher’s experience is merged with descriptions and analysis of the external cultural elements; reflexive dyadic interviews, which address the interview interactive dynamics, and the researcher interacts with the participant(s) more openly with analysis gaining deeper dimensions through reflexivity; and layered accounts, which describe multiple perspectives or levels of consciousness through diverse forms, including vignettes, reflexivity, and introspection. The expression of these various forms was made through different literary styles: prose, diary entries, and reflections. Auto-ethnographic analysis was initially personal but overlaid with perspective elaboration through the five CDA approaches as outlined above.

4.4 Validity, Reliability and Generalisability

The researcher believes that the material offers valid insights if the participants appear to believe in their assertions. Because much of the material concerns individual understanding, or the meaning that people give to their lives and to their cultural experience, validity is open to reader interpretation. Probing “can so easily lead to bias” (Fielding, 1993, p. 141). The ‘findings’ thus demanded to be openly and clearly expressed. Validity was enriched through
the inclusion of the auto-ethnography and its various perspectives, because the text assumes an implicit political function by undermining the authorial voice. The author self-referentially announces the text’s construction and engages the reader in deconstructive capability. The concept of ‘reliability’ of data is also questionable. “The value of the case study is its uniqueness; consequently, reliability in the traditional sense of replicability is pointless here” (Janesick, 1998, p. 51). In relation to the repertory grid process and the interviews, the responses are as reliable as the participants’ voices are reliable in their subjectivity.

The aim of the qualitative research was to deepen understanding, not to draw generalisations or conclusions from the insights or gained understandings. In addition, the research samples were small, so, again, generalisability was not an aim. Fielding (1993) gives value to small samples “provided we do not claim that by doing so we have proven what they do, nor offer predictions about what they will do” (p. 148). Furthermore, there is no definite, universally accepted definition of ICU or of IL, so the understandings gained will remain tentative for as long as those capabilities remain disputable. In addition, though a number of ‘capabilities’ were addressed through informal, analytical assessment, the methods for assessing capabilities are still contested. This research remained neutral on the advantages or disadvantages of particular assessment procedures, as the ‘capabilities’ that make up ICU are all strongly influenced by psychological attitudes and are open to further analysis.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

The researcher is sensitive to adhering to ethical standards. The research received approval from the Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (SHREC, 2016) within Sydney University and each institute’s principal and education boards. The focused ethnographic research engaged with Australian and non-Australian citizens. All participants were provided with a Participant Information Statement explaining the true purpose of the research. All participants were provided with an Informed Consent form. The researcher
clearly identified the research intentions to interviewees. The researcher did not attempt to coerce prospective participants and questioned each participant to ensure that the research intentions and the content of the Informed Consent form were understood. All interviews took place in the institutions’ public spaces.

In regard to the observational research of out-of-class areas, all research was conducted in public spaces and anonymity and confidentiality was respected. No one was at any risk of harm as a result of any aspect of the research. Data security was assured. All material was stored in a locked cabinet at the university. Anonymity and confidentiality were ensured through pseudonyms for locations and participants and through the researcher’s assurance that confidentiality would be upheld. Furthermore, any names or contact details, sometimes provided without request, were immediately removed. Data collected from the interviews was digitally recorded on a Mac Air computer, a Panasonic RR-US950 and an Iphone. One copy of the digital recordings was then stored on the university’s security database and the original recordings were deleted.

This chapter has explained the study’s methods and provided further detail on the methodology to investigate the nature and value of ICU in three pathway contexts. Reasons for adopting qualitative research and the value of applying CDA as a methodology to focused ethnographic data were outlined. The research involved two approaches. The first approach entailed an investigation of three institutes (two IELTS and one non-IELTS in focus) offering an alternative pathway to HE and included interviews with administrators, tutors and students, analysis of curricula documents and the main textbooks, and observations of out-of-class institutional contexts. One of the three pathways included in the study was the researcher’s own employment context. Five CDA lenses were applied to the obtained research data. These elucidations enabled comparisons with Deardorff’s (2006, p. 254) signifiers of positive and negative intercultural characteristics, as stated within her Pyramid
Model (see Table 4). Constructivist and feminist considerations were also related to the CDA extrapolations, to expose dimensions of narrativity and patriarchy in the various pathway processes affecting ICU, as determined by the CDA analyses. Insights that were gained from the Approach 1 research are presented in Chapter Five. The second approach, the auto-ethnographic reflections, is provided in Chapter Six.
Chapter Five: Approach 1 – Interpretative Insights from the Research

5.1 Introduction to the Chapter

This chapter presents the significant interpretations of pathway processes and dynamics gathered from the research. The chapter highlights the nature and value of ICU in the researched NSW pathway contexts through providing analyses concerned with the three research questions. Fairclough’s dialectical-relational approach (DRA) forms the framework to the analysis. The DRA comprises four stages:

Stage 1: Focus upon a social wrong, in its semiotic aspect.

Stage 2: Identify obstacles to identifying the social wrong.

Stage 3: Consider whether the social order ‘needs’ the social wrong.

Stage 4: Identify possible ways past the obstacles. (2016, p. 91)

Stage 1 has been identified as a lack of address to ICU in pathways to HE, and drives the research to this study; this stage is not explicitly further addressed, because the semiotic aspects of the social wrong are located through uncovering various obstacles to identifying the social wrong, which is Stage 2 of the analysis. The DRA’s Stage 2 provides the backbone of the analysis, and is performed through the CDA methodologies previously outlined in Chapter Three, including Fairclough’s DRA (2009, 2016), van Leeuwen’s social practices approach (2009, 2016), Reisigl and Wodak’s discourse-historical approach (2009, 2016), van Dijk’s socio-cognitive approach (2009, 2016), and Jager & Maier’s dispositive analytical approach (2009, 2016). Fairclough’s DRA Stage 3 is also applied to each analysis at the end of each discussion. Fairclough’s Stage 4 is not discussed in this chapter but given focus in the Recommendations section in Chapter Seven. Each adopted CDA approach is thus positioned within Fairclough’s DRA.

In terms of how the CDA approaches contribute to answering the research questions, as outlined in Table 2, the first research question, ‘How do the identities in pathway
institutions, those of administrator, tutor, and international student, promote or impede ICU?’, was investigated through Fairclough’s DRA and van Dijk’s SCA. Fairclough’s DRA is adopted to examine how identities in pathway institutions may act as obstacles to identifying the social wrong, a lack of address to ICU in pathways to HE. van Dijk’s SCA follows to analyse the nature of cognitive, social, and discourse features of particular pathway contexts, with focus on how the social actor creates their context.

The second research question, ‘How do pedagogical practices, including curricula discourses, promote or impede ICU?’, was also examined through Fairclough’s DRA as well as van Leeuwen’s SPA and Reisigl and Wodak’s DHA. Fairclough’s DRA is adopted to locate obstacles to identifying the social wrong that relate to pedagogical practices. van Leeuwen’s SPA was employed to understand how curriculum document discourses construct student and tutor identities. Reisigl and Wodak’s DHA was applied to an excerpt from each pathway’s main textbook to locate underlying ontological assumptions that may affect the development of ICU.

The third research question, ‘How do the physical environments promote or impede ICU?’, was analysed through Jäger and Maier’s DAA. Their analytical lens was adopted to locate the ways that the pathway physical environments affect the expressions and interactions of international students and their tutors.

These analyses elicited deep descriptions and understandings of processes that can enhance or inhibit ICU development in the three researched pathways. At the end of each analysis a brief intersectional overview is provided. Patriarchal structures that inhibit feminine expression in pathways are also identified, along with evidence of feminine expressions that appear to challenge patriarchal authority. Throughout, Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence is consistently referenced to identify processes that have been posited as attributes inherent to ICU or appear to stultify or conflict with those
ICU attributes. At the same time, the author wishes to avoid essentialist assertions; therefore, the comparisons that are made to the Deardorff model are acknowledged as tentative. Where participant statements are cited, they are classified with a pseudonym and their stated identity in the pathway: student, tutor, or administrator. Focus groups are identified as either FGS or FGT, for student and tutor groups respectively, and each is accorded a number that simply corresponded with the order of the interviews. Each case study is only discussed separately where it was found relevant to do so. A brief paragraph on the three pathway contexts precedes the analyses.

5.2 Interpretative Insights

Path 1’s English Language Centre was located on the outskirts of a rural city within a university. The Centre had 58 students enrolled in its programs. Its location within the larger university provided students with a broad range of facilities. Over half of the students were residents of one of the university colleges. Paths 2 and 3 were located in a large city and shared the same campus; Path 2 was an English Centre and run by the university, while Path 3 was a company functioning as an international college and affiliated with the university. The Path 2 enrolments were 186 at the time of the research, while the Path 3 enrolments were 139. As earlier stated, each pathway’s enrolments comprised one hundred per cent international students. Path 3’s academic English units were referred to as Academic Communication, but throughout the following, all units of focus within each pathway are referred to as academic English (AE) units, each sharing common aims. Therefore, all tutors are similarly referred to as AE tutors.

5.2.1 Research question 1: ‘How do the identities in pathway institutions, those of administrator, tutor, and international student, promote or impede ICU?’

1a. Fairclough’s dialectical relational approach (DRA).
One of the main obstacles to identifying the social wrong of a lack of address to ICU was found in the ways that social actors within the pathway contexts were characterised with particular homogenised identities. The significant pathway identities of administrator, tutor, and student were found to occur through ‘recontextualization’, “the movement of parts or elements of interactions and texts out of their original context (so they are ‘decontextualized’) and into a different context (the ‘recontextualizing context’)” (Fairclough, 2015, p. 38).

Individuals are not usually referred to in relation to recontextualizations; the term is typically applied to discourse components, but the difference between the individuals in their home environments and their pathway identities may be seen at the semiotic dimension as a form of recontextualization.

Recontextualizations occurred where personal characteristics, interests, and backgrounds became unacknowledged and replaced with the accepted pathway identities, which were the social actor roles of administrator, tutor, and international student. The administrators’, tutors’, and international students’ home culturalities were apparently suppressed and made redundant within the pathway context, seemingly because they had no recognised educational or economic value. The absence of non-hierarchical, personal identities enabled homogenisation that produced a power vacuum for the pathways’ administratively created hierarchical roles, which were sustained through the knowledges that were upheld within the pathway (evidencing ‘inculcation’ and ‘order of discourse’, 2009, p. 171) and the physical spaces allocated to each role. The recontextualized identities carried historical values: identities that align with traditional Eurocentric standards held significance, for in each pathway the Director was a White male who employed an immediate subordinate executive White female. The three main homogenisations, administrator, teacher, and student, tended to govern formal and informal interactions, worked interactively to sustain
the ‘social wrong’ of inadequate recognition of ICU in pathway contexts, and prevented recognition of the ‘social wrong’.

Teachers’ past experiences in different countries, for example, were not reflected in the contexts. Table 6 below sets out the staff and student demographics. As evident in the table, the teachers were mainly Australian, with a few Americans, and one Filipino, but a number of tutors had also lived and/or worked in countries other than their ‘home’ country, including Thailand, Nepal, China, Indonesia, the United Kingdom, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Japan, Switzerland, Azerbaijan, Russia, Ireland, and Papua New Guinea. The array of different national cultural experiences could have been drawn upon to give students a stronger sense of inclusion and to promote ICU, but this potential was stultified through the hierarchical structures that gave no regard to tutors’ personal expressions.

In the student recontextualizations, the homogeneity of ‘international students’ was concretised. As Table 6 illustrates, in all three facilities, students of multiple nationalities had enrolled in the programs, yet this only became apparent through the study’s Student Questionnaires, for acknowledgement of cultural diversity was barely evident in any of the pathways. Though ‘cultural understanding’ extends beyond national identifications, the presence of possible national influences needs to be acknowledged. Students who were interviewed identified with the following nationalities: Chinese, Saudi Arabian, Japanese, Vietnamese, South Korean, Mongolian, Ghanaian, Nigerian, South African, and one student who identified as a Hong Konger. Of students who had lived in another country other than their home country and Australia, countries included America, South Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan, the UK, Thailand, China, Turkey and Indonesia. Personal or social cultural expressions—geographic, political, linguistic, musical, or religious—were rarely overtly evident in any of the three contexts, other than a few posters, photos, and a string of small
international flags. This absence of recognition, of either personal or social expressions of diverse culturalities, exemplified the ‘social wrong’.
Table 6: Participant Demographics: Paths 1, 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATH 1</th>
<th>Identifiers: Pseudonym &amp; Position</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Countries Worked and Lived In</th>
<th>Languages Spoken Other than English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judith, Admin.</td>
<td>62 Australian</td>
<td>Thailand, Nepal</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin, Admin.</td>
<td>57 Australian</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>French, Japanese, Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy, Teacher</td>
<td>55 Australian</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germaine, Teacher</td>
<td>33 Australian</td>
<td>Australia, China, Thailand</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen, Teacher</td>
<td>42 American</td>
<td>America, Australia, China</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby, Teacher</td>
<td>38 Australian</td>
<td>China, Australia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moira, Teacher</td>
<td>45 Filipino</td>
<td>Philippines, Australia</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim, Student</td>
<td>21 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally, Student</td>
<td>20 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durriyah, Student</td>
<td>29 Saudi Arabian</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed, Student</td>
<td>25 Saudi Arabian</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Saudi Arabian,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine, Student</td>
<td>26 Chinese</td>
<td>China, Australia</td>
<td>Chinese, Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen, Student</td>
<td>26 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie, Student</td>
<td>26 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate, Student</td>
<td>31 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina, Student</td>
<td>24 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, Student</td>
<td>22 Chinese</td>
<td>China, Australia, USA</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATH 2</th>
<th>Identifiers: Pseudonym &amp; Position</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Countries Worked and Lived In</th>
<th>Languages Spoken Other than English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shane, Admin.</td>
<td>39 Australian</td>
<td>Australia, China</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda, Admin.</td>
<td>48 Australian</td>
<td>China, Indonesia</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol, Teacher</td>
<td>50 Australian</td>
<td>Australia, UK</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine, Teacher</td>
<td>33 Australian</td>
<td>Australia, Mozambique, Netherlands</td>
<td>Dutch, Portuguese,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma, Teacher</td>
<td>60 Australian</td>
<td>Japan, Australia</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin, Teacher</td>
<td>42 Australian</td>
<td>Japan, UK, Australia</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda, Teacher</td>
<td>34 Australian</td>
<td>Australia, Japan</td>
<td>Japanese, French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin, Student</td>
<td>32 Vietnamese</td>
<td>Sth Korea, Philippines</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon, Student</td>
<td>22 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese, Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akemi, Student</td>
<td>19 Japanese</td>
<td>Japan, Taiwan, USA, Australia</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arban, Student</td>
<td>25 Mongolian</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianguo, Student</td>
<td>26 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese, Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nin, Student</td>
<td>22 Japanese</td>
<td>Thailand, Japan</td>
<td>Thai, Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdal, Student</td>
<td>27 Saudi Arabian</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia, Australia</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Student</td>
<td>24 Sth Korean</td>
<td>Sth Korea, Australia, China</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuejia, Student</td>
<td>22 Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese, Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faheem, Student</td>
<td>45 Saudi Arabian</td>
<td>USA, Australia, Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PATH 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifiers: Pseudonym &amp; Position</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Countries Worked and Lived In</th>
<th>Languages Spoken Other than English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret, Admin.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Australian / Italian</td>
<td>Japan, Italy, UK, Australia</td>
<td>Italian, Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold, Admin.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Australian/ Irish</td>
<td>Australia, Thailand, Ireland, Switzerland</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane, Teacher</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Azerbaijan, Russia, Australia</td>
<td>French, Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki, Teacher</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australia, Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary, Teacher</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>French, German, Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamira, Teacher</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>China, Papua New Guinea, Australia</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah, Student</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>Australia, Ghana</td>
<td>Twi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahnaf, Student</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Saudi Arabian</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia, Australia</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary, Student</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>Nigeria, Australia</td>
<td>Igbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon, Student</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>South Korean</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anh, Student</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lok Son, Student,</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong, China, Australia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alya, Student</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Saudi Arabian</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaolin, Student,</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim, Student,</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Saudi Arabian</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia, Indonesia, Turkey</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virshanka, Student,</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sth African</td>
<td>Sth Africa, Australia</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main global instigation for students to study in Australia, also perceivably a process of ‘interpellation’ (Althusser, 1971), was to gain English for international employment options and/or more employment options in their ‘home’ country, coupled with Australia’s friendly, multicultural image. Hence, financial aspirations governed choices. Students interpreted and discussed national policies indirectly through their ‘international’ identity as particular conditions affecting them; for example, health cover, safety, eligible working hours, experiences of prejudice, and working within different assessment procedures. No issues were raised in relation to their relevance to political processes.

Interdiscursivity was evident in the students’ orientation to future employment, which was appropriated within a neoliberal framing of international education. This economic
framing was consonant with students’ adoption of a positive outlook towards ICU, so the students’ experiences of different culturalities through their interactions with others were repeatedly attributed with high value.

I think this one is international environment so it’s not only the values the Australian stands for, the country stands for, but also the international value that we can see here by the way people work with each other, yeah. (Justin, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 29, 2017)

While no students explicitly referred to developing a global identity, transnational identities were evident subjectivities among pathway participants. Students referred to the pathway experience as ‘internationally’ or ‘globally’ valuable:

Firstly, improve my English. It’s very important. Secondly, to find me a better job in China. If I get – I want to get a postgraduate degree…The Australian degree is more valuable than the Chinese degree. (Kate, Path 1 student, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

Studying in Australia – I can experience other country. Chinese, Saudi Arabia, France so it is good for me…I can understand other country people – very important now because of global situation. (Sharon, Path 3 student, personal communication, May 16, 2017)

In their many expressed beliefs, ‘international’ education was valued as a positive vocational choice and this value, which rested upon English language ability, seemed to predominate over all others. This aspiration may be viewed as synonymous with the myth of the heroic quest (Campbell, 1993), individualist in essence while also clearly driven by economic ambitions. The ICU dynamic in this context lacks interrelatedness, drawing upon external elements for personal gain, functioning as a means to achieve employment.
In response to the question: “In what ways does the institute integrate different cultural perspectives?”, students indicated that they believed their ICU was enhanced through interacting with other students in discussion activities (paired and group work) on social topics and textbook content. The participant average claim for discussion percentage in their class sessions, respectively for Paths 1, 2, and 3, were 31.5%, 28.5%, and 23.6%, and their stated participation percentages were, respectively, 79%, 51% and 73%.

The group has different country people and we discuss what is happening in our country so we can share our opinion of our country. (Shannon, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 29, 2017)

I talk to people in class. Korea, Japan, Iraq. We learn about different things. (Catherine, Path 1 student, personal communication, January 30, 2017)

At the same time, it was also clear that both tutors and students avoided discussing religion and politics:

Politics is a little complicated. We know the situation – we used to talk about Taiwan-Chinese relationship... It’s very [sensitive] easily to fight – different opinions. (Yuejia, Path 2 student, personal communication, April 7, 2017)

The chronotopic (time space) frame (Bakhtin, 1981b) of the heroic quest, which was active at the semiotic level, was dependent on the suppression or denial of religion and politics. Religion and politics were neutralised. To embark on the heroic adventure, it emerges that the student must forfeit certain discerning features of difference or at least overt expressions of them. Homogenisation appears as a kind of sacrifice, ‘self-chosen’ in the act of enrolment.

From the interview data, identification of early emergence of sliding identities, non-nationalist and hybrid, could be tentatively deduced and appeared to support ICU development. When asked: “How do you think this pathway influences the ways you feel
about Australia or other cultures?” students indicated that they believed that they were undergoing a kind of transformation. It is apparent that the regular contact with characteristics and identities that were generally associated with cultural signs, for example, home language, nationality, skin colour, religious affinity, dress style, and food choice, assisted in breaking down barriers to difference and dissipating fear of the different or unknown.

Put together in a class with different cultures. You get a better understanding. Making friends, class discussions and given a chance to get into the same group. At first, it’s a force but then it’s a good force, because some people are too shy to talk with strangers. (FGS 1, Path 3, personal communication, May 19, 2017)

I think it change me and change my feeling, my experience of this country, and this environment. (Justin, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 29, 2017)

Made me a lot more tolerant to people’s beliefs, for example Asian beliefs. I didn’t really agree with them before but when I hear about why they believe in these things and why it’s so important to them, I kind of, I am starting to understand them.

(Virshanka, Path 3 student, personal communication, May 19, 2017)

The students’ interactive experiences seem to give deeper meaning and value to their pathway ‘international student’ identity and this appeared to undercut homogeneous identifications. Thus, some ICU development was occurring through the experience of physical differences; some students were becoming more familiar with, and more accepting of, physical and material diversity, although an underlying motivating force was at least in part driven by individualist and economic aspiration.
Similarly, one of the focus group discussions elicited that students held the belief that ICU was more effectively developed through the actual experience of another country’s features though it was not essential. The main criterion was the sharing of opinions about different cultural features:

…tell me about the culture and what is happening, that makes the person you are talking about be friendly with you and help you know a lot of information. (FGS 2, Path 3, personal communication, May 24, 2017)

Whereas the category of ‘international student’ made student culturalities invisible, students’ home identities sometimes assumed greater significance when students interacted with others. The intersectional opportunities provided through student interactions undermined the vacuity attached to the ‘international student’ identity. Most students were accepting of each other in the classroom context. The students’ positive attitudes and interest in diverse cultural heritage also demonstrated the “requisite attitudes” outlined in Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model (p. 254). These dynamics indicate that the nature of ICU was developing, consisted of continual comparisons and intersections between the host and home cultures, and was highly dynamic for students.

These intercultural experiences assumed interpretations. Students were sometimes consciously selective in aiming to pursue what they perceived as the ‘appealing’ aspects of cultures, such as wealth and employment, while the ‘unappealing’ aspects were rejected:

Yeah and I find something like relaxing or something is good lifestyle in Australia. I will do that, but I still keep as a Chinese, like traditional idea, because that’s my, from my education, from my culture, but I want to still keep that…. because in China we have strong connection with my family like we should look after our parents and we should … But in Australia I feel it’s more freedom, every young people like move out
after 18 and yeah they leave space between families. (Catherine, Path 1 student, personal communication, January 30, 2017)

There’s no better or worse in the culture I think, but like, if they think one of the culture is good then I think it is good to like do the same thing as them. (Akemi, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 30, 2017)

I have open mind so I can speak with anyone, but I have also rule in my life, rule, so I need respect these rules. So I can draw here red line. I can’t go out of this red line. (Durriyah, Path 1 student, personal communication, January 20, 2017)

These discerning utterances may be identified as pertaining to the deeper affective dimension of belief or religion. In each case, the student is expressing their personal viewpoint while interdiscursively (Fairclough, 2009) relating to a more widely accepted socio-cultural textuality or belief system and, through that system, they are asserting their own agency.

While these assertions demonstrate that students were active in evaluative reasoning/s, another underlying indication is that this kind of comparative thought processing was not occurring in conversation or shared in critical, scholarly contexts. One interpretation of the above may be that the “red line” and “open mind” are in contradiction, but the student’s relationship to the “rules” is particularly important here and needs to be clarified. Such “red line” views that may be confronting need to be discussed openly so that the personal, affective dimension of the perspective is experienced and better understood. The students indicate willingness to listen and learn while also evaluating culturalities in a vacuum. Students’ conclusions about culturalities, tentative or not, appear to have been made independently and without discussion, which leaves a potentially dreadful gap between various cultural understandings.
The insights revealed thus far demonstrate that the pedagogic approaches to the teaching of English contribute to the ‘White’ English hegemonic positioning over international diversities. The denial of student identities and avoidance of discussion on religion and politics perpetuate the English monoculture. AE contexts could be a stronger platform for students to learn about each other and each other’s cultures, including the political conditions that they have experienced and the religious interpretations that they are familiar with. Social constructivist learning emphasises the need for students to interact and learn through talking and this could occur through regular student-student and student-teacher interaction. Learning is an active process as students accommodate the new concepts into their current schema; sharing is intrinsic to learning. In each of the case studies, politics and religion were not only denied but were denied without explanation. This is an assertive and implicitly aggressive act, because it normalises silence; it also asserts that silence and denial of expression with an accompanying hierarchical claim that politics and religion are not a part of education or if they are, they are only accessible to an elite group. This is quite a cruel suffocation and one that can have disadvantageous effects on further cultural developments. As Durriyah’s “red line” evaluations indicate, independent assessments of cultures formulated without communication can limit perception of the Other.

From responses to the repertory grid questions, apparent obstructions to addressing the social wrong and developing ICU lay in the absence of explicit address to difficulty in adjusting to cultural differences. One of the most prominent omissions was in student participants’ lack of awareness of different cultural characteristics, as outlined by Deardorff (2006), rarely detailing knowledge or understanding of alternative cultural perspectives. This is not to suggest that students did not perceive difference, but rather that they had no apparent knowledge of the explanations of difference. In addition, in evident contradiction to identity shifts, students often referred to their own identities and the culturalities of their past
experiences in homogeneous, ethno-nationalist terms: “Japan is not a Multicultural country—well it is but we don’t really feel that” (Akemi, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 30, 2017); “We live in China and have Chinese lifestyle” (Shannon, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 29, 2017). These phrasings might be explained by adopting a ‘collectivist’ viewpoint of the language (Hofstede, 2001) but their relevance in relation to ICU development lies in that these expressions point to fissures in educational communications. Students were left to their own imaginings and resources to reconcile the differences that they encountered.

The ‘silencing’ that occurred in the absence of open cultural discussion allowed for the expansion of a sense of confusion and isolation. Some of these frustrations may have been exacerbated by language difficulties, as English was expected in each pathway’s English classroom. The interviews revealed that problems consistently existed in communicating between students from different countries due to: understanding others’ oral and written English and/or being understood (Sally, Durriyah, Mohammed, Catherine, Doreen, Akemi, Xiaolin, Virshanka, 2017; FGS 2, Path 1, 2017); formulating and expressing opinions in group work (Tina, John, Akemi, & Yuejia, 2017); sharing ideas with teachers and class peers from various cultures (Tim, Ruby, Tina, Sharon, Xiaolin, & Ibrahim, 2017); and inhibitions. One student (Justin, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 29, 2017) stated that in his class, if students spoke to each other in their ‘home’ language, they had to pay a dollar to the tutor, the implication being that the context is friendly enough to only impose a light hearted penalty but serious in its intent to enforce the English voice. Such restrictions on expressive avenues, however, further confine ICU development.

Inhibitions on self-expression negate critical thought and also hinder tutors’ insight into student ability: “Three quarters of them come here as rote learners, and you know, they know nothing but memorisation. It’s just so difficult for them to just embrace new strategies”
(Rosemary, Path 3 tutor, personal communication, May 10, 2017). Rosemary’s words indicate a deficit approach to students, which has been shown to stultify tutors’ expectations of student ability (Benzie, 2015; Dagenais, 2013; Khawaja & Stallman, 2011; Ninnes et al., 1999; Piller, 2011). In this hegemonic AE classroom context, the students remain unknown.

Clearly, AE classrooms need to provide for the development of the social dimension of AE expression. Without heeding the perspectives of others, the authenticity and value of learning is lost. Authentic foci, through materials or topics for discussion and writing, increase student motivation to learn and develop their English skills (Brodin & Frick, 2011; Garbutt, Biermann, & Offord, 2012; Shirai, 2013; Zhetpisbayeve, Mun, and Shelestova, 2012). Ontological and axiological dimensions of understanding, which more readily occur through informal discussion, can correct the imbalance of emphasis toward knowledge and organisational structures in classrooms (Brodin & Frick, 2011). The AE classroom can also provide alternative cultural texts, imagery, and video data to undermine the hegemonic standing of English and students’ broader studies and their subordinated standing.

Additional challenges to ICU included: adjusting to different expectations regarding study and break scheduling, such as promptness and times for sleep (Tim, Doreen, Jodie, Nin, & Mary, 2017); sharing classrooms with the opposite gender (Mohammed, Faheem, & Alya, 2017); having timetables that did not allow for prayer (Mohammed, Faheem, & Alya, 2017); tolerating racially prejudiced comments and behaviours (Sally, Lee, Faheem, Hannah, & Mary, 2017); tolerating behaviour that was seen as rude or aggressive (John, Akemi, Ahnaf, Alya, Hannah, Mohammed, 2017); and living with a sense of alienation or loneliness (Catherine, Tina, & Xiaolin, 2017). Students thus found some pathway cultural expressions quite confronting, while their orientations to acculturation varied:

I think my English is not good, so I worry, worry. I’m worried about my behaviour or my language is not suitable for Australians so I’m more careful. I’m more careful
about my gestures because I did look some uncomfortable faces sometimes, yes.

(Kate, Path 1 student, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

The students ask about your greying hair? (Researcher)

The white hair because it means old man you know. For me it is a negative to keep asking about it [my age] because as we know most of them like between 18 and 20 most of the students in our class… always they keep asking about age… In Arabic culture if you ask age it is not polite. Also, I mean they keep asking my age that means something strange for me. (Ibrahim, Path 3 student, personal communication, May 18, 2017)

Saudis want to be friends but, in my culture, I don’t like, don’t understand Saudi Arabian culture because they making [marry] many girls, one guy … but I can’t understand their culture…. I don’t want to [understand it]. (Sharon, Path 3 student, personal communication, May 16, 2017)

Sometimes I don’t understand – language barrier. I can’t understand other people – loneliness. (Catherine, Path 1 student, personal communication, January 30, 2017)

Like it’s not really natural for me…. Normally in Japan I just sit in the classroom and just listen to the lecture, with here I have to talk and do a speech sometimes, so I have to change my mind of just receiving the study or to be more aggressive. (Akemi, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 29, 2017)
Yeah in the sense we don’t have any Australian classmates so when we first got here, we were confused about everything and we didn’t like have anybody that we knew that was Australian. We were all just foreigners, confused. (Virshanka, Path 3 student, personal communication, May 18, 2017.)

These various challenges point to conflicting institutional intentions at the semiotic level (Fairclough, 2009). On one hand, the organisation was apparently aiming to teach students to be accepting of each other and to work together and held that this orientation ideologically sat comfortably within the institute. On the other hand, the AE tutors were not promoting discussion about students’ diverse cultural subjectivities and student culturalities were inhibited within the classroom and pathway frameworks.

The disregard within the AE classrooms of many student identities, therefore, was a further obstacle to identifying the ‘social wrong’. Relating to student identities through experience enhances comprehension and a sense of belonging (Dewey, 1902/2008; Inhelder & Piaget, 1958; Kovarova, 2006; Le et al., 2017; S. McCormick, 1995) and contributes towards the continuation of liberal values. As seen through the DRA analytical lens, however, the failure to foreground student identities perpetuated cultural prejudices, particularly traditional national-cultural discriminations, and also preserved Eurocentric cultural values which would be better questioned and challenged.

In applying Stage 3 to Obstacle 1, considering whether the social order of the institution needed the social wrong of limited identities, it is apparent that the administrative dimension of the pathways’ social orders, incorporating the underlying organisation of the AE classrooms, functioned smoothly because of the limitation of identities. The clear categorisations of ‘international student’, ‘tutor’ and ‘administrator’ aided in establishing a network of orders of discourse (Fairclough, 2009; Foucault, 1981), which facilitated speed of processing for multiple purposes—of learning requirements, for example—but predominantly
for the purposes of achieving regular demonstrable, measurable, successful education outcomes. Arguably, these processes of order, so evident in neoliberal efficiency and effectiveness drives (Connell, 2013; Jiang, 2007; Marginson, 2011; Rizvi, 2009; S. Robertson, 2011), do not need to be so restrictive on identities to fulfil educational aims. The AE classroom is an integral part of these processes; however, it stands within the unique position of freedom to undermine these neoliberal processes through presenting opportunities for critical, social interaction. Restructuring processes require recognition of the hegemonic position that is currently held and commitment to dissipate that stance.

The insights achieved from the Fairclough DRA analysis of pathway identities are applied to Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model below. The practices have been categorised into the Model’s five developmental levels—“Requisite Attitudes”, Knowledge and Comprehension”, “Skills”, “Desired Internal Outcome, and “Desired External Outcome”. In doing so, I acknowledge that I am unqualified in the field of psychology, so my readings of individual processes, the complex relationships between attitudes, knowledge and skills, are limited.

Table 7: DRA Question 1 Insights Applied to Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model

| Positive ICU Indicators |  | Negative ICU Indicators |
|-------------------------|  |-------------------------|
| Promoting Requisite Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development |  | Limiting Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development |
| New national context promoted ‘international’ identity—fosters an open attitude. |  | Recontextualizations (fixed identities) within pathway contexts—limit “curiosity and discovery” and “openness”. |
| Neoliberal economic aspirations lead students to international education and to accept cultural differences other than those recognised (interpreted) as religious or political. |  | Avoidance of religious, political, or belief discussion—sustains closed attitudes. |
|  | Nationalist identities adhered to and not discussed or questioned—limits openness to knowledge of other culturalities and skills development. |
|  | Students drawing conclusions about ‘cultures’ and culturalities without discussion—maintains held attitudes that may be closed. |
Student difficulties not foregrounded; students indicated emotional problems, with no mention of support networks. This could impede requisite attitudes, and hinder skills and ICU development.

Table 7 shows that while students adopt an ‘international student’ persona, which is open to experiencing and learning about different culturalities, numerous practices are simultaneously working against student acquisition of “requisite attitudes”. A consistent oversight in the above negative performances is recognition of multiplicity, which closely relates to denial of creative expression, once again demonstrating denial of the feminine.

Ib: van Dijk’s socio-cognitive approach (SCA).

The SCA was adopted to investigate the cognitive, social and discourse components of two context models significant to ICU development: curricula delivery and social events management. To briefly reiterate my earlier explanation, according to SCA, discourse processing involves two types of “mental models” (van Dijk, 2016, p. 66): situation or semantic models that “represent the situation a discourse is about” (p. 67) and context or pragmatic models that represent the “communicative situation or experience in which language users are ongoingly involved” (p. 67). The context models determine selection and interpretation of the situation model’s information. Knowledges and ideologies also influence the nature of context models. The analysis aimed to elucidate the ways that agents perpetuate processes that either enhance or inhibit ICU. Analysis occurred through four main questions:

1. What are the significant cognitive representations evident in the contexts of curricula delivery and events management?

2. What are the significant micro and macro social interactions (structures and relations) that create contexts of curricula delivery and events management?

3. What ideological structures do the context’s discourse components of curricula delivery and events management comprise?
4. How do the three context components (cognitive, social, and discourse) interrelate with the broader dominant culture?

1. What are the significant cognitive representations evident in the contexts of curricula delivery and events management?

Neoliberal processes that prioritised business gains over quality education were continually influencing the principles of administrative staff and tutors (Connell, 2013; Jiang, 2007; Marginson, 2011; Rizvi, 2009; S. Robertson, 2011). These ideologies were also operationalised at the micro-level through daily practices, such as meetings, assessment processes and the pedagogical methodologies that those processes excluded or demanded.

Intrinsic to pedagogical contexts were attitudes relating to care, which appeared to function through the AE tutors maintaining an internal or cognitive representation of an external ideal that had little relation to the surrounding neoliberal processes. Paths 1 and 2 tutors seemed open to the affective dimension of expression in the classroom. Administrators and tutors of Paths 1 and 2 regularly referred to nurturing behaviours and welcomed students’ personal expressions. The tutors’ attitudes facilitated students to gain a sense of belonging (for example, Sally, Catherine, Colleen, Jodie, Kate, & Tina, 2017).

The teacher in class – sometimes she asks about the different cultures and say it’s good culture or just show respect—no judge. (Tina, Path 1 student, personal communication, February 3, 2017)

The teacher really encourage us—separate us into different cultural groups. (Nin, Path 2 student, personal communication, April 5, 2017)

The development of student oral communication was also integral to the curriculums, and support for this outcome was apparently sustained through regular staff interactions. The
knowledge of the benefits of positive student support was thus reinforced ideologically among the AE staff, exemplifying cognitive representations influencing social interactions.

The tutors’ situation models of the classroom environment, inferred from their interview comments, were embedded with notions of developing understanding and relationships. The cultures of acceptance (questioning cultures, accepting diversities, showing respect) showed that the tutors’ situation models were selective of cultural similarities and differences because they were considered relevant for interrelating with the students; the tutors were similarly selective of care as an appropriate approach to different culturalities. In Paths 1 and 2, knowledges were viewed as a medium for deep understanding, with strong regard for personal student response, for learning as a process, and not just as object bites for knowledge ownership.

Teachers can kind of bring that up as a topic: “Let’s have a chat about …”; they kind of have pastoral care within students. (FGT 1, Path 1)

As teachers we also have pastoral responsibility. (Moira, Path 1 teacher, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

[The institute] definitely does a lot to support students in their life in general while they’re here and help them to make that transition to Australian life but also to tertiary life, and I think for the most part we do a good job of that. (Germaine, Path 1 teacher, personal communication, January 20, 2017)

We try to mentor them – they come from different countries … try to be a guide or a help to them. [The Director] will say, “We will help you”. (Colleen, Path 1 teacher, personal communication, January 30, 2017)
The AE tutors’ caring expressions upheld a moral fabric within the institutions, which many participants alluded to. The nurturing gestures created a counter-discourse that resisted the apparently ‘uncaring’ demanding nature that accompanied neoliberal marketing imperatives. The tutors’ pedagogical and social efforts compensated for the pathway’s economic focus and helped to preserve the institutions’ liberal values.

In interview, the situation models of the Path 3 participants did not project cognitive representations of expressions of care; rather, care was implicit in the tutors’ emphasis on the students’ responsibility for learning:

We teach them a little bit about how it is here [in Australia] and they adapt…We discuss what are learning styles in a lot of the Asian countries and what are learning styles in Western countries, and as I say, here is where they have to possibly adapt to a new learning style, and we provoke them then to, for the Asian students in particular, to get out of their shell and learn to be in an interactive environment and to ask questions and learn to think critically. We encourage discussion. (Vicki, Path 3 teacher, personal communication, May 18, 2017)

The Path 3 AE tutors were more demanding in their attitude and unwilling to accept students’ lack of conformity, such as the Islamic need for prayer at particular times:

You’re still going to be marked down if you’re out [of the classroom]. (Tamira, Path 3 teacher, personal communication, May 19, 2017)

The Path 3 tutors discussed the students in a more removed tone than the tutors of either of the other two pathways. They did not admit the warmth that they may have felt towards their students to each other; on the contrary, they seemed to work at diminishing care from their shared situation model:

Vicki. And then you see them come along and then.
Tamira. And then they love you and they don’t want you to leave them.
Vicki. Absolutely.

Tamira. And then you go (making gagging sound) which is what I say to them
when they say we love you.

Vicki. I don’t want to finish today, why is that, oh I’m in love with you. Oh
God, you’re hilarious. (Path 3, personal communication, May 25, 2017)

In the above conversation, two teachers appear to be consolidating their situation models,
agreeing on the inappropriateness of expressions of love for their professional context model.

Having worked with one of these tutors on a regular basis, these assertions are recognisably
inconsistent with her actual approach to students in class. This incongruity indicates that the
AE tutors are producing context models that conform to a pathway expectation of neutrality
and distance in attitude towards students, consistent with the aspirations of ‘objectivity’ in
traditional academic contexts. This AE adherence to ‘objectivity’ resists narrative that could
otherwise promote interculturality (Genova & Stewart, 2019; Gillman, 2013; Rizvi & Beech,
2017; Weatherall, 2019), and thus perpetuates the hegemonic positioning of English
organisational structures and ontological assumptions. Notions of objectivity sustain
patriarchal power arrangements, the inequalities of neo-colonisation existing between the
‘White’ AE tutor and the multiplicity of international student diversities (Adely, 2019;
Lugones, 2010; Manion & Shah, 2019; Weatherall, 2019).

These positivist assumptions also place further homogenising culturalities on the teacher,
reducing or disguising their personal specificities and thus limiting ICU. It is a similar semiotic
process evident in the students’ forfeiture of religious, spiritual and other personal specificities
in their acceptance of homogeneity, as earlier noted.

The SCA analysis thus elucidates two kinds of situation models in the researched
pathways: one that accepted and promoted expressions of care and the other that maintained a
more reserved approach to learning, which align with both the Classicist tradition and the
administrative neoliberal focus on economic advancement. The tutors in Paths 1 and 2, therefore, were able to be more expressive of their care in different contexts because their situation models upheld caring expressions as acceptable within a learning environment. In Path 3, such expressions were not made socially explicit; their relationships with students were described as more formal and reserved.

The informal, amicable atmospheres of Paths 1 and 2 may have also been supported through their relatively low class sizes, under 16 in both pathways, and smaller rooms, which were conducive for more intimate discussion: “In the curriculum … we have many questions to ask the teachers. They are very nice.” (Kate, Path 1 student, personal communication, February 2, 2017). Both pathways also employed some tutors on a full-time basis, so the tutors shared opportunities for informal conversation, such as discussions at morning tea and lunch breaks, which promoted a sense of friendship towards each other and care for the students.

In Path 3, staff had little interaction. Each of the AE tutors was employed as a Casual. The five staff shared two staffrooms (with the staff of other disciplines), three in one, and two in the other, but each staff member was on a different timetable, so the tutors were rarely in the staffrooms at the same times. In addition, Path 3 AE tutors did not have staff meetings. The Director was the coordinator for all disciplines within the institute, but his supervision did not include external communications such as meetings. While perhaps tutors of other disciplines still organised meetings, the AE staff did not. Social interaction was further limited because a community kitchen was not utilised for socialising, and there were no organised staff social functions. In this context, any ideologies of academia, such as sharing different perspectives and debating issues for socio-cultural benefit (Brick, 2009), remained unspoken.

The AE class enrolment sizes of Path 3 were also generally around 25 students, although lower attendance was a regular occurrence (Diane, Path 3 tutor, personal communication, May 9, 2017; Tamira, Path 3 tutor, personal communication, May 19, 2017)
and the classrooms were larger than those of Paths 1 and 2. The higher numbers and the larger classrooms could have had some effect on the tutors’ orientation to a class. Hence, the tutors could dismiss expressions of care through traditional academic positivist assumptions that promote objective, non-emotional communication structures. The AE context did not serve to destabilise these now well-challenged perspectives; on the contrary, the context model appeared to sustain the rejection and absence of caring expressions, which contributed to maintaining its hegemonic power and limiting ICU development.

Another distinctive context-situation model relationship in relation to cognitive representation was in the organisation of student events that aimed to facilitate students in their integration into social communities. Activities that were provided to satisfy policy guidelines exemplify expressions of care, where care is seen as related to empathy, which features in Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence as a “Desired Internal Outcome” (p. 254). Each pathway was working within university policies committed to code of conduct and cultural diversity values of respect, dignity, equity, accountability, honesty, transparency, privacy, and prevention of harassment, including: the Multicultural NSW Act 2000 (2014) and the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (Austl.) (2017), and the Australian Human Rights Commission’s (2012) Principles to Promote and Protect the Human Rights of International Students. Representatives of the universities were prohibited in engaging in bullying discrimination, harassment, vilification, sexual harassment, and victimisation. Path 1’s “Cultural Diversity Priority Statement Objective 1” (2007) aimed “To develop a University culture which … engenders social responsibility …[and be] receptive to new ideas and critical enquiry” (p. 1); Path 2 and 3’s university “Diversity and Inclusiveness Policy” (see “University title”, 2017) aimed to “recognise the unique capabilities, experiences and characteristics of staff and students in their workplaces and study environments” (Section 3, para. 1). Each pathway also upheld the university
policies, for example, Path 1’s, English Language Centre Student Rights and Responsibilities (2014) states:

[Institute title] will ensure students are granted all rights and protection to which they are entitled under Australian Federal Government and New South Wales State Government laws, rules and regulations plus [University title] policies, procedures and guidelines and [institute title] procedures and guidelines.

Policy implementation was facilitated through a Student Engagement Coordinator or similar role.

The level of support varied across the three institutes, with differences apparent between the ELICOS based pathways, Paths 1 and 2, and the VET, Path 3. In Path 1, all students completed a questionnaire in their first week, which the Engagement Coordinator could follow up on, assisting in finding outlets for student interests and solutions to current problems. This undertaking was comprehensive, such as finding activities for students’ wives. In the same pathway, the Coordinator also drew upon local resources for support: the local museum provided events, including: an annual photography exhibition; public volunteers provided conversation classes on a roster basis; volunteers took students on excursions; the local paper interviewed an international student each week; and the Officer organised swimming and driving lessons, and participation in study tours with students visiting from overseas. Path 2’s students also volunteered work on a community garden and provided tuition in their ‘home’ language (Belinda, Path 2 administrator, personal communication, April 12, 2017). Additionally, set days were timetabled for excursions, for example, Picnic Day and Australia Day (Judith, Path 1 administrator, personal communication, January 18, 2017). Paths 1 and 2 were also timetabled to allow for Muslim prayer and provided prayer rooms. Administrators also shared numerous stories of personal support, such as driving students to classes when public transport was unavailable, assisting
with enquiring about phone bills, and accompanying a student through the whole process of receiving a cochlear implant. Path 1’s Events Officer and Path 2’s Student Engagement Coordinator also regularly communicated event details to the teachers, who were often asked to disseminate information to students and encourage attendance to events.

Path 3 played a more limited role in providing extra-curricular activities and was more dependent on the facilities at the affiliate university (as stated, Path 2 was within these same grounds). Fundamental support in relation to course work and psychological support was still available, but there was far less active interaction with the broader community.

While both the Officer’s and Coordinator’s roles of Paths 1 and 2 pertained to student social welfare, Path 3’s Student and Academic Services Officer oversaw Student Services, Student Support, and Student Administration. Only the Student Support role was concerned with student social activities, so in view of the Officer’s additional responsibilities, less attention could be given to that role. The Path 3 Officer also operated in isolation. The events were posted on the student website, and tutors were not usually aware of them. Exceptions included rare lunchtime events (one a trimester) that were held on the same floor as the classrooms and which staff were invited to.

In Paths 1 and 2, because upcoming events were shared with the staff, tutors stated that they regularly used event feedback as an in-class discussion focus, even though they were not typically involved with the actual event. Hence, Paths 1 and 2 created shared context models of care and interculturality that grew out of their institutional situation models. In contrast, in Path 3, any models of care and interculturality were predominantly dependent on each tutor’s own situation models, which were not likely to be supported in any of the institutional contexts other than those stated in curricula documents. In applying Fairclough’s Stage 3, the inhibition of caring gestures is considered unnecessary to sustain the social order. The gestures of care seemed to undermine the austerity of formal procedures
without destroying the economic or educational intentions and invested the contexts with acknowledgement of the creative individual as one who belonged to a community.

2. What are the significant micro and macro social interactions (structures and relations) that create contexts of curricula delivery and events management?

In relation to the pathways’ social interactions, focus is on locating positions of power and domination, interactions of control between groups (van Dijk, 2016), at both the micro-level of daily interactions of group members and in the broader structures and interactions of communities and organisations at the macro-level (p. 70). The aim of the social analysis is to reveal unfair leaning towards fulfilling the interests of the dominant group at the expense of the subjugated. Power is recognised through social and cognitive control over the actions of the dominated and their cognitions, their mental models, knowledge, and ideologies. Power includes material power resources, such as items of wealth, and symbolic power resources, such as status (p. 71).

As the above analysis outlines, in each pathway, situation and context models were instrumental in determining the manner of curricula delivery. The Path 1 and 2 tutors compensated for the absence of the affective dimension in the curricula through promoting expressions of care. In Path 3, processes of power that were functioning in the semiotic dimension gave greater voice to the formal, neoliberal elements of the administration at the expense of the international student and tutor needs for ICU. Social control was established through the denial of an active coordinator, because the absence ostensibly controlled cognitive elements of situation and context models, knowledge, and ideologies. The power that Path 3 AE tutors held was limited to their individual self-initiated interactions with students and other tutors; it was not promoted through explicit or shared ideologies. The absence of explicit administrative guidance and promotion of interaction with and between
tutors thus created and reinforced an implicit administrative power over behaviours and cognitive processes. This in turn sustained the established organisational hierarchy and the hegemonic positioning of the English tutors over the international students.

In response to the interview question, “If you could make any changes at all to this pathway context, in relation to deepening ICU, what changes would you make?”, nearly all members of each pathway and each participant group—administrators, tutors, and students—criticised the limited opportunities for social interaction in the pathway context. Student responses largely related to increasing social interaction and included more organised class discussions, food sharing, artistic exhibitions and performances, artefact displays, excursions, games, parties, barbeques, and the integration of host-national students into lessons. Throughout, most students indicated that they did not consider the possibility of alternative conditions. The circumstances that confronted them were those that they had to deal with. However, most students stated that they would seek assistance if needed. No students had discussed union membership with any host-national.

Tutor interview participants also revealed that they believed they held limited power to initiate change. While 13 of the 14 tutors offered ideas on desired changes in their workplace towards furthering ICU, the majority of tutors believed that it was the executive’s responsibility to initiate change. Tutors felt restricted in expressing their creative ideas and most indicated that they would not attempt to overcome the sense of hierarchical limitation imposed upon them. A few tutors (Colleen, Ruby, & Carol, 2017) indicated that they could individually push for some changes to be made, but changes to fundamental processes, such as those reliant on assessment, were not measured as within their power. No considerations of unions as a means of initiating changes were made evident.

Tutors focused on the lack of time (Wendy, Germaine, Ruby, & Carol, 2017), the tendency of units to stultify real life experience (Wendy, Germaine, & Emma, 2017), and the
emphasis on formality and assessment (Wendy, Germaine, & Kevin, 2017). They spoke of the need for greater social interaction through discussion opportunities and activities.

I definitely think we set unrealistic expectations. Language is a business. Like ticking KLA’s—but there’s so much. It’s unfair and unrealistic for students and for educators. (Germaine, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, January 20, 2017)

People are under too much pressure and they’re just so intent about exiting from the course so that they can continue with their studies at the university, this university, and it’s the same in other places ... There’s not enough time and space to really broaden intercultural understanding. (Wendy, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, January 19, 2017)

Both tutors and administrators were cognisant of the undue weight given to the economic management of student progress, which highlights their awareness of the identified “social wrong” (Fairclough, 2001).

The staff acquiescence to assessment demands may be partly explained through the bureaucratic system of responsibilities that administrations establish as a way of ensuring and protecting the fulfilment of responsibilities. Path 1’s English Language Centre: Staff Handbook (2016), for example, states: “The Director of Studies is line manager to the Academic Manager, Senior Administrative Assistant, Administrative Assistant and Events Office. The Academic Manager is line manager to the Head Teacher, and the Head Teacher is line manager to all teaching staff” (p. 5). Under “Duties, Responsibilities and Expectations” (pp. 10-18), the text further states that all staff must seek approval from the Directory of Studies, the academic Manager and Head teacher for “all operational matters” (p. 10). The intention to safeguard processes can become lost within the guidelines. Instead of encouraging innovation, such voices of authority outlining superior-subordinate relationships
can set up barriers to creative endeavours, weaken the will to initiate change and negate agency, so the status quo continues unchallenged.

The rules seem to embody postcolonial masculinities, disallowing nuances of care and transformation, exemplifying the kind of exclusion in Kramer’s (2017) descriptions of “constitutive exclusion” (p. 1), which internalise the rejection of difference in their construction. The exclusion is consolidated through the accompanying omission of recognition of personal characteristics, such as individual histories, beliefs, and characteristic expressions, which subjugates the feminine creativities of students and tutors within a masculinised hegemonic ontology. Both tutors and students had more power to initiate change than either of these groups pursued. This was evident in the small independent initiatives that had taken place, such as joining clubs (the students, Catherine, Akemi, Faheem, & Sharon, 2017) and churches (the students, Tim, Tina, Yuejia, & Hannah, 2017), and providing community volunteer work, for example, in the community garden, the local nursing homes, St Vincent de Paul, the SES and, within the institute, through conversation classes (the administrators, Judy & Belinda; the student, Sharon, 2017). The nature of the changes that students made were restricted to personal experience and occurred within existing structures. No other kinds of independent initiatives were evident from administrators, tutors or students.

In offering possible changes that could enhance ICU, each group acknowledged awareness of intercultural inadequacies, yet few of the participants could envisage themselves either instigating or enacting the changes that they themselves posited. These acknowledgements confirm the presence of conflicting feelings. The underlying ideological assumptions that perpetuated the current processes occurred in a vacuum of silent acceptance, which can be recognised as a “participant construct” (van Dijk, 2006, p. 159). Their agency was diminished (Van Dijk, 2008) but the re-creation of the ideological context elements also
occurred through compliance. Application of Fairclough’s Stage 3 again highlights that the subdual of agency is unnecessary. Both students and tutors surrendered their multiple identities, which consolidated the passivity of their pathway identities and sustained the existing stratifications of power. The realisation of the final stages of Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model, the desired external and internal outcomes, are reliant on individuals realising their freedom to initiate change in directions that they feel are necessary to deepen ICU. Participants’ agency to express their ideas for change was, however, consistently occluded through exclusionary discourses.

3. What ideological structures do the context’s discourse components of curricula delivery and events management comprise?

In relation to the discourse components relevant to curricula delivery and events management, which in this research incorporates a large proportion of the interview data as well as each curriculum’s significant reading text, van Dijk (2016) focuses on the structures of discourse that reveal the underlying ideologies of the dominant social groups, which he identifies through: polarisation, pronoun use, adopted identifications, emphasis of positive self-descriptions and negative Other-descriptions, assertion of activities, and the expression of norms, values and interests (pp. 73-74). In examining the expression of norms, values and interests, the van Leeuwen curricula analysis that occurs later in this thesis overlaps with this section and is not included with this analysis.

The two contrasting approaches to students discussed above, one of considerable attention to pastoral care and the other more detached approach, point to a social polarisation in education. The desire for bonding and emotional interaction is in constant tension with the economic demands of the institute. The tutors’ silence in particular was in a dialectical relationship with educational and social aims for students, highlighting contradiction
The discourses exemplify regular positive self-descriptions (van Dijk, 2016, p. 74). The teachers often adopted plural pronouns in consolidation of their ideological identification with the other pathway tutors, creating a sense of unity and direction. In the below excerpts, tutor group pronouns and descriptions include “we”, “they”, “the centre”, “teachers”, “team”, “casuals”, and “permanents”. The tutors’ actions are also described as a single united group: “we can …”, “The centre definitely presents…”, “we mix up…”, and “we try…” “…everybody is willing”, as evident in the following contexts:

I found the teachers and managers here are open. (Ruby, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

The centre definitely presents as an environment that is supportive of students and definitely supportive not only in their academic learning but also pastorally as well. (Wendy, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, January 19, 2017)

Each week, we mix up the seating chart. (Colleen, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, January 31, 2017)

I would like to think that it’s very multicultural and we try to cater to the needs of the students to help them to adapt to the other culture as well, so we are very meaningful. (Moira, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, February, 2017)

They are part of the team. Casuals are like permanents. (Emma, Path 2 tutor, personal communication, April 5, 2017)
It’s a very collegiate atmosphere … everybody is willing to help each other out. There’s a lot of sharing of ideas and resources especially among teachers. (Glenda, Path 2 tutor, personal communication, April 7, 2017)

The assertions also include evaluative statements in the continuous tense. The discourse pronouns and descriptions thereby demonstrate and sustain the tutors’ unity in embracing a protective role and the underlying ideology of the tutors’ social group.

These positive self-descriptions of Paths 1 and 2 teachers demonstrate that the responsibilities of pastoral care supported their identification as a group as well as their own status as teachers, reinforced by their work ethic and all of the accompanying curricula and institutional processes. This was also true of the Path 3 staff, although, as discussed, the responsibility for pastoral care was not overtly emphasised.

An area of negative-Other description that was relevant to ICU related to classroom dynamics, though the tone of teachers’ discussions was more of frustration than of negativity. In addition, categorisation into clear positive or negative grouping is not static:

A while ago there was some incidence of a terrorist attack and the Chinese students got a bit nervous and said, “Oh, you know, they’re Muslim?”… I mean it’s quite insensitive, but I understand why. So, very directly the Chinese students asked one of the Muslim students, you know, are you a Muslim and he said, “Yes”, and the Chinese student said, “Do you support terrorism?” And luckily the Arabic student stood up and he went up to the board and he explained that there are two types of Muslims and, you know, “one group and the other group”, and “I’m a Muslim but I believe that the Quran says you don’t kill other people.” So yeah it was, I think, it’s quite a positive. (Ruby, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, February 2, 2017)
A few terms ago we had mostly Chinese and we had, I think it was like thirteen students, maybe eleven Chinese and one Taiwanese and one Saudi Arabian woman, and they pretty much shunned her [the Saudi Arabian woman]… She was very bright and articulate, but they sort of ignored her …When they had to rate her for her presentation, like we do peer assessments, the Chinese were perfect but she always had faults. In fact, hers was better than theirs. (Colleen, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, January 31, 2017)

Students just take offence to each other. One boy came to me saying, “I don’t want to be in this group with this guy. He’s talking about me in his own language…. He wasn’t happy, having to deal with people from other cultures that were being quite disrespectful…. There were a few of them that were ganging up on him, so it was those two cultures against him. (Vicki, Path 3 tutor, personal communication, May 18, 2017)

I think it’s more of making each other realise that … “This may sound not good in your part of the world, but this is totally acceptable in this part of the world.” So making them understand and embrace their differences and to translate that into something that’s positive in the classroom. (Moira, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

Descriptions of the negative-Other or situations of tension are reconfigured as much as possible to become positive experiences, which is the value of having ICU integral to class content. Tutors demonstrated informal collective acceptance of responsibility for culturally tense behaviours to be addressed, discussed and deconstructed, during lessons. However, the above extracts demonstrate that the tutors are often positioned to deal with issues as they
arise. The attention to ICU is incidental. The dealing of these issues was extra-curricular work, as it was not overtly a part of the syllabuses. This is problematic, which is evident in Vicki’s narrative above, where no mention of resolution was forthcoming. In such situations, the AE tutor upholds the dominant ideological assumption of silence and resists the need for address, thus allowing the silence to possibly lead to hostility. In assessing whether the social order ‘needs’ the social wrong, these pedagogical approaches are indicators of a need to speak to ICU more directly, for instance, through selective topic choice and training.

Despite commitments to the university and pathway policy statements, the pathway context models of curricula delivery and social events management reveal that the complexity and value of ICU is not adequately realised in pathways, placing additional burden on tutors and students. In two pathways, the mental models in the researched pathways that the SCA analysis revealed were caring expressions; these contrasted with the more detached discourses of the third pathway.

4. How do the three context components (cognitive, social, and ideological) interrelate with the broader dominant culture?

Relationships with the cultures outside the pathway were largely beyond the scope of this research. However, Tronto (1993, pp. 106-108) sheds light on the possible semiotic origin of the different approaches to student social activities. As previously discussed, Tronto explains care as gendered, with “caring about” and “taking care of” aligned with the masculine traits of intelligence and assessment; these attributes may be recognised in academic culture’s address to real life issues as ‘topics’. “Care-giving” and “care-receiving” are aligned with emotion and the feminine but are active and creative traits that disrupt the constructed student passivity of transmissive pedagogies. The release of feminine expression may challenge phallogocentric practices (Derrida, 1978) and facilitate the expression and
recognition of multiplicities. This masculine/feminine split in care’s nature is reflected in the different styles of learning. In this reading, the Path 3 tutors were more closely associated with academia’s masculine elements of academic intelligence and assessment than the staff of Paths 1 and 2, even though, as has been pointed out, the two kinds of institutes overlap at the IELTS’ highest level, the EAP program. This may explain the Path 3 tutors’ more formal attitude towards the students. They also point to how the neoliberal influence of casualisation may disrupt the time available to develop and execute care.

Given the Path 1, 2 and 3 participants’ suggestions for changes to initiate stronger ICU and given the close association that each institute had within a university, it could be construed that the universities were entirely driving the intense economic emphasis with which participants expressed discomfort. Nevertheless, no mention of requests for the universities to change were forthcoming and nor was it articulated as an organised group aspiration. Rather, the staff complied with the ongoing demands. One participant stated, when asked for suggested changes: “You know, trying to encourage the students to actually get out into the world a bit more, not just sit in that classroom space. But that’s never going to happen” (Wendy, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, January 19, 2017).

In relation to the ideological dimension of contexts, the polarisation (van Dijk, 2016, p. 73) between many students’ explicit expression of love and the tutors’ discomfort with explicit love points to a difference in the way the emotional dimension may be read, for example, when comparing traditional Eurocentric interpretations with those often associated with east Asian countries. Problematically, cultural differences are often not recognised as valid foci for curricula content, but as inadequacies that need to be addressed in order to satisfy academic requirements (Hatoss, 2006; Prabhakar, 2014). As in the illustrations relating to expressions of love, tutors often require students to remove any emotional expression from their writings. This reveals how pedagogical approaches that do not relate to broader dominant culturalities are
perpetuating curriculums that lack relevance to students’ real experiences.

In contrast, as Thurgood (2018) asserts, a relevant unit would relate to wider social and political concepts, examine identity, subcultures and behaviours, and so relate to other disciplines, to other courses, past and present, to assessments, and to future workplaces. In applying Fairclough’s Stage 3 (whether the social order ‘needs’ the social wrong) to these practices, disconnection from the broader dominant culturalities strengthens the institute’s image and ability to function as an independent unit, which supports assessment demands and places greater pressure on students to conform. The pathway isolation endows greater power to its organisational structures. Insulation from the broader community minimises recognition of the importance of ICU for future contexts, creating an elevated ‘model’ in the AE tutor position. In Path 3, this social isolation was heightened; within the AE course, the absence of active coordinators, AE unit meetings, and detachment from students’ personal expressions promoted a more austere environment that upheld the power structures. The nature of social interactions perpetuated rather than challenged the pathways’ approaches to ICU.

The insights attained from the van Dijk SCA analysis of pathway identities are now compared and contrasted with the intercultural attributes provided in Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model.

Table 8: SCA Question 1 Insights Applied to Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive ICU Indicators</th>
<th>Negative ICU Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting Requisite Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Limiting Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers performing nurturing and caring behaviours – fosters interrelationships, “requisite attitudes” and deepens cultural understanding.</td>
<td>Students predominantly left to their own resources to learn to adjust to new culturalities; support networks not foregrounded; care often not explicit— inhibits “requisite attitudes”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ respect for others—cultivates respect for others and supports “requisite attitudes”.</td>
<td>Rejection of explicit caring expressions in favour of ‘objective’ persona—stultifies “openness”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Small classrooms and small student class numbers—facilitates discussion and interaction and fosters “respect” and “openness”.
- Promotion of oral expression and student interactions and selection of cultural similarities and differences for discussion (though limited)—promotes “requisite attitudes”, “culture-specific information”, and deeper cultural awareness and understanding.
- Supportive networks established internally and externally—enhances interrelationships and “requisite attitudes”.
- Teamwork and ‘team’ identities upheld by staff members—promotes “adaptability” and “flexibility”.
- Large classrooms used with large (25) student numbers—can render shared class discussion more difficult or less effective thus restricting “requisite attitudes”, “culture-specific information” and ICU “skills” development.
- Nearly all participants expressed desire for more social interaction—current pedagogical methodologies or pathway practices not adequately integrating social interactions to satisfy personal social desires—interrelationships and “requisite attitudes” are reduced.
- Dependency on the affiliation with the university to offer support networks. Student and Academic Services Officer operated in isolation—student and tutor interrelationships reduced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrators of support networks interacting with tutors— informs tutors of pathway’s social motivations and assists “adaptability”.</th>
<th>Lack of administrative support reinforced administrative power positions— maintains current negative practices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit time constraints and assessments highly demanding—undermines value of culturalities and social interaction; restricts growth of “requisite attitudes”.</td>
<td>Eurocentric ideological assumptions were commonly (unintentionally) expected—limits knowledge of culturalities and skills growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurocentric ideological assumptions were commonly (unintentionally) expected—limits knowledge of culturalities and skills growth.</td>
<td>Pedagogies not incorporating actual events or practices. Significant current socio-cultural issues not seen as closely connected with the pathway ‘knowledges’ and dealt with ‘ad hoc’—creates a superficial ‘knowledge’ context that sustains the (limiting) pathway knowledges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogies not incorporating actual events or practices. Significant current socio-cultural issues not seen as closely connected with the pathway ‘knowledges’ and dealt with ‘ad hoc’—creates a superficial ‘knowledge’ context that sustains the (limiting) pathway knowledges.</td>
<td>Most participants believed change lay with administrators— maintains power positions and continues restrictions on ICU growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most participants believed change lay with administrators— maintains power positions and continues restrictions on ICU growth.</td>
<td>Teachers acquiesced to administrative assessment demands— diminishes tutor expressions and actions for change so sustains inhibiting practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows that caring expressions and support networks feature prominently as performances that were likely to facilitate requisite attitudes towards ICU development. Other participants expressed factors revealing a lack of support networks. While some cultural traditions may include assumptions that individuals will create their own networks as part of a ‘coming of age’ process, there were clearly some expectations for more support. Insular learning contexts and heavy curricula demands placed barriers on student-student and student-tutor interactions and creative self-expression. Hence, numerous pathway practices and knowledges restricted the exploration of new knowledges and the skills involved in developing ICU.

5.2.2 Research question 2: ‘How do pedagogical practices, including curricula discourses, promote or impede ICU?’

2a. Fairclough’s DRA.

The delivery of a particular style of learning in AE classes also functioned to inhibit ICU potential. In Fairclough’s (2009) vernacular, ‘genres’ are “the use of language associated with a particular social activity” (Fairclough, 1993, p. 138) that carry “semiotic ways of acting and interacting” (p. 164). The pathway genre social activity that was chosen for analysis was curricula delivery. This genre contributed to the construction of pathway identities and governed interrelationships, the ways of acting and interacting between students, tutors, and administrators. Curricula delivery processes functioned as a substantial semiotic cause of the ‘social wrong’. The AE tutors apparently positioned students in passive submission to the academic text, which included the curricula and classroom space, but particularly the textbook or given handouts; it was assumed that the student would execute the exercises set under the tutor’s guidance. Within these normative processes, the textbook can become a materialisation of discourses that help shape the pathway’s education with a
classic transmissive approach to pedagogy over transformative, constructivist, collaborative, or student led approaches. In this classroom textbook reality, the student’s experience is rarely featured; perspectives may be sought individually or in paired or group work, but they are confined within the textbook relationship as it creates a context that students work through. The learning outcomes are predetermined. Alternative contexts, particularly the broader community cultures, are made absent. Students are not encouraged to relate to new realistic (external) contexts, so ‘discovery’ is entirely governed. The students’ passive behaviour is thus created and made normative.

Tutor passivity was also evidenced from the research interviews with all of the tutors denying that they discussed politics, other than incidentally and, even then, very briefly, and yet all of the texts (analysed in more detail in section 2b below) were filled with political topics, including language death, diversity, globalisation, health care, and government policies. Nevertheless, the tutors did not acknowledge the political nature of the texts. Possibly, the staff believed that it would reflect poorly on them if they admitted to discussing politics, but the more likely explanation is that they did not identify the textual content as political.

Some of the tutors (for example, Wendy, Germaine, Ruby, & Emma, 2017) intentionally screened or neutralised content, perhaps influenced by social pedagogical expectations to be politically neutral. Contested religious, ‘racial’, and political meanings associated with the knowledge content were removed:

The backgrounds of most of our students are very different, but also, for example, a lot of our students are Chinese so making any kind of criticism of the government is not something that they feel comfortable doing, and a lot of our students are also Islamic so those two groups together often don’t find a common ground on those
topics, so I tend to avoid them. (Germaine, Path 1 tutor, personal communication, January 20, 2017)

There was this thing about the news and they show images of bomber attacks and things like that and they talk about terrorism and I’ve always gone that’s highly inappropriate when we have Arabic speakers, people from the Middle East, Muslim students in the classroom, and I’m always going “Oh God, I think I’ll avoid this because it might just, if they understand, make them feel uncomfortable”. (Wendy, tutor, personal communication, January 19, 2017)

By avoiding discussion of terrorism, Wendy does not deal with terrorism as a significant disturbing social issue, and possibly perpetuates students’ false connections between (all/any) Muslims and terrorism. The tutors discussed the text content as themes and the absence of specific contexts meant that, for them, the texts were neutral. In this way, the texts’ long-term political effect of passivity production remained hidden (Apple, 2017; Giroux, 1980; Giroux & Purpel, 1983). While students may have questioned the underlying messages of given themes (Apple, 1982/2017, p. 8), their open critique of religious, ‘racial’, and political meanings were left unexpressed within a neutralising context, while their own preconceptions were left unexplored or challenged.

The value that tutors allude to in not discussing cultural similarities and differences was to avoid conflict and show respect for the individual rights of different beliefs and physical signifiers. The topic omissions, however, did not function to create a condition of accord:

Sometimes students don’t understand me – they ask me about my scarf. Some students here are aggressive. They think I’m rich – to pay for their food – but I just
told them I don’t have enough money. (Alya, Path 3 student, personal communication, May 17, 2017)

I think the Aboriginal people I heard a lot of bad things from my friends, told me about the Aboriginal people drink at night and do something bad. (John, Path 1 student, personal communication, February 7, 2017)

People don’t want to interact with you because you’re not the same colour… In the class, some students don’t want to contribute—put back to me. They are just backing me and just talking to others. (Mary, Path 3 student, personal communication, May 16, 2017)

The nature of discrimination is subtle: being avoided, not being spoken to, being constantly questioned, being turned away from, but they are all exclusionary (Baak, 2018) and insensitive behaviours. Hence, a distinct contributor to ongoing discrimination was a lack of open discussion on culturalities and this absence could be seen as helping to maintain stereotypical assumptions and offensive discrimination. As stated earlier, the resistance to political and religious discussion and difference perpetuated the inequalities existing between the White English academic tutor and the diversity of international students. The refusal to acknowledge student diverse identities and the control over topic choices arrests change, stultifies recognition of difference, hides the arts, creativity and colour and asserts once again the ‘White’ English monoculture as the ruling elite.

A lack of professional development on ICU also facilitated contradictory interpretations of ICU among educators. Professional development on ICU was either not provided or offered online among many other topic choices (Path 3), and the latter which was entirely by choice was to be completed in the tutor’s own time. The ‘professionals’ were also
other tutors in different branches of the company. While recognising the tutors may have had expertise in their chosen subjects, they may not necessarily be recognised as expert in that field in the wider community.

Tutors conceived of ICU in significantly different and sometimes conflicting ways. All discourses referred to cultures within homogenised national imagery. A number of tutors clearly believed that knowledge about another culture played a critical role in ICU and that different cultures are learning from each other. One tutor believed that the natural disposition is to want to understand another culture and that other cultures are not something to be scared of (Kevin, Path 2 tutor, personal communication, 5 April, 2017), while most tutors posited that the ability to accept difference was something difficult, a challenge, through which respect should be maintained. Varying from the earlier stated belief that the culture needed to be generally understood dwelled another belief that the other culture could not be understood. In this perspective, understanding of the other culture was not considered necessary, as long as respect for the other existed, that people were open-minded, not judgmental, and open to new ideas. The need to understand was thus not recognised as a prerequisite to acceptance.

The administrators indicated the following perspectives about the nature of the development of interculturality in the pathways. Generally, explanations of ICU pointed to how a particular view of Australian culture is presented to students rather than to how international cultural differences are incorporated into the institutes, evidencing a limited, unidirectional interpretation of interculturality.

For all interviewed administrators, the English units’ focus on accommodating AE conventions was considered the main shift in cultural understanding:

Writing that’s linear, that follows rules, which has an introduction, main body, conclusion, which has very different meanings in their first culture, their first language, to be able to be understood. So that is a clear movement from first culture
expression to new culture expression. (Colin, administrator, personal communication, January 19, 2017)

The texts and curricula, including students’ online tasks, were viewed as intercultural due to their incorporation of content relating to different nations and showing modern cultural responses to digital media. In Path 1, for example, students could choose from Thailand, Nepal and Brazil as a country of focus to write on the topic of a ‘developing’ country.

Another administrator view was that intercultural understanding occurred through expressions of care:

- Within the centre the staff are very caring and that’s come across in a lot of surveys, student surveys, about the extra length that our staff members do. It’s not just you know their curricular work or anything like that; it’s also about integrating into [the local area]. (Belinda, Path 2 administrator, personal communication, March 29, 2017)

Intercultural learning was interpreted broadly and showed genuine concern for the student experience; administrators were considerate of incidental interactions: teaching students that putting a car in at a garage does not entail watching “the workmen all day to make sure that they don’t swipe the parts that you’re paying for” (Judith, administrator, personal communication, January 18, 2017); gaining assistance with relating to TELSTRA for a phone plan (Belinda, Path 2 administrator, personal communication, January 18, 2017); or accessing pathway extra-curricula events, such as “multilingual salons” (Shane, Path 2 administrator, personal communication, March 29, 2017) where students deliver lessons on a voluntary basis about their own ‘home’ cultures.

Two administrators expressed uncertainty about the integration of IU development in the unit programs:
I don’t know if they do actually… I guess it would happen because there are changing events in countries all the time … But it’s not an explicit thing. (Colin, Path 1 administrator, personal communication, January 19, 2017)

Yeah, I mean hopefully, hopefully the communication courses are reflecting the changing socio-cultural environment that students are part of…. (Harold, Path 3 administrator, personal communication, May 24, 2017)

Administrators also conveyed an underlying assumption that tutors shared their views, but with the tutors varying in their interpretations of interculturality, as the above analysis demonstrates, that was not verified.

In the interviews, tutors also revealed that the issues that confronted them required shifts in perspective and pedagogy.

I guess my biggest culture shock for students was the large influx of people from Saudi Arabia. I had to really work hard at and get up to speed on cultural issues between men and women and me being female, lots of things. …They didn’t want their women in a class with other Saudi men. This made it difficult…. We couldn’t change all our classes so we put the women up the back and they were allowed to sort of work from there, and that’s where you start to build up, putting them with other students and whatever. (Emma, Path 2 tutor, personal communication, May 4, 2017)

The intention to equalise the classroom in terms of gender determined the tutors’ actions, while their awareness of the students’ concerns was evidently troubling for them.

The political and religious suppressions again point to a “contradiction” (Fairclough, 2009, 173; Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 36) or “omission” (van Dijk, 2009, p. 71). The depoliticising role that tutors adopted concealed the actual political effect of producing passive identities and contexts. From an intersectional perspective, their caring personas
appeared to interconnect with and be supported by neoliberal “naturalization of market logics” (Rizvi, 2009, p. 254) that gave emphasis to economic gain over social issues. This enablement of a neutralising tutor persona is an additional strong contributing factor to the creation of the ‘social wrong’.

In tutors’ demands for positivist expressions of objectivity, students had little opportunity to personally express themselves. Verbal and written expressions were confined to particular modes: argument, comparison and contrast, problem-solution, for example; narrative was also completely excluded and all tutors stated that they discouraged the ‘I’ persona. The practices support Lausch, Teman, and Perry’s research findings (2017) that students’ individual identities are largely unrecognised in postgraduate international student classrooms. Student writings were meant to conform to particular cultural conventions that were cultivated as ‘academic’ but were in keeping with positivist perspectives (where academia includes honest attention to others’ perspectives and sincere expression of one’s own views) that stultify self-expression.

These insights signify a patriarchal split between the emotional, affective dimension and the cognitive dimension (Boler & Zembylas, 2016; Kristeva, 1980, 1982, 1984, 1989). The absence of the feminine provides a vacuum to project and impose subordination. The lack of opportunities for students to share in personal narrative discussion is indicative of masculinised cultures, for if students (and tutors) were free to share their experience and discuss the ‘how and why’ of their beliefs, the classroom dynamic would become engaged with the construction of social knowledge (Gillman, 2013; S. Mohanty, 2000).

Further within the genre focus of curricula delivery, Fairclough (2009) points to numerous characteristics that enable language to function to support the new global order, including the absence of time, and universality (indifference to place), and he also emphasises the need to “include analysis of how the relations of past/present to the future are
represented because that affects what is seen as desirable and what is seen as possible” (2015, p. 42).

Within each pathway, the removal of present time and present place occurred at the semiotic dimension through the creation of a narrative with a strong plot along a linear time frame marked by assessments. In each pathway, all meaning was focused on the future through a curriculum that was dedicated to assessment items, valuing demonstrable outcomes and measurement, as demanded in contemporary incarnations of neoliberal capitalism. In Path 1, assessments occurred at the EAP level 4 in week 4 as a means of determining students at risk, with the main assessments, seven in all, occurring in the unit’s final week of week 10. In Path 2, assessments were continuous, with twelve across the four learning modes held within the ten weeks. In Path 3, six assessments occurred over the thirteen weeks, including an ongoing homework assessment, two in-class tests, an essay, a speech delivery, and a final examination. The assessments strongly influenced subject agency and ICU development, because they governed the focus of staff and students’ attentions. The assessments were explicitly explained on the basis of achieving university entry, and implicitly justified through the value aims of a future degree and employment. Managerial financial purpose was also evident through the tight time frames that assessments were contained within.

In summary, the overwhelming principal ontological presence in primary discourses was Eurocentric, through the exclusion of multiple cultural perspectives and expressions. Arguably, this is the nature of AE education that many of the students were seeking in choosing to study in Australia (Soong, 2018) in the perception that the ‘Western’ experience has particular value. Nevertheless, this current ‘Western’ hegemonic character need not negate the accommodation of deeper attention to ICU. Instruction in formal AE combined with continuous assessment requirements, provided little time to discuss prior learning or foreground differing current perspectives, or to actually become involved in social issues—
individually, in groups, or as a class. This management of perception (Fairclough, 2001, p. 10), speaking from a contrived objective, impersonal position, functioned as an obstacle to effective intercultural interactions. In applying Fairclough’s Stage 3 to research question 2, the social order does not need the social wrong of limiting pedagogical approaches with passive, transmissive learning styles. Rather, it appears that the need for change requires targeted professional development on this issue, and institutional flexibility and willingness to rewrite units so that they more directly relate to actual local, national, and global communities.

The results show that Deardorff’s intercultural competency characteristics in her 2006 Pyramid Model were only partially addressed, as evident in the following table.
Table 9: DRA Question 2 Insights Applied to Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive ICU Indicators</th>
<th>Negative ICU Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting Requisite Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Limiting Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators and tutors addressed students’ knowledge of various Australian culturalities – supports development of “requisite attitudes” towards Australian citizens and “culture-specific information”, “sociolinguistic awareness” and “deep understanding and knowledge of culture”.</td>
<td>Interculturality was often interpreted as mainly concerned with learning about Australian culturalities – denies recognition of student and other culturalities and restricts knowledge and understanding of new culturalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum delivery positioned students as passive; textbook exercise completion and learning outcomes not investigative, exploratory – stifles openness and creativity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and religious content excluded or neutralised – suppresses cultural awareness and knowledges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External socio-cultural occurrences excluded – stultifies growth of “requisite attitudes”, “culture-specific information”, “deep understanding and knowledge of culture” and “skills” development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A lack of professional development on ICU meant that staff had unshared differing views on ICU. This may have still resulted after PD sessions, but those varying perspectives would have been more informed – significance of culturalities among staff varied and lacked purpose or direction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tutors and administrators perceived ICU development in terms of students learning about Australian cultures – demonstrates a lack of respect for student culturalities and dulls “requisite attitudes” and “knowledge and comprehension”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and written expression restricted personal expression – limits “openness” and “curiosity and discovery”, since without subjective expressions, students will not be learning as much from each other as potentially possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments focused attention on the future which eradicated the present – current practices have no explicit value so address to ICU (or to any significant change) is seen as of no particular relevance to current practice, which undermines knowledges and “skills” development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 illustrates that student and tutor “knowledge and comprehension” (p. 254) of various culturalities is minimal. The “desired internal outcomes” (p. 254) are also undeveloped, with ongoing discrimination and criticism of numerous cultural signifiers demonstrating a lack of “ethnoreal view” and “empathy” (p. 254). These responses are indicative of lacking in “requisite attitude” (p. 254), which demonstrates that student orientations to diversity are inadequately pedagogically approached. These findings further indicate that characteristics toward developing intercultural competence, as outlined in Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model, are restricted in their progression toward “behaving and communicating effectively and appropriately” (p. 254) because without subjective expression, students will not be learning as much from each other as potentially possible.

2b. van Leeuwen’s social practices approach (SPA).

The following adopts van Leeuwen’s social practices approach (SPA) to analyse the three curriculum documents of the three pathways, in order to determine how the curriculum discourses might affect the ways that ICU is approached or activated. The three documents were:


- Path 2. (2017). English for academic purposes handbook: ELICOS program for international students. Institute place and publisher withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study.

- Path 3. (2017). Course Outline. Unit title withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study. Institute place and publisher withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study.
The aim was to locate how tutor and student identities were constructed in the curriculums, by examining how actors were positioned towards ICU, both in degree of attention to ICU and the kind of roles or identities that might be acknowledged or assumed in approaching intercultural concepts and activities that may enhance ICU. The approach was thus relevant to the research questions, shedding light on how ICU was perceived and valued within the pathway. The specific questions applied in the research were:

1. “What kinds of actions are attributed to what kinds of participants?” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 151).
2. “What kinds of actions tend to be objectivated, de-agentialized and so on?” (p. 151).

van Leeuwen’s schema of the crucial elements of social practices and, second, the “social action network” were adopted for analysis (pp. 141-151).

1. “What kinds of actions are attributed to what kinds of participants?” (p. 151)

The student and tutor identities as they were constructed in each pathway’s written curricula were addressed in analysis. The student’s eligibility as a student is positioned through “performance modes” (p. 142), which characterise students, directing their actions and the manner that actions are executed. The student learning within each of the three contexts is clearly outlined and tightly controlled. van Leeuwen classifies social actors “as ‘agents’ (doers of action), ‘patients’ (participants to whom actions are done), or ‘beneficiaries’ (participants who benefit from an action)” (p. 142). In the below analysis, the three identities are each activated at different times, indicating a multi-dimensional foundation to the projected student personas and revealing interconnectedness and intersectional binding.
In the curriculum documents, the students appear to be made the agents of the action, the doers:

“asking questions”, “explaining, summarising, paraphrasing” (Path 1, 2015, p. 9);
“read and comprehend”; “extract main and supporting information” (Path 2, 2017, p. 4); “demonstrate”, “discuss and apply”, “develop skills for ...” (Path 3, 2017, p. 2)

In this role, the student is attributed with high ability modality; their potential achievements are foregrounded. Becoming academic is attainable through completing a finite list of specific tasks, and the actions are represented as “material actions”, not semiotic, which makes the required behaviour not only concrete, identifiable and achievable, but also “seem more active and dynamic” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 143).

While the assessment tasks aim to promote individual development, value is also attributed to the ability to effectively interact. Emphasis is given to developing listening and speaking skills and to participation engagement in each program. Language that indicates the potential employment of ICU skills include:

“to extend the learner’s awareness of cross-cultural differences and their ability to use language appropriately to negotiate these differences” (Path 1, 2015, p. 7);
“…expressing your own opinion…responding to questions…asking questions, referring to the opinions or views of others” (Path 2, 2017, p. 11); “working in teams … group work” (Path 3, 2017, p. 6).

The students, however, may also be seen as “patients” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 142) because they are answering to instructions; the tutor will have the students fulfil a range of skills and strategies: This adoption of a ‘patient’ persona is given further weight through the enforced language of assessment.
“Teachers monitor the progress”; “Teachers give feedback” (Path 1, 2015, p. 15);
“You will be required to read …”; “You must complete …” (Path 2, 2017, p. 7);
“Students are expected to…”; “You are reminded that …” (Path 3, 2017, p. 4).

Becoming a student requires submission to the tutor’s agency and participation sits within this condition.

The tutors are continuously “agents” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 142), creating and moulding the academic student persona. The curricula occasionally describe the role of the tutors in positive terms:

“provide opportunities”; “develop skills and strategies” (Path 1, 2015, p. 7);
“you will be awarded” (Path 2, 2017, p. 7); “you will also be taught” (Path 2, 2017, p. 11); “teachers will provide…” (Path 3, 2017, p. 4).

The students are also “beneficiaries” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 142), learning the skills necessary to enter and succeed at university, but that entry is established as elitist through the imperative voice of authority:

“Students should … be able to” (Path 1, p. 9); “employ appropriate…” (Path 1, 2015, p. 9); “participate in” (p. 9); “respond to” (p. 9); “On successful completion of this course, students should have the following skills…” (Path 2, 2017, p. 4); “You should attend…” (p. 6); “You will be required…” (p. 11); “You need to spend” (Path 3, 2017, p. 4); “You are expected to” (p. 4); “You must” (p. 8).

The process and setting are established as hierarchical, which removes equity principles and undermines the development of ICU. The personas of agent, patient and beneficiary combine and intersect to orientate the student towards assuming a passive persona. This insight also provides a strong complementary perspective on the preceding section’s discernments gained through application of Fairclough’s DRA lens.
2. “What kinds of actions tend to be objectivated, de-agentialized and so on?” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 151).

With student subjectivities removed through non-acknowledgement, “deletions” (p. 143) are evident. Emphasis is on the individual adopting their new student role, while the text content semiotically asserts additional subjectivities as irrelevant to present and future academic contexts. “Legitimation” (p. 144) of selectivity (deletion of multiple identities) appears to draw upon a moral interpretation of academic text that is not foregrounded in the curricula. Brick, for example, emphasises that adherence to academic conventions, such as logical, rational and impersonal discourse, aids in foregrounding issues because “knowledge develops through discussion, debate and argument” (2009, p. 5). Knowledges are recognised as cultural and constructed. The curriculum documents, in contrast, give no mention of any broader socio-cultural motivations for working towards achieving the acquisition of academic conventions; the aims are confined to the university setting:

“… to function within an English speaking university” (Path 1, 2015, p. 7); “….for future success at university” (Path 2, 2017, p. 2); “… to interact, participate and communicate effectively in an academic and professional environment” (Path 3, 2017, p. 2).

The brief “legitimations” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 144) relate wholly to required university skills, not to the benefits that academia can bring to the broader social arena such as social improvements occurring through public debate. The aims are essentially individualist and instrumentalist and place no value on others or society. The ideological support for committing to study is confined to the needs of university and employment, and these needs are idealised through their abstract presentation.

The brevity of legitimation serves to further validate the discourse and may be seen as a form of “addition” (p. 144), for the absence of explanation “naturalizes” (p. 149) the
commands. They are also “de-agentialized” (p. 149). It is often the courses or modules within the course that are doing the action, or an unstated source assessing the student:

“… modules provide”; “the range of modules … aim to develop” (Path 1, 2015, p. 11); “The purpose of the exams is not to test content but to test skills learned through the course” (Path 2, 2017, p. 14); “Lectures are used to discuss and demonstrate …” (Path 3, 2017, p. 4).

These examples also demonstrate that the didactic de-agentialized voice “generalizes” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 150) action. The focus is not on a specific assessment task but on the overall development of skills. The discourse asserts unquestionable authority, which positions the student in submission. Learning is not described in terms of the control that students may have over their learning. Hence, the discourse does not speak to the reader as a creative decision-making entity but serves toward consolidating the student identity as in a particular process, with demonstrable outcomes. Student commitment is tightly held through the continuous assessment schedules. Barriers to academic success, such as inadequate comprehension and writing skills, are not explicitly stated, but are implicit throughout with the pronounced grading system, which further legitimates the discourse demands. It is clear that the overall aims of the curriculums are to sharpen each individual’s abilities for each student’s own benefit, while the development of ICU is not clearly integral to this process.

The space of learning is also confined, constructed as separate from the socio-cultural actual world. Apart from one excursion in Path 2, the learning is to take place entirely inside the classroom; further, with the exception of Path 1’s inclusion of a guest lecture, the outside only enters into the classroom through the given academic texts. They may filter the actual or overlay the actual with alternative meaning. Additional resources are minimal: access to the Internet and a projector. The student actions are thus predominantly “non-transactive” (p. 148), involving only the student or discussions with the other students in the class. The
curriculums thereby “infuse a version of a social practice with representations of the actors’ reactions to the actions that constitute the practice” (p. 147); the continuum of assessments become representative of the position that should be associated with the content, which is removal from actuality and acceptance and drive toward each assessment, since student actions and reactions are only “activated” (p. 149), represented dynamically as actions, through assessments and their consequent progression through the course. The discourse thus engages the mythic impulse of the heroic quest, exemplifying “symbolization” as a form of “overdetermination” (p. 150) and the quest is individualised. The individual’s interdependency with others is almost entirely deleted, and with it, a recognition of the values of ICU.

Another obstacle to identifying the social wrong is thus identified in the way that agency is delineated in curriculum documents. Applying Fairclough’s Stage 3 to this obstacle, the selective channelling of student agency is acting as an unnecessary hindrance to the development of ICU.

When applied to Deardorff’s 2006 Model, the van Leeuwen analysis also highlights contradictions at the semiotic ideological level of text.
Table 10: SPA Question 2 Insights Applied to Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive ICU Indicators</th>
<th>Negative ICU Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting Requisite Attitude,</strong></td>
<td><strong>Limiting Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students are made agents of action – facilitates potential openness through promoting individual positioning.</th>
<th>Students are “patients” and “beneficiaries” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 142) so their agency is diminished – undermines respect for self and other students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction is valued – fosters “requisite attitudes”, “culture-specific information”, “flexibility”, “ethnoretative view”, and “empathy”.</td>
<td>Student subjectivities are deleted – denies personal expression, “cultural self-awareness” and inhibits “respect” for other culturalities or for diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are not positioned in control of their learning, while learning is individualised – social interaction is not emphasised and “respect”, “openness”, “knowledge and comprehension”, and “skills” assume insignificance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows that while students are given agency, their agency is conditional and strongly regulated. The denial of student subjectivities is incongruous to the enhancement of exploratory agency and “curiosity and discovery”. Tutors’ ascribed supervisory agency hinders student agency. Pedagogies include limited social connections, which weakens the social value of all practices, while strengthening the pathway’s inner contexts. Student-student and student-tutor interrelationships are diluted through the emphasis on individual attainments. The multiple culturalities that students are bringing into the pathway, often referred to in value statements welcoming international students into courses, are not addressed.

2c. Reisigl and Wodak’s discourse-historical approach (DHA).

The identified social wrong of a lack of address to ICU was further investigated through Reisigl and Wodak’s DHA (2016), adopting each pathway’s main reading resource as the medium. The DHA analysis extended understanding of the nature of ICU in pathway
contexts through systematic examination of the curricula texts, and further exposed the political nature of the classrooms that was either unheeded or actively denied. Analysis elucidated how textbook personas may function to inhibit student identities and interactions.

DHA requires “selection and downsizing of data according to relevant criteria…” (2016, p. 34). Path 1 listed five core texts for the Level 4 unit, one main reading text, one main writing text, two reading and writing texts, which were interrelated, and an introductory text on academic culture. Path 2 listed one essential reading textbook and one essential writing textbook. Path 3 students required one textbook. As stated in Chapter Four, analysis was applied to excerpts from the main reading textbooks that were predominantly employed in each of the pathway’s AE classrooms, because, as readings, the texts were dense with meaning. The second research question—‘How do pedagogical practices, including curricula discourses, promote or impede ICU?’—was related to the three discourses. The question was addressed through Reisigl and Wodak’s five strategic questions, which are also provided in Chapter Three and Appendix E:

1. How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?
2. What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?
3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?
4. From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?
5. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, intensified or mitigated?
The following DHA analysis addresses a paragraph from Path 1’s main reading text, *Making Connections 3* (Pakenham et al., 2013, p. 113). The paragraph comprises nine sentences and the top half wraps around a close-up colour photo of a young woman wearing a colourful hijab, with only her eyes and eyebrows exposed. The background, the backs of a couple of people and a Pakistani flag, is out of focus. Her left hand, which is perhaps adjusting the hijab, is next to her face and is decorated with sienna tattoos. The text is descriptive of two main responses to the banning of the hijab in French state schools. It does not include citations. The excerpt is provided in Appendix F and is immediately followed with the DHA analysis in Table 13. The following five DHA responses have grown from the analysis in Table 13.

1. How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?

The main discourse topics are identified as:

- Diversity as a racial and ethnic conflict
- Young women wearing hijabs, a religious symbol
- Hijabs as a controversial garment
- Muslims living in France
- French government ban on the hijab in state schools
- French public support for the ban
- Critics of the ban

The topics are interrelated by an attribution of political significance, both within the immediate French context and globally. This is made explicit, first, through the mention of the French government’s ban and also in the discourse’s position within the chapter, “Multicultural Societies”, within a reading “The Challenge of Diversity” (pp. 110-115).
under the subheading, “Discrimination Against Resident Minorities” (p. 111). References to numerous countries place the discourse in a global context. The text’s adoption of comparison and contrast terminology strengthens the construction of difference and debate that the hijab is claimed to be causing: terms such as “the ban”, “secular country”, “French public”, “French society”, “integration” and “state schools” are placed in opposition to critics of “the ban”, “Muslim”, “religion”, “Arabic”, “private schools”, “headscarves”, “hijab”, “highly visible article of clothing”, and “religious symbols”.

2. What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?

The minority group of Muslim women in France and their wearing of headscarves are attributed with causing the creation of the controversy. It is a “highly visible article of clothing” that “has sparked” the controversy. In contrast, the onus of the ban is attributed to the French law (“a French law banned”), not the French people. Similarly, it is “this thinking”, again, not the French people, that believes the ban will prevent the splitting up of society into ethnic communities and accomplish the integration of Muslims into French society. The critics of the ban, however, are directly linked to the verbs: they “think” the ban violates an individual’s freedom of expression, “see” the ban as discriminatory, and “believe” that the ban is an obstacle to the integration of Muslims into French society.

3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?

The text exists within the predication that in an academic reading, attention may be given to differing views openly and equally. Both responses to the French government’s ban on the hijab in state schools—the French public and the critics—have supporting arguments. The French public are said to believe that “in a secular country, religion should be a private
matter; the ban would have a unifying effect”—it would better facilitate the integration of Muslims into French society. The critics argue that the ban violates an individual’s freedom of expression. It is seen as discriminatory because it forces young Muslim women into private schools. The critics also see the ban as an obstacle to the integration of Muslims into French society. The actual view of the “young Muslim women” is not provided, and it is not stated whether or not the critics include the voices of the young women, echo them, or are an entirely separate group. The text’s use of the unidentified “critics” suggests the latter.

4. From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?

The discourse perspective retains European ownership of the controversy, creating and controlling both views. This ownership is evidenced from the beginning. The statement, “At times, something particular about a minority group creates controversy”, attributes the cause of controversy with the minority group; linguistically, it is the discourse that is creating the division. The photo caption has the same effect: “The wearing of headscarves by Muslim women in Europe has caused controversy”; the hegemonic power and control over creating division, the negative response to a scarf, is thus hidden. The “At times” also normalises (Foucault, 1978) controversy between minority and majority groups as a regular, expected and ‘natural’ occurrence. In addition, nationalist homogeneity is upheld. The use of “unifying effect” is placed in opposition to “splitting up of society into ethnic communities”, so, again, “ethnic communities” are constructed and viewed as divisive; they are better if “integrated” into “French society”; no emphasis is given to the “French society” making accommodating cultural shifts.
5. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, intensified or mitigated?

Epistemic mitigation is evident in the exclusion of quotations and citations. The text provides opposing views ostensibly from an objective viewpoint. However, whereas the discourse’s implicit argumentation that multiple perspectives will provide a balanced account of an issue, the authors have implicitly carried Eurocentric ontological assumptions that create and exclude an Other that consists of Muslims, youths, and women. The argument is intensified through the contraction of the two views, presenting them as in equal opposition with two supporting arguments provided for each side.

Reisigl and Wodak’s (2016) “argumentation scheme” (p. 35) contains two relevant rules for such analyses as this:

1. Use of plausible schemes of argumentation—claims may not be regarded as conclusively defended if the defence does not take place by means of an appropriate argumentation scheme correctly applied.

2. Logical validity—an argumentation that is presented in an explicit and complete way must not contradict the rules of logic. (p. 36)

The text’s exclusion of the voices of Muslims, youths, and women and the contraction of the arguments violates both of the rules. The attribution of the controversy to the Muslim women wearing hijabs instead of to the French public response to the hijab violates the second rule. From a DHA perspective, the text may thus be classified as “fallacious” (p. 35). The exclusion of relevant voices and the brevity of the discourse also limit an adequate understanding of the two views.

The text’s positioning of the reader as passive is an obstacle to identifying the social wrong. In this process, the student’s passive persona intersects with an objectified knowledge of intercultural learning, resulting in the students’ interpretation of ICU being constructed
within a particularly limited response. There is no apparent encouragement to question or critique the text or the presented cultures, as the text is didactic in style. Applying Fairclough’s Stage 3 to this obstacle, the discourse is considered to sit within a closed ‘textbook’ genre, but one that could immediately be thrust open with a young, female Muslim voice, expressive of the given picture. Such a voice could occur in the classroom and could be promoted through the text. Instead, masculine dominance is maintained, and ICU is again inhibited.

**Text two**

Path 2’s main reading text, Westbrook’s *Unlock Level 3 Reading & Writing Skills 3* (2014), comprises ten units, and each unit incorporates videos, readings, and exercises in vocabulary, grammar, critical thinking and writing. The entire text consistently relates to broad social problems such as endangered species, traffic congestion, and the causes of deforestation, as well as ethical concerns in academia, including avoiding generalisations, identifying purpose in text, and evaluating evidence. A number of the videos are on different nations: Customs in Dagestan, Egyptian archaeology, Indian transport, Alaskan glaciers.

The article chosen for analysis and the given associated grammatical exercises (pp. 36-38) sit within the broader context of a unit titled “Customs and Traditions” (pp. 32-49) and are presented as Reading 1: “Customs Around the World” (p. 36). The excerpt is provided in Appendix F and immediately followed with the DHA analysis in Table 14. A macro analysis identifies the main discourse topics as reading comprehension, vocabulary, and discussion skills. Three sets of exercises precede Reading 1 under the title “Preparing to Read” (p. 36), which asks readers to scan the article for five given words, answer five comprehension questions, and to read the article and identify a word that is not in the article from a list of seven words. Another three sets of exercises follow Reading 1. The student is
told to match given sentence halves, to make inferences from the reading, to state whether they have ever been abroad, to name a country they would like to visit, and to provide advice they would give to a visitor to their own country.

The selected Reading 1 is stated as originating from a magazine article but is embedded without clear signs of either its origins or value. The only evidence that the text is from a magazine, or from an outside source, is that the opening paragraph refers to “our ‘Customs around the world’ series … of which this month’s locations are Brazil, Japan and India” (p. 37). The Reading’s topics focus on differences between Brazil, Japan and India: greeting customs, dressing for business and dinners, appropriate gifts in business and for dinner hosts, and appropriate behaviours for business meetings. The discourses have no overt political associations. The following five DHA responses are drawn from the analysis in Table 14.

1. How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?

Each nation’s people are homogenised: “Brazilians are very friendly”; “The Japanese […] can be quite formal”; “Hierarchy is important in India”. The nations are thus oversimplified. Brazil, for example, has around 150 languages; the nations do not exist in the homogenised form that they are presented and so the imagery does not reflect the actual world.

2. What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?

The reader is predicated on a business identity: “to help you prepare for that important trip”; “so that you don’t upset your foreign contacts”, “in a business meeting” “if you go to a
business meeting”, “your company”, “hand over a business card”. Further predications include: the reader will be travelling to numerous countries; conducting business overseas is manageable (easily achieved) as long as you follow some simple rules; and visitors should conform to a nation’s traditional customs: “Brazilians …touch each other’s arms, elbows and back regularly while speaking. You should not move away if this happens”.

The student persona is also characterised as simplistic and easily manipulated. In a text that is written for students learning English, the question “Have you ever been abroad?” demonstrates either a lack of thought about the student’s situation or a patronising attitude. The questions also predominantly relate to the concrete level of the text and have no in depth query of the countries. In addition, because the article is not clearly presented as a magazine article, its intertextuality is disguised and shifts the reader from ‘student’ to a fictitious ‘businessperson’, operationalising neoliberal values rather than academic interrogation.

3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?

A high level of oversimplification is evident in the nominated Reading, “Customs Around the World” and is reflected in the author’s instructive persona. No arguments are posited in the discourse, as the persona is rigidly didactic and locks the student persona into a simplistic, two-dimensional figure that has nothing meaningful to discover or contribute.

4. From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?

The “perspective of the nomination, attributions and [non] arguments expressed” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2016, p. 32) is completely void of any attempt at intercultural communication. Instead, the persona’s position seems to be absorbed in re-creating meaningless exercises, viewing learning as a process that can be disconnected from meaning,
and, in this practice, with the reader relationships occurring at a semiotic level, Westbrook appears to be incognisant.

The student’s relationship with the actual world is thus lost through the text’s meaninglessness, where place is fallacious and time is non-existent, both in the instructor’s persona and the nominated intertext. This is also indicative of Fairclough’s critique of discourses as inculcating new ways of being (2009, p. 165). Without place, either in the pathway context or in the textual context, the student identity’s interaction with subject content is limited in capacity to apply critical interpretation. This is exacerbated when the ‘I’ persona is also prohibited in written texts. Further, without time or space location in their responses to texts, students are made passive and removed from responsibility (Fairclough, 2009). Placed within a linear time frame in a space that has no place, other than in relation to the last or next assessment item, the student persona as an active, expressive, interconnected agent is stifled through the power of the text, confined to a closed classroom context.

5. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, intensified or mitigated?

The textbook persona is didactic. The nominated Reading, which is identified as a business magazine, aims to instruct the reader on correct behaviour in different countries. The authorial voice adopts a position of absolute authority with consistent imperative verbs: “stay clear of…”, “arrive at least…”, “don’t stand too close”.

In application of Fairclough’s Stage 3, therefore, the obstacle is considered unnecessary for the social order. The nature of ICU that is constructed in the textbook appears to be tokenistic. The authorial voice seems careless with textual power. The provided thematic chapters, including “Customs and Traditions” (p. 32), “Environment” (p. 86), and “Fashion” (p. 140), suggest concern for social communities, but no action for change is seriously addressed, and this absence of care is hidden. There is intent to teach critical
thinking, but the exercises are closed and circulate within and through the textbook’s imaginary, rather than actively connecting the student to real life cultures. Even where students may be given the stimulus and time to associate the new learning with their own experience, which is understood to promote comprehension (Dewey, 1902/2008; Inhelder & Piaget, 1958; Kovarova, 2006; S. McCormick, 1995; Piaget, 1936/1952; Sikkema & Sauerwein, 2015), further potential developments that could grow from those associations dissipate without explanation or recognition. The purpose of the text, to educate the individual student for university entry, is maintained within a vacuum. The student’s focus will remain on their own individual futures, because their passive, individualist student identity is acknowledged, while their additional personal identities and agencies are unheeded. As with Text 1, the student passive persona is intersecting with an objectified knowledge of intercultural learning. Learning is contracted into a linear process: masculinist order is sustained, as students are absorbed into hegemonic powers. This process contributes toward obstructing recognition of the ‘social wrong’.

**Text three**

Whereas Paths 1 and 2 texts employed themes to develop academic skills, Brick’s text, *Academic Culture: A Student’s Guide to Studying at University* (2009) approaches the physical features of the modes of academic communication and the underlying attitudes and values explicitly. As Brick explains in a video (2016), the focus is on the ‘why’ of academic culture, rather than the ‘how’. Topics that are addressed within the text include: an author’s position, sources, voice, essay and report writing, seminars, and group work. Terms such as ‘culture’ and ‘English-speaking universities’ are defined. Examples of formal and informal writings promote comparisons, which elucidate physical differences between academic and non-academic texts. The excerpt selected for a DHA analysis is “What type of argument do
university lecturers expect?” (p. 38). The text occurs within a chapter on “Inductive and Deductive Thinking” (pp. 35-45), after an explanation on the nature of inductive and deductive argument, as well as examples of both forms. A paragraph titled “Do I have to write a deductive argument?” follows the text, advising students that while deductive organisation is not essential, students who do not use it may be marked down. The excerpt is provided in Appendix F and is followed with the DHA analysis in Table 15. The five DHA questions are applied to the analysis.

1. How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?

The use of “Most lecturers in English-speaking universities expect …” and “people who come from cultures which favour inductive organisation” indicates that Brick (2009) is attempting to select language carefully to clarify academic culture within the parameters of the “common culture of universities of Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, the UK and the USA” (p. 3). The delineations outline two groups of social actors, those who are accustomed to a deductive style of communication and those who are accustomed to an inductive style. Brick also gives weight to the division through the use of “Australians” and “foreign business people” or “foreign counterparts”. Brick explains the nature of the selection through framing the processes of selection as occurring naturally due to the familiarities of the “English-speaking” and “foreign” customs.

The two differing styles are also perceived from the opposing critical viewpoints. Brick thus provides two differing cultural perspectives. The text is intercultural in its clear and explicit approach to developing an awareness and understanding of differences between the two forms of communication. It is also intercultural in devoting deconstructive explanations to aid students to understand how their writings may be interpreted and misconstrued.
2. What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?

The social actors of both lecturer groups and of business people who use either inductive or deductive communication are described as possibly not possessing cultural knowledge and critical awareness of the ‘other’ style. Their potential misinterpretations are provided. The author does not attempt to position the reader as either a lecturer or as a businessperson; explanations are descriptive from a third person perspective.

3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?

There are two explicit arguments. The first argument is that the existence of two identified styles of writing that are employed by different cultures may cause confusion. The second argument is that both writing styles should be broadly accepted: “Both types of organisation are good” (p. 38).

4. From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?

An implicit argument, which is carried through its positioning within the chapter, is that students within English-speaking universities are better to use the deductive style in order to not confuse their lecturers or to be marked down.

5. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, intensified or mitigated?

A combination of modifying and assertive language produces a persuasive voice that is reflective of the traditional ‘objective’ form. That is, two perspectives of an issue are provided to indicate impartiality.
Brick’s construction of ICU appears sincere and academically approached, intending to promote critical thinking. The authorial voice provides a balanced portrayal of cultural perspectives that pertain to two different formal writing styles, presenting the reader with intercultural opportunity. Intersections between these perspectives and the students’ learned perspectives might be thereby encouraged. Brick does not extend the intercultural potential by elaborating on how inductive writing has been utilised within other academic arenas, which would have projected a stronger acceptance of cultural diversity. In applying Fairclough’s Stage 3 to this text excerpt, nevertheless, the text is not considered to be contributing towards the social wrong.

Reisigl and Wodak’s DAA thus demonstrates that of the pathways’ three main reading resources, two of the texts contributed to inhibiting ICU. The executives selected the texts in each of these cases, perhaps on the basis of the texts’ thematic inclusions and organisation. An underpinning problem is that neither executives nor tutors typically have enough time to adequately assess a text, and often priorities differ among staff. This often means that texts are trialled in the classroom, which is unfortunate given the importance of ICU. Though the third text was not based on social themes, it exemplified how an academic textbook may help to promote ICU. The text’s relevance for ICU does not in any way reflect its suitability for the student English level. Without social themes, for example, perhaps students would not understand the text as easily as one of the thematic texts. Texts that draw upon a combination of themes and cultural perspectives in relation to academic expectations may be more appropriate and useful for the integration of ICU development.

Insights from Reisigl and Wodak’s DHA, when applied to Deardorff’s 2006 Model, reveal that some texts can be useful for providing clear examples of culturalities to students, while others may reduce a student’s motivation to socially connect with a text’s thematics or critically examine its claims.
Table 11: DHA Question 2 Insights Applied to Deardorff's (2006) Pyramid Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive ICU Indicators</th>
<th>Negative ICU Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting Requisite Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Limiting Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit address to academic conventions – facilitates “knowledge and comprehension” and “sociolinguistic awareness” of academic culturalities.</td>
<td>Didactic and instructive textbook personas inhibit student identities and interactions, which promotes passive learning – stifles “curiosity and discovery”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different perspectives provided – develops “openness” to difference and “ethnorelative views”.</td>
<td>Texts carry Eurocentric perspectives, often do not initiate critical thinking, and hide bias; students are positioned as passive learners – fails to foster interaction, “requisite attitudes”, “cultural self-awareness”, “knowledge and comprehension” or “skills”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located textual practices included homogenisation, oversimplification, and meaning disconnected from learning procedures, time and place – positions student personas as passive and of no need for interrelationships – undercuts value that may be given to ICU development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 demonstrates that the nature of text content may not contribute towards assisting students to interrelate. References to differences between people carried stereotypical imagery. Homogenised national cultural differences were the most common cultural descriptions, naturalising notions of unified cultures, particularly in terms of place and religion. Textual bias was not always explicit, and students were not necessarily instigated to question claims. These textual processes do not motivate students to engage with real events and tend to numb participative and interactive behaviours.
5.2.3 Research question 3: ‘How do the physical environments promote or impede ICU?’

*Jäger and Maier’s discourse analytical approach (DAA).*

Jäger and Maier’s discourse analytical approach (DAA) highlights the effects of the pervasion of suppressive powers within the AE dispositive. Their identification of a dispositive as knowledge comprising language and thought, action and materialisations gives avenue to analyse the physical contexts of each group, the environment and objects and their relationship to the language and action practices. Application of DAA enhanced understanding of ICU in the pathways, by illuminating how the spaces and objects assigned to each pathway identity, the staff and students, served to sustain the identities and their hierarchical positions. The materialisations perpetuated disregard for ICU in each pathway, which was identified as contributing to the ‘social wrong’, and recognition of that oversight. The research applied the following questions in the DAA study.

1. What influence do the broader environments have on the upheld knowledges?
2. How do the dominant objects and environments carry the knowledges of each group?
3. In what ways do the knowledges that are upheld within the environment and objects of one group connect with significant knowledges held within the environments and objects of other groups?

1. *What influence do the broader environments have on the upheld knowledges?*

The environments of each pathway were semirural, with Path 1 next to a large reserve and Paths 2 and 3 surrounded by trees. Students’ informal comments during the research indicated appreciation of the natural environments. In each pathway, the main learning sites were set at quite a distance from the mainstream university buildings. In addition, no host-national students were integrated into the pathway contexts. This extremely limited students’
need to use English and created a gap between domestic and international students. The segregation also seemed to normalise non-integration (Foucault, 1978): “Different cultural groups sticking together because of language, limiting friendships” (Nin, Path 2 student, personal communication, April 5, 2017). Concerning Fairclough’s Stage 3, the creation of separate spaces may have been due to the students not yet actually being enrolled in their undergraduate degrees, though students of Paths 1 and 3 were enrolled in the university as students of the English Centres. The detached environments exacerbated the students’ alienation, and set the tone for their adaptations, placing the onus on them to accommodate difference. The practice thus seems unwarranted. From an intercultural perspective, it was definitely so, for the effect was to physically marginalise the transnational students.

2. How do the dominant objects and environments carry the knowledges of each group?

While the nature of particular professional work may require privacy at times, the executive spaces assumed connotations that stultified creative endeavours. The executives’ offices were removed from the main activity. Their offices asserted authority, equating both non-interaction and personal space with power. One Director’s office was large enough to have provided a student meeting area, which the students did not have. Two of the Directors adhered to an open-door policy and their desks faced the doorway. Nevertheless, the offices’ distance and isolation suggested that executive power was removed and above the majority. While the Directors’ work might often require a quiet space for completion, the allocated executive spaces appeared owned and inaccessible. In a society that upholds individualism, therefore, the individual spaces represented territorial possession and success, reflective of capitalist values, and placing those ‘below’ as inadequate, in a process of becoming.
In each pathway, tutors were allocated shared office areas, with two to three staff members in each, and all staff members shared an open kitchen area. The allocation of shared space was perhaps economic and ideologically justified through the acceptance of hierarchical structures within an educational facility, indicated by the tutors’ acceptance of their spaces. The absence of provision of a personal space may also be viewed as a manifestation of the ‘coworking spaces’ movement, which has developed through neoliberal demands. This underlying philosophy is that productivity is predominantly increased through social relations (Gandini, 2015). The spaces asserted the tutors as sharers of knowledge and strategies; they were ‘the workers’ and their spaces reflected their role, which was integral to their identity and ever-present. Path 1’s and 2’s online sites similarly reflected their positioning, identified under the executives and with only very short introductions. Path 3’s online site of Staff information was a more extreme example of subordination and “omission” (van Dijk, 2009, p. 71), featuring the ‘Marketing Team’ and ‘Student Services’, but no mention of any of the academics that were working with the students, their identities entirely unacknowledged.

As spaces that provided for students from a diverse range of backgrounds, the pathways presented extensive ICU opportunity both inside and outside classrooms. In all three pathways, however, the students had no common room. Students arrived and entered their designated classroom and left at the designated time. Areas for students to congregate were apparently to be found in the main university grounds, which meant that the particular student groupings of each unit and institute were not given supported opportunities to meet on a casual basis.

In addition, repetitive formation and expression permeated the physical pathway dimensions. The classrooms were closed, box-like forms; their common elements were desks, chairs, whiteboards, and one computer for the tutor. The walls were bland, either white or
grey, with a chosen colour trimming. The regularity of classroom forms, especially the seating, helped to control student behaviour, support recontextualizations, and maintain the required passivity of the significant knowledge. One classroom in Path 1 had desks in groups; all other classroom desks in Path 1 were set out in horseshoe design with the teacher’s desk at the top open end. The desks in Paths 2 and 3 were set in rows. From a positive perspective, the spaces were quiet and clean. A critical view is they lacked character, and were more like extensions to office blocks, rather than spaces to promote investigation, exploration, creativity, and sharing. The spaces thus upheld the significant knowledge that the nature of learning is passive, consumerist, and individually conformist, again supporting underlying capitalist assumptions.

In assessing visual rhetoric as a useful method of communicating individual worth and giving emphasis to diversity (Jäger & Maier, 2009; Wallace, Hoover, & Pepper, 2013, p. 321), personal, creative, and artistic expressions were non-existent, apart from a smattering of pictures. Any form of artistic expression was also rarely integrated into pedagogical methodologies, though tutors pointed to its benefits: “It would make it intercultural so their perspective would be indirectly presented but still present” (Janine, Path 2 tutor, personal communication, March 31, 2017). Alternative performances – artistic, social, political, and religious – were marginalised, overridden, with the mainstream neoliberal paradigms serving as eradicators of difference. This absence of creative interest or inspiration may be considered as contributing to the ‘social wrong’, sustaining the limitations of significant knowledge to passive behaviour, with no apparent opportunities for students to express their multiple personal culturalities.

Recognition of student diversity was largely symbolic. In Path 1, the front classroom had a glass cabinet with various national artefacts. Photos of students from past excursions and visiting Japanese students lined the walls of one hallway. The reception area had a large
number of small international flags hanging high on a wall. The manner of display was unobtrusive and tidy, out of the way. Neither the art nor the flags were positioned for focus. In Path 2, one section of a wall on one of the floors had student projects, which portrayed their national heritage. All the other walls were blank. In Path 3, an array of small international flags hung from a central rail on the education floor, and four noticeboards displayed information for students; all other walls were blank. The range of difference or diversity in genres, discourses and styles (Fairclough, 2015) was limited. In interview, however, a few students pointed to the institution’s physical environments as exemplifying cultural difference:

Vietnamese greeting words…. One big poster with different languages. Here – upstairs, there are flags – it’s the interaction. (Justin, Path 2 student, personal communication, March 29, 2017)

Hence, although each pathway displayed few images, the small symbolic artefacts such as a display of international flags held significance for some students and reinforced value to their sense of intercultural experience. The more evident alternative perception that students were stripped of their multiple subjectivities is in line with Moss et al.’s (2017) conclusions from their school foyer research, where internal assertions of individualist ideology displaced demonstrative manifestations of diversity and community.

In relation to Fairclough’s Stage 3, numerous AE tutors indicated that artistic expression was irrelevant to their units. However, the scant display of artistic expression in the physical spaces, whether student created or not, seems unfounded. From a feminist and CDA perspective, the lack of artistic expression points to disregard of creativity and to the homogenisation of student identities (Guo & O’Sullivan, 2012). In educational terms, this disregard among the AE tutors demonstrates a lack of recognition for, or an unwillingness to assert the actuality of, the socially constructivist ways that we learn, our interdependencies, our
reliance on social interaction to participate in meaning making to accommodate new concepts into our present schemata. The inability to engage openly, freely, and creatively with our environments not only deadens our surroundings (Galman, 2011; M. Parker, 2012) but also our expressions, our performances (Barsade & O’Neill, 2016). It is thus a dead territory that the AE tutors hold stubborn dominance of, but a release of the grips that give supremacy would free student expression and promote conceptual development.

The physical ordered forms are thus a means of perpetuating ideologues and negating student agency (Van Dijk, 2009). The settings exemplified M. Parker’s (2012) online descriptions of “poor design of spaces”, which may be harmful to the development of the sense of self and belonging, particularly in a new environment, and particularly for international students where the external environments are also ‘new’. As school environments are more disposed to demonstrate, personal expressions can be drawn out in multiple ways, for example, through expressions of art, music, poetry, narrative, sport, film, and photography. Personal touches to a physical environment may introduce or extend an individual’s sense of control over their environment, which can translate into power within the classroom and beyond the educational context. These insights support claims that work contexts need to be far more welcoming of each individual’s diverse subjectivities and their various expressions, especially emotional manifestations (Barsade & O’Neill, 2016; Boler & Zembylas, 2016; Galman, 2011; Motha, Jain & Tecle, 2012; M. Parker, 2012).

3. In what ways do the knowledges that are held within the environment and objects of one group connect with significant knowledges held within the environments and objects of other groups?

Student experience was denied expression, which subordinated and marginalised the students from the tutors and administrators. The limitations on expression demonstrated
“contradiction” (Fairclough, 2009, 173; Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 36) and “omission” (van Dijk, 2009, p. 71), as the pathways were selective of student experience. The binary perspective of welcome and denial suggests masculinist hegemony. The “dispositive” (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p. 56) exists in unstable fluidity, as the contradictions and omissions (of subjectivity, of artistic expression) evidence, pointing to weakness and frustration. Each omission is confirmation of denial of the feminine or meaningful communication between the self and the other. Because the practices refuse the feminine, the symbolic dimension is void of any present social value and functions within a fashioned emptiness that consistently points toward the future. The preoccupation with assessment exemplifies the effort to give meaning to the context, but it is a hopeless task.

Without any meaning for existence, the text must continually re-create itself, and it does so with a transitory materialist, superficial purpose of economic gain that is operationalised through iterative processes. Pathway discourses thus function to designate valued materialisations within the dispositive—various essay styles, reports, and presentations—and these productions are discursively ascribed to the successful academic, typically through the split between the teacher and the student. This production occurs within a linear framework so that students are constantly in a state of uncertainty and not belonging. The time that does have significance in pathway contexts, therefore, is the future, not the present.

The application of the DAA to Deardorff’s 2006 Model shows how the pathway spatial contexts affected ICU development.
Table 12: DAA Question 3 Insights Applied to Deardorff's (2006) Pyramid Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive ICU Indicators</th>
<th>Negative ICU Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Requisite Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</td>
<td>Limiting Attitude, Knowledge of Culturalities and Skill Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning spaces not shared with domestic students and are also not in central university areas, which marginalised international students – radically reduces opportunities or need for either international or domestic students to learn to interrelate, so skills and knowledge development are strongly affected.</td>
<td>Spaces were hierarchical in terms of position and volume; students had no allocated space (i.e. common room) – lacks requisite attitude toward international students so provides a poor model for ICU development; stultifies opportunities for student incidental interactions with others of difference that might cut across chosen interactions with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces were hierarchical in terms of position and volume; students had no allocated space (i.e. common room) – lacks requisite attitude toward international students so provides a poor model for ICU development; stultifies opportunities for student incidental interactions with others of difference that might cut across chosen interactions with others.</td>
<td>Object formations such as desks (workstations) were static, which positioned students and contained their behaviours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Spaces uncreative, bland, lacking artistic expressions – inhibits self-expression and a sense of belonging; stifles “skills” development:  
  - students are not seeing new expressions, so observation is diminished.  
  - interpretation is limited to written texts.  
  - visual literacies, analysis and evaluation of visual forms, are not foregrounded as valuable abilities.  
  - opportunities to relate to visual differences are not provided. | |

Table 12 demonstrates ways that the pathway physical spaces, their organisation and their contained objects determined power positions and influenced the nature of interactions. The removed position of the facilities, the relative absence of domestic students, the denial of a common room, and the repetition and staticity of classroom spaces and their objects stifled free expression and ICU. The spaces spoke of conformity and adherence to formal behaviours, supportive of passive learning styles, rather than communicative interaction. In the ways that the case study pathways utilised their spaces, each level of ICU development in Deardorff’s Model was denied.
5.3 Summary of Interpretative Insights

Overarching Question: ‘What is the nature and value attributed to intercultural understanding in NSW pathway contexts?’

5.3.1 Research question 1: How do the identities in pathway institutions, those of administrator, tutor, and international student, promote or impede ICU?

*Promoting ICU processes and behaviours.*

Analysis employing Fairclough’s (2009; 2013) DRA revealed sliding identities, both non-nationalist and hybrid, which indicated development in ICU in all three case studies. In addition, students held a shared belief that travel was a strong avenue for ICU development. They embraced international education, in meeting others of different nationalities, and developing communication skills, including in AE. Discussion featured prominently as a strategy for enhancing ICU.

Analysis employing van Dijk’s (2009) SCA located nurturing performances that fostered self-expression, group discussion, and foregrounded attention to cultural similarities and differences. These more personal and emotional expressions undermined the more detached demands indicative of neoliberal concerns with administrative processes. Smaller classrooms also facilitated an informal atmosphere. Notification of events varied between the pathways, impacting on interrelationships. In-class discussion again featured in fostering ICU. Tutors showed flexibility in undertaking discussion as the need arose on cultural issues.

*Impeding ICU behaviours and processes.*

Fairclough’s DRA revealed that designated pathway identities restricted student and tutor expressions and inhibited pedagogical approaches to ICU. Students maintained nationalist identifications in their descriptions and often expressed uncritical nationalist bias in their comments, which were not overtly challenged within regular pathway processes,
enabling discriminatory concepts and behaviours to be sustained. The absence of professional development on ICU also meant that interpretations were disparate and arbitrary.

van Dijk’s SCA exposed the overall random nature of dealing with culturality issues. Path 3’s lack of communicative processes between tutors created a power of its own that inhibited ICU. Also noted was tutors’ resignation to the status quo, while disconnection from culturalities beyond the pathway was a further source of pressure on students to conform to pathway academic demands.

5.3.2 Research question 2: How do pedagogical practices, including curricula discourses, promote or impede ICU?

Promoting ICU processes and behaviours.

While Fairclough’s DRA drew attention to the ways that texts and tutors neutralise the political dimension of texts, tutors’ efforts to avoid conflict and show respect for different beliefs was recognised as a positive behaviour for ICU development. Each pathway also provided extensive student Orientations. van Leeuwen’s SPA revealed that at least one constructed student persona in curricula documents does give agency to students.

Impeding ICU processes and behaviour.

Fairclough’s DRA revealed that in-class texts neutralised the political nature of content and tutor personae. Transmissive pedagogical approaches also positioned students as passive, and superficial cultural learning occurred through an avoidance of open discussions on cultural similarities and differences. Knowledge was treated as an acquirable object involving a linear series of assessable skills. While Orientations provided information sessions and field trips, the opportunity for students to share their own interests and responses to the new cultures was not grasped.
Within the curricula documents, van Leeuwen’s SPA revealed limitations of agency imposed on students and tutors within a hierarchical environment. The confined roles were created and maintained through the suppression of multiplicities, the omission of social ideological motivations and the overlaying of assessment value. Reisigl and Wodak’s DHA highlighted the difficulties that textbooks can impose for tutors who are aiming to develop student ability in critical thinking. Two texts demonstrated consistent biases, which were not targeted through either of the texts’ questionings. Both of these texts lacked any address to realistic circumstances and carried multiple stereotypical homogenising discourses.

5.3.3 Research question 3: How do the physical environments promote or impede ICU?

Promoting ICU processes and behaviours.

Given that the pathways draw from a dissimilar national scope of students, the researcher stated an accepted premise that the spaces provide for extensive ICU development. Jäger and Maier’s DAA revealed some utilisation of space and items to promote ICU: displays of international flags, a small selection of student works, photos from visiting Japanese students, and a cabinet display of cultural artefacts.

Impeding ICU processes and behaviours.

Jäger and Maier’s DAA uncovered that the three pathway physical environments sustained the designated hierarchy of pathway identities and defined the nature of their interactions. Indifference to diversity in pathway processes was echoed in the emptiness of the physical surroundings.

The following chapter provides accounts from the researcher’s own employment experiences in three pathways prior to undertaking the study. None of these pathways were the same as the three case studies. These descriptions aim to complement the insights gained
from the preceding components of the research. My informed perceptions support these other aspects of the research in providing a tutor’s subjective, ‘insider’ perspectives. Sharing personal stories contributes to increasing awareness of cultural diversity (Cloonan, O’Mara, & Ohi, 2014, p. 94).
Chapter Six: Approach 2 – Auto-Ethnographic Pathway Reflections

6.1 Introduction to the Chapter

In this chapter, I provide auto-ethnographic descriptions and analyses that parallel the insights of the research study. The accounts share in their address to the nature and value of ICU, adoption of CDA lenses, and chosen foci: the nature of relationships between the administrators, tutors, and students, the nature of knowledge, and the ‘persona’ of the physical surroundings. I analyse the nature and value of ICU in Academic English and Academic Communication (AE and AC) NSW pathways to higher education by providing and interpreting data from my casual employment with three different NSW pathways to higher education. Observations of regular administrative, tutor and student practices recorded in diary entries over five years, combined with colleague correspondence and memories, are compared and contrasted across three pathway institutes. Throughout, analyses are consistently extrapolated to shine a torch on processual effects on ICU, determining whether they impede or promote interculturality. Sharing personal experiences and interpretations can provide insights into cultural practices (Patton, 2002, p. 84), facilitate teachers’ reflexivity about intercultural interactions (Cloonan, Fox, Ohi, & Halse, 2016), and contribute to increasing awareness of cultural similarities and differences. I must explicitly acknowledge that these retellings and ‘insights’ are my own subjective interpretations, shaped by my own worldviews. As they are thus my own subjective expressions, they are limited in perspective.

Adopting CDA as my critical methodology, my focus is on the semiotic dimension of power processes (Fairclough, 2009) within the three pathways and the effects of those processes on administrators, tutors and students to either promote or inhibit intercultural communication. Explanations of my experiences draw on theories of social constructivism, feminism and multiplicity. My analyses focus on how “power functions in the production of
diversity knowledge” (Ahonen et al., 2014, p. 279), which is found through individual identities, their behaviours, and the structures that they are positioned and work within. In my subjective interpretations, I posit that where power performs on a free, equitable basis, the nature of intercultural interaction appears open and commonplace, functions to develop personal knowledge and extend relationships, and is valued for its functions. In pathway contexts where power is restricted and inequitable, interaction seems constrained within formal education structures, acts merely as a means to succeed within an education context and valued to that limited end.

Students not only require ability in employing academic conventions but also proficiency in their ability to critically interpret the diverse culturalities around them, including the ‘host’ cultures, in relation to their own cultures. Koutlaki and Eslami (2018) note that successful intercultural communication is frequently left to the language learner (p. 101) due to assumptions that privilege the native speaker. As noted, Holliday (2018) points to the “West as steward discourse” (p. 7) that asserts domination over critical thinking skills and denies the “creative criticality” intrinsic to all cultural environments (p. 8). This chapter aims to raise awareness of the “West as steward discourse” that I perceive as existing in the pathway cultures of my experience, with the intention of promoting the free expression of culturalities. I identify intercultural understanding as a means of initiating organisational, structural change and as essential for enabling informal, determined, spiritual, and creative educational environments. Interculturality may work towards “bridging the academic and affective divide” (Galman, 2011, p. 35) or saving the private from being swallowed in neoliberal subjectivities of enterprise (Brown, 2016; Rottenberg, 2019). In contrast to culturalism, culturalities are seen as unstable, malleable and ever-changing and constructed contexts as determining the cultural weight and meaning of human features, such as spiritual belief, age, education, and class.
Consonant with Jäger and Maier’s definition of ‘dispositive’ (2009, p. 56), as the world that we ‘know’ comprising language, action, and materializations, I view texts within their three-dimensional context and not detached from their surroundings. Spatial frameworks, buildings, rooms, and objects, for example, may be viewed as texts. The autoethnographic analysis is thus sociological rather than linguistic: “Linguists have generally differed from sociologists in deriving processes (syntagms) from systems (grammars, paradigms), rather than processes (practices) from systems (institutions and objectified forms of knowledge)” (van Leeuwen, 2009, p. 147). Analysis focuses less on the text of language than the way language functions within social spaces. The analysis of textual spaces points to how textual forms – classroom interactions, staff-meetings, syllabi, textbooks—are positioned within pathway contexts.

The chapter is organised into three sections, each aiming to contribute to the research question: “What is the nature and value of ICU?” I first explore academic language as a significant knowledge, through associated linguistically and non-linguistically performed practices (Fairclough, 2001; Jäger & Maier, 2009), and its various relationships with other knowledges associated with organisational processes. I then employ van Leeuwen’s Social Practices approach (2005; 2009) in investigating the nature of texts to locate “representations of social actors in discourses” (van Leeuwen, 1996, p. 33), to identify constructions of self and other. Thirdly, my analysis gives emphasis to the subject’s physical context, the “materializations” (Fairclough, 2009; Jäger & Maier, 2009) or “spatiotemporal settings” (van Dijk, 2009, p. 74). Adopting a sociocognitive approach, I seek to identify the form of context and context processes as a manifestation of the subject(s) (Jäger & Maier, 2009; van Dijk, 2007; 2008). Throughout, I refer to the three pathways as Paths 4, 5, and 6.
6.2 Valid Knowledges and their Administration

The following provides examples of my three pathways’ organisational procedures to demonstrate how the internal processes excluded multiple social culturalities and inhibited intercultural interaction. I examine assumptions surrounding the significant knowledges that are upheld in contexts concerned with teaching AE and AC units and how these knowledges may work to stifle alternative voices. My analysis provides a lens on how the nature of intercultural interactions may be interpreted ethnocentrically and how student cultural expressions may be thus undervalued. In their approach to CDA, Jäger and Maier (2009, p. 34) state that knowledge refers to “all kinds of meanings that people use to interpret and shape their environment”. Knowledge is thus conditional and culturally determined. Drawing on activity theory (Leont’ev, 1978), Jäger and Maier identify the subject “in all their activities” as the connecting link between discourses and material reality (2009, p. 45). The body of knowledge that AE and AC units draw upon functions as a particular discourse and serves to “institutionalize and regulate ways of talking, thinking and acting” (2009, p. 35). Pathway discourses determine how pathway agents construe and manage discursive and non-discursive practices and materializations, and create identities, identity relationships and the reality that constitutes the ‘pathway’.

As a tutor of both AE and AC units and in my own evaluations, the most evident ‘significant knowledge’ (Fairclough, 2001, Jäger and Maier, 2009; Reisigl and Wodak, 2009), or upheld, valued ‘knowledge’, in each pathway where I have worked has seemed to maintain assumptions associated with academic practice, particularly academic language. Academic language is generally valued for its provision of a shared and thoughtful means of communication and its consequent ability to position current issues into an arena for discussion and debate. This initial purpose is related to a further social intent of bringing about social change that has been broadly discussed and generally agreed upon. Academic
language as a social value is upheld in pathways through multiple functions: the choice of subject content, the understandings attributed to the content, and the method of delivery. As a subject, the modes of academic language are most assiduously addressed through their forms, as evidenced in EAP texts (for example, Cox & Hill, 2011; Mooney-Smith & Goss, 2012; Slaght & Pallant, 2012): sentence constructions, paragraph structure, report writing and essay structures, including cause-effect, comparison and contrast, problem-solution, and argument. These structures are supported with listening and discussion activities.

Academic language in pathway contexts is often confined within the institutional, education framework. Student writings are ‘naturally’ considered inappropriate for public transmission and are restrained within an assessment system. Hence, in my considerations, academia’s semiotic dimension (Fairclough, 2009), its “meaning-making as an element of the social process” (p. 162), seems to lose its broader social value through the pathway’s academic representations. The information and the student’s ownership of it performs without any direct social relationship outside the educational institution (van Leeuwen, 2009), and so appears to have value only as it relates to the individual student’s assessment, which diminishes its present social value; the content and the student seem restricted to a classroom structure that has no immediate presence in the world beyond the classroom and relate to an assessment system that projects as though it is always pointing towards the future.

When I first started teaching at Path 5, the current social dimension or ‘theme’ that was carried throughout the particular AE unit was on difficulties that international students experience in adjusting to Australian culture. The coordinator who had introduced the theme was trying to make the unit more authentic. I also believed that this theme enriched the dry subject matter of academic forms that we were teaching such as the structural components of an essay. A colleague criticised the theme, however, asserting that the students were not interested in the general conditions of international student. Perhaps there was some truth in
that, but I was still supportive of the subject content because I believed that at least the students could relate to that theme. I did not find myself having to explain the concepts around which the various articles that we read were written. I did not need to explain what was meant by international students finding accommodation a difficulty at times, for example, or establishing friendships with ‘locals’, so I could focus on the actual learning content such as the structure of the articles and their posited evidence. Hence, it was a compromise that I thought was valid.

When I transferred over to another unit, I felt a kind of detachment with the new themes, even though the topic choices included such problematic issues as refugee and asylum seeker resettlement, the disproportionate aging population, financial services for the poor, and income gender inequality. My sense of superficiality of the content was not a consequence of subject selection, because the issues were highly topical (p. 162). Rather than the issues themselves, from my perspective, it was the way that these issues were pedagogically delivered and valued that transformed them from actual social issues into shallow textbook chunks and froze real public concerns into manageable and convenient sources of information. Hence, even though the topics were all very real social issues, they seemed to me to lack validity; the authenticity that I had felt with the earlier unit was gone. There did not seem to be any real or actual relationship to what we were studying in the classroom and what was happening in the actual social world. Students were researching the different topics outside class and some were no doubt making connections with their study, but I felt as though the topics might as well have been plucked from a web page somewhere. They had no apparent relation to the students’ own experience. Nor had there been a program of work to cultivate interest in these issues, so the subject topics felt superficial and meaningless, disconnected from the students’ lives. Perhaps I have become too judgemental, but it seems to me now that education networks are actually training individuals to accept that
the current public domain is of less significance than their own futures. The episteme, or significant knowledge, appears to support the Western development paradigm (Tikly, 2004), actively stultifying intercultural interaction and the value that interactions potentially hold.

I wonder at what the students’ interests actually were at that time. It would have been insightful to have heard and read their narratives early in the semester. From there, we might have been able to offer avenues for the development of one or more of their interests. Hellstén and Ucker Perotto (2018) ask “Why is it both important and necessary to think about pedagogies or practices which consider an international approach?” (p. 40) and point to narrative and auto-ethnographic perspectives as a way forward for international education. It is not such a simple decision for pathway tutors to make. If we spent three weeks (lessons) on students’ written narratives, they would lose that time learning the conventions of a written form that they are expected to have in their first undergraduate year such as argument or problem-solution writings that integrate paragraphing and synthesis. This is already within a context of shortened course lengths. It would be unfair to burden students with appropriating those skills in their first undergraduate year, quite possibly by trial and error.

Perhaps another area that could have been explored would have been in trying to help students make connections with the local community. Each of the pathways were isolated from their immediate communities, but at the time I just accepted that separation without question, even though they were each in highly populated areas, which would have offered many choices for interactions. I now discern moral lack (Merchant et al., 2012) in a way that I had not seen before, in not showing explicit regard for various local community cultures. Now that I look back, I feel that without either discussing our own context as an international environment, or without acknowledging the immediate local cultural diversities, the English tutors were possibly denying students of potential, authentic connections with their study. It is conceivable that we were creating and sanctioning a pedagogy that ignored the underlying
tensions of the local and pathway communities. I may have spent years teaching students to ignore the world around them! It seems to me that AE and AC tutors need to be certain that their units are not value void. We can accommodate local and student issues in our curricula. English units can be invested with an authentic depth of humanity that resonates with the students and not be void of social value. Of course, these are only my own subjective considerations and can only be taken tentatively in the contexts of my limited experiences.

In 2017, within the first hour of a new class, a Chinese student yelled out an abusive comment to a student who had identified themselves as a Hong Konger. Although I calmed the student, I felt uncomfortable because I knew that, in view of the curriculum requirements for that lesson, I did not have the time to deal with the political and ideological differences in the classroom in a way that would help the students to accept their differences. As Cormick-Dockery and Punnen (2019) have noted, the teaching schedule limits teachers in addressing cultural, linguistic differences (p. 14). I still felt fearful that the student’s aggression was likely to manifest again in a different environment, but I did not deal with that concern. I did nothing because I felt that my academic cultural environment was implicitly pressuring me to push on with the lesson’s learning content. I consistently carry a sense that the content is all-important, more important than the students’ social context and yet I am simultaneously aware that my assumed positioning is morally lacking.

The value of the significant knowledge of academic language is shifted from the social to the personal through emphasis on the individual’s future and hopes for employment. Academic concerns for educational values are lost against neoliberal economic goals (Lyons, 2016, p. 31; Marginson, 2011; Rottenberg, 2019). Time for free, open discussion, personal intercultural interaction, which can assist perceptual development and deepen understanding of self and others, is dependent on individual tutor choice and highly unlikely to transpire, given general current workloads. In a diary entry of 13th October 2015, I observe:
I think that there really needs to be some time in every class just given over to talking… Can’t we just enjoy each other in conversation for 30 minutes? Education has become too seriously aimed at outcomes; there’s just too much to do in a short space of time. The staff is so stressed. Everyone is stressed!

Units feel like speed trips through a series of assessment stations. Paths 4, 5 and 6 were marketing machines, “edu-factories” (Lyons, 2016, p. 32), focusing entirely on input and output, getting students into and out of their courses. There seemed to be little or no time for students to share their experiences, to relate the unit content to their past or present perceptions.

If there was more sharing of views, the nature of interculturality may be less unidirectional. In questioning her feedback to a Hong Kong student, Trahar (2013) points to the problem with absenting discourse.

But I thought you prided yourself on your familiarity with his academic practices in Hong Kong? Haven’t you come to understand that they are derived from Confucianism, which places more importance on the acquisition and accumulation of knowledge, privileging critical reflection rather less? Why, then, in your feedback to this student, do you not draw on his knowledge but continue to display, apparently, a lack of sensitivity to his approach? Why do you not celebrate his use of anecdote? (p. 368)

I also experience this guilt and anger for what looks to be a constant denial of student expression. I hear myself telling students to write in third person, “just for now” I say, “until you enter uni, until you can show me that you can”. At the same time, I feel that it is hypocritical, but I have a programme that relates to university standards, or, more specifically, to expected student numbers. Academic practice involves acknowledgement of alternative voices, yet in the education context, where, surely, these voices should be heard,
these alternative voices seem to be criticised and silenced. The interculturality that is occurring appears confined to students specifically learning Western conventions.

In each pathway, academic language, upheld as a significant knowledge, was contextualised and sustained within the institution through the interactive processes of administrative communications and organisational knowledges. The establishment and perpetuation of an enclosed educational context is internally justified through the systems it produces. This creation must be convincing no matter the political persuasion of the constructed system. The following provides examples of the three pathways’ organisational procedures, to demonstrate how the internal processes affected the degree of exclusion of the social external. It is apparent that where freedom and responsibility are equitably distributed the nature of intercultural interaction is uninhibited, functions to encompass new relationships and knowledges, and is valued for its functions. In pathway contexts where knowledge and responsibility are fixed and held within strict boundaries, intercultural interaction is stifled, performs only within a restricted education context, and thus has reduced value.

Path 4 was highly systematised, promoted transparency among the staff, and aimed to function democratically in its distribution of tasks. Simple and specific directives helped to maintain an equitably run organisation. At the end of each lesson, for example, the lesson’s smart-board notes were to be uploaded onto the college portal. This meant that all classroom data was saved onto each tutor’s own Moodle site for future reference, enabling further editing and use of the material. Each unit’s staff members also shared access to each other’s Moodle sites, so they could copy and use others’ work if they wished, as long as the respective staff member agreed; tutors could thereby build upon their own site by utilising other’s work.
At first, I interpreted the requirement to upload our smartboard notes as an invasion of privacy, but I soon realised that the task had educational advantages, for I was able to build upon my own lesson plans by viewing others’ sites. I soon found how the ability to share each other’s work consolidated the AE tutors as a community working towards the same aims. I thus came to appreciate the democratic dimension that lay in the task, each able to enhance their lesson plans according to the choices that they made, informed through others’ actions.

I now believe that this acknowledgement of our interdependencies is what interculturality is. Path 4 was successful in its resistance to hegemonic neoliberalist influences because the administrators positioned the AE and AC tutors’ everyday practices within an intercultural framework. Our freedom to present and share our creativity and to draw on others’ creativity foiled our own habituations and fixed culturalities. My lesson planning was not just formulated gatherings from my own ‘known’ schemata, but, rather, a conversation, a learning process, a social constructivist manifestation. In our interdependency we saw ourselves as learners, as mutable, and this encouraged our openness and creative thought.

In Path 5, in contrast, the distance between the power positions of the administrative staff and the academics was so oppressive that individual creative expression seemed completely unrelated to the workplace. Decisions were implemented without consultation or debate between tutors and administrative staff. The tutors’ opinions did not seem to be considered at any stage of the enrolment to graduation process. This may have been in part my own illusion, born from my concerns and preoccupations with this issue. The Supervisors on each unit were responsible for relating any problems to the administrative staff. Hence, technically, there was a communication avenue between the academic and administrative
staff, but the feedback that was required was electronic, and in the five years in a supervisory role in Path 5, no administrator ever responded to any of the formal feedback that I provided.

It was perhaps the absence of overt formal communication expressions, therefore, which perpetuated a sense of discord between the two divisions. The door between the staff room and the administrative rooms, for example, was kept locked for a number of years. This instigated a number of academic staff members to perceive themselves in opposition to the administrative staff and interpret their environment as pertaining to a binary ‘them and us’, superior-inferior dynamic, inhibiting their sense of agency within their environment. It was not uncommon for staff members to subside into whispering when talking, checking for unwelcome figures with regular glances towards the locked door. From my standpoint, the administrators thus seemed to thrive on the power that they asserted, literally closing the door to communication with the academic staff. In doing so, they seemed to be the disablers of intercultural relationships, which are reliant on basic respect and empathy for others (Deardorff, 2006).

The administrators’ apparent lack of deference appeared to intrude on all dimensions of the education context, such that the environment little resembled a space of learning. Other AE tutors also shared their disappointment in the administration. The absence of response to our work was demeaning, yet when I reflect on my feelings and behaviours at that time, I am uncertain as to what degree I was compliant. There are those who can resist silent ill-treatment, but I became more withdrawn. I came to believe that I was required to fulfil the function of teaching exactly what I was given to teach, without query or discussion, passing as many students as possible. Beyond that, I felt that I had no role to play. When I look back, I understand my anger. I had so much more to offer. I could have been so much more creative in the classroom. I may have produced a play, as I had done in work with schools, held poetry
readings, shared narratives, held inter-class visits. The administrators actually did not know what they were destroying, and I did not realise what I was letting them destroy.

6.3 Identity Formation: Normative Roles and Processes

Identities are constructed through regular performances and through implicit communications that are intentionally sustained (van Leeuwen, 2009). The analysis of ‘discourse’ here applies van Leeuwen’s definition as “socially constructed ways of knowing some aspect of reality … or … context-specific frameworks for making sense of things” (p. 144). The approach is applied to my own experiences to uncover how common processes work to sustain administrator, student and tutor identities, how subjects construct themselves and others. This is an important step in determining how intercultural understanding may be developed within AE and AC communities.

The positioning of staff status is carried into various contexts (van Leeuwen, 2009), so the way that formal conventions are managed has a strong bearing on how power positions are upheld. In pathway institutions, the relationships between administrative staff and tutors are often limited to formal meetings, as the two sections can complete their daily functions quite separately. Path 4 held monthly whole-staff meetings. Emails were sent about 10 days prior to the meeting with a request to add any items to the agenda if the tutor wished. Further, operating on a rotational basis, a different staff member ran the meetings on each occasion and another member would take the minutes.

In this education context, the administrators were still the final decision makers, but the staff input was as equitable as could be made possible. As a consequence, the administrators were respected and trusted. Lesson breaks and lunch-hours provided a spirit of genuine amity. The apparently simple feature of giving staff a voice meant that we were also more prone to camaraderie. Our context thus became intercultural; we were able to tap into
our commonalities and break down our essentialist boundaries. We were “moving from blocks to threads” (Holliday, 2018, p. 8).

From my perspective, Path 4’s success in creating an intercultural environment probably aided the English tutors in their pedagogical delivery. From a personal and social constructivist viewpoint, the experience of acceptance is important in a workplace, because it inspires freedom of expression, the sharing of personal experiences and perspectives, which is essential for pedagogical advancement—it gives tutors the background experience and support that they need to share with students, to foster intercultural interaction and understandings in their classroom practices.

Conversely, it seems that when pathway organisations do not uphold regular, shared discourse, intercultural interaction, communication between administrators, tutors, and students, may become stilted. The only all-staff meetings in Path 5 were held at the beginning of each semester. Their purpose was to serve as a platform for the Director to deliver the statistics on student achievements and provide a summary of intakes and other economically relevant data. Academic staff had no input, other than an occasional question for clarification of data, and there was no equivalent meeting on pedagogy, such as the nature of the subject content or delivery methods.

This apparent absence of democratic process seemed to rob the Path 5 English tutors of connecting with the social dimension of the institution, which should be an active aspect of the AE curriculum. In my supervisory role in Path 5, for example, I determined to link the students’ learning in the unit that I was responsible for with the students’ other units. I wanted to provide support with their core unit textbook comprehension, for instance, and facilitate intercultural connections. My intention was to open up discussion on their textbook concepts, not only by assisting with vocabulary but also by giving students time to share their current knowledges on the content topics. Students’ freedom to work from the known, from
their past experience, is a “moral principle”, as Holliday states (2018, p. 5), because it is also a physiological need; learning depends on extending and deepening the concepts that already exist, and is most successful when students are engaged in “meaningful interaction” (Kumaravadivelu, 1993, p. 12). My aims accord with one of Kumaravadivelu’s (1993) macrostrategies to assist genuine classroom communication:

… activate the intuitive heuristics of the learner… [the] conscious and unconscious cognitive processes of inquiry that help them discover and assimilate patterns and rules of linguistic behaviour. One way to activate the intuitive heuristics is to provide enough data so that the learners can infer and internalize underlying rules from their use in varied communicative contexts. (p. 12)

There seemed to be no way that my aims could be implemented, however, without an interdisciplinary, all-staff approach, which was not obtainable, as I needed to have an understanding of the different tutors’ intentions with their unit’s content, and to ascertain how I could be of most assistance. Perhaps I did not have the forethought to request such a meeting through the administrative staff; if I did, I probably believed, as I do now, that the risk of unemployment was too high or that the request would not have been acted upon in any case. My defeatist attitude may have been propagated through the lack of agency attributed to me in decision-making practices and in my own tolerance and acceptance of my positioning. Perhaps in my lack of corporate experience in the Path 5 context, I felt intimidated, without the confidence to be clear about my views and respectfully assertive. Nevertheless, I still feel that my pedagogies could have been extended if principles of equity had explicitly permeated the pathway and promoted intercultural understanding and openness to learning (Deardorff, 2006). I was frustrated in the knowledge that the AE unit remained void of connections to students’ other unit content. That particular opportunity for a useful intercultural pedagogy in
the English classroom context remained unexplored. It seemed to me that it was inequitable communication processes that were stifling the creative potential of relationships.

Although Path 6 ran regular all-staff and unit meetings, the academic staff adhered to an unwritten rule to not vocally participate in them. Having worked in Path 5, where whole-staff meetings were non-existent, and unit meetings were rare, on arrival to Path 6, I welcomed the freedom to participate in staff meetings. I quickly became confused by the staff silence, however; none of the tutors participated in the discussions or debates that arose among the senior staff. A few weeks into the term, I became privy to the unwritten rule, when a colleague confided that she did not participate in staff meetings because she valued her friends too much. It is apparent that in spaces where the creative spirit is expected to transform into a mechanical performance, a means of retaliation is withdrawal, a complete denial of creative sharing (Berardi, 2003). Neither the administrative staff nor the AE tutors brought attention to the lack of participation. The silence and the disregard of it would conceivably have had a detrimental effect on the development of academic debates in the staffroom context. The lack of communication between the staff appeared to have become normative, suggesting a complete unawareness of how stifling the effects of their silences may have been on pedagogical practices, meaningful learning, and intercultural opportunities.

The contract process that is inherent to casualisation also contributes towards diminishing intercultural understanding, because it normalises part-time hours, which influences energy output in the workplace and restricts interactions and relationship development. I have been employed as a casual in each pathway institute that I have worked for, which covers a period of eight years. I had previously worked as a full-time permanent teacher within both private and public-school systems. I did not realise at first just what an impact the shift from permanent employment to casual status would have on my orientation to work and students. In my experience, pathway tutors are generally employed on a contract
basis for a 10 to 13-week term, with a number of unpaid weeks between each term. In sessional work, time and effort seems to be directly linked to pay, because the employee is only present for a fixed number of hours. In contrast, permanent employees often have time for additional activities that contribute to the social dimension of the workplace. Hence, sessional work cannot only be financially insecure, but it can also rob institutions of social enrichment.

Some tutors may prefer the flexibility of sessional work, so that casualisation fits comfortably into their lifestyle. Nevertheless, the ‘casual’ status that is currently imposed on tutors tends to implicitly define the tutor as one who is not integral to the system. A diary entry from 8 February 2016 reads:

Last week I was told that I would be getting work with [Path 4], but only one day a week. Three colleagues won’t be coming back. I spoke with two of them, and they are both incredibly angry and upset. [A colleague] was finding it hard not to take it personally. She has been with the institute for 13 years. She said that there had been no mention of her dedication over that time, just that there was no work for her in the future.

The offhand way that employees can be removed from their employment seems to situate the tutor as subordinate. As new and old identities come and go, insecurities are compounded. I started to keep a record on one unit of the tutors who were not asked to return at the beginning of the new semester. At two years, when I stopped counting, the tally had reached 14. Although I was the unit supervisor, I had never been consulted about these dismissed tutors, about their work attitudes or participation. I felt terrible for these tutors. To me, none of them deserved to lose their work; there was never any apparent reason for their dismissal. It was as if the administrators were staging a revolving door of tutors just to keep the core workers committed to the institution. My casualisation experiences have always seemed to
position myself and my colleagues in AE tutoring as inferior, and the recurrence of systematic review can understandably reinforce that sense of lower status.

Casualisation can also disrupt or negate pedagogical teamwork. Tutors are often unable to meet to discuss their units or their students with co-workers, because their timetables do not coincide. Collaborative processes that teaching across a shared cohort might involve can hold no significance in these casual settings. Exchanges in text messages of mine from 2015 reflect this:

Colleague: Hello … how are you? Are you still at [Path-5]?
Author: Yes – sent u an email last nite – am in Mondays and Tuesdays – 3 classes only – how about you?
Colleague: 3 classes only too. I will read your email and reply. Pity I won’t see you now! No Monday class!
Author: I know! I feel the same.
(Personal communication a, June 25, 2015)

Colleague: Hello … I miss seeing you around! How things have changed….
(Personal communication b, September 4, 2015)

When tutors can meet and discuss their programs, some degree of importance to their work is ‘naturally’ shared, which in turn stimulates enthusiasm and passion towards their programs and their interactions with students. My colleague in the above text excerpt is not even sure that I am still working in the same institute. Brown (2016) captures the sense of alienation that I constantly felt: “The combined effect [of de-regulation] is to generate intensely isolated and unprotected individuals, persistently in peril of deracination and deprivation of basic life support, wholly vulnerable to capital’s vicissitudes” (p. 3). Instead of having a community of reliable contacts to connect with, and strong, established routines, I was forced to
predominantly function independently in an insecure environment, relying entirely on my own resources. This in turn fed into my resentment and frustration, which affected my attitudes towards my teaching delivery.

Students may be similarly objectified, when commodified through the homogenised definition of ‘international student’ (Fincher, 2011). Entering a production line of assessments, students’ past cultural identities may be annulled as they assume the economic Western values that are projected onto them. Students apparently struggle with accommodating their new cultural identities, as they sense their past selves to be unrecognised. Belief systems, for example, are often not recognised. The refusal to acknowledge students’ voices leads to bitterness:

The amount of money our parents invested in us is not really worth it ... the tuition fee has gone up to 160% over a decade ... after all the years we spent to study and make a living in Australia ... the government don’t [sic] think that we deserve it. They have been trying to make it harder and harder for us to apply to stay in Australia.” (Minh, Personal correspondence, 2017).

Minh’s writings indicate a sense of division, with the terms “us”, “we”, “they”, and “the government”, and his tone is one of hurt, frustration, and resentment. A comparable attitude was communicated to me recently when a Saudi student expressed his belief that a lot of Saudis are deliberately failed because staff know that their government will pay for their second attempt. These misconceptions seem to originate from resentments that grow out of a lack of acknowledgement of identity and acknowledgement and acceptance of difference.

The crux of my frustrations lie in that the apparent negation of tutor contributions seems to silence the very people who have expertise in the discipline and allows AE education to be managed by those who either do not actually have expertise in the subject or in education generally or whose interest is confined within an economic outlook. This is a
sentiment that is often shared: A colleague’s text 12th January, 2014, reads: “I have never felt so angry as I M now about teaching this subject!!! I have had enough of last-minute teaching instructions and [it’s] difficult for students!!! 3 weeks they have for two assessments!!! It’s gone too far!” It is not enough to be a tutor that is merely designated as someone who delivers a curriculum, for teaching pertains to greater ideals, with aspirations of self in relation to high regard for the academic voice and associated work and its deep social value (Connell, 2013; Cooks, 2010; Marginson, 2012; Rizvi, 2009). These are values that need to have space for sharing. In contrast, in the pathway education systems of my experience, the curricula and its integral assessment arrangements seem locked into a financial system that does not promote student-student or student-tutor interaction and replaces the humane dimension of learning and intercultural opportunities for classroom interactions. As Moses (2017) states, in promoting diversity, “everyone has a leadership role” (2017). Student and tutor voices need to be heard within a non-judgmental context and need to be encouraged so that they can help to transform their institutions to tie their practices into the core values of an equitable pluralistic society.

6.4 Context Settings as the Product of Agency

The chapter’s third section investigates my experiences of the purposes and performances surrounding the physical pathway environments as contributing to particular agent identity and discourse manifestations and how they serve to give permanence to cultural assumptions and thus inhibit intercultural understanding in the AE context. Cultural structures are clearly evidenced through discourse materialisations (Jäger & Maier, 2009; Fairclough, 2009; van Dijk, 2008, 2009). M. Parker (2012) states: “Design and poor design of spaces can have an absolute detrimental impact on people’s psyche and their wellbeing, in particular when we don’t have control over those environments”. van Dijk (2009) argues that social structures (organisations, groups, gender, race) cannot be directly linked to the mental
processes of discourse production and understanding. Rather, we apply mediating cognitive devices, or “context models” (p. 73), that represent the relevant structures of the social situation (p. 73); context models reconcile discourse structures with social structures (p. 66). Context models are ordered by a simple schema consisting of fundamental classifications, including spatiotemporal setting, participants … [and] the ongoing social action (p. 74). The focus here is on how the physical settings produce and sustain identities that define the nature of intercultural interactions. I trace the construction of context elements as outcomes of agent performances, of their own self and group images, to locate self-defining elements of physical spaces that appear to further inhibit intercultural understanding in the AE and AC contexts.

Within Paths 4, 5, and 6, the approach to learning underlying AE practices was sustained through various conventional forms (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009), evident in the classroom settings. The office style of the Modernist era, characterised by its absence of decoration, emphasis on rectangular forms, and combined use of steel and concrete (Jones, 2011), has dominated most of the education facilities where I have worked. The ubiquitous bland walls of concrete architecture and austere angularity still remain, despite postmodernist and deconstructivist architectural progressions. The classrooms of Paths 5 and 6 were dull, with a few select art pieces to atone for the emptiness. In school classrooms the walls are often an extension of student expression, with various artworks and writings pinned upon them. This generally ends at the higher education levels, however, and this was the case in Paths 5 and 6: apart from one feature wall in each, a large painting in Path-5 and student photos in Path-6, the walls were blank. Path 4 was an exception, where recent student work, paintings and various writings, covered the walls throughout the building. The absence of creativity in Paths 5 and 6 may be considered as indicative of a cultural split between the cognitive and affective, the notion that emotional and creative expression are associated with
youth, weakness, and the feminine. While school walls function as reflections of student participation in their learning, these pathway walls were predominantly blank.

The use of space is pedagogically significant for it influences learning behaviour, as Souter, Riddell, Sellers and Keppell (2011) assert:

Although the purpose of higher education is the development of independent thinking skills and domain knowledge by and for students … with lectures and tutorials still predominant in higher education, the organisation of space and time continues to configure students as receivers of knowledge. (p. 3)

The absence of student expression or creativity in pathway architecture and classroom spaces appears to configure students as passive. The lack of variation points to an absence of creativity and to homogenisation of student identities (Guo & O’Sullivan, 2012). In each pathway, students were like fixtures behind the desks. Rows, horseshoe contours, even group formations were ordered arrangements, which maintained the student stasis. The physical ordered forms may thus be recognised as a means of perpetuating ideologues and defining the parameters of student agency (van Dijk, 2009).

Students resist isolating identity. After researching the built, urban and institutional contexts of students in Melbourne, Fincher (2011) found that where the urban built forms deter local intercultural encounters, the reaction of students is to strengthen their international connections by either connecting with their national peers or “with peers from countries they are lumped together with administratively (as ‘international students’)” (p. 178). The classroom spaces, alienated within the university landscapes, and alienating in their bland containment, appeared to define the students as pathway products, as “international students”, and to enclose their behaviours within those spaces. It is apparent that embracing student identities and diversities is contingent on giving acknowledgement to frameworks that they can relate to (Guo & O’Sullivan, 2012), which starts with their own experiences and contexts
In reflecting on my past AE teaching, I consider now not only how hostile the environments possibly were but also how the spaces also homogenised the students. These contexts I now conceive influenced me to unconsciously adopt ethnocentric methodologies and thus externalise the affective dimension and refuse interculturality. In each pathway, the AE and AC staff were apparently not promoting as deep a sense of care for the students as we could have done. I do not mean to suggest that there was an absence of duty of care, but there is a distinction between encouraging interaction and personal sharing on one hand and simply maintaining an overview of the student’s wellbeing on the other. In examining pathway materialisations, the structure of the pathway architecture and décor, the setting or stage of interactions (Jäger and Maier, 2009), I have found that pathway contexts appear to limit the social relevance of student learning and knowledge. Instead of fostering student voices, I feel that I have contributed to restricting the students in working imaginatively within the constructed borders of the pathway. Physical contexts can change in meaning over time and contemporaneously, as they are dependent upon participant identities and their interpretations. If students and tutors can harness greater autonomy, the spaces they inhabit are likely to assume a more diversely creative and interactive character.

6.5 Conclusion

A split between the creative, informal, personal and subjective dimensions of life on one hand and the disciplined formal, educational and objective dimensions on the other seems to have permeated my experience and perception of all education contexts that I have worked in. I have found a predominance of patriarchal practices within education environments that acknowledge and give power to formal constructs while externalising spirituality, or the affective dimensions of humanity. Rather than recognising the subject in

multiplicity, students and staff members seem to be defined in narrow and often uncreative terms, as sacrificial enterprise (Brown, 2016). In these experiences, the despotic nature of administrations disables interculturality, but where power is equitably distributed, where the AE and AC staff and students are able to equitably interact, the nature, function and value of interculturality is relaxed and commonplace, occurring without issue and open to developing relationships and learning. Methods for reconciling the split between the formal and the informal, the material and the spiritual, point toward deconstructing inequitable practices, particularly the formal codes that sustain unfair power positions which lurk in the subordination of staff, the commodification of students, the implicit ‘textbook’ curriculum, and the closed classroom. Emphasis must simultaneously be given to promoting interculturality through facilitating open, creative expression on immediately relevant issues, and encouraging staff and students to feel comfortable with their various culturalities or subjectivities in an education environment.

This chapter contributes to the research by providing personal accounts of AE and AC experiences in three pathway locations. The three focus areas—the participant identities, the knowledges, and the physical environments—correspond to the thesis research foci questions. The analysis of these identities has contributed to understanding aspects of the reasoning behind the creation of relationships within pathway processes, which has exposed some of the rationales behind the formation of the nature and value attributed to intercultural understanding in AE teaching contexts. Addressing the choice of knowledges and their dissemination has deepened that understanding by, firstly, revealing how the agents’ adopted pathway identities function within the context, and secondly, demonstrating the values that are formally upheld that serve to either perpetuate or interrogate bias, and thus determine the nature and value of ICU. Examining interpretations of the pathway physical spaces has also given additional insight into how settings, the manner of form, including the linearity of time,
are created, and act to sustain the constructed ‘realism’ that maintains a masculinist order within the pathway (Jäger & Maier, 2009). The constructed, fictional nature of pathway identities and internal organisations is thus interrogated. The following chapter builds upon these insights by drawing the autoethnographic perceptions together with the research insights provided in Chapter Five.
Chapter Seven: Discussion and Recommendations

7.1 Introduction to the Chapter

This chapter draws upon the main insights provided in the Chapter Five accounts of the interviews, observations, and literary analyses, and the Chapter Six autoethnographic descriptions, and relates them to the core research questions. In doing so, I have also related back to main assertions examined in the literature review. Some of these conceptual insights were dependent on related themes emerging from the data. Following this discussion, I provide my considerations on the effectiveness of the methods, methodology, and theoretical choices that I have made, emphasising how the design enabled richer understandings to be gained, as well as noting its limitations. Recommendations to policy makers and other stakeholders that offer ways forward for enhancing the nature and value of ICU in pathways are provided and proposals for further research are outlined.

7.2 The Nature and Attributed Value of Intercultural Understanding

Students demonstrated interest in physical, behavioural and ideological differences among their peer group, and indications of development of a more accepting attitude of different culturalities were clear. Like Belford’s (2017) research participants, most students spoke appreciatively of their intercultural experiences, in having met so many students from other cultures in their classes and having had the opportunity to have discussions with them. Student responses to their experiences of cultural diversity were often inspiring and support arguments for greater inclusion of address to ICU within the academic English contexts. Tutors encouraged ICU within the English Communication classrooms in promoting varied discussion through seating changes and group work, and in providing texts that apparently aimed to address different cultural issues. The provision of various social events and support for community interaction also demonstrated administrative intention to address ICU.

Insights achieved through the five adopted CDA lenses, however, revealed that the
pathways’ actual performances were often in conflict with stated aims; the value of ICU in the pathways could have been far more enhanced. Numerous processes were in clear “contradiction” (Fairclough, 2009, 173; Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 36) to the university policies. On one hand, the pathways aimed to extend knowledge, but on the other hand, processes instigated tutors to maintain the status quo. Moreover, apart from the organised social and community events, the actual nature of ICU as it functions within these education contexts is predominantly incidental. Participants expressed value in ICU, yet numerous practices and processes within each of the pathways undermined the effectiveness of ICU development.

Pathway actors performed within pre-defined homogenous characterisations still under Modernist influence (de Fina, 2011; Hassan, 1987; Hutcheon, 1988; Klages, 2003; Waugh, 1984). Actor recontextualisations and the subsequent hierarchical pathway identities pointed to widespread unawareness of, or lack of interest in, the complex subjectivities that any one individual may have possessed, which was detrimental to ICU development. Homogenisation enabled tutor and student agency subordination, while student values were also constructed in an abstract future. The absence of a student common room in each pathway seemed to symbolise an underlying disregard for student social and intercultural needs. The reliance on the surrounding university facilities overlooks the need for students who are enrolled in a particular institution to be able to connect socially. Once students have left the pathway facility, they disperse, so the opportunities for them to extend their interactions are lost.

Attention to the requisite attitudes, awareness, knowledge, and skills posited by many ICU models was not explicit. Knowledge functioned as a “product of specific forms of social labour” (Connell et al., 2016, p. 1), lacked acknowledgement of multiplicity, and overpowered multiple cultural perspectives and narrative opportunity, which perpetuated the
power inequalities that sustained the flow of international students as a homogenised commodity. Attention to the dynamics of student experience and their intercultural knowledge (McLaren, 1995) was thereby lost. Awareness of cultural similarities and differences occurred through observation, in-class discussions and incidentally. Most in-class discussions that students described, however, were not targeted towards assisting with understanding student identities or cultural interactions. To a large extent, students’ learning was maintained as a passive process through knowledge-as-object English language formats, transmissive pedagogical approaches that carried neoliberal drive for efficiency and effectiveness. Whatever transformations the students believe they had made or were undergoing should have been able to be discussed openly and safely in a classroom. It is reprehensible that students can go through a whole course, having recently arrived from overseas, without the opportunity to experience and develop through such discursive opportunities. Intercultural skills development, moreover, which could have been promoted through transformative pedagogies, were not evident from participant discussions, and artistic or theatrical expressions, for example, were dismissed as irrelevant to an academic platform.

The political neutralisation of the processes and texts was further sustained through an adopted neutralising tutor persona. Avoidance of religious and political discussion allowed the Eurocentric discursive practices of concealment to remain dominant (Jäger & Maier, 2009; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009), which in turn enabled the perpetuation of discriminatory behaviours, because the exclusion of attention to subjectivities or identities allowed for the perpetuation of stereotypes (Hatoss, 2006). Even though social topics were often the medium for learning, the focus on other culturalities or on student identity choices was either shallow or non-existent. Although teachers promoted acceptance of difference by integrating discussion on particular national cultural differences, the formal framing of the discourses, and the political and religious limitations in discussion generally, restricted ICU. These
interpretations support Hatoss’s (2006) results that “superficial cultural learning” as opposed to deep cultural learning is failing to develop “awareness of cultural and global citizenship” (p. 62). They thereby also give weight to Ting and Patron’s (2013) and Ramsey’s (2000) position that discourses of cultural difference need to be openly expressed in the classroom so that related fears and prejudicial views can be discussed and carefully challenged. This is also consistent with Rizvi’s (2011) arguments for “new discourses and practices of internationalization of higher education, consistent with the emerging dynamics and possibilities of transnationality” (p. 699), “cosmopolitan learning”, and “epistemic virtues” (2009, p. 254).

A wide scope of topics was usually provided in Paths 1 and 2, but they foregrounded European issues from a European perspective. Rizvi’s noted advice above could not occur in classrooms that do not foreground the political nature of global dynamics, which is significant because the majority of participants demonstrated that they were extremely influenced by international trends. These perceptions give weight to Naskali and Keskitalo-Foley’s (2017, p. 6) point that knowledge is not recognised as in constant change, nor as political or power-laden, but as a linear series of skills and information acquisition. The fundamentally colonialist notion of space/time and the preoccupation with the future that offers the subject a place in the world (Quijano, 2000, p. 221) is evident in this dynamic. The acquisition of English is central to the production of labour; together with an English university degree, English suggests the promise of international status, becoming more White in offering to lift the ‘Asian’ from ‘Asianness’. Fear of being left behind economically is also a driving force. Discourses referring to the resources that international students bring to the nation are acts of legitimisation of essentially exploitative processes. Even while entering into the student contract is a promise of emancipation, it occurs through “rewriting” the nature of difference so that this lacking identity, this “poverty” (Limki, 2017, p. 336), in this case, in
academic English ability, functions to perpetuate the belief in potential employment and international success.

In addition, despite students’ acceptance of cultural diversity, “knowledge and comprehension” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 254) of different cultural epistemologies or customs was a noted void, particularly through stereotypical expressions of national cultures. This undermines any assumption of acquired “desired internal outcomes” (p. 254); since students were not necessarily aware of the nature of individual culturalities, their adjustment to difference would in turn be limited. The dominant ideological power sustained socio-cultural weight (Jäger & Maier, 2009; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009), while the capacity for tutors and students to articulate their own cultural interpretations of given topics or to create and recreate context elements (van Dijk, 2009) that represented their cultural subjectivities remained tightly restricted. It is evident through CDA that the semiotic dimensions of many of the pathway processes and texts promoted student passivity as a standard response in a linear learning process. These insights are consistent with those of Channa, Gilhooly, Channa, and Manan (2017) who similarly found that education learning through textbook content often created and maintained compliance.

The auto-ethnography highlights how willing tutors are to share their learning and pedagogical methodologies when given the means and incentive to do so, how accepting tutors are of additional responsibilities when not taken for granted, and how rewarding active formal communication channels are when created across all ‘levels’ of institute actors. The narratives also underscore the disadvantages of an academic culture of multiple assessments, casualisation, denial of student and tutor voices, and a lack of consideration of the power that physical environments can hold.

The short anecdotes provided through the three pathway comparisons of Paths 4, 5, and 6 demonstrate how behind what may seem to be complex barriers to progressive change,
there are often quite simple remedies. The interviews with the tutors similarly showed that processes often continued because tutors were resigned to existing attitudes and processes, which is in keeping with Halse et al.’s (2015) findings that “many believed these factors were beyond their control and, therefore, that they could not be held responsible for the absence of intercultural capabilities among students, staff or school practices” (p.6). It is the politics of power that makes change appear so difficult.

Hofstede’s (2001) masculinity versus femininity theory and Leech’s politeness framework could be read into those students who stated that they found some students rude or aggressive (John, Akemi, Ahnaf, Alya, Mohammed, 2017); E.T. Hall’s descriptions of interpersonal loyalties in low context cultures could also be applied to students’ expressions of wanting more student-student and student-tutor interactions. Both these readings are extremely superficial, however, particularly, in relation to the former, because students also noted degrees of prejudice and, in relation to the latter, because nearly all tutors and students stated a desire for more social interactions. E.T. Hall’s theory of proxemics may be seen as consonant with Jäger and Maier’s DAA in their examination of meaningful space and, from this perspective, need no further elaboration. Student proxemic preferences were evident in their particular dress codes as well as in some having predilection for male in-class presence over female. E.T. Hall’s distinction between monochronic and polychronic times may be applicable to the staff’s sentiments toward the evaluative and time-demanding nature of their employment duties, with apparent leanings developing towards a more polychronic approach to teaching.

7.2.1 Intersectionality.

Identities were homogenised, and this practice was sustained through curricula documents and in-class texts, where processual intersections were structured to support ‘passive’ learning and the delivery of knowledge as object. In contrast, student discourses
often pertained to the international traveller, which consistently intersected with home and national identities in aspirations pertaining to future employment either internationally or in the ‘home’ country on return. Intersecting identities were evident between students’ past and present self-perceptions. While colonialist ties of nation-state were perhaps challenged by geographical shifts, most students indicated that they believed their intercultural interactions were beneficial for them in that their discussions with others from different locations made them more open to accept that others held different values and related to different performances to their own. In showing willingness to accept difference without being threatened or feeling pressured to conform to others’ choices, they point to possible shifts in their own prior orientations to difference.

Tutors’ protective behaviours, shielding students from attention to political, religious and social difference, intersected with neoliberal naturalisations as a kind of normative behaviour that muted ICU initiatives. Students were made passive through the intersections of ‘patients’, ‘beneficiaries’ and ‘agents’, where the latter’s foci were channelled into individualist and futurist purpose. In addition, the passivity was consolidated through transmissive pedagogies that enabled time and place exclusions, produced closed settings that rejected the import of actual local, national, or international communities to focus on a non-existent idealised future. This passive intersection with a superficial knowledge object, together with a neutralised tutor persona, is counter to ICU aims.

Within the Directors’ and administrators’ approaches, considerable care for student well-being intersected with assumptions that tutors shared the same perspective on ICU and that ICU was predominantly limited to students learning about Australian culturalities. These intersecting views restricted administrative action on ICU development, as it transferred responsibility for ICU development to the tutors. At the same time, the tutors were not
professionally guided on how to approach ICU, and their beliefs about the nature of ICU varied.

### 7.2.2 Feminist pedagogy.

The research also aimed to identify patriarchal processes that deny or subvert feminine expressions, in order to locate avenues for liberating feminine manifestation and facilitate the expression and recognition of multiplicities. Across the three case studies, pathway mechanisms supported masculinist processes through voidance of care, emphasis on competitive behaviours, established hierarchies, and denial of creative expression. The practices recall Cantini’s (2017) findings that care may be commodified for economic gain and thereby obstruct the development of affective care expressions. Discourses of the Path 3 tutors that overtly rejected student affectionate utterances produced a class structure in the pathway imaginary that elevated the non-emotional, academic intelligentsia and supported the neoliberal power processes.

Nevertheless, feminine manifestations and new masculinities were occurring through interactions that cut through homogenised identities. Students were keen to establish new friendships and demonstrated willingness to learn and be open to change. They thus indicated openness to experience of different gender expressions, such as Muslim men and women interacting in class. The tutors’ caring gestures in Paths 1 and 2 also initiated and supported gender disordering, disturbed neoliberal, patriarchal procedures, and invested the contexts with acknowledgement of the students’ past and present identities, so that students were encouraged to interact and share their outlooks. The research thus lay bare that caring endeavours, both individual and institutional, penetrated neoliberal economic demands and invested the contexts with a deeper social dimension, more open to ICU development. These insights expose the problematic espoused in Lu’s (2018) speculation that neoliberal influences, such as “discourses of performativity and managerialism” (p. 87), can negate
emotional support for students. Recognition of this difficulty supports Halse et al.’s (2015) findings that intercultural education is most effective when integrated across disciplines and thus embedded in attitudes, practices and values of the staff and students (p. 7) and enhanced through professional development (p. 4). The findings are also in keeping with hooks’ (2003) claims and Tsouroufli’s (2018) study that expressions of caregiving and care-receiving act to challenge patriarchal discourses; the affective dimension serves as a way of correcting the imbalance created by ‘clinical’ neoliberal demands. The insights also support Kim’s (2017) research conclusions that particular pedagogical approaches, especially critical caring, can “reform the core of the educational practice rather than seeking curriculum revisions on the surface” (p. 979). Nurturing expressions aid in promoting positive attitudes, such as “respect”, “openness” and “curiosity and discovery” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 254), which points to the need to foster and extend caregiving and care-receiving as tutor pedagogical methodologies.

7.3 Review of the Methods, Methodology and Theoretical Choices

The triangulated data collection through interviews, literature and curricula analyses, and observations enabled extensive data collection and deep analysis that has resulted in significant insights into the nature and value of ICU. The interviews revealed personal attitudes and cultural interpretations and facilitated the semiotic dimensions of discourses to be analysed. The repertory grid questions produced incisive responses, particularly in the request to recall positive and negative intercultural experiences, as these were often quite vivid and contrasting descriptions. The curricula analyses pointed to the various ways that discourses create student and tutor personas that are not wholly beneficial or encouraging of active learning. They were also useful in revealing underlying, semiotic messages that were Eurocentric and in contradiction to the institutional aims. The observations regarding the
physical environments were also informative in exposing how they uphold the identified hierarchical structures of the pathway agents.

The auto-ethnographic anecdotes, which paralleled the research foci, aimed to complement the research through connecting personal experiences and insights with the social, cultural, and political circumstances. The experience of writing the personal accounts through CDA lenses guided me to critically compare and contrast the three pathways and helped me to approach my past experiences openly. The combination of a perspective that was both personal and analytical extended understanding of the research foci, while extending and reconciling my own subjective experiences. I have found the reflections have deepened my respect for the influence that I may carry throughout all of my work areas and the power of empathy and expressions of care. The comparisons between the pathways also underscore just how differently institutes can function while working within the same government guidelines.

The auto-ethnographic explanations added another dimension to the qualitative research, providing an insider view to a tutor’s pathway experiences. The perspectives do have their limitation, in providing a subjective reflection of private experiences and perspectives. Nevertheless, such detailed accounts of personal experiences in pathways are rare. Drawing on personal narrative, diary entries, past emails and mobile messages, opinions and reflections, the descriptions provide others with the ability to reflect on social and cultural processes and their effects on tutors’ perceptions, decisions, and actions. When I chose to share my perceptions, I imagined that I would include my more emotional experiences, but that has not been the case. My choice instead to adopt CDA lenses in the auto-ethnography guided my experiential selections, which were more revealing of my experiences of social, cultural, and political processes and their power practices.
The integration of five differing CDA approaches together with the auto-ethnography offered an in-depth study into the nature and value of ICU in the three pathways, how it was created, interpreted and regarded. Each lens offered a new perception on the same broad context, by shining a torch on a different area or dimension of the researched pathway. Placing four of the CDA lenses within Fairclough’s dialectical relational approach also enabled the focus to remain on the obstacles to successful ICU, so that the aims to identify the nature and value of ICU and locate avenues to enhance ICU could be sustained. The regular allusions to Deardorff’s 2006 Model respected the notion that some broadly accepted ICC characteristics could serve to provide reference points and tentative deductions. The comparisons of the ICC characteristics with the participant responses were an enriching addition to the study. It is important, nevertheless, to maintain consideration of these ICC insights as possibilities rather than decisive conclusions.

While each of the methods was highly informative, they also had their limitations beyond the tight boundaries of the three pathways. The administrator questions might have been more illuminating if they had been the same as those for the tutors. The apparent omission of Other on the participant forms occurred as a result of not omitting the gender options, which had been the intention, as each particular participants’ gender identities were not a part of the research. My own view of including ‘Other’ on such forms is that it still privileges the male/female identities. In addition, I did not include discussion on sexuality. Although I have taught sex education to Year 6 level, I would not feel comfortable discussing sexual issues with individual students. In retrospect, while the gender question could have been omitted from the participant forms, questions on gender identities and sexuality may have been useful inclusions in the focus group interviews.

The text analysis was also particularly limited, specifically in its scope, with only one item chosen from each textbook, although the general themes of the whole of each text were
broadly addressed. This selectivity in relation to printed texts is, however, a recognised choice involved in conducting CDA, and does not minimise its potential contribution. The text analyses demonstrated that the texts carried global North or Eurocentric perspectives, despite the intercultural intentions of tutors and perhaps also the authors. This gives weight to Rizvi and Beech’s (2017) promotion for participant directed and context-specific “cosmopolitan learning” (p. 125). While the out-of-class observations were extremely useful in focusing on the semiotic dimension of the physical environments, there was little to garner from actual participant interactions, as each pathway lacked student common rooms, so students did not linger within any of the institute’s public spaces. This absence in itself, nevertheless, spoke to the limited value given to ICU.

7.4 Recommendations for Pathways

In identifying possible ways past the obstacles to eradicating the identified social wrong of a lack of address to ICU (Fairclough, 2015), the following recommendations, not provided in any specific order, would likely initiate significant change.

7.4.1 Diversity acceptance.

*Explicit embrace of diverse cultural identities.*

A significant outcome of this research has been the discovery that nearly all participants, including the pathway Directors, desired greater social interaction. At the same time, clearly, driven by economic aspirations, students place a high value on their international experience. Pathway and HE administrations should utilise this economic value and heavily invest in developing students’ social interactions. All sectors must take responsibility to redress the distinct imbalance toward financial interests at the cost of social interaction and development.

As homogenisation is integral to pathway processes, cultural manifestations need opportunities for expression. Administrators, tutors, and students need opportunities to
discuss and implement contextualised strategies together to break down stereotypical assumptions of homogenised identities. This is most evidently achieved through providing a wide range of avenues for subjective expressions.

Far more value needs to be placed on providing a creative environment through physical mediums within the classroom and public pathway spaces. Scholars (for example, Cooks, 2010; Ma, 2017, & Weber, 2010) emphasise the aesthetic arts to generate new knowledges that may challenge traditional cultural assumptions. While the difficulty in integrating arts activities in English classes is acknowledged, the option to display and celebrate artistic diversity in the material contexts is always available yet in these studied pathways was not utilised. Leaving such decision-making to individual administrations is inadequate. Integration of the arts must be included in administration policies and supported in TEQSA and ASQA guidelines so that patriarchal leanings that exclude the creative expressive are gradually dissipated and recognised as unnecessary.

Intercultural discussion.

Current pedagogical practices may not be lacking in shared discussions, as indicated in the questionnaire percentage results, but the focus of discussions needs to be more interculturally interactive and targeted on international student integration. Students need additional support to interact with host-national students and students of other nationalities and languages. This recommendation is supported by past findings that discursive interaction will aid in both discovering the heterogeneity of linguistic use (Piller, 2011) and breaking through nationalist and linguistic groupings (Burdett & Crossman, 2012; Dunn and Olivier, 2011; Pandian et al., 2016; Ting & Patron, 2013; Woods, Jordan, Loudoun, Troth & Kerr, 2006).

Further, Ekland et al.’s (2009) finding that recognition of similar experience to another’s experience facilitates empathy has implications for developing care in educational
contexts. If international students are to continue to be segregated from domestic students in classroom contexts, regular inter-class interactions need to be promoted. Leaving relationships to naturally develop between domestic and international students is not a strategy; on the contrary, within a framework that values the economy over social developments, such inaction is actually destructive. Hence, the need to develop the skills of intercultural understanding through acknowledgment and acceptance of cultural differences is paramount. Recognition of the students’ family (Doyle et al., 2016) through extended support, as Path 1 adopted in its program, should be a part of this process.

**Personal voices.**

Embracing cultural diversities is contingent on giving acknowledgement to frameworks that students can relate to which starts with their own experiences, their histories, geographies, assumptions and perceptions. Students must have opportunities to speak, write, and share their narratives. This insight gives weight to Lausch et al.’s (2017) findings that students must be given freedom of expression through narrative as a means of making sense of their interactions and to undermine the homogeneity of the ‘international student’ identity (p. 897).

**Diversity in texts and classroom content.**

Silence can be a means of expressing respect in cultures that foreground European customs, but in an educational framework, silence can be detrimental and inhibit student participation. In-class discussion on student subjectivities, including of ‘race’, ethnicities, age, place, spiritual beliefs and political viewpoints, would be a step towards stimulating interest in existing diversities, extending capabilities in intercultural competence, and desisting discriminations (Crisp, Epstein, Rojan, & Taket, 2018; Gill, 2016; Ramsey, 2000; Wakelin (in West, 2017). This position supports Halse et al.’s (2015) conclusions that extending networks into educational facilities of “different ethnic, religious and linguistic
profiles” (p. 7) is highly beneficial for developing and sharing intercultural capabilities. This approach to identities gives recognition of our own vulnerabilities and strengths. This recommendation should also be adopted in TEQSA, ASQA and pathway policy guidelines, because education of identity as enculturation and as choice can bring greater freedom and responsibility in making future choices.

**Pedagogical strategies.**

As evident in this study, excessive neoliberal productivity demands are placing strain on tutors and students, destroying the quality of social interaction, failing to challenge cultural assumptions, and perpetuating passive transmissive learning. These recognitions echo Jiang’s (2007) research recommendations that performance measurements in universities should be more equitably balanced with “teachers’ self-management of quality [and support for] academics to innovate in teaching” (p. 239). There have been many advances in this direction in more recent years, particularly through promoting technological facilities. Nevertheless, pathway administrative top-down policies can continue to inhibit integrated social undertakings. Technological opportunities are highly recommended, but change is not dependent on the classroom materials; it is dependent on the orientation toward intercultural interaction. It is currently incumbent on all staff to take responsibility for integrating more social communication opportunities into units and to restructure assessment to be more skills based and socially interactive as far as it is practically possible. Assessment demands, and the time frames that structure those demands, often weigh too heavily on all participants. Reducing assessments may not be an option at this stage but changing the nature of assessments may be.

Transformative pedagogies instigate student-focused learning, where topics are current and driven by students’ own social interactions and interests, including family and community (Hatoss, 2006; Hayes et al., 2017; Pandian et al., 2016; Thurgood, 2018; Woods
et al., 2006). By interacting with sources outside the pathway context, students are more likely to recognise that the ways that differences are defined and understood are determined by culturalities, which is why they vary across contexts (Meriläinen et al., 2009). TEQSA and the Higher Education Standards Panel, an advisory board to TEQSA, must promote greater community interactions that include those beyond the immediate university or pathway setting. Assessment should be included in relation to social interactions, most evidently through a standardised approach to intercultural understanding that includes knowledge, awareness, and skills. This would help to initiate a turn toward education becoming more active and purposeful in communicating with the community and would help to drive a shift away from the meaningless cyclic pattern of passive learning and assessment.

### 7.4.2 Learning needs.

Within the three pathways, no tutors or administrators received professional development on ICU, while tutors held varying positions on ICU and approached discussion on social and ICU issues differently. These insights point to the need for administrators and tutors to receive professional development on ICU and effective pedagogies for ICU enhancement.

In relation to the above recommendation to include religious awareness in class content, it is acknowledged that approaching differences in a classroom of young students can be fraught with tensions. For this reason, the strategies to successfully appropriate necessary pedagogical methodologies must be incorporated in pre-service training. This also points to the need for TEQSA, the Higher Education Standards Panel, and ASQA to address the integration of strategies that will promote interculturality.

The insights also revealed that caring characteristics foster positive attitudes towards ICU, such as “respect”, “openness” and “curiosity and discovery” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 254). Administrators and tutors require training in expressing care in the workplace, particularly in
pedagogical care-giving and care-receiving methodologies, which go far beyond positive reinforcement strategies. The provision of a student common room could be an outcome of such training.

The overall unwillingness of both students and staff to envisage the initiation of changes through their own actions also points to the need for explicit discussion and professional development in the specific area of agency. Teachers and students need to learn how to recognise opportunities to introduce change in their employment environments. Towards this end, the practices for policy decision-making must aim to facilitate teacher and student involvement. This would initiate recognition of policy as a process (Yeatman, 1998) and provide a more representative service throughout the pathway. Students who have completed units can also be involved, as they have the experience to provide informed feedback in areas such as difficulty level and interest. Areas where staff and students could share in decision-making include topic choice, literature selection (textbooks), additional resources, assessment methods, and extra-curricular activities.

Explicit instructions on the avenues to initiate change would include the provision of an overview of the various unions available to students. The political influence of an outlet such as CISA, for example, depends on student knowledge of the association, awareness of his or her own agency, and motivation to implement change. Pathway locations, therefore, need to not only clearly provide the means for students to initiate contact with such political associations, they also need to actively support interactive communication with them, so that the political resources are realistically encountered and not passed by. This is important because many students come into Australia from non-democratic experience and will unnecessarily tolerate unacceptable conditions. This can relate to accommodation and employment issues, for example, and other areas where exploitation can occur. Such matters are typically addressed in Orientations but they require more serious attention. These issues
are tangential to pathway dynamics but can impact student integration and attitude toward learning.

7.4.3 Regulation.

Ongoing complaints about the English standards of students entering pathways point to the need for more stringent regulation. As Piller (2011) states: “We need to ask whether … the market does not need to be better regulated to ensure consumer protection and fair trading” (p. 167). The provision of equitable access to universities for transnational students is complicated by the students’ varying standards and made more problematic by the differing standards that exist across pathway programs. Tutors are placed under greater duress with students entering well below Year 11 ability (Gerd Shroder-Turk, in Worthington, 2019) as requirements stipulate. If students and tutors were more readily integrated into decision-making processes, ‘whistle-blowers’ would become redundant. TEQSA and the Higher Education Standards Panel should prioritise a review of student output at EAP and Foundation level and the curricula that supports them as a means toward implementing a standardised entry program. A standardised pre-test at the learning institution before beginning the program and another standardised test again at the end of the program is one possible solution to this ongoing issue.

The reifications of political and media rhetoric require an impartial and balanced voice, which could be created through a scholarly monitoring system, as Levine (2012) has recommended. Such a system would work well with an established “regional knowledge network” (Welch, 2016). These are both complex recommendations, which have not been discussed extensively as they are tangential to pathway processes. Nevertheless, their implementation is seen as a means of strong protection against prejudicial behaviours and discourses in Australia. A similar monitoring system could be applied at a local level through one or more individuals overseeing agency in decision-making processes within pathways.
7.5 Recommendations for Further Research

The study’s insights point to a number of possibilities for future research. For those who are researching paradigms of care in pedagogy, the study found that tutors’ expressions of care beyond the formal administrative events invested the environments with deeper responses to intercultural interactions. The need to find ways to promote caring endeavours, to work towards de-gendering care through sharing strategies more openly, and to weave caring processes more deeply into the institutional network is essential. Through such practices, student trust and respect may be increased, and through such practices, the liberal nature of institutions may be sustained (Ignatieff, in West, 2018). The nurturing behaviours that upheld the institutional values were also those that supported the broad acceptance of diversity. Research into the pedagogical implementation of known and newly found caring methodologies is thus recommended.

For those who are researching how to shift unequal positionings in education facilities, ongoing explorations into how students and tutors might assume stronger voices in administrative processes are imperative. The study showed that students and tutors do not draw upon union support, even though both participant groups expressed desire for administrative changes. Stronger student and tutor voices would allow for greater diversity in cultural representations.

For those who are researching transformative teaching methodologies, a meta-analysis of research into the different ways that tutors are implementing transformative approaches within international student classes, comparing methodologies in the development of ICU, would help promote active learning. Investigation into in-class assessment methods of ICU based on transformative learning strategies would also be beneficial.
7.6 Conclusion

The value of intercultural understanding cannot be overstated. The perception that nothing needs to be done because students of different nationalities are already interacting in their learning experiences ignores the need to dissipate stereotypical assumptions and prejudicial views, and to extend our knowledge and care for others no matter how different they are or appear to be from ourselves. Ignorance and bias can lead to cruelty and violence, as witnessed every day through the media. Every educator is responsible for reinforcing each individual’s cultural identities and fostering intercultural understanding (UNESCO, 2010, p. 9). As the study’s insights showed, many of our prejudices are ontologically embedded: a text that appears to provide equal views to a story can still be prejudiced; curricula that aim to orientate students to their new environment can stifle exploration through institutional indoctrination; and the provision of neat nondescript facilities can stultify creative expression. Many barriers to ICU need to be dismantled so that strong standards of intercultural respect and interaction are realised.
References


textbook, well read 1. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8(2), 184–196. doi: 10.17507/tpls.0802.02


Between critical reflections and future policies (pp. 59–72). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0


Dawson, A. (2002). ‘This is the digital underclass’: Asian dub foundation and hip-hop cosmopolitanism, *Social Semiotics, 12*(1), 27–44. doi: 10.1080/10350330220130359


Fahrutdinova, R.A. (2014). English language in the development of a tolerant person of the student in a multi-ethnic educational environment of the university (for example, Kazan Federal University). English Language Teaching, 7(12), 77–84. doi: 10.5539/elt.v7n12p77


Galman, S. (2011). “Now you see her, now you don’t”: The integration of mothering, spirituality, and work. In H. Chang, & D. Boyd (Eds.), *Spirituality in higher
education: Autoethnographies (pp. 33–49). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.


Gill, S. (2016). Universities as spaces for engaging the other: A pedagogy of


Head Look Big in This? Bookbird, 53(2), 30–35. doi: 10.1353/bkb.2015.0032


and methodological orientations. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 18*(1).


Lee, V. S. (2017). Political determinants and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women: Don’t leave your integrity at the political gate. *Journal of Public Health Policy; Basingstoke, 38*(3), 387–393. doi:10.1057/s41271-017-0075-y


Moses, Y. (2017, June 5). Diversity and inclusion on campus – are we there yet? National Centre of Cultural Competence. Paper presented at University of Sydney, NSW.


Pan, J-Y., & Wong, D. F. K. (2011). Acculturative stressors and acculturative strategies as predictors of negative affect among Chinese international students in Australia and
Hong Kong: A cross-cultural comparative study. *Academic Psychiatry, 35*(6), 376–381.


Path 1. (2014). *English Language Centre student rights and responsibilities – guidelines and procedures*. URL withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study.


Path 1. (2016). *English language centre: Staff handbook*. City withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study. NSW: English Language Centre.


Path 2. (2017). *English for academic purposes handbook: ELICOS program for international students*. Institute place and publisher withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study.

Path 3. (2017). *Course Outline*. Unit title, institute place and publisher withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study.

Patron, M-C. G. (2006). 'Une annee entre parenthese' French academic sojourners in
Australia: The impact of social and cultural dimensions of acculturation and repatriation on perceptions of cultural identity (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of South Australia, Adelaide, South Australia. Available from Australian Education Research Theses Database.


doi:10.1057/978023028337


multidimensional process model. In P. B. Pedersen & J. G. Draguns (Eds.), 

international and host students using longitudinal social network analysis. 

Rizvi, F. (2007). Beyond the East-West divide: Education and the dynamics of Australia-Asia 

of Education, 30(3), 253–268. doi: 10.1080/01596300903036863

Rizvi, F. (2011). Theorizing student mobility in an era of globalisation. Teachers and 
Teaching, 17(6), 693–701. doi: 10.1080/13540602.2011.625145

Rizvi, R., & Beech, J. (2017) Global mobilities and the possibilities of a cosmopolitan 
curriculum. Curriculum Inquiry, 47(1), 125–134. doi: 
10.1080/03626784.2016.1254500

Robbins (Eds.), Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation (pp. 1–19). 
Minneapolis, MA: University of Minnesota Press.

university support services in Australia: A case study. International Education 
Journal: Comparative Perspectives, 14(3), 122–137. Retrieved from 

environments and perceptions: A case study using the Delphi technique. Higher 
education research & development, 19(1), 89–102. doi: 10.1080/07294360050020499


*Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Austl.)* Retrieved from


Tisdell, E. J. (1998). Poststructural feminist pedagogies: The possibilities and limitations of 
feminist emancipatory adult learning theory and practice. *Adult Education Quarterly,* 
48(3), 139–156.

of socio-cultural adaptation for international business students. *International Journal 
of Educational Management,* 21(2,3), 194–212. doi: 10.1108/09513540710738656

*European Education Research Journal,* 12(3), 367–375. doi: 
10.2304/eerj.2013.12.3.367

and Education disciplines. *Higher Education Research & Development,* 27(3), 245- 
256. doi: 10.1080/07294360802183804

Tran, L. T., & Vu, T. T. P. (2016). 'I'm not like that, why treat me the same way?': The 
impact of stereotyping international students on their learning, employability and 
connectedness with the workplace. *Australian Educational Researcher,* 43(2), 203– 
220. doi: 10.1007/s13384-015-0198-8

cultural diversity in business* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Nicholas Brealey.

NY: Routledge.


Tsouroufli, M. (2018). Gendered pedagogic identities and academic professionalism in Greek 
medical schools. *Gender and Education,* 30(1), 45–58. doi: 
10.1080/09540253.2016.1262008


University title – withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study. (2017). *Promoting a respectful and collaborative university: Diversity and inclusiveness policy.* URL withheld to maintain anonymity of the specific case study.


Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic Questionnaires

Administrator Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer all the questions below. Your responses are strictly confidential. Thank you.

1. Age: ___________
2. Gender: Male ______ Female ______
3. What is your nationality? ________________
4. What are your academic qualifications? 
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
5. How long have you been employed at this institute?
   Less than 6 months (   ); 1 year (   ); 2 years (   ); 3 years (   ); 4 years (   );
   5 years (   ); over 5 years (   ).
6. What units are you currently overseeing?
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
7. What is the main aim of each of these units?
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
8. What countries have you lived and worked in?
   _______________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________
9. Please state any languages that you speak other than English.
   _______________________________________________________________________
10. How long have you been employed in the field of academic English for international
    students? ____________________
Academic Staff Demographic Questionnaire
Please answer all the questions below. Your responses are strictly confidential. Thank you.

1. Age: _____________
2. Gender: Male _____ Female ______
3. What is your nationality? __________________
4. What are your academic qualifications?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
5. How long have you been teaching at this institute?
   Less than 6 months ( ) 1 year ( ) 2 years ( ) 3 years ( ) 4 years ( )
   5 years ( ) over 5 years ( )
6. What units are you currently teaching?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
7. Briefly, what are the main aims of each of the units that you teach?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
8. What countries have you lived and worked in?
____________________________________________________________________
9. ____________________________________________
10. Please state any languages that you speak other than English.
____________________________________________________________________
11. How long have you been teaching English? ________________
12. Approximately what percentage of your class time incorporates student discussion?
   5% ( ) 10% ( ) 15% ( ) 20% ( ) 30% ( ) Above 40% ( )
Student Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer all the questions below. Your responses are strictly confidential. Thank you.

1. Age: ______________
2. Gender: Male _____ Female ______
3. What is your “home” country? __________________
4. What countries have you lived in?

__________________________________________________________________

5. What countries have you studied in? If same as above, state “As above”.

__________________________________________________________________

6. Are you an undergraduate or postgraduate student?
   Undergraduate (    ) Postgraduate (    )
7. Please state your parents’ occupations _______________ ________________
8. How long have you been studying in Australia?
   Less than 6 months (  ); 1 year (  ); 2 years (  ); 3 years (  ); 4 years (  ); 5 years (  ); over 5 years (  ).
9. What is your field of study? __________________
10. Please state any languages you speak other than English

___________________________________________________________________

11. How long have you been studying English, including in your home country?
    ________________
12. Approximately, what percentage of class time is spent on student discussion?
    5% (  ) 10% (  ) 15% (  ) 20% (  ) 30% (  ) Above 40% (  )
13. How actively engaged do you generally become in student in-class discussions? Place a X on the line below to indicate your general percentage of engagement.

1%____________________________________________________________100%
Appendix B: Repertory Grids

Example Repertory Grid for Participants

MATERIALS: numbered cards (1 – 6), 1 repertory grid

1. Place the numbers face down and shuffle. Choose 3 numbers.

2. Put a small tick on the first row under the corresponding element number at the top.

3. Find a similarity between two of the elements in their relation to ‘petness’ i.e. Which 2 of the 3 have something in common with each other? How do they promote ‘petness’ in the same way? [When you do the Intercultural understanding grid, ask “how do they promote Intercultural understanding in the same way?”]

4. Write a brief description of how the two elements are the same in the “positive” left hand column.

5. Now find a way that the third element is unlike the other two.

6. Write this description on the first row of the “negative” column, on the right side of the grid.

7. Repeat procedures 1 – 6 until all the rows are filled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct of ‘Petness’</th>
<th>1 HORSE</th>
<th>2 DOG</th>
<th>3 CAT</th>
<th>4 BIRD</th>
<th>5 GUINEA PIG</th>
<th>6 MOUSE</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Construct of ‘Petness’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Repertory Grid—Individual

What is the nature of intercultural interaction in this institute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID:</th>
<th>+ Experience of Intercultural Interaction</th>
<th>+ Experience of Intercultural Interaction</th>
<th>- Experience of Intercultural Interaction</th>
<th>- Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher records described experience here.</td>
<td>Researcher records described experience here.</td>
<td>Researcher records described experience here.</td>
<td>Researcher records construct based on similarities here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researcher records construct based on similarities here.

If provided, researcher records additional constructs here.

If provided, researcher records additional constructs here.

If provided, researcher records additional constructs here.

If provided, researcher records additional constructs here.

In aiming to locate the nature of intercultural understanding, how are two the same, yet different from the third? Find a common attribute in two that isn’t in the third.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Construct of Interculturality</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Construct of Interculturality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural Topics for Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural Material for Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural Topics for Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Expression in Writing (to be read)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-Class Artistic Expression (role-play, art, poetry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repertory Grid – Focus Groups
| + Construct of Interculturality | 1 | Intercultural Topics for Writing | 2 | Intercultural Material for Reading | 3 | Intercultural Topics for Discussion | 4 | Intercultural Topics for Writing (to be read) | 5 | Personal Expression in Writing (to be read) | 6 | In-Class Artistic Expression (role-play, art, poetry) | 7 | Classes with mixed national cultures | 8 | Small classes | 9 | Multicultural group working together on one project | 10 | Students discuss their home country in multicultural class | 11 | English practice in class | - Construct of Interculturality |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
|                                |   |                               |   |                                 |   |                                   |   |                                         |   |                                          |   |                                          |   |                                |   |                            |   |                                      |   |                                |   |                                        |   |                                   |   |                                      |   |                                 |   |                                       |   |                                      |   |                                 |   |                                       |   |                                 |   |                                       |   |                                      |   |                                 |   |                                       |
Appendix C: Interview Procedures & Research Questions

Administrative Staff—Individual interviews.

Interviews with education institute administrative staff comprise three sections: Section A, Section B and Section C.

Section A
At the initial meeting (whether in person or via email), participants will be asked to complete a short questionnaire prior to the interview and to bring it with them to the interview: see Appendix A “Administrator Demographic Questionnaire”. At the interview, the researcher will collect the questionnaire and ensure that it has been fully completed.

Section B
A form of the research question—“What is the nature of intercultural interaction in this institute?”—and a repertory grid will be on a sheet of paper and shown to the participant; see Appendix B, “Repertory Grid—Individual”. The researcher will use the grid to fill in the participant’s responses.

Participants will be asked to think of two experiences at the institute, which in their opinion describe or depict a classroom interaction that is a positive intercultural experience and one classroom experience, which in their opinion is a negative intercultural experience. The researcher will explain that there is no right or wrong answer and that the procedure is not a test. No examples of intercultural understanding will be provided as the ideas must come from the participant; the researcher’s own conceptions may contaminate the research.

The participant will then be asked to think of how the two positive intercultural experiences are the same but different from the negative intercultural experience. The researcher will record the answers on the grid. Prompts may be provided if the participant is uncertain; for example, “What do you mean?”, or “Can you explain that a bit more please?”.

The term Repertory Grid is not used on the Participant Information Sheet to maintain lay language, but a description of the activity is provided: “The interviewer… will ask you to provide and compare a few of your own experiences of intercultural understanding within this education pathway”.

Section C of the interview—questions:
Participants will be asked to provide answers to the following questions.

Education Institute Administrative Staff

1. How does the institute aim to help students gain a sense of belonging to the institute?
2. What image does the institute aim to portray?
3. In what ways do the English language units embrace different cultural perspectives?
4. How do the units address the changing nature of cultures, including ‘Western’ cultures?
5. How do the units address the differences between the pathway culture and the students’ home cultures?
6. How do you define intercultural understanding?
7. If intercultural understanding could be strengthened in this institute, what would you change?
8. How would you go about making such changes?
Individual interviews.
Interviews with academic staff comprise three sections: Section A, Section B and Section C.

Section A
At the initial meeting (whether in person or via email), participants will be asked to complete a short questionnaire prior to the interview and to bring it with them to the interview: see Appendix A: “Academic Staff Demographic Questionnaire”. At the interview, the researcher will collect the questionnaire and ensure that it has been fully completed.

Section B
A form of the research question—“What is the nature of intercultural interaction in this institute?”—and a repertory grid will be on a sheet of paper and shown to the participant: see Appendix B, “Repertory Grid—Individual”. The researcher will use the grid to fill in the participant’s responses.

Participants will be asked to think of two experiences at the institute, which in their opinion describe or depict a classroom interaction that is a positive intercultural experience and one classroom experience, which in their opinion is a negative intercultural experience. The researcher will explain that there is no right or wrong answer and that the procedure is not a test. No examples of intercultural understanding will be provided as the ideas must come from the participants and the researcher’s own conceptions may contaminate the research.

The participant will then be asked to think of how the two positive intercultural experiences are the same but different from the negative intercultural experience. The researcher will record the answers on the grid. Prompts may be provided if the participant is uncertain; for example, “What do you mean?”, or “Can you explain that a bit more please?”

The term Repertory Grid is not used on the Participant Information Sheet to maintain lay language, but a description of the activity is provided: “The interviewer… will ask you to provide and compare a few of your own experiences of intercultural understanding within this education pathway”.

Section C of the interview—questions:
Prior to beginning the questions, tutor participants will be asked to state whether their answers are going to be personal perspectives and not those of the organization or whether they are speaking on behalf of the organization and are authorized to do so. Participants will then be asked to provide answers to the following questions.

1. What kinds of writing (or writing identities) are promoted in your units?
2. How is topic selection chosen?
3. In what ways does this institute, including your unit, embrace different cultural perspectives?
   [Prompts: discussion on well-known figures, moral and religious concerns, political issues, excursions to special sites or the meaning and value of public occasions]
4. Are there any occasions where the nature of student learning is openly discussed or reflected upon?
5. How do you organise classroom interactions?
6. How is artistic expression experienced or facilitated in this institute?
7. How would you define culture?
8. What do you think intercultural understanding is or involves?
9. What image or images does this institute portray and how do you relate to them?
10. How has this pathway influenced the way you understand other cultures?
11. How do you, your units, or the facility address differences between the pathway culture and the students’ cultural experiences?
12. Are you explicit about the constructed nature of the units you teach? If so, in what ways?
13. If you could make any changes at all to this pathway context, in relation to deepening intercultural understandings, what changes would you make?
14. How would you go about making such changes?
15. How are decisions made at this institute/centre?
Academic Staff Focus-Group Interviews.

About two weeks after the individual interviews, tutors will be invited to a focus group interview, with four other academic staff members. If tutors attending the focus group interviews did not attend an individual interview, a questionnaire will have been provided for them to complete prior to the focus group interview – see Appendix A –“Academic Staff Demographic Questionnaire”. The focus group interviews incorporate questions and the completion of a repertory grid. With each tutor’s approval, this group interview will be audio-recorded. The aim is to stimulate open discussion and expression of ideas that may not have been put forward in the individual interviews.

For academic staff, the questions are:

1. How would you define culture?
2. What do you think intercultural understanding is or involves?
3. How has this pathway influenced the way you understand other cultures?
4. How do you, your units, or the facility address differences between the pathway culture and the students’ cultural experiences?
5. If you could make any changes at all to this pathway context, in relation to deepening intercultural understanding, what changes would you make?
6. How would you go about making such changes?

The researcher will posit the questions to the whole focus group orally and record the answers in writing and digitally. The first two questions will be asked as they are considered open questions that will not influence the participants’ answers.

A copy of Appendix B, “Repertory Grid – Focus Groups” will then be distributed to each academic along with a set of numbered cards. Participants will then be shown how to complete a repertory grid. The Repertory Grid Example, Appendix B, will be used for the explanation. Participants will be asked to discuss the repertory grid question as a group but to complete their own repertory grid independently. When the group has completed at least 3 rows of their repertory grid, or when there is only 10 minutes of the allocated 60 minutes remaining (whichever comes first), the researcher will collect the repertory grid sheets.
**Individual Student Interviews**

The individual interviews with students comprise three sections: Section A, Section B and Section C.

**Section A**
At the initial meeting (whether in person or via email), participants will be asked to complete a short questionnaire prior to the interview and to bring it with them to the interview: see Appendix A, “Student Demographic Questionnaire”. At the interview, the researcher will collect the questionnaire and ensure that it has been fully completed.

**Section B**
A form of the research question—“What is the nature of intercultural interaction in this institute?”—and a repertory grid will be on a sheet of paper and shown to the participant: see Appendix B, “Repertory Grid—Individual”. The researcher will use the grid to fill in the participant’s responses. Participants will be asked to think of two experiences at the institute, which in their opinion describe or depict a positive intercultural interaction and one experience, which in their opinion describes or depicts a negative intercultural interaction. The researcher will explain that there is no right or wrong answer and that the procedure is not a test. No examples of intercultural understanding will be provided as the ideas must come from the participants and the researcher’s own conceptions may contaminate the research. The participant will then be asked to think of how the two positive experiences are the same but different from the negative experience. The researcher will record the answers on the grid. Prompts may be provided if the participant is uncertain; for example, “What do you mean?”, or “Can you explain that a bit more?”.

The term Repertory Grid is not used on the Participant Information Sheet to maintain lay language, but a description of the activity is provided: “The interviewer… will ask you to provide and compare a few of your own experiences of intercultural understanding within this education pathway”.

**Section C of the interview:**
Participants will be asked to provide answers to the following questions.

1. What adjustments have you had to make in becoming a student here? (Prompts: writing formats; topic choices).
2. What kinds of writing styles do you use in the classroom, i.e. personal narrative, essay, report, ‘I persona’ use?
3. What kinds of topics do you write on, i.e. cultural issues?
4. Do you ever choose topics for discussion or writing, or only the tutor?
5. What differences have you noticed between the ways your home culture is portrayed here to your own knowledge of your home culture?
6. How do you define culture and then what do you think intercultural understanding is or involves?
7. In what ways does the institute integrate different cultural perspectives, i.e. discussion on well-known figures, moral and religious concerns, political issues, excursions to special sites, the meaning and value of public occasions?
8. What is the nature of interaction in the classroom; how do people interact, i.e. seating arrangements?
9. In class, do you reflect on your student experiences and learning, either through classroom discussion or written work?
10. Have you had any opportunity to express yourself artistically in your academic learning, i.e. through art, drama, or poetry?
11. What do you think about the different cultures that are represented in Australia and this facility?
12. How do you think this pathway influences the ways you feel about this country or other cultures?
13. If you could make any changes at all to this pathway context, in relation to deepening intercultural understanding, what changes would you make?
14. How would you go about making such changes?
15. Are you aware of international student unions or organisations that give voice to student needs?
Student Focus-Group Interviews

About two weeks after the individual interviews, students will be invited to a focus group interview, with four other students. If students attending the focus group interviews did not attend an individual interview, a questionnaire will have been provided for them to complete prior to the focus group interview – see Appendix A, “Student Demographic Questionnaire”. The focus group interviews incorporate questions and the completion of a repertory grid. With each student’s approval, this group interview will be audio-recorded. The aim is to stimulate open discussion and expression of ideas that may not have been put forward in the individual interviews.

For students, the focus group questions are:

1. What do you think intercultural understanding is or involves?
2. How are different cultural perspectives brought into your units? [Prompts: discussion on well-known figures, moral and religious concerns, political issues, excursions to special sites, the meaning and value of public occasions.]
3. What is the nature of intercultural understanding in the classroom? [Prompt re seating.]
4. Have you had any opportunity to express yourself artistically in your unit work i.e. through art, drama, poetry, photography, IT media?
5. What kinds of writing styles (or writing identities) do you use in the classroom?
6. How has this pathway influenced the way that you understand other cultures?
7. If you could make any changes at all to this pathway context, in relation to deepening intercultural understanding, what changes would you make?

The researcher will posit the questions to the whole focus group orally and record the answers in writing and digitally. The first two questions will be asked prior to the repertory grid distribution as they are considered open questions that will not influence the participants’ answers.

A copy of Appendix B, “Repertory Grid – Focus Groups” will then be distributed to each student along with a set of numbered cards. Participants will then be shown how to complete a repertory grid. The Repertory Grid Example, Appendix B, will be used for the explanation. Participants will be asked to discuss the repertory grid question as a group but to complete their own repertory grid independently. When the group has completed at least 3 rows of their repertory grid, or when there is only 10 minutes of the allocated 60 minutes remaining (whichever comes first), the researcher will collect the repertory grid sheets.

The remaining questions 3 – 7 will be asked in the last 10 minutes of the allocated time of 60 minutes.
## Appendix D: Observation Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL SPACES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are spaces organised?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What rooms are available and for whom? Why/Why do I think so?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the purpose of the space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What formal or informal features exist in the room/s? Why/Why do I think so?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do elements within the space/s define behaviours? How? Why/why do I think so?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What histories &amp; connotations do significant objects pertain to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What power positions do the spaces uphold/sustain?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What cultural signifiers exist in the room/s?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What intercultural signifiers exist in the room/s?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE’S APPEARANCE &amp; BEHAVIOURS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the space attract mainly students, tutors, or admin staff? Why? How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What ages, genders, can I see? Why is this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What cultural characteristics are evident (institutional, local, national, international)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are people interacting (independently, grouped, casual, formal, close, distant, following, providing authority)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What tone/atmosphere predominates?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What power positions are evident (dominant speaker attributes – age, gender, role, attitude, tone)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the main behaviours (interactive, polite, controlling)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there evidence of interculturality? If so, what cultural interactions are apparent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Questions Guiding CDA Approaches

**Fairclough’s dialectical relational approach (DRA)**
- Stage 1: Focus upon a social wrong, in its semiotic aspect.
- Stage 2: Identify obstacles to identifying the social wrong.
- Stage 3: Consider whether the social order ‘needs’ the social wrong.
- Stage 4: Identify possible ways past the obstacles.

**Reisigl and Wodak’s discourse-historical approach (DHA)**
1. How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?
2. What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?
3. What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?
4. From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?
5. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, intensified or mitigated?

**Jäger and Maier’s dispositive analytical approach (DAA)**
1. What influence do the broader environments have on the upheld knowledges?
2. How do the dominant objects and environments carry the knowledges of each group?
3. In what ways do the knowledges that are upheld within the environment and objects of one group connect with significant knowledges held within the environments and objects of other groups?

**van Leeuwen’s social practices approach (SPA)**
1. “What kinds of actions are attributed to what kinds of participants?” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 151). The student and tutor identities were addressed in analysis.
2. “What kinds of actions tend to be objectivated, de-agentialized and so on?” (van Leeuwen, 2016, p. 151).

**van Dijk’s socio-cognitive approach (SCA)**
1. What are the significant cognitive representations evident in the contexts of curricula delivery and events management?
2. What are the significant micro and macro social interactions (structures and relations) that create the discourse of attention?
3. What physical forms and ideological structures does the discourse component comprise?
4. How do the three context components (cognition, action, and materializations) interrelate with the broader dominant culture?
At times, something particular about a minority group creates controversy. In Europe, some Muslim women wear headscarves – *hijab* in Arabic. This highly visible article of clothing has sparked a great deal of controversy, and in France, the debate has been particularly heated. In 2004, a French law banned the wearing of all visible religious symbols, including the *hijab*, in state schools. At that time, most of the French public supported the ban, and agreed with the government’s view that in a secular country, religion should be a private matter. According to this thinking, the ban would have a unifying effect since it would help prevent the splitting up of society into ethnic **communities** [original highlighting for the purpose of a grammatical exercise]. It would better facilitate the integration of Muslims into French society. Critics of the ban argue, however, that it violates an individual’s freedom of expression. They see it as discriminatory because it forces young Muslim women who choose to wear the *hijab* to leave state schools and attend private ones where the wearing of religious symbols is permitted. Furthermore, critics of the ban believe that it is an obstacle to the integration of Muslims into French society – just the opposite of what the government claims it intends to accomplish.

**End of excerpt.**

The following DHA analysis is composed in reference to the five DHA questions.

Table 13: Text 1 Analysis—Discourse-Historical Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Discourse on Muslim Women Wearing Hijab in France”</th>
<th>Discursive strategies</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nomination strategies: How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?</td>
<td>Discursive construction of social actors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>proper nouns:</em> French, Muslim, Arabic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>deictics:</em> this, they, that, it, ones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>generalising anthroponyms:</em> ethnic, young,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Collectives, including metonymic toponyms:</em> critics, minority groups, ethnic communities, minority group, Muslim women, French society, French public, state schools, private ones [schools]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>anthroponyms referring to geopolitical units:</em> French, France, Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>anthroponyms referring to religion or ideology:</em> Muslim, secular country, freedom of expression, private matter, integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>anthroponyms referring to language:</em> Arabic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive construction of objects/phenomena/events:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>concrete:</em> headscarves, hijab, highly visible article of clothing, religious symbols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>abstract:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <em>mental object/feelings:</em> controversy, debate, support, argue, agree,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <em>political matters:</em> the ban, government’s view, unifying effect,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o <em>ideological matters:</em> secular country, religion,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive construction of processes and actions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>material:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Predication strategies:

What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive characterisation/qualification of social actors, objects, phenomena, events processes and actions (positively or negatively)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>social actors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minority group of Muslim women: create controversy, wear headscarves (hijab), sparked a great deal of controversy, Muslims integrating into French society, leave state schools and attend private ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- French public: French public are split; some supported the ban and agreed with the government’s view; think the ban will be unifying; think the ban will prevent the splitting up of society into ethnic communities; think it would better facilitate the integration of Muslims into French society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Critics of the ban: think the ban violates an individual’s freedom of expression, see the ban as discriminatory, believe that the ban is an obstacle to the integration of Muslims into French society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- French Government and law: banned the wearing of all visible religious symbols in state schools, intends to accomplish the integration of Muslims into French society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argumentation strategies:

What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persuading readers of the validity of specific claims of truth and normative rightness:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- claims of truth regarding the existence of two perspectives on the hijab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- claims of truth regarding the cause of controversy with minority groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- claims of rightness regarding responses to controversial issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- claims of rightness regarding responses to the ban on the hijab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perspectivisation strategies:

From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positioning speaker’s or writer’s point of view and expressing involvement or distance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- ideological perspectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- academic assumption: viewing at least two sides of an argument will present objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adult – objectifies ‘young women’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- nationalist – French society, integration of Muslims into French society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Western’ – Arabic perspective and young female perspective are absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minorities should integrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- controversy is caused by minority group action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mitigation and intensification strategies:

Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, intensified or mitigated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying the illocutionary force of utterances in respect of their epistemic or deontic status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- epistemic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- mitigation: Excludes quotations and citations, provides opposing views ostensibly from an ‘objective’ viewpoint thereby creating a ‘safe’ debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intensification: contracts two views and presents them as in equal opposition with two supporting arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provided for each side, includes close up of colour photo of young woman in hijab – context excluded.

- **deontic:**
  - mitigation: “In Europe, some Muslim women wear headscarves”, “In 2004, a French law banned the wearing of all visible religious symbols, including the hijab, in state schools”. The author presents the government position first, followed by “most of the French public supported the ban”, “It would better facilitate the integration of Muslims into French society”
  - intensification: “This highly visible article of clothing”, “has sparked a great deal of controversy”, “the debate has been particularly heated”, “it forces young Muslim women who choose to wear the hijab to leave state schools and attend private ones where the wearing of religious symbols is permitted”
PREPARING TO READ

SCANNING TO PREDICT CONTENT

1. Scan the magazine article opposite for the words and phrases in the box and underline them each time they appear.

   kiss    shake hands    touch    gift    dress

2. Answer the questions below, according to the information in the article. Use the text around the words you have underlined to help you.

   1. In which countries should you not kiss your business partner?

   2. In which countries do men shake hands when they meet each other?

   3. In which country do people touch each other when they are talking?

   4. In which country is it common to give a present at a business meeting?

   5. In which country is it unlucky to give white flowers?

WHILE READING

READING FOR MAIN IDEAS

3. Read the article on page 37 opposite. Which of the customs (a-g) below are not mentioned?

   a. greetings
   b. personal space
   c. giving gifts
   d. business meetings
   e. table manners
   f. giving business cards
   g. being punctual

Customs Around the World [pictures not included]
As more and more people travel all over the world, it is important to know what to expect in different countries and how to react to cultural differences so that you don’t upset your foreign contacts. In our ‘Customs around the world’ series, we look at three different cultures every month to help you prepare for that important trip. This month’s locations are Brazil, Japan and India.

BRAZIL Brazilians are very friendly people and are generally informal, so it is important to say hello and goodbye to everyone. Women kiss men and each other on the cheek but men usually just shake hands. Brazilians stand very close to each other and touch each other’s arms, elbows and back regularly while speaking. You should not move away if you go to a business meeting, you are not expected to take a gift. In fact, an expensive gift can be seen as suspicious.
On the other hand, if you’re invited to someone’s house, you should take a gift – for example, flowers or chocolates. However, stay clear of anything purple or black, as these colours are related to death.

If you are invited to dinner, arrive at least 30 minutes late, but always dress well because appearances are very important to Brazilians.

**JAPAN** The Japanese are quite different from the Brazilians. They can be quite formal, so don’t stand too close. Kissing or touching in public is not common. When you meet someone, they may shake your hand, although bowing is the more traditional greeting.

In a business meeting, Japanese people often like to know what your position is in your company before they talk to you. You should hand over a business card using both hands and when you receive a business card, you should immediately read it carefully. It is important to be punctual in Japan. It is recommended that you arrive early and dress formally. Gifts are often exchanged, but it is common to refuse before you accept them. When you present your gift, you should say that it is just a token of your appreciation.

Most visitors are entertained in a restaurant, so it is a great honour to be invited to a Japanese person’s house.

**INDIA** Hierarchy is important in India, so when you meet Indians, it is important to greet the oldest or the most senior person first. Men may shake hands with men, and women often also shake hands with women, but men and women tend not to shake hands. When leaving, you should say goodbye to everyone individually.

Personal relationships are important in business in India and you should not be surprised if the first meeting is spent getting to know everyone. In addition, it is important to know that many Indians do not like to say ‘no’, so it may be difficult to know what they are really thinking. Appointments are necessary and punctuality is important. Business dress is formal, so men and women should wear dark suits.

If you are invited to an Indian’s home, arrive on time. You do not have to bring a gift but gifts are not refused. However, do not bring white flowers, because these are used in funerals.

4. Match the sentence halves. Then read the article again and check your answers.

**READING FOR DETAIL**

1. In Brazil, women kiss men and each other on the cheek, but men  
2. Taking a gift to a business meeting  
3. If you are going to a Brazilian’s house for dinner, you  
4. bowing is a common way to  
5. In Japan it is very impolite to  
6 Spend time getting to know everyone when you  
7 In India and Japan punctuality is very important, so you should  

a Is not a good idea in Brazil.  
b arrive on time.  
c put away a business card without studying it first.  
d do not kiss each other.  
e meet Indian business partners.  
f greet Japanese people.  
g can arrive late.

Reading for detail

Reading for detail is an important part of academic reading and it is a skill which is tested in many language examinations. Look for key words in the text and pay attention to words like not, however and but which show contrasting views or information.

**READING BETWEEN THE LINES**

MAKING INFERENCEs FROM THE TEXT
5 Work with a partner. Try to answer the questions below.

1 In Brazil, why would people be suspicious of an expensive gift?
2 Why shouldn’t you move away if Brazilians touch you during conversation?
3 Why is it important for Japanese business people to know your position in a company?
4 Why do Indians not like to say ‘no’?
5 Why is it important to know about other people’s customs?

DISCUSSION

6. Work with a partner. Discuss the questions below.

1 Have you ever been abroad? Where?
2 Which country would you like to visit? Why?
3 What advice about customs in your country would you give a visitor?

End of excerpt.

The following DHA analysis is composed in reference to the five DHA questions.

Table 14: Text 2 Analysis—Discourse-Historical Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive strategies</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nomination strategies:</td>
<td>Discursive construction of social actors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?</td>
<td>• proper nouns:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• deictics: this, they, that, it, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• generalising anthroponyms: partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collectives, including metonymic toponyms: visitors, women, men, contacts, senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• anthroponyms referring to geopolitical units: Brazilians, Japanese, Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• anthroponyms referring to religion or ideology: personal space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discursive construction of objects/phenomena/events:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• concrete: cultures, flowers, chocolates, death, house, gift, dinner, hand, kissing, touching, business meeting, hands, business card, dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• abstract:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o nature/environmental: death, personal space,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o mental object/feelings: informal, friendly, formal, not be surprised, great honour, a token of your appreciation, suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o ideological matters: hierarchy, individuality, appearances, punctuality, purple or black, white flowers, personal relationships, bowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discursive construction of processes and actions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• material/physical: don’t upset your foreign contacts, Women kiss men and each other on the cheek; men usually just shake hands, you should take a gift; hand over a business card using both hands; arrive early; dress formally; be punctual; refuse [gifts] before you accept them; do not bring white flowers, examinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **econonomic:** don’t upset your foreign contacts; to help you prepare for that important trip; business meeting; You should not move away if you go to a business meeting; always dress well; appearances are very important; visitors are entertained in a restaurant; when you receive a business card, you should immediately read it carefully; be punctual; personal relationships are important in business; appointments are necessary; punctuality is important; business dress is formal; men and women should wear dark suits.
- **mental:** surprised; suspicious; getting to know everyone; great honour to be invited;
- **verbal:** business meeting; like to know what your position is; say that it [the gift] is just a token of your appreciation; the first meeting is spent getting to know everyone; do not like to say ‘no’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predication strategies:</th>
<th>Discursive characterisation/qualification of social actors, objects, phenomena, events processes and actions (positively or negatively)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes? | - **social actors:**
| | - Brazilians: friendly people; generally informal; women kiss men and each other on the cheek; men shake hands; all Brazilians stand very close to each other, touch one another; appearances are very important; Brazilians relate purple and black to death.
| | - Japanese: quite formal; traditionally bow, but may shake hands; want to know your position in your company; consider punctuality as important.
| | - Indians: Uphold hierarchy based on age; hand-shaking is usually contained within the same gender; Indians do not like to say no; it may be difficult to know what they are really thinking. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argumentation strategies:</th>
<th>Persuading readers of the validity of specific claims of truth and normative rightness:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What arguments are employed in the discourse in question? | - **claims of truth** regarding expectations of three countries
| | - **claims of rightness** regarding appropriate behaviours in three countries
| | - **claims of rightness** regarding appropriate exercises for learning |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectivisation strategies:</th>
<th>Positioning speaker’s or writer’s point of view and expressing involvement or distance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?</td>
<td>- <strong>ideological perspectives:</strong> Reading comprehension involves specific skills: scanning, reading for main ideas, reading for detail, and making inferences from the text; national cultures are largely homogeneous; visitors to countries should obey the rules that are stated in the text; student readers can be politically passive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation and intensification strategies:</th>
<th>Modifying the illocutionary force of utterances in respect of their epistemic or deontic status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, intensified or mitigated? | - **epistemic:**
| | - **mitigation:** the Reading comprehension questions are non-political; the Reading text’s cultures are homogenised.
| | - **deontic:** |
What type of argument do university lecturers expect?

Most lecturers in English-speaking universities expect students to use a deductive approach. They may not even recognise when inductive reasoning is used. In fact, many lecturers comment that inductively organised texts seem confused and illogical. This is because they do not expect to have to infer the argument. Because they are used to deductive argument, they expect that it is the writer’s job to identify the argument.

Without an explicit position, lecturers may also feel disoriented because they cannot check that the evidence being presented relates to the writer’s position. Another common complaint is that too much ‘irrelevant’ or background information is included.

On the other hand, people who come from cultures which favour inductive organisation, tend to find deductive argument repetitive and simplistic. I remember one such student exclamining in disgust, ‘You mean you want me to tell you what I am going to say, then say it, then tell you what I have said? That’s ridiculous!’ People from cultures that favour inductive organisation may also feel that the explicit nature of the argument forces the reader to a specific conclusion and reduces the possibility of other interpretations. The point to remember is that both types of organisation are good, but that problems arise when a reader expects one type of organisation but gets the other.

This is not only an issue at universities. The difference often causes confusion in both business communications (especially reports) and business meetings. Australian business people often complain that their foreign counterparts beat around the bush instead of going directly to the point. They also complain about being drowned in detail and tend to ‘turn off’ in business meetings if they do not understand what conclusion the discussion is headed towards. In the same way, many foreign business people complain that Australians seem to have made up their minds already, meaning there is no point in discussion. The repetitive nature of inductive argument may also make them feel as if they are being bullied or treated as children. Of course, neither response is appropriate, but each is understandable given the difference in the two forms of argument.

End of excerpt.

The following DHA analysis is composed in reference to the five DHA questions.

Table 15: Text 3 Analysis—Discourse-Historical Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomination strategies:</th>
<th>Discursive construction of social actors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are persons, objects, phenomena/events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically?</td>
<td>• <em>proper nouns</em>: English-speaking, Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>deictics</em>: they, that, it, you, each, this, such, other interpretations, both types, I, me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>generalising anthroponyms</em>: lecturer, university-lecturer, writer, people, student, reader, business people, foreign business people, Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Collectives, including metonymic toponyms</em>: people, cultures, lecturers, universities, foreign counterparts, children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>anthroponyms referring to geopolitical units</em>: Australians, foreign business people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• anthroponyms referring to religion or ideology: [Not actually named] People from cultures that favour inductive organisation

Discursive construction of objects/phenomena/events:
• concrete: cultures, universities, lecturers, texts,
• abstract:
  o nature/environmental:
  o mental object/feelings: argument, position, approach, evidence, complaint, disoriented, favour, inductive organisation, deductive argument, explicit nature, specific conclusion, have made up their minds, instead of going directly to the point, drowned in detail, ‘turn off’, confused, illogical.
  o political matters:
• ideological matters: inductive approach, inductive reasoning, deductive approach, deductive argument, explicit position, writer’s position, repetitive, simplistic, beat around the bush, inductive organisation, inductive argument, [Note: There is some overlap between abstract and ideological matters.]

Discursive construction of processes and actions:
• material:
  o natural/environmental:
  o political:
• mental:
  explicit position, writer’s position, ‘irrelevant’ or background information
• verbal:

Predication strategies:
What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena/events and processes?

Discursive characterisation/qualification of social actors, objects, phenomena, events processes and actions (positively or negatively)
• social actors:
  o most lecturers in English-speaking universities: expect students to use a deductive approach; may not recognize when inductive reasoning is used; comment that inductively organized texts seem confused and illogical; expect that it is the writer’s job to identify the argument; feel disoriented because they cannot check that the evidence being presented relates to the writer’s position; [complain] that too much ‘irrelevant’ or background information is included [in inductive texts].
  o people who come from cultures which favour inductive organisation: favour inductive organisation; tend to find deductive argument repetitive and simplistic; may also feel that the explicit nature of the argument forces the reader to a specific conclusion and reduces the possibility of other interpretations.
  o one such student [preferring inductive style]: [feels] disgust [at deductive logic]; states [of deductive structure] That’s ridiculous!
  o Reader: may expect one type of organisation but get another – this can be a problem.
- **Business communications and meetings:**
  Australian business people often complain that their foreign counterparts beat around the bush instead of going directly to the point. They also complain about being drowned in detail and tend to “turn off” in business meetings if they do not understand what conclusion the discussion is headed towards; may also make them feel as if they are being bullied or treated as children.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argumentation strategies:</th>
<th>Persuading readers of the validity of specific claims of truth and normative rightness:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What arguments are employed in the discourse in question?</td>
<td>• <strong>Claims of truth:</strong> regarding the existence of two different writing styles: inductive and deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Claims of truth:</strong> regarding expectations of most lecturers in English-speaking universities for students to use a deductive writing style: “expect students to use a deductive approach”; “do not expect to have to infer the argument”; expect that it is the writer’s job to identify the argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Claims of truth:</strong> regarding the responses of lecturers in English-speaking universities to inductive writing styles: “may not recognise”; “confused and illogical”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Claims of truth:</strong> regarding responses of people from cultures that use inductive styles in their writing to the use of deductive writing: “find deductive argument repetitive and simplistic”; “feel that the explicit nature of the argument forces the reader to a specific conclusion and reduces the possibility of other interpretations”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Claims of truth:</strong> regarding difficulty in having two different writing styles. “Problems arise when a reader expects one type of organisation but gets the other”; “The difference often causes confusion in both business communications (especially reports) and business meetings”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Claims of rightness:</strong> Asserting that both writing styles should be broadly accepted but only a deductive style should be used in English-speaking universities. “The point to remember is that both types of organisation are good”; “Of course, neither response is appropriate, but each is understandable given the difference in the two forms of argument”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectivisation strategies:</th>
<th>Positioning speaker’s or writer’s point of view and expressing involvement or distance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?</td>
<td>• <strong>ideological perspectives:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o academic assumption: explaining different sides of a communication method presents an objective viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o didactic: students need to recognise the two different styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o didactic: students need to adopt the deductive style for their work to be accepted by lecturers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation and intensification strategies:</th>
<th>Modifying the illocutionary force of utterances in respect of their epistemic or deontic status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the respective utterances articulated</td>
<td>• <strong>epistemic:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                          | o **mitigation:** consistent use of modifiers: “may not even”, “many lecturers”; “may also feel”; “tend
| overtly, intensified or mitigated? | to find”; “often causes”; “often complain”; “many foreign”; “seem to”; “may also make them feel”.  
   |                             | o **intensification**: Modifiers are balanced against assertions: “this is because”; “Because they are used to”; “they do not expect”; “they expect”; “they cannot check”; “I remember”; “this is not only”; “they also complain”; “neither response is appropriate”; “each is understandable”.  
   |                             | • **deontic**:  
   |                             |   | mitigation:  
   |                             | o **intensification**: “both types of organisation are”; “problems arise”. |