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ABSTRACT

This research examines the fundamental elements (called qualifications) of the *Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom* that particularly relate to teaching international students. The Profile originates from Western Europe and outlines the sorts of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are put forward as being beneficial for lecturers working in higher education environments characterised by increasing cultural, language, and educational diversity. It was selected for critical appraisal because it is a recent, one-of-a-kind, and, ultimately, a whole-of-person approach to teaching international students. Further, the Profile’s theoretical and practical pillars have yet to be investigated. This is achieved by the research carried out in this thesis. Overall, the research illuminates an area that has received scant attention in the Australian and international literature on the internationalisation of higher education. Whilst attention has been paid over the past decade to internationalisation at the organisational level, and, lately, to the international student experience, this investigation makes a significant contribution at the level of the individual lecturer, that is, the internationalisation of the academic Self.

The theoretical pillar of the Profile was examined to determine how its qualifications that particularly relate to teaching international students are supported by the various bodies of related literature. The literature review was incorporated into a critical conceptual framework that formed the basis of the examination of the Profile’s theoretical pillar. Each of the four qualifications examined was subjected to critical analysis which drew upon the literature on teaching and learning in higher education, international students, and culture. Further, a thematic analysis was
carried out which considered the Profile in light of theories associated with
globalisation, internationalisation of higher education, transformative learning, and
cosmopolitanism. A number of important findings were made. The Profile appears to
be a normative claim for the development of multi-reference grid curricula in
response to increasing cultural, language, and educational diversity of the student
body. To this end, it subscribes to a hyperglobalist worldview which promulgates
universal moral cosmopolitanism. A strong argument is made from the literature,
however, that the Profile should be realigned to reflect both the transformationalist
global worldview and a rooted, or grounded, form of cosmopolitanism.

Further, whilst many pedagogical claims made by the Profile are generally
supported by the literature on teaching in higher education, what is not supported is
the concept of (the Other) culture driving teaching approaches in the host-culture
classroom. The work of Biggs (2003), in particular, demonstrates that good teaching
ultimately relies on the universality of the learning process in which the ethnicity of
students is largely irrelevant. Coincidentally, however, it is also through Biggs’s
(2003) work that the likely value of the Profile is revealed. That is, as a mechanism
through which the concept of culture is initially made apparent and then made
‘invisible’ in the educative process, should lecturers choose to embrace a
cosmopolitan outlook in their personal and professional lives.

The practice pillar of the Profile was examined to determine how the
qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students
are supported by teaching practice in an Australian university department that is peer
recognised as an example of leading practice in teaching international students. Purposive sampling located an allied health department which satisfied a number of criteria to sufficiently identify it as engaging in leading practice in this area. The resultant case study on six lecturers in the department utilised a small questionnaire and multiple in-depth phenomenographic interviews to examine the relationship between the Profile’s claims and actual teaching practice. Whilst the research findings support the majority of the Profile’s claims, it is evident that the concept of (the Other) culture is not pivotal in terms of directing the teaching and learning framework in the allied health department. This is despite the lecturers recognising, respecting, and appreciating cultural difference in their students. Culture in the classroom in this instance of teaching practice is dealt with more informally than what is suggested by the Profile.

The examination of the Profile’s pillars of theory and practice provides an evidence base from which to critically engage with its claims in relation to teaching international students. The resultant recommendation for a revision of the Profile recognises its significant potential to assist lecturers at various levels of teaching understand how they can work positively with cultural, language, and educational diversity to enhance teaching and learning in the international classroom. In doing so, they open themselves to their own transformative possibilities to be among the cosmopolitans of the Twenty-First century.
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CHAPTER I

SETTING THE CONTEXT FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF A PROFILE OF THE IDEAL LECTURER FOR TEACHING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Introduction to Chapter I

This investigation examines the qualifications of Teekens’s (2000d) presentation of the Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom that particularly relate to teaching international students (see Table 1.1). It does this by investigating the theory and practice pillars of the Profile. The degree to which the Profile is supported by both theory and practice will help determine its credibility in terms of its intended aim to inform lecturers, professional developers, human resource staff, and university administrators of the types of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that best support teaching students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. The Profile has been selected for examination because it is a recent, one-of-a-kind, and, ultimately, a whole-of-person approach to teaching students in a rapidly changing world. Further, although the Profile is receiving exposure in Europe and, lately, in Australia its theoretical and practical pillars have yet to be investigated. This is the focus of this investigation.

The aim of this chapter is to contextualise the investigation. The background to the development of the Profile is provided. Following this, the research interests and key research questions of the investigation are made explicit. The investigation’s

1 Teekens was an invited speaker at the Internationalisation of the Curriculum: Secondary and Tertiary Perspectives conference held in Adelaide on 28 November 2005 which was organised by the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) and the Australian Technology Network (ATN). The title of Teekens’s presentation was The Profile of the Ideal Lecturer in the International Classroom.
significance as a scholarly piece of work is then outlined, followed by its positioning in relation to educational, internationalisation, and globalisation theory. After the delimitations and limitations of the investigation are listed, the structure of the thesis and the focus of each chapter is provided. The investigation is then situated by describing the changing student demographic in Australian higher education and the internationalisation of curricula. The final section of the chapter briefly provides the writing and presentation conventions that are used in this investigation.

Background to the Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom

The Profile originates from Europe and outlines the sorts of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are posited as being beneficial for lecturers working in higher education environments characterised by significant cultural, language, and educational diversity. It is much more than an offering of hints and tips for teaching international students. The Profile is a heuristic device which ultimately informs a whole-of-person, authentic, and cosmopolitan approach to the internationalisation of teaching in higher education. In essence, the Profile turns the focus from students to lecturers as the new internationalists who need to possess certain knowledge, skills, and attitudes to operate successfully in the global workplace.

Teekens (2000b) stated that the Profile first appeared in print in 1997 in a report from an Academic Staff and Internationalisation symposium attended by Dutch and Flemish university representatives who were engaged in internationalisation activities in their respective institutions (p. 5). The publication was Number 8 in the Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education
(NUFFIC) Papers series. It was titled *Teaching in the International Classroom; Profile of the Ideal Lecturer, and its Implications for Staffing Policy*. The Profile was generated in response to the *international classroom* (described at the beginning of Chapter II) becoming a feature of some universities in the region. At the time, the focus was on the demands created by cultural and language diversity in the international classroom. For the delegates at the symposium, it seemed that teaching approaches and strategies which were traditionally driven by national perspectives and needs might no longer be wholly sufficient for the novel teaching and learning environment of the international classroom (Teekens, 2000b, p. 5). This led to the question of what qualities or abilities or attributes might be required of lecturers.

The development of the Profile was a poignant reflection on the way that contemporary global forces were impacting on higher education and the implications this had for university teaching. It reflects Qiang’s (2003) thinking that current global processes mean that “higher education can no longer be viewed in a strictly national context” (p. 248). More broadly, it also resonates with Chandler’s (n.d.) claim that “We are all internationalists today” (p. 1) as a result of being caught up in extensive and intensive global flows. The Profile was put forward as a working document that had been debated and refined through a number of discussions with “lecturers and international officers” (Teekens, 2000b, p. 5) prior to the symposium. It was meant to generate discussion and awareness on the following three levels:

1. To heighten understanding among institutional managers of the types of qualities and skills required of lecturers in the international classroom.
2. To make staff recruitment and staff development personnel aware of the nature and demands of the international classroom.

3. To provide lecturers with a framework to reflect on the changing nature of their work environment and what this means for their teaching practice.

(Teekens, 2000b, p. 6)

The demand for NUFFIC Paper Number 8 continued long after the initial print run was exhausted. Rather than produce more, however, it was decided that a number of developments in the meantime which related to the internationalisation of higher education in Europe necessitated a revision of the original material. First, the 1999 Bologna Declaration encouraged European universities to harmonise their curricula and cooperate with other institutions across much of Europe. Second, it was perceived that education was increasingly being shaped by market forces. Third, there was a realisation that curricula changes were necessary to internationalise non-mobile local students at home. Fourth, significant utilisation of ICTs (Information and Communication Technologies) by universities since 1997 had more deeply incorporated higher education into global flows that were creating what Teekens (2000b) called a “borderless world” (p. 6). Such concurrent developments reflected the fact that local and national realities were being increasingly influenced by regional and global forces. To address these changes, a revised edition of NUFFIC Paper Number 8 titled *Teaching and Learning in the International Classroom* was
published in 2000. Significantly, this included a refinement of the Profile. It is this iteration of the Profile that is the focus of this investigation.  

Table 1.1 *The qualifications of the Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom that particularly relate to teaching international students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification 1 (Q1): General</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 K1: The lecturer must be a good academic, with ample teaching experience and a thorough knowledge of the subject</td>
<td>Q1 S1: The lecturer must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs</td>
<td>Q1 A1: The lecturer must be open, flexible and interested in the teaching and learning customary [sic] in other cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 K2: The lecturer should be aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in his or her field may differ substantially in other academic traditions</td>
<td>Q1 S2: The lecturer must be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used</td>
<td>Q1 A2: The lecturer should be aware that some students ascribe him or her [sic] a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or she has been used to within his or her own tradition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 A3: The lecturer should reflect on the cultural context of his or her role as a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 K1: The lecturer must have a very good oral and written command of the language of instruction</td>
<td>Q2 S1: The lecturer must be able to use the language of instruction in such a way that the natural flow of speech is not impeded by unnatural use of the voice, such as speaking very loudly</td>
<td>Q2 A1: The lecturer must be aware of the fact that he or she is not using his or her native tongue and reflect on this fact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 K2: The lecturer must be capable of writing general texts, scientific reports and articles in the language of instruction and, where required, policy papers</td>
<td>Q2 S2: The lecturer must be aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, but not use it in an extreme manner, such as making exaggerated movements to support spoken language</td>
<td>Q2 A2: The lecturer should be aware that body language and other non-verbal aspects of communication have a great impact on the way he or she is understood (or misunderstood)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Although the Profile also appears in a more recent publication (see Teekens, 2003a), it has not been modified in any way from its presentation in Teekens (2000d).
Qualification 2 (Q2) (cont.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 K3: The lecturer must know the terms in the language of instruction that are used for teaching the subject in question, and be familiar with the jargon in his or her field.</td>
<td>Q2 S3: The lecturer must be able to say things in different ways, rephrasing sentences that are not understood.</td>
<td>Q2 A3: The lecturer must be aware of the role of humour in communication, but also that humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined spheres of personal identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S4: The lecturer should use audio-visual aids in support of spoken texts.</td>
<td>Q2 A4: The lecturer must be aware that different levels of language proficiency within the group may account for differences in performance, but should not simply ascribe attitude to language (a ‘silent’ person may be shy, not interested, incompetent, bored, full of respect for the teacher or one of a whole range of explanations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S5: The lecturer must never use two languages at the same time, for example to explain something quickly to some of the students.</td>
<td>Q2 A5: The lecturer should be open to suggestions as regards the use of language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K1: The lecturer should know that culture can be defined in different ways.</td>
<td>Q3 S1: The lecturer must be able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework.</td>
<td>Q3 A1: The lecturer should be aware of his or her own culture and understand that this strongly colours his or her own views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K2: The lecturer should know that formal education is one of the most important features of a national culture.</td>
<td>Q3 S2: The lecturer should be able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, for example knowing whether a student is only shy or feels that it is not appropriate to ask a question.</td>
<td>Q3 A2: The lecturer must try to avoid thinking in stereotypes, and to behave and express opinions without resorting to such generalizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K3: The lecturer should know that culture is learned, and is very difficult to un-learn [sic].</td>
<td>Q3 S3: The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account.</td>
<td>Q3 A3: The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments for cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of other group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K4: The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of the culture(s) of the students in the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K1: The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of educational theory</td>
<td>Q4 S1: The lecturer must know how to make his or her teaching methods</td>
<td>Q4 A1: The lecturer should realize that his or her own status as an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and different teaching and learning styles</td>
<td>and aims explicit to students</td>
<td>academic is strongly conditioned by national and cultural values and be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>willing to reflect on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K2: The lecturer should realize that professional identity is closely</td>
<td>Q4 S2: The lecturer should discuss with the students how the group</td>
<td>Q4 A2: The lecturer must have a flexible attitude towards various styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related to the hidden curriculum</td>
<td>intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present</td>
<td>of student behaviour. (For example, in some countries students stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when asking a question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K3: The lecturer must understand that the learning process is affected</td>
<td>Q4 S3: The lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction</td>
<td>Q4 A3: The lecturer should take an interest in the cultural backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by a student’s own personal and social development, and pay sufficient</td>
<td>which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of</td>
<td>of the foreign students in the group and support initiatives for extra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention to individual differences</td>
<td>instruction</td>
<td>curricular cultural activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K4: The lecturer should know that students’ learning strategies are</td>
<td>Q4 S4: The lecturer must know how to involve students from different</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a result of instructional models, and that procedures and standards for</td>
<td>national traditions in the learning process by using examples and cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and</td>
<td>from different cultural settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nationally defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 S5: The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1.* The criteria presented in Table 1.1 above are tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, pp. 23-36). In addition, each qualification and criterion has been labelled with a shorthand version of its place in the Profile. For example, Q1 refers to ‘Qualification 1: General’ and the first Knowledge criterion in that qualification is expressed as Q1 K1. This makes it easy to locate and identify each qualification and criterion.

*Note 2.* The Profile is presented in its entirety (all nine qualifications) in Appendix A.
Research interests of this investigation

The research interests of this investigation congregate around the idea of internationalisation at home. Knight (2004) believed that this aspect of internationalisation has recently emerged to complement cross-border internationalisation activities that have revolved around, for example, staff and student mobility (p. 16). Whereas much of the activity in Australian universities concerned with internationalisation at home has focused on assisting non-mobile local students to internationalise their knowledge and their personal outlook, this investigation instead focuses on the internationalisation of the academic Self as a fundamental building block in an institution’s response to global forces affecting higher education.

Bartell (2003), Knight (1999), and Singh (2002) maintained that universities have embarked on a mission to help all students become new internationalist learners, workers, and citizens. The corollary, indeed precursor, of this is that academics as individuals must operate from a base that extends beyond local and national perspectives to help students achieve this outcome. They, themselves, have to be among the cosmopolitans of the Twenty-First century. This reasoning is at the very heart of the Profile. Further, the cumulative effect of the strengths of individuals in this area is consistent with Webb’s (2005) view that an institution will become internationalised “only through the creative utilisation of the imagination and agency of those who comprise the university” (p. 117).
Key research questions

The key research questions are of two types; the overarching question and the associated questions. The overarching question represents the main outcome that is sought from the investigation:

*Overarching Question: The Profile’s theoretical & practice pillars*

How are the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students supported by theory and practice?

*Associated Question 1: The Profile’s theoretical pillar*

How are the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students supported by the various bodies of literature it draws upon?

*Associated Question 2: The Profile’s practice pillar*

How are the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students supported by teaching practice in a university department that is peer recognised as an example of leading practice in teaching international students?

These questions represent the essence of the investigation. Theory and practice are two fundamental pillars of the Profile which have yet to be examined.
Significance of the investigation

The investigation makes an original contribution to that part of the literature on the internationalisation of higher education which concerns the internationalisation of teaching practice. Whilst issues relating to the quality of higher education, national higher education policy, and international students have increasingly become the focus of research into the internationalisation of Australian higher education, there has been a lack of investigation into the experiences of Australian lecturers who work in an environment that is more diverse in terms of culture, language, and educational backgrounds of students than ever before.

Harman (2005), in a critical review of the Australian literature on internationalisation and higher education, noted that despite some studies having been carried out at the institutional level regarding innovation in internationalising the curricula, “there is almost a complete absence of material on the active involvement of academics in internationalization, their perceptions of other cultures and people, the value they place on internationalization and their competence in speaking and reading other languages than English” (p. 131). Lee’s (2005) view that “the phenomenon of internationalisation of [Australian] higher education has remained largely un-researched in terms of either curriculum or pedagogy” (p. 42) supports Harman’s (2005) claim. This investigation is a positive response to both observations. In addition, it is also a positive contribution to the general body of knowledge on the internationalisation of higher education which, according to de Wit (2002), “is still a phenomenon with a lot of question marks regarding its historical dimension; its meaning, concept and strategic aspects; its relationship to develop-
ments in society and higher education in general; and its status as an area of study and analysis” (p. 215).

A search of the Australian and international literature suggests that this investigation is the first scholarly work to critically examine how the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students are supported by theory and practice. As much as the Profile represents a foray into an area of internationalisation of higher education that is reasonably uncharted, this investigation, too, travels to similar places by virtue of its novel engagement with theoretical and practical perspectives on the same subject matter. This is important because there is little in the internationalisation literature which comprehensively frames internationalised dimensions of the activity of teaching itself. Commonly cited theorists such as Jane Knight and Hans de Wit have concentrated on the theoretical underpinnings of the internationalisation of higher education in terms of definitions and processes that focus on universities as organisations. It is largely left up to individual institutions and, often, individual lecturers to work out initiatives at the within-institution level. This investigation, then, is significant because it addresses a gap in the literature concerning the internationalisation of teaching in higher education.

The location of the investigation

By virtue of using the Profile as a template for the investigation this thesis reflects and willingly embraces some defining characteristics of the Profile itself. In terms of educational theory, the investigation is located in the related traditions of
humanistic education and transformative learning. Correspondingly, the Profile is a model of teaching that is value-driven and respects, responds to, and supports the needs of learners from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. In terms of internationalisation theory, the investigation is located in the area of the internationalisation of the personal and professional outlooks of individual lecturers. In an associated and unique way, the Profile deals exclusively with within-institution internationalisation activities, rather than with the broad organisational approach to the internationalisation of higher education which has been prevalent in the literature over the past decade. The Profile’s focus is on internationalisation at the level of individual lecturers. Where the views of this investigation and the claims of the Profile differ, however, is in the area of globalisation theory and this will be made apparent in Chapter III.

The delimitations & limitations of the investigation

The scope of the investigation can be assessed in terms of its delimitations and limitations. The investigation is delimited (made manageable) by:

- Investigating one teaching department that is peer-recognised as an example of leading practice in teaching international students.

---

3 Throughout this thesis, the word support will be used frequently by the author in relation to teaching and learning. Rather than this word implying deficit in a negative sense, (for example, in relation to the educational backgrounds of students), it should be taken to signify forms of academic and pastoral assistance as part of the teaching process which is designed to help students make a successful transition to life and study in the higher education environment. This is regardless of whether they are Australian or international students.
• Investigating the experiences and opinions of academic staff only (and not, for example, the international students in the department for triangulation purposes).

• Investigating only those qualifications in the Profile that most strongly relate to teaching international students.

Whilst the delimitations listed can also be interpreted as limitations, the investigation is further limited in the following ways:

• Recognition that, philosophically and practically, no investigation can ever reveal the true nature of reality. As noted by Silverman (2000), data are only “partial” (p. 39) accounts of reality and as such it is not possible to give “the whole picture” (p. 39). For example, in terms of interviewing people Schutz (as cited in Seidman, 1991, p. 3) suggested that it is never possible to understand another person perfectly. Ontological and epistemological limitations are such that the best outcome of the research will be a close approximation of what is happening in the real world. It is the responsibility of the researcher, then, to ensure that the research design is as rigorous as possible to maximise the extent to which reality is portrayed and understood.

• Recognition that the research carried out in this investigation is only one way of interpreting an event. As suggested by Janesick (2000), there is no “correct” (p. 393) interpretation.
Chapter I - Setting the context for the investigation

The structure of the investigation

The conclusions of this investigation will be drawn from its two major elements. Chapter II and Chapter III comprise the first element. Chapter IV and Chapter V comprise the second element. The first element relates to Associated Question 1 of the Key Research Questions and it has two objectives. One is to provide the conceptual framework for the investigation. Another is to undertake a critical appraisal of the Profile’s qualifications that particularly relate to teaching international students by reviewing the various bodies of literature that underpin the Profile’s claims. This objective in particular will help determine how the theoretical foundations of the Profile are supported by the various bodies of literature upon which it draws. The second element of the investigation relates to Associated Question 2 of the Key Research Questions, that is, how the Profile is supported by the teaching practice of university lecturers in a department that is peer-recognised as an example of leading practice in teaching international students. Chapter IV outlines the research methodology and methods and Chapter V presents and discusses the research data to help answer Associated Question 2. A description of the ensuing chapters in this investigation is provided below.

Chapter II

Chapter II begins by outlining Teekens’s (2000c) description of the characteristics of the international classroom, that is, a higher education setting characterised by cultural, language, and educational diversity. Following this is a critical review of the four qualifications from the Profile that are examined by this
investigation. Each separate qualification is considered (not chronologically but simultaneously) from three different perspectives.

First, the criteria in each qualification are presented as they are reported by Teekens (2000d). Second, Teekens’s (2000d) commentary which accompanies each qualification is considered, along with information from other chapters in Teekens’s (2000a) collection of essays titled *Teaching and Learning in the International Classroom* in which writers including Teekens (2000b, 2000c), Schröder (2000), Peters (2000), de Bruin (2000), and Divis (2000) expand on themes related to the Profile and the international classroom. Third, the literature on teaching and learning in higher education, and language and culture is reviewed to determine the degree to which the Profile’s qualifications and associated criteria reflect established theory and educational research. This latter exercise is necessary because the Profile, as presented by Teekens (2000d), is extremely thinly referenced. This is due to it being heavily reliant on the experiences of seasoned higher education practitioners rather than direct appeals to theory. It was written *by* experienced educators *for* other educators (H. Teekens, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Whilst the importance of experience in supporting a pragmatic approach to teaching and learning in higher education should never be overlooked, the lack of an evident research and theoretical basis means that the literature review in Chapter II (and Chapter III) takes on the critical function of establishing the credibility of the Profile’s claims. This is vital given that the Profile has yet to be empirically tested to this point (Teekens, 2000c, p. 6; H. Teekens, personal communication, June 8, 2005).
The critical nature of Chapter II means that whilst it deals with a review of the various bodies of literature that are associated with the Profile, it also moves beyond this to suggest revisions that might benefit the Profile in light of the various theoretical perspectives that are apparent in the literature. The aim is to draw conclusions about the Profile’s four qualifications that particularly relate to teaching international students. Chapter II concludes with a report of how its theoretical pillar is supported by the review of the various bodies of literature carried out in this chapter.

Chapter III

Whilst Chapter II concentrates on the Profile’s qualifications and a number of their criteria, Chapter III provides an appreciation of the fundamental conceptual underpinnings of the Profile itself. Various bodies of literature are examined to determine if logical relations exist between the Profile, as presented by Teekens (2000d), and the foundational theories which are most likely to support its claims. To this end, Chapter III considers the Profile from three perspectives. The first is the Profile’s location in relation to globalisation theory. This is important because the Profile is a response to certain trends in global processes that are perceived to have significance for directions in higher education. It is critical, therefore, to determine whether or not the perceived trends can be substantiated by the literature on globalisation theory. The second perspective ascertains the Profile’s location in relation to internationalisation theory as it applies to higher education. This is important because upon initial inspection the Profile appears to be a contribution to the literature on internationalisation at the level of the individual lecturer, rather than
at the level of the organisation. As mentioned previously, much of the contemporary literature on the internationalisation of higher education has focused on the latter. An important part of this second perspective is the confirmation that logical relations exist between the Profile’s claims and authenticity in teaching (transformative education theory) and the theory of cosmopolitanism. The sort of cosmopolitanism that the Profile implies, however, is misguided due to its commitment to a particular view on the nature of current global processes. The third perspective in Chapter III returns the attention to the Profile itself, particularly in terms of the categories of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude that characterise each qualification. The Attitude category is of particular interest for it commits the Profile to being driven by strong humanistic education imperatives. Following this, Chapter III consolidates the Profile’s main strengths and limitations and concludes with a report of how its theoretical pillar is supported by the review of the various bodies of literature carried out in this chapter.

Chapter IV

Whilst Chapter II and Chapter III investigate the Profile’s broad theoretical pillar, Chapter IV and Chapter V establish how actual teaching practice supports its pillar of practice. Chapter IV is an account of the research methodology and methods that are used in the investigation of the practice pillar. It begins by recognising that there is a diversity of approaches to educational research and that this is positive in terms of helping provide credible accounts of the real world. It is important, however, that the nature of the phenomena being studied determines the most appropriate methodology and methods for any particular investigation. It is held that
this investigation is best suited to the qualitative research approach in the form of a phenomenographical case study. To this end, a brief outline is provided of some of the defining characteristics of the qualitative research approach, the qualitative case study, and phenomenography. Chapter IV also outlines the research framework. For example, details are provided about the preferred sampling technique, gaining access to the research site, and the recruitment of the research participants. The use of a small questionnaire and multiple in-depth interviews is justified and the strengths and limitations of each method are outlined. The discussion also extends to pre- and pilot-testing of the research instruments, how meaning is to be established from the interview data, and ethical issues in the investigation. Throughout the chapter, references are made to appendixes which outline the research framework in detail and form an audit trail of activities associated with the investigation.

Chapter V

Chapter V presents and discusses the research data from the questionnaire and the multiple in-depth interviews that were conducted with individual academic staff members in the allied health department. The four qualifications are treated in chronological order and a summary of the findings are presented for each criterion in the Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude categories in each qualification. Chapter V concludes with a report of how the Profile’s practice pillar is supported by the research data.
Chapter VI presents the conclusions of the investigation. Conclusions for the two Associated Key Research Questions are presented and these are used to inform the Overarching Key Research Question. This chapter also revisits the delimitations and limitations of the research to place it in perspective. This is followed by a discussion of steps used to enhance the validity of this investigation. To conclude, suggestions are made for further research.

Situating the investigation

A changing student demographic in Australian higher education

The introduction of the Full Fee Paying Overseas Student (FFPOS) program by the Commonwealth Government in the late 1980s ushered in an era of unprecedented growth in numbers of international students in Australia. Against a backdrop of dwindling public funding and at a time of increasing student mobility throughout the world and a shortfall of tertiary places in many developing countries, the fact that Australian universities could keep tuition fees as discretionary income was the catalyst for a rapid mobilisation to market their academic programs to international students. In numerical terms, their success is evident in the growth of the onshore international tertiary student population from approximately 37,000 in 1993 to over 145,000 in 2002 (see Figure 1.1). Further, given that a sizeable percentage of all onshore enrolments in 2003 came from non-Western countries (see Table 1.2), many Australian lecturers had students in their classes from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. It is also interesting to note that approximately two-thirds of onshore international students in 2003 were enrolled in
engineering, information technology, commerce, and management programs (Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee, 2003). This implies that international students would represent a far greater proportion of the total student body in classes in such disciplines, perhaps up to 50 per cent or more, than, for example, in arts or education. Such an environment has significant implications for teaching and learning issues and these will be made explicit throughout Chapter II.

![Figure 1.1](image-url)  
*Figure 1.1*  International students enrolled at Australian universities, 1993-2002  
*(Source. AV-CC, 2003)*

*Internationalisation of curricula*

This investigation is particularly concerned with changes to curricula in light of the increasing cultural, language, and educational diversity in Australian universities. Whilst Australian institutions pursued a fairly narrow, commercial internationalisation agenda from the late 1980s, Rizvi (n.d.) indicated that there was broader engagement with other aspects of internationalisation towards the end of the 1990s (p. 2). This was reflected in agreement at senior levels in Australian
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Institutions that internationalisation represented “the complex of processes that gives universities an international dimension [and is] relevant to all facets of university life, including scholarship, teaching, research, and institutional management” (AV-CC, 2001, p. 5). One example of this maturation is the internationalisation of curricula. Smart, Volet, and Ang (2000) suggested that towards the end of the last decade there had been growing interest in this, although it was largely pursued in a sporadic, ad hoc manner and was mostly concerned with altering subject matter, or curriculum content, to make it less parochial (p. 41).

### Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>8 715</td>
<td>10 815</td>
<td>10 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>6 790</td>
<td>9 304</td>
<td>10 969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>9 467</td>
<td>12 443</td>
<td>13 781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>6 268</td>
<td>13 466</td>
<td>19 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>9 516</td>
<td>11 088</td>
<td>10 748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5 568</td>
<td>7 716</td>
<td>10 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3 737</td>
<td>7 868</td>
<td>8 913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>3 031</td>
<td>4 598</td>
<td>5 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>2 677</td>
<td>3 342</td>
<td>3 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Sth</td>
<td>2 365</td>
<td>3 230</td>
<td>3 594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>58 134</td>
<td>83 870</td>
<td>97 015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>23 603</td>
<td>35 012</td>
<td>39 792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>81 737</td>
<td>118 882</td>
<td>136 807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table notes.** (a) Includes only public funded universities. (b) The scope of the Overseas Student Statistics (OSS) is broader than the Higher Education Statistics Collection (HESC) which counted only 112 342 overseas students in 2001. From 2002 HESC and OSS use the same scope.

**Note.** Adapted from Nelson (2004, p. 31).
Whilst internationalisation of curriculum content is seen as a positive development, Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003) suggested that internationalisation of curricula should not be limited to content alone. Rizvi (n.d.) agreed with this view and suggested that it should also address issues of pedagogy and “cross-cultural” (p. 7) understanding:

With demographic changes in our classrooms, the issue of how to cater for and take advantage of individual and cultural differences in learning should become crucial in the development of effective pedagogies. (p. 7)

This theme was echoed by Smart et al. (2000) who noted Volet’s (1997) observation that while content reform was beneficial, the most promising innovations would most likely emerge in the area of instructional methods and classroom intercultural interaction (p. 41). According to Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003), however, there were few concrete examples of how lecturers “actually go about internationalising the curriculum in a tangible and easily replicable way” (p. 87). Such comments bring the multi-dimensional nature of curricula into sharp relief, that is, as well as being about content, curricula also includes considerations of process (how teaching and learning occurs) and context (where, when, and to whom content is taught and why) (Ninnes, 1998). Once it is appreciated from this perspective, the door is opened to a vast and relatively unexplored landscape that affords a view of what is happening in Australian universities in terms of internationalised teaching and learning that not only has the capacity to support international students but also to extend the ‘skill set’ and, indeed, to internationalise the mindset of Australian lecturers. The extent to which Australian universities can encourage these sorts of developments is precisely the extent to which they support cultural, language, and
educational diversity in general. This investigation deliberately chooses to traverse these less-travelled paths not only to better understand how academic staff might internationalise their teaching practice to benefit international students, but also how they might use the opportunity of cultural, language, and educational diversity in the student body to transform their own personal and professional outlooks.

Writing conventions used in this investigation

The presentation style of this thesis follows the conventions of the American Psychological Association (APA) (2001), commonly referred to as APA 5th. This includes guidance on matters such as punctuation, quotes, text and on-line references, use of italics, levels of headings, numbering, use of tables and figures, tense, and spacing. However, the spelling that is used is British English except in direct quotations where the original spelling is reproduced.
CHAPTER II
EXAMINING THE PROFILE’S THEORETICAL PILLAR: THE PROFILE’S QUALIFICATIONS THAT RELATE TO TEACHING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Generally speaking, it is fair to say that the role of lecturers in internationalization has not received sufficient attention. Many issues remain implicit and much has been taken for granted. Current practice in most countries has created a situation in which highly motivated individuals are teaching international programmes using curricula which many have developed themselves. (Teekens, 2000d, p. 22)

The fact that university teaching has been done essentially the same way for most of this millennium is not a good defense against the arguments that it be done a different way in the next millennium. (Skolnik, 2000, p. 64)

Introduction to Chapter II

This chapter begins by presenting the characteristics of the international classroom. This provides the context for understanding the Profile’s origins and intent. Following this is a critical review of the four qualifications of the Profile that will be examined by this investigation. This review draws upon different bodies of research and theory in a bid to ascertain how the Profile is supported by the various bodies of literature that inform its claims. The focus in this chapter will be on literature which is related to cultural theory, teaching and learning in higher education, and teaching international students.

The international classroom

The teaching and learning environment that has been a catalyst for the creation of the Profile is called the international classroom (Teekens, 2000a). The international classroom comprises students from diverse cultural, language, and
educational backgrounds. In Teekens’s (2000d) view, the challenges that emerge from this diversity require lecturers to develop certain knowledge, skills, and attitudes to maximise teaching and learning outcomes (p. 23).

Initially, some clarification is needed in relation to the vocabulary that is used to describe what is meant by the international classroom. The use of the word classroom throughout Teekens’s (2000a) publication does not refer solely to the activities of formal teaching areas such as lecture theatres or tutorial rooms. Instead, it extends to the broad environment of the educational setting in which lecturers and students come into contact with each other. Furthermore, the arguments throughout Teekens’s (2000a) publications suggest that activities in the international classroom include both formal and informal interactions between lecturers and students. Formal interactions, for example, would occur in lectures, tutorials, practical sessions, examinations, during fieldwork, and when a student visits the office of a lecturer or has telephone or email contact with him or her. Informal interactions might occur at social functions or in chance meetings between lecturers and students in, for example, the corridor. The activities of teaching and lecturing are referred to in Teekens’s (2000a) publication in equally broad terms and often interchangeably; they do not refer exclusively to the delivery of a lecture or a tutorial. Such usage is not problematic. Indeed, in terms of discussion about the internationalisation of teaching, this is positive because it suggests that lecturers need to carry their internationalised outlook beyond the confines of a particular place and time (for instance, in a lecture or a tutorial). Further, it complements the idea of “the entire
Teekens (2000c) believed that unprecedented student mobility has lead to growing numbers of international students sharing classrooms with domestic students. This has given higher education an “increasingly international flavour” (p. 8). An outcome of this is “extra demands on lecturers” (Teekens, 2000b, p. 6) which are the result of “a challenging multi-cultural educational setting” (Teekens, 2000c, p. 8). Thus far, this describes similar situations in higher education in many developed countries around the world, where there are more international students and greater cultural, language, and educational diversity. For Teekens (2000d), however, the language-related challenges in the international classroom have more to do with lecturers having to teach their classes in a language other than their native tongue than with international students having to work in the language of instruction. In the international classroom in The Netherlands, for example, a Dutch lecturer would teach a class of Dutch, French, American, English, and Japanese students in a language other than Dutch. The language of instruction, according to Teekens (2000d), was more likely to be English (p. 26).

This reveals the precise nature of the international classroom as being one of two streams within some universities in Western Europe. It caters for the education of English-speaking international students and some English-speaking locals (Peters, 2000, p. 91) whereas the other stream is taught in the host country’s mother tongue, for example, Dutch in The Netherlands. International students who speak Dutch are
able to enrol along with local students in academic programs in this stream. Peters (2000) suggested that it is common for lecturers to work between both streams (p. 98).

On the basis of language, then, international classrooms in parts of Western Europe and what can be described as international classrooms in Australian universities are simultaneously similar and different. In terms of similarity, just like students in the international stream in parts of Western Europe, international students who study in Australia must either be native English speakers or demonstrate a certain level of English proficiency before entering an Australian university. In terms of difference, the vast majority of Australian lecturers teach in their mother tongue, English (and many, it is anticipated, speak no languages other than English). As circumstance would have it, the Australian higher education sector was well-positioned to take advantage of the English language “becoming the global language of communication in technology, trade, culture, science, and education” (de Wit, 2002, p. 183). Despite the different focus on language in the international classrooms in parts of Western Europe and in Australia, both are characterised by English as the medium of instruction and increasing cultural and educational (background) diversity. It is on this basis that the Profile is relevant to the Australian higher education setting. Moreover, because the Profile is essentially about teaching students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds, Teekens

---

4 Dutch universities require international students to demonstrate proficiency in the language of instruction of their academic programs. For degrees taught in Dutch, they have to satisfy minimum Dutch language requirements (University of Twente, 2005a). To study a Master's degree in English, they must score a minimum of 6.5 in the IELTS (International English Language Testing System) test (University of Twente, 2005b).
(2000b) indicated that it has universal application to lecturers who work in such environments.

For Teekens (2000c), the international classroom is “a truly intercultural academic community” (p. 19) which is a logical and ethical response to the forces which are increasingly weaving regional and global perspectives through the national focus that has traditionally been associated with national education systems. Moreover, the international classroom is just as pertinent to lecturers and local students as it is to international students, for it prepares all participants for work in an increasingly interconnected world by offering an opportunity to develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes for local, national, regional, and global contexts. In the Australian setting, this line of thinking is evident in the work of Sinclair and Britton Wilson (1999), Hudson and Morris (2003), the Australian Government (2005a, 2005b), and McLean and Ransom (2005). To maximise such opportunities, Teekens (2000c) suggested the following:

Such an environment requires a conceptualization of the international classroom as a pro-active setting that supports global and intercultural learning for all students. A revised education agenda is needed that responds to these new demands and their implications for teaching and learning. We have to prepare students for a future where local and global issues are irrevocably intertwined and where intercultural learning is not limited to internationally mobile students. (Teekens, 2000c, p. 20)

Clearly, for Teekens (2000c), the emergence of the international classroom has implications for the roles of lecturers and universities in the Twenty-First century. The increasing cultural, language, and educational diversity requires new approaches to teaching. To this end, the Profile was advanced as a catalyst for
change in teaching in higher education so that it more closely reflects contemporary educational realities and demands. Indeed, this is the basis of the response to any counter-argument that might be levelled against the value of the Profile in the present-day higher education setting (and this will be revisited in the section titled ‘A response to a possible counter-argument of the Profile’s usefulness’ in ‘Perspective 3: A return to the Profile’ in the following chapter).

The international classroom in context

Although Teekens’s (2000a) publication described the main features of the international classroom, it did not expand on its position in the broader higher education setting of the countries in which it is found, that is, on the international classroom in practice. Some information is available, however, about the international classroom in the Dutch context. The Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC) reported that internationaal onderwijs (IO), or international education, was a distinct feature of higher education in The Netherlands (note that this information also informs the Profile’s practice pillar):

IO [has] a relatively small number of students [and] offers advanced training courses originally designed for people from developing countries whose jobs require highly specialized knowledge. Problem-oriented courses and programmes of various types, including master’s programmes, are offered in a wide range of specific fields. The emphasis can be either on research or on the practical application of knowledge. Courses are given in English and last from a few weeks to two years. (NUFFIC, 2004a, p. 1)

According to NUFFIC (2004b), The Netherlands was the first country in continental Europe to offer tuition in English (¶ 2). In 2004 there were over 1,000
study programs and courses conducted entirely in English in Dutch institutions, making The Netherlands the largest provider of English language-based education on the Continent. In 2003 there were approximately 35,500 international students enrolled in IO programs. Given that there were 500,000 students enrolled in total in higher education in The Netherlands in 2003 (NUFFIC, 2004c, p. 46), international students in the international stream comprised approximately seven per cent of the entire tertiary student population in The Netherlands.

With regard to approaches to teaching and learning that are characteristic of higher education in The Netherlands, NUFFIC (2004d) reported to potential students that there was an emphasis on student-centred learning, independent study, and critical thinking:

Students from other countries soon notice that at a Dutch institution for higher education everyone is expected to do a lot of talking. The most common form of teaching is the seminar or working group. Under a teacher’s supervision, a small group of students analyzes a certain problem. They get together to discuss it as a group, usually on the basis of a paper one of them has written about one aspect of the problem in question. Teachers stimulate students to take a critical view, and everyone is expected to play an active part. On examinations students must demonstrate not only that they know the material, but also that they have formed well-founded opinions on the subject. (NUFFIC, 2004d, The Dutch way of teaching, ¶ 3)

As will be shown in this chapter, there is some discrepancy between the way the Profile describes the teaching approach in the international classroom and NUFFIC’s (2004d) view of the process as more or less conforming to the Western tradition of Dutch tertiary education. The Profile, then, should be seen as normative rather than descriptive.
An example of the international classroom

The brief commentary by Peters (2000) on the internationalisation of academic programs at the Rotterdam School of Management (now called RSM Erasmus University) provides an example of the international classroom at the institutional level. Peters (2000) reported that the Rotterdam School of Management first offered its Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree in 1985. Its curriculum was developed in association with the Wharton Business School of the University of Pennsylvania and it primarily had exchange links with American universities. By 2000, RSM Erasmus University had expanded its academic offerings to include a range of undergraduate and postgraduate programs, with many being taught exclusively in English (see Table 2.1 for a list of programs taught in English).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program type</th>
<th>Name of Academic Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Program</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in International Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Program</td>
<td>Masters of Science in Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Full-time MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Executive OneMBA [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Program</td>
<td>Master of Philosophy in Business Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD in Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Program</td>
<td>Company Specific Tailored Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Tabulated from text (RSM Erasmus University, 2005a).

In 2000, over 90 per cent of enrolments in the full-time MBA program at RSM Erasmus University came from outside The Netherlands (Peters, 2000, p. 93). In 2005, RSM Erasmus University (2005b) reported that over 80 nationalities were represented in their academic programs (Master of Science in Business
Administration, ¶ 5). Further, the learning philosophy of RSM Erasmus University is based on a teaching and learning model that “teaches you to think critically … In order to facilitate this we concentrate on student centered [sic] learning. This encompasses lectures, case studies, workshops, global residencies, simulations, real-life projects, internet, and group and independent work” (RSM Erasmus University, 2005c, ¶ 2 & 3). This is consistent with NUFFIC’s description of teaching and learning in higher education in The Netherlands in general as reported in the previous section.

Summary of the features of the international classroom

The international classroom is a feature of some universities in Western Europe. It is a special stream of higher education in which the student body is characterised by significant cultural, language, and educational diversity and the language of instruction is English. The Profile was developed in response to the emergence of the international classroom. One of its aims was to offer lecturers an opportunity to reflect on the sorts of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are required for teaching in this novel educational environment. It appears that in practice, according to NUFFIC and RSM Erasmus University, the students in this stream learn in the Western tradition which is characterised by an emphasis on student-centred learning, independent study, critical thinking, interactive debate, and small-group teaching.
The Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom

The background to the development of the Profile was provided in Chapter I. The previous sections of this chapter have placed the international classroom in context. Attention can now be directed to the Profile’s qualifications and the associated criteria that appear in each, under the categories of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude. All the Profile’s qualifications are listed below. Those that will be examined by this investigation are shown in bold text.

**Qualification 1 (Q1): General.**
**Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction.**
**Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences.**
**Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles.**
Qualification 5 (Q5): Using media and technology.
Qualification 6 (Q6): Specific requirements connected with the academic discipline and diploma recognition.
Qualification 7 (Q7): Knowledge of foreign education systems.
Qualification 8 (Q8): Knowledge of the international labour market.
Qualification 9 (Q9): Personal qualities.

*Examining only four qualifications*

As mentioned in Chapter I, one way in which this investigation is delimited is by its examination of only those qualifications that particularly relate to teaching international students. Examining only four qualifications gives this investigation a focus that is both scholarly and economical. It isolates the particular aspect of

---

5 A review of the five qualifications that are omitted from examination in this investigation is presented in Appendix B to provide an overall appreciation of the Profile.
internationalisation that represents the interests of this investigation. Whilst the Profile in its entirety concerns the internationalised work practices of lecturers, not all aspects of such practice are directly related to helping students achieve the specific learning objectives of their studies. For example, ‘Qualification 8 (Q8): Knowledge of the international labour market’ is more about lecturers being familiar with worldwide trends in employment for graduates.

Those that are particularly important for teaching international students, however, are Qualifications 1, 2, 3, and 4 which together deal with experience, knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to teaching and learning, culture, and teaching students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. Together, these four qualifications contain approximately two-thirds of the Profile’s total of 62 criteria. This suggests that although five qualifications from the Profile are omitted from the investigation, the four qualifications that are examined represent a substantial component of the overall Profile. Preference was given to these qualifications because they deal with the fundamental issues associated with teaching and learning in the international classroom.

*The Profile in the Australian & international higher education literature*

In Chapter I it was stated that a search of the Australian and international higher education literature failed to uncover either a comprehensive or a critical review of the Profile in its entirety or of the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students. The Profile has received limited exposure in the Australian higher education literature to this point. Of the two entries
that were located, Clifford (2005) concentrated on student views of higher education in Australia and briefly acknowledged the Profile’s focus on cognitive and attitudinal aspects of the work of lecturers with international and local students. Leask (2000, 2005) drew attention to the iteration of the Profile that was presented in publication Number 8 in the NUFFIC Papers series, that is, the document that was the precursor of Teekens’s (2000d) presentation of the Profile, to support a brief argument for internationalisation at the level of the lecturer.

With regard to the international higher education literature, all entries that could be found originated from Europe and essentially promoted the Profile as a novel device for generating discussion and awareness on the three levels that were outlined in Chapter I in the section titled ‘Background to the Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom’. Examples of this are Teekens (2000e), Teekens (2003b), and Otten (2003). What is evident from the search of the Australian and international higher education literature is the complete absence of a critical examination of the Profile. This investigation has embraced that lack of engagement with the Profile as a significant opportunity to explore its theory and practice pillars in detail to determine the credibility of its claims and, therefore, its usefulness for the original purposes for which it was created. To reiterate, these were informing lecturers, professional developers, human resource staff, and university administrators of the types of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that best support the teaching of students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds.
The focus of the remainder of this chapter

Each of the four qualifications that will be examined by this investigation will be considered in the light of the available literature concerning teaching and learning in higher education in general and teaching international students in particular. It is not the intention of this chapter to evaluate each individual criterion in the qualifications to be examined. Instead, the main focus will be on each qualification as a stand-alone concept. Closer attention will be paid to each criterion in Chapter V when the research results from the interviews with lecturers will be presented and discussed. In this way, Chapter II (with its focus on theory) and Chapter V (with its focus on practice) combine to provide an exacting treatment of the Profile’s qualifications and criteria that particularly relate to teaching international students.

As stated in the previous chapter, the review of the four qualifications will have three components. The first is that the criteria in each qualification as they are reported by Teekens (2000d) will be listed. Second, Teekens’s (2000d) commentary which accompanies each qualification will be considered, along with information from other writers who have contributed chapters to Teekens’s (2000a) publication titled Teaching and Learning in the International Classroom. Third, the literature on teaching and learning in higher education, and language and culture will be reviewed to determine the degree to which the Profile’s four qualifications and associated criteria reflect established theory and educational research. Given that the Profile is extremely thinly referenced, this activity will look for evidence that might establish the credibility of the Profile’s claims. By necessity, this is a form of reverse
engineering in that although the Profile exists, the theoretical evidence to support its claims is not made explicit by its creators.

Qualification 1 (Q1): General

Table 2.2 lists the criteria for ‘Qualification 1 (Q1): General’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 K1 The lecturer must be a good academic, with ample teaching experience and a thorough knowledge of the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 K2 The lecturer should be aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in his or her field may differ substantially in other academic traditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 S1 The lecturer must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 S2 The lecturer must be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 A1 The lecturer must be open, flexible and interested in the teaching and learning customary [sic] in other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 A2 The lecturer should be aware that some students ascribe him or her [sic] a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or she has been used to within his or her own tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 A3 The lecturer should reflect on the cultural context of his or her role as a teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 25).

This qualification provides an introduction to some of the main characteristics of the Profile and sets the tone for the other three qualifications that will be examined. Inasmuch as the first qualification is a description of the sort of lecturer who would ideally be able to respond the demands of the international classroom, it is evident that it is also a call for a particular sort of person; one who is able to meet the demands of this present period of globalisation. To this end, the Profile itself needs to be viewed from the outset as ultimately a whole-of-person
internationalisation response to the global forces presently impacting on higher education and life in general.

The Profile suggests that to deal with the changes that are happening, lecturers will need to complement their experience, knowledge, and skills in their field of expertise with an understanding of their own culture and the cultures of others. This appreciation of culture, along with attitudes such as open-mindedness, reflection, flexibility, acceptance, and understanding is what fundamentally drives the Profile and enables lecturers to develop a frame of reference that supports internationalised curricula and intercultural communication in the contemporary educational setting. The ensuing sections highlight the main characteristics of this qualification.

_Going beyond the ‘old’ national approach_

Teekens (2000d) suggested that the international classroom required lecturers to possess knowledge, skills, and attitudes that extended beyond those which were considered sufficient under “normal” (p. 24) circumstances. By normal, Teekens (2000c) meant “the national approach” (pp. 8-9) that has prevailed in higher education and which reflects and perpetuates homogeneity in the classroom, that is, cultural, epistemological, and ontological sameness, with curricula to meet local and national ends. Luke (2004) commented that teaching and schooling in general have historically “been developed as technologies of nation, nationality, and nationalism” (p. 1437). Morrow and Torres (2000) termed this “the traditional system [of an] old
capitalist order” (pp. 35-36) which constructed citizens for nation-states. Further, they suggested that this approach was passé given contemporary global trends.

In opposition to the traditional system, the international classroom carries with it the expectation that lecturers will have to mediate between different viewpoints and “deviate substantially from a well-established canon” (Teekens, 2000d, p. 24). There is a presumption that lecturers in the international classroom will have to acknowledge and accommodate different perspectives related to culture, epistemology, and ontology. This is a significant departure from the localised and nationalised curricula that has traditionally characterised higher education in many nations to this point. Indeed, the critical appraisal of the Profile that will be undertaken in this chapter will demonstrate that, in its ideal form, the curricula of the international classroom resonate with a globalised view of education, as opposed to one which is internationalised. Whilst this does not diminish the Profile’s usefulness for practical and theoretical outcomes in relation to the internationalisation of higher education, it does present some limitations. These will become evident in the remainder of this chapter as well as in Chapter III.

Age & gender in the international classroom

Teekens (2000d) made special comment on the roles of age and gender in relation to the lecturer in the international classroom. She suggested that “as regards experience [sic], the role of age is important” (p. 24). The inference is that older lecturers are more likely to have greater experience and that this would hold them in good stead to teach in the international classroom. It is anticipated that older,
experienced lecturers would have a well-developed knowledge base and a comprehensive repertoire of skills related to good teaching practice. These might include the sorts of qualities suggested by Davies, Hirschberg, Lye, Johnston, and McDonald (2005), such as “enthusiasm, clarity, showing good management of student behaviour, demonstrating well developed \textit{sic} interpersonal skills, being able to provide intellectual stimulation, showing respect for students, being organised and having good presentations skills” (pp. 186-187). Such qualities would help support good practice in relation to criterion Q1 S1 which focuses on curriculum process.

The idea of an older, experienced lecturer also implies someone with a certain amount of \textit{wisdom}. This is supported by Schwen’s (1998) claim that good teaching in higher education “depends upon a great deal of self-knowledge, upon no small amount of experience, and (...) upon the exercise of prudential wisdom” (p. 77). This, of course, assumes that an experienced lecturer also has a passion for teaching and an interest in the workings of the international classroom. Although this may be an untested assumption, Teekens’s (2000d) point has merit.

Whilst older, experienced lecturers were preferable, Teekens (2000d) said that young lecturers should also be involved in the international classroom to gain experience. Teekens (2000d) believed that some young lecturers had “a natural talent for intercultural communication [which could] sometimes be worth as much as many years of experience” (p. 24). Whilst Teekens (2000d) did not describe what was meant by natural talent, assuming that a young lecturer is someone with little experience, it might include such qualities as a capacity for reflection, open-
mindedness, language proficiency, passion for teaching and learning, sensitivity, understanding, flexibility, and enthusiasm. Indeed, they might also be the sorts of qualities that Teekens (2003b) suggested would be desirable to develop in local students (internationalisation at home) like “broad-mindedness, understanding, and respect for other people and their cultures, values and way of life” (p. 110) as well as the eschewal of racism. Such qualities, plus experience, advanced teaching skills, and wisdom would most likely satisfy Teekens’s (2000d) ideal of the most suitable lecturer for the international classroom.

With regard to age and gender, Teekens (2000d) suggested that because some students would not be used to young, female lecturers being in what they traditionally considered to be a male-dominated domain, this could present obstacles for communication both in formal and informal education settings (pp. 24-25). This comment relates to criterion Q1 A2 listed in the Attitude category which states that the lecturer “should be aware that some students ascribe him or her [sic] a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or she has been used to within his or her own tradition” (from in Table 2.2). Upon first inspection, the nature of this criterion appears to be better suited to ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’. Further, criterion Q1 A2 as stated is more of a knowledge statement about something rather than attitude towards it. If the criterion is to appear in the Attitude category it might be better expressed as “The lecturer should accept that some students might view his or her cultural role as a teacher and as an individual differently and be prepared to develop strategies to resolve any resultant tensions.”
The categories of Knowledge, Skills, & Attitude

‘Qualification 1 (Q1): General’ also introduces Teekens’s (2000d) use of the categories of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude. Whilst Teekens (2000d) did not clarify what is meant by these terms, they appear to be an appeal to common usage. Knowledge refers to “the fact of knowing; awareness; understanding … information acquired through learning or experience” (Manser & Thomson, 1995, p. 706), for example, the sort of knowledge that is specific to a discipline such as commerce or geography. The term also extends to a more sophisticated understanding of knowledge in terms of comprehending concepts and procedures. A definition of Skills is “expertness” or “a talent or accomplishment, naturally acquired or developed through training” (Manser & Thomson, 1995, p. 1158). Examples include lecturers being able to utilise media and technology to enhance teaching and learning, or being able to communicate effectively with students. The third category, Attitude, describes a personal disposition. The definition is “a way of thinking and behaving” (Manser & Thomson, 1995, p. 79). For example, a lecturer might be open to the way that cultural difference manifests itself in students’ approaches to academic work or, conversely, be intolerant of this.

These general explanations of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude will suffice for the consideration of the Profile’s qualifications and criteria in this chapter. A deeper treatment of the three categories will be undertaken in Chapter III in the section titled ‘The categories of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude’ in ‘Perspective 3: A return to the Profile’.
Another important aspect of the three categories in the Profile’s qualifications is the inference of logical connections between Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude. This means that an item of knowledge should be accompanied by an attitude towards that item, as well as a skill or strategy that reflects both the attitude and the item itself. Whilst this may be desirable, in practice it may not necessarily always be the case. For example, a person may know that there is a demonstrated link between smoking and cancer, but continue to smoke heavily. As Pedersen (1988) observed, “knowing the right response to a situation … doesn’t guarantee the facility or the inclination to use it” (p. 20). A lecturer may acknowledge that the well-established canon of knowledge in his or her field may be substantially different in other academic traditions (criterion Q1 K2 in Table 2.2) but ignore the implications of this when teaching in the international classroom. It cannot always be predicted that a certain item of knowledge will be accompanied by a related and desirable expression of behaviour or attitude. Still, in terms of Teekens’s (2000d) presentation of the Profile as an ideal state, it is understandable why such links are inferred (and preferred) between knowledge, skills, and attitude.

**Summary of Qualification 1 (Q1): General**

This qualification introduces teaching- and culture-related themes as important elements of the Profile. The lecturer as described by the Profile has a reflective disposition and is open to working with students from diverse cultural and educational backgrounds in a milieu that is increasingly being shaped by regional and global forces. Further, lecturers will have to acknowledge and accommodate different perspectives related to the cultures, knowledge claims, and worldviews of
their students. The ideal lecturer is an experienced teacher with a well-developed knowledge base and a comprehensive repertoire of skills related to good teaching practice.

Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction

Table 2.3 lists the criteria in this qualification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 K1 The lecturer must have a very good oral and written command of the language of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 K2 The lecturer must be capable of writing general texts, scientific reports and articles in the language of instruction and, where required, policy papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 K3 The lecturer must know the terms in the language of instruction that are used for teaching the subject in question, and be familiar with the jargon in his or her field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S1 The lecturer must be able to use the language of instruction in such a way that the natural flow of speech is not impeded by unnatural use of the voice, such as speaking very loudly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S2 The lecturer must be aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, but not use it in an extreme manner, such as making exaggerated movements to support spoken language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S3 The lecturer must be able to say things in different ways, rephrasing sentences that are not understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S4 The lecturer should use audio-visual aids in support of spoken texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S5 The lecturer must never use two languages at the same time, for example to explain something quickly to some of the students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A1 The lecturer must be aware of the fact that he or she is not using his or her native tongue and reflect on this fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A2 The lecturer should be aware that body language and other non-verbal aspects of communication have a great impact on the way he or she is understood (or misunderstood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A3 The lecturer must be aware of the role of humour in communication, but also that humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined spheres of personal identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A4 The lecturer must be aware that different levels of language proficiency within the group may account for differences in performance, but should not simply ascribe attitude to language (a ‘silent’ person may be shy, not interested, incompetent, bored, full of respect for the teacher or one of a whole range of explanations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A5 The lecturer should be open to suggestions as regards [sic] the use of language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualification 2 (Q2) outlines the importance of a lecturer’s abilities in terms of verbal and non-verbal communication skills that are required in the international classroom. Although the criteria are specifically directed at lecturers who have to teach in a language other than their native language, many of the requirements are still applicable to lecturers in the Australian setting because they emphasise the importance of basic communication skills. This is a particularly important precursor for competence in intercultural communication. Discussion of this qualification will show that the Profile’s focus on the language abilities of lecturers is at the expense of considering language-related issues and challenges for students who are learning in a non-native language. By doing so, it underestimates the implications this is likely to have both for students and lecturers.

*Communication & presentation requirements*

An important feature of the international classroom, as described by Teekens (2000d), is that it operates in a language other than the lecturer’s first language. Clearly, this is not the experience of the majority of lecturers in Australia. Nevertheless, many criteria listed in Table 2.3 are still relevant for Australian lecturers because they address the types of knowledge required of lecturers as well as basic skills for communicating this knowledge to students. The three criteria listed under Knowledge in Table 2.3 are implicit in the very idea of what it means to be a lecturer at university, that is, a well-qualified person who possesses a range of advanced skills that constellate around a certain area of knowledge and expertise (Ramsden, 2003, p. 108). It is expected that they would be either academics or
practitioners (or perhaps both) who would be able to generate and express complex ideas in spoken and written forms.

Note, however, Ramsden’s (2003) comment that knowledge about subject content and knowledge about techniques for teaching it were two separate things (p. 108). It does not necessarily follow that a lecturer who is knowledgeable about his or her subject is also proficient in terms of having good presentation and interpersonal communication skills. Of interest in this regard is Johnson’s (1996) observation that “education is about people and yet, until recently perhaps, we have rarely addressed the interpersonal skills needed to be a successful academic” (p. 59). According to the Teaching and Educational Development Institute (TEDI) (2005a), a lecturer needs to have good communication and presentation skills in addition to discipline knowledge:

Your success as a teacher is largely determined by your ability and skill in communicating your message. We have all experienced teachers who were clearly experts in their field but lacked the skills to convey their knowledge and understanding to a group of students. Presentation skills are integral elements of the complex craft of teaching. (TEDI, 2005a, p. 2)

Skills relating to audibility, pace of verbal delivery, pitch, articulation, pronunciation, emphasis, pause, energy, enthusiasm, eye contact, gestures, movement, and stance are all valuable assets in the lecturer’s presentation toolkit (TEDI, 2005a, pp. 2-4). Such skills and strategies were also promoted by Lowman (1984) who spoke of (American) college classrooms as “dramatic arenas” in which lecturers could captivate students’ attention and stimulate their emotions through high quality speaking skills and mastery of gesture and movement (pp. 72-93).
Further, it is evident from the criteria relating to presentation skills in Table 2.3 that the lecturer needs to be aware of cultural difference in the international classroom and take this into account in their communication with students. For example, lecturers should be aware that a quiet student might not necessarily be disinterested (Ballard & Clanchy, 1984, p. 95) or that a student who avoids eye contact with a lecturer might not be shy (Mezger, 1992, p. 27).

Language & students in the international classroom

Teekens’s (2000d) focus in this qualification is largely on the implications of language in the international classroom from the lecturer’s point of view, in particular the challenges that Dutch lecturers, for example, might face as a result of having to teach and write academic and policy papers in English. From the outset, it is worth noting a possible benefit to English as Another Language (EAL) students being taught by an EAL lecturer. Having gone through the process of learning another language themselves, they should be able to empathise with EAL students and appreciate the hard work and challenges inherent in learning another language (and then using that other language in an academic context). Hofstede (2001) made a related point:

Language plays a crucial role in intercultural interactions. In the Anglophone literature on intercultural encounters, the role of language tends to be

---

6 EAL is used for consistency throughout this investigation, rather than moving between terms with similar meaning such as NESB (Non-English Speaking Background) students, ESL (English as a Second Language) students, EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students, L2 (Second Language) students, LOTE (Languages Other Than English) students, FLOTE (First Language Other Than English) students and ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) students.
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underestimated; many of the authors are monolingual themselves, and it is almost impossible to grasp the importance of language if one has not struggled with learning one or more foreign languages. (Hofstede, 2001, p. 425)

It seems odd, however, that a qualification based on the use of a non-native language in the international classroom would fail to take into account the impact this would have on EAL students and (perhaps) native English-speaking students alike. This oversight might be attributed to Teekens’s (2000d) view that using a non-native language of instruction has the capacity to diminish communication problems in the international classroom. She stated that “when the language of instruction is a lingua franca (usually English), all members of the group seem to make a greater effort to make themselves understood. They watch their listeners and rephrase where necessary” (p. 26, emphasis in original). It is as if the amalgam of EAL participants in the international classroom will ameliorate language-related issues and challenges. Perhaps the oversight can also be attributed to Teekens’s (2000d) belief that “students often have a better command of language than their teachers, at least as far as spoken English is concerned” (p. 26). Teekens (200d) provided no empirical evidence to substantiate either of the above claims.

Despite the supportive intercultural and non-native language environment in the international classroom and the possibility that the students have better English language skills than the lecturer, Teekens’s (2000d) commentary and the criteria associated with this qualification significantly underestimate the language-related issues and challenges that would most likely be faced by EAL students. To this extent, there is also a failure to recognise the responsibility of the lecturer to be
aware of and to address them. Based on the Australian experience, most EAL students would be most likely to encounter difficulties when using English in the university setting. This is despite their having met minimum English language requirements to enter an academic program. For instance, as a general rule, most Australian universities accept an overall band score of 6.0 in the IELTS test for EAL undergraduate students who have not previously studied at an acceptable level in English. IDP (International Development Program) Education Australia (2006) reported that although this score indicated that a student was a “competent user” of English with “generally effective command of the language”, they would nevertheless also exhibit “some inaccuracies, inappropriacies [sic] and misunderstandings” (Competent user, ¶ 1). Achieving minimum entry requirements for language, then, does not mean that an EAL student will easily master the social and academic language that characterises Australian society and Australian universities. (This is not even to mention the significant impact that culture has on the use of language in these environments). Indeed, Ballard and Clanchy (1997) maintained that most EAL students “will never draw level with native speakers in their control of English” (p. 29).

In the Australian academic setting, most EAL students are challenged in terms of speaking, listening, reading, and writing requirements; the four fundamental categories of language use. Research by Matthews (2003) found that speaking and listening presented more problems to EAL students than reading and writing. Ballard and Clanchy (1984) believed that, despite perhaps having studied English for many years prior to arriving in Australia, “nearly all foreign students who come to
Australia to study have problems with English” (pp. 1-2), particularly at the beginning of their academic program. Biggs (2003) reported that many international students had “language problems” (p. 122) despite having met language-related university entrance criteria. Research by Mulligan and Kirkpatrick (2000) in an Australian university, for instance, found that “slightly fewer than 1 in 10 NESB students was able to understand the content and intent of their lectures very well. More disturbingly, almost one-quarter of them had not understood much of the lectures at all” (p. 311). The important point to consider here is that not only is language an issue for EAL students, but it also impacts on lecturers who teach and assess them (Ballard & Clanchy, 1997). There is a need, then, for lecturers to play an active role in supporting the language needs of EAL students in the international classroom. This does not mean they become language teachers. Instead, it can be achieved by lecturers employing the sorts of communication skills that Mezger (1992) suggested would reduce language-related barriers:

- Be aware of the difficulties caused by use of slang, colloquialisms, idiom, prepositional phrases (eg ‘in the light of’), accents, passive verbs etc. If used, explain the meanings.
- Be aware of cultural differences in greetings and everyday conversation.
- Speak clearly and simply at normal volume without being simplistic or patronizing.
- Be prepared to clarify meanings, yours and the students.
- Check to see if you and the student both understand the message.
- Be aware of your own communication style. (Mezger, 1992, p. 207, abbreviations, quotation marks, and emphases in original)
Similar suggestions were made by Ryan (2000) and McLean and Ransom (2005). Lecturers could also adopt strategies such as those suggested by Mulligan and Kirkpatrick (2000):

Lecturers can best assist their NESB students by providing a comprehensive unit outline and reading list; by beginning each lecture with a clear outline, and returning to the outline as the lecture progresses; by providing students with skeleton notes of lecture content, so that they are better able to concentrate on listening; by using clear and concise OHTs [overhead transparencies] and other visual reinforcement of content; by delivering their lectures at a reasonable pace and with clear signalling of changes in topic or focus, so that students are able to distinguish the main ideas from the supporting argument; by allowing students opportunities during the lecture to discuss in groups or pairs the main points of the lecture, perhaps by referring to worksheets and handouts; and, most importantly, by being prepared to listen to their students. (Mulligan & Kirkpatrick, 2000, p. 333)

It is important to note that this qualification also neglects to consider the possibility that international students who are native English speakers might also be challenged by the use of English by EAL participants in the international classroom. The native English speakers, too, would have to concentrate on the accent, grammar, and content of the speech of the EAL lecturer and EAL students to understand what was being said. It is possible that they might be frustrated by what they perceive as unnecessary repetition and seemingly meandering conversations. They might want people to get to the point rather than spending time clarifying what was meant in discussion. The teaching and learning literature is less forthcoming with advice on how to deal with such challenges. Nevertheless, given the likely language-related issues and challenges that would be faced by all parties in the international classroom, criterion Q2 A1 under Attitude in this qualification could be amended to the following in any revision of the Profile to cover all bases: “The lecturer must be
supportive of the language-related issues and challenges faced by *all* participants in the international classroom with regard to the language of instruction.”

*Flexibility towards use of the language of instruction*

Peters (2000) made the following observation about the use of English by EAL students in the international classroom:

Lecturers must cope with an extremely diverse set of ‘Englishes’ which reflect the origin [*sic*] of the student body. Additionally, they must develop the ability to judge student performance keeping this diversity in mind. This means that thought must be given to a diverse student body’s ability to write essays, to make oral presentations and to work in different situations. (Peters, 2000, p. 100)

Peters’s (2000) statement above identifies with the intent of criterion Q2 A5 in Table 2.3 which states that “The lecturer should be open to suggestions as regards [*sic*] the use of language.” Whilst there appears to be some flexibility (although vague in terms of its practical application) regarding the use of academic English in the international classroom in some parts of Western Europe, on the whole it is difficult to ascertain whether the same can be said of the Australian tertiary setting. In relation to assessment in particular, the general expectation is that international students have to meet the same minimum academic and English language requirements as Australian students. For example, De Fazio (1999) emphasised to international students that Australian lecturers required an assignment to be structurally sound and free of errors in typing, spelling, grammar, referencing, and punctuation (pp. 61-66). In a similar fashion, Ballard and Clanchy (1984) suggested that essays from EAL international students had to be “competently presented”
and that final drafts had to be edited “very carefully for errors of style, format, grammar and spelling” (p. 75). To be sure, there will be differences between individual Australian lecturers in terms of what they find acceptable. Some are likely to be more flexible than others.

Mezger (1992) suggested that Australian lecturers in the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) sector should not penalise international students for “minor grammatical errors and poor sentence construction” (p. 220). Instead, they should focus on their thinking and understanding. How widespread such a practice is in the Australian university setting is not known. In relation to Mezger’s (1992) suggestion, however, Hudson and Morris (2003) postulated that one outcome of the internationalisation of assessment practices in Australia might be that “good argumentation” (p. 71) could at some point replace the traditional emphasis placed on “‘correct’ English” (p. 71). At present, however, it is likely that, in the main, international students have to meet the same English language presentation and assessment criteria as their Australian peers.

A feature of the Australian higher education system is that lecturers generally do not spend time helping EAL students with their English language skills. Biggs (2003) suggested that most lecturers would contend that they are not experts in skill development in “language for academic purposes” (p. 122). Instead, they tend to refer students to “teaching counsellors or ESL advisers for assistance” (Kenyon & Amrapala, 1991, p. 73). De Fazio (1999) stated that “each [Australian] institution has an academic skills support unit” (p. 13) to help all students with, amongst other
things, essay writing and oral presentations. Further, Australian lecturers should be aware that the majority of EAL international students who come to Australia to study will have learned American or British English. Very few will have been exposed to Australian English. Kenyon and Amrapala (1991) believed that “Australian spoken English can cause considerable problems in comprehension for students” (pp. 76-77) due to being confronted with Australian colloquialisms, slang, sense of humour (including its expression in language and tone), and speed of delivery. Another consideration for Australian lecturers to keep in mind is that the depth of thinking of EAL students is likely to be much greater than what they can express in English. Hofstede (2001) suggested that monolingual speakers of English are “tempted by the fallacious assumption that what foreign speakers can express in English words is all that the foreigners have on their minds” (p. 425).

Summary of Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction

The teaching and learning literature supports the Profile’s claims in relation to verbal and non-verbal communication skills that are required for successful teaching in the international classroom. The Profile neglects, however, to focus on language-related issues and challenges for students who are learning in a non-native language. As such, it significantly underestimates the implications that this is likely to have both for students and lecturers.

Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences

The criteria for this qualification are displayed in Table 2.4.
Table 2.4 Criteria of Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge criteria</th>
<th>Q3 K1</th>
<th>The lecturer should know that culture can be defined in different ways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 K2</td>
<td>The lecturer should know that formal education is one of the most important features of a national culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 K3</td>
<td>The lecturer should know that culture is learned, and is very difficult to un-learn [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 K4</td>
<td>The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of the culture(s) of the students in the group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Skills criteria | Q3 S1 | The lecturer must be able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework |
|                | Q3 S2 | The lecturer should be able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, for example knowing whether a student is only shy or feels that it is not appropriate to ask a question |
|                | Q3 S3 | The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account |

| Attitude criteria | Q3 A1 | The lecturer should be aware of his or her own culture and understand that this strongly colours his or her own views |
|                  | Q3 A2 | The lecturer must try to avoid thinking in stereotypes, and to behave and express opinions without resorting to such generalizations |
|                  | Q3 A3 | The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments for cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of other group members |


The concept of culture is undoubtedly the foundation feature of the Profile. The Profile is given its unique disposition by requiring the lecturer to be aware of and to accommodate cultural difference on a number of levels. They also need to be critically conscious of how their own culture shapes their views. Effectively, this corresponds with what Sinclair and Britton Wilson (1999) called the journey of two directions; the “inward journey” (p. 36) of personal discovery and the “outward journey” (p. 36) of learning about other cultures. Such a view resonates strongly with the notions of authenticity and cosmopolitanism in relation to internationalised teaching in higher education that will be developed in the next chapter. Culture is a keystone upon which the Profile rests. Accordingly, this section elaborates on the
implications of culture for teaching in the international classroom. It introduces Hofstede’s theory of cultural dimensions as an important part of the Profile’s makeup, where culture-specific knowledge is posited to be useful for lecturers to assist them to better understand their international students. The dangers of stereotyping are also highlighted.

The Profile’s perspective on culture

In the view of Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton (1999), the cultural aspect of globalisation, that is, the movement of objects, signs, and people between regions and continents, is one of the most directly perceived and experienced aspects of contemporary global forces. They interpreted culture in its broadest sense:

Culture refers to the social construction, articulation and reception of meaning. We are using culture in its fullest, if sometimes ambiguous sense; culture as a lived and creative experience for individuals as well as a body of artefacts, texts and objects; it embraces the specialized and professionalized discourses of the arts, the commodified output of the culture industries, the spontaneous and unorganised cultural expressions of everyday life, and, of course, the complex interactions between all of these. (Held et al., 1999, pp. 328-329)

Although Teekens’s (2000d) interpretation of culture is narrower than the one presented above, its focus on behaviour as an important aspect of culture is not inconsistent with the broader definition. Rather, it chooses to emphasise the individual’s lived experience component of the definition provided by Held et al. (1999). This way of looking at culture is, according to Pedersen (1988), concerned with “within the person” (p. 3) experiences such as values, habits, customs, and lifestyles. This is exactly the arena of Hofstede’s (2001) work, which is promoted by
Teekens (2000c) and Schröder (2000) as an example of a theoretical framework that can act as a foundation for knowledge, skills, and attitudes for ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’ and, indeed, for all nine qualifications of the Profile.

Culture in the classroom

Teekens’s (2000d) commentary on this qualification began with the observation that a nation’s education system plays an important role in developing its peoples’ values and norms. National education reflects, shapes, and reinforces national culture; the classroom is a “miniature country” (p. 28). The classroom, therefore, is a mirror of national cultural norms and values. Further, its domestic students and lecturers are both reflections and reflectors of this because they are part of the fabric of the national culture. The logical extension of Teekens’s (2000d) argument is that the international classroom, by virtue of having students from many nations, is a setting which has already moved beyond the national perspective and, as such, it requires a whole new way of thinking in terms of its management and curricula. Accordingly, it is important that lecturers understand something about the characteristics of other national cultures in the classroom as well as the assumptions that underwrite their own cultural practices. This understanding, for Cranton (2001), was fundamental to teaching in higher education:

Teaching is a special sort of communication between people with the goal of fostering learning. In order to communicate in a meaningful way, there must be some connection between the people involved in the communication. At the very least, one person speaks to another with some awareness of the person to whom he is speaking, and another person listens with some awareness of the person to whom she is listening. (Cranton, 2001, p. 73)
The Profile’s use of the Hofstedian lens to explain culture in the international classroom


Hofstede’s work essentially maps out descriptive relativism, that is, the notion that social norms differ from one place to another. This is not to say that Hofstede’s contribution is simply a modern day confirmation that people do things differently in different places. It is more comprehensive than that. In some respects, it shares a similar theoretical space to Vygotsky’s (1962, 1978) thinking on social cognition which posits that a person’s culture is a fundamental determinant of their worldview. Søndergaard (n.d.) reported that the “Hofstedian argument has become an influential classic” (¶ 9). Chapman (1997) said Hofstede’s work had “become a dominant influence and set a fruitful agenda” (p. 1360). Gannon (2004) commented
that of all the major dimensional approaches to cultural theory, Hofstede’s work is “the most robust and useful” (p. 9). Teekens (2000d) described the Hofstedian approach in the following way:

Geert Hofstede has described culture as the collective mental programming which distinguishes members of one group or category of people from members of another culture ... Culture seen as mental programming defines culture in the anthropological sense, covering all spheres of life. It is learned, and it is very hard to unlearn. It defines the way we think, feel and behave. The source of our mental programming is our social environment. It starts at home, continues to develop on the street, in school, at work and in all the social settings a person encounters. (Teekens, 2000d, pp. 28-29)

Hofstede’s work is a comprehensive account of particular characteristics of over 72 national cultures through the way they fit into a model that he produced from two rounds of questionnaires between 1967 and 1973 into attitudes of over 100,000 International Business Machines (IBM) employees. The resultant model originally contained four cultural dimensions. A fifth dimension was added in the 1980s. Hofstede (2001) said these dimensions reflect “basic problems” that are faced by every society, but for which solutions can differ (p. xix). See Table 2.5 for a summary of the five dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural dimension</th>
<th>Description of cultural dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance Index (PDI)</td>
<td>Related to the different solutions to the basic problem of human inequity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI)</td>
<td>Related to the level of stress in a society in the face of an unknown future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism and Collectivism (IDV)</td>
<td>Related to the integration of individuals into primary groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity and Femininity (MAS)</td>
<td>Related to the division of emotional roles between men and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long versus Short Term Orientation (LTO)</td>
<td>Related to the choice of focus for peoples’ efforts: the future or the present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Tabulated from text in Hofstede (2001, p. 29).
See Appendix C for a detailed description of the five dimensions.

According to Schröder (2000), Hofstede’s model of cultural dimensions represented knowledge that could support productive “cross-cultural communication [which is] the basic medium by which teaching and learning takes place in the international classroom” (p. 48) and could assist lecturers to “understand behaviour that might otherwise seem deviant” (p. 54). Schröder (2000) made the assumption that international students were likely to have a mindset which was receptive to a cross-cultural communication setting because they chose to be educated in a foreign country. They were likely to be open-minded, respectful of difference, and curious. “Regrettably,” Schröder (2000) suggested, “the same cannot be said of the lecturers and staff at host institutions” (p. 48).

Whilst it is a big leap to state that international students were likely to be better equipped to operate in the intercultural setting because it was they who had left home, Schröder (2000) is on firmer ground in suggesting that host institutions and lecturers have a responsibility to provide a teaching and learning environment that addresses what Hofstede (1986) called “the perplexities of cross-cultural learning situations” (p. 316). To this end, Hofstede’s (2001) model of cultural dimensions is promoted by Teekens (2000d) as a useful theoretical tool for the practical purpose of, according to Hofstede (2001) himself, engaging in intercultural cooperation to meet “the crying need for integration of human efforts in a shrinking world” (p. 73).
The potential use of Hofstede’s work for lecturers

It is not difficult to see how Hofstede’s (2001) model of cultural dimensions might be useful to lecturers. In addition to understanding what each cultural dimension means in general, they could also compare the host country’s index scores with those of another country for particular cultural dimensions. The interesting thing for lecturers would be to note any similarities or differences between the respective index scores and to give thought to what these might suggest. For example, an Australian lecturer who had Malaysian students in their class could compare the Power Distance Index (PDI) scores between Australia and Malaysia. Figure 2.1 shows that Australia’s PDI score lies towards the lower end of the PDI pole, whilst Malaysia’s score lies towards the higher end.

![Figure 2.1](source: ITIM Culture & Management Consultants, 2003)
Taking note of the relatively large difference in the PDI scores between the two countries, the lecturer could then refer to information from Hofstede’s (2001) Power Distance dimension which outlines characteristics of low and high PDI societies in relation to schooling (see Table 2.6) to better understand what this difference could signify.

Table 2.6  *Key differences in schooling between low & high PDI societies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia (Low PDI)</th>
<th>Malaysia (High PDI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat students as equals</td>
<td>Students depend on teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students treat teachers as equals</td>
<td>Students treat teachers with respect, even outside class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centred education</td>
<td>Teacher-centred education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students initiate some communication in class</td>
<td>Teachers initiate all communication in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are experts who transfer impersonal truths</td>
<td>Teachers are gurus who transfer personal wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents may side with students against teachers</td>
<td>Parents supposed to side with teachers to keep students in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of learning depends on two-way communication and excellence of students</td>
<td>Quality of learning depends on excellence of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower educational levels maintain more authoritarian relations</td>
<td>Authoritarian values independent of education levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational system focuses on middle levels</td>
<td>Educational system focuses on the top level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Nobel Prizes in sciences per capita</td>
<td>Fewer Nobel Prizes per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More modest expectations on benefits of technology</td>
<td>High expectations on benefits of technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Hofstede (2001, p. 107).*

The information presented in Table 2.6 would be useful for lecturers in terms of painting a general picture of how Malaysian students are likely to initially present in the international classroom. This knowledge can then be the basis for lecturers to develop appropriate skills and attitudes which would enable them to work with rather than against cultural difference and differing expectations in class. For example, knowing that teachers initiate all communication in class in high PDI countries, the Australian lecturer could adopt an attitude of openness to the possibility that a quiet
Malaysian student might not be bored, disinterested, or shy. Ballard and Clanchy (1991) provided examples of appropriate skills or strategies to encourage communication such as “give reticent students a chance to prepare themselves by telling them that you will call on them to speak after the next speaker” (p. 41) or “call on overseas students to add comments based on their own cultural background” (p. 41).

Similarly, paying heed to the distance between the scores of each country for the Individualism and Collectivism (IDV) dimension (see Figure 2.1), the lecturer could note the characteristics of schooling that Hofstede (2001) suggested would be typical of low and high IDV societies (see Table 2.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.7</th>
<th>Key differences in schooling between low &amp; high IDV societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malaysia</strong> (Low individualistic)</td>
<td><strong>Australia</strong> (High individualistic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers deal with pupils as a group</td>
<td>Teachers deal with individual pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils’ individual initiatives discouraged</td>
<td>Pupils’ individual initiatives encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchildren report ethnocentric, traditional views</td>
<td>Schoolchildren report “modern” views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students associate according to preexisting [sic] in-group ties</td>
<td>Students associate according to tasks and current needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students expect preferential treatment by teachers from their in-group</td>
<td>In-group membership no reason to expect preferential treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony, face and shaming in class</td>
<td>Students’ selves to be respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will not speak up in class or large groups</td>
<td>Students expected to speak up in class or large groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' aggressive behaviour bad for academic performance</td>
<td>Students’ self-esteem good for academic performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of education is learning how to do</td>
<td>Purpose of education is learning how to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomas provide entry to higher-status groups</td>
<td>Diplomas increase economic worth and/or self-respect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Hofstede (2001, p. 237).*
For example, an Australian lecturer would most likely expect all students to take responsibility for their own learning. The students would be expected to show initiative which is consistent with a critical and analytical approach to learning that might include, for example, synthesising information from a wide range of sources in order to write an essay (Ballard & Clanchy, 1997, p. 13). Knowing that schooling in low IDV societies is likely to have discouraged students from showing individual initiative, the lecturer might choose to be open to a range of responses and behaviours from Malaysian students and employ specific teaching skills and strategies to address any apparent lack of confidence to tackle tasks that require independent action and seemingly poor initiative shown in pursuit of academic tasks.

*A cautionary note on the use of essentialist cultural theories*

Despite its popularity, Hofstede’s theory of cultural dimensions is not without criticism. Smith and Schwartz (1997), McSweeney (2002), and Gooderham and Nordhaug (2003) disagreed with Hofstede’s research methodology and also argued that nations were not ideal units of cultural comparison and that five dimensions of culture were not enough. Such criticisms were recently addressed (and discounted) by Hofstede (2002) (see Appendix C for common criticisms of Hofstede’s work, plus Hofstede’s responses to each criticism). Others, like Hewling (2005) and Macfadyen (2005), were critical of Hofstede (2001) because his theory of cultural dimensions is *essentialist* in nature, that is, it “implies a belief that an individual’s cultural ‘identity’ (nationality, ethnicity, ‘race’, class, etc) determines and predicts that individuals [*sic*] values, communicative preferences and behaviours” (Macfadyen, 2005, pp. 20-21). The fundamental oversight made by both Hewling (2005) and
Macfadyen (2005), however, is that Hofstede (2001), himself, clearly pointed out that an individual’s values and behaviour cannot and should not be predicted from national cultural norms (see the following section for more on this). There are good reasons to use caution when using an essentialist or, indeed, any types of cultural theory to better understand the differences and similarities between individuals from various cultures and countries. This is so whether using Hofstede’s work or using other essentialist cultural theories, such as those put forward by E. Hall (1959, 1966), E. Hall and M. Hall (1990), and Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (2000). A case in point is the following observation made about students from Malaysia who further their education in Australia:

I’m not convinced that Hofstede’s cultural profiles are useful. Even if they are accurate averages for the Malaysian population, Malaysian international students in Australia are not typical Malaysians. Only around one per cent of the tertiary age population in Malaysia studies overseas and compared with the Malaysian norm, they are younger, richer, more Chinese, more urban, more likely to have parents who have studied overseas, etc. Also, these are people who are seeking an education which is different to the Malaysian educational norm, indicating that they may not share the same values as are ascribed to the Malaysian norm. (C. Ziguras, personal communication, March 24, 2006)

The message in the statement above is similar in sentiment to Hewling’s (2005) comment that although the Sudan comprises the “Arab Muslims in the north … to Black African Christian or animist in the south” (Notes, ¶ 2), an essentialist view of Sudanese nationality would mask the distinctly different cultural norms and practices of the two groups. This, too, is precisely the view of Cope and Kalantzis (1997) who believed that generalisations about national cultures created “oversimplified images of national sameness” (p. 254). Given the sound reasoning in objections such as these, lecturers who prefer to use essentialist cultural theories to
help them understand cultural difference should also remain open to the possibility that the values and behaviours of individual students may not conform to what is predicted of their national group (again, see the following section for more on this).

At this point it is also important to note that the use of Hofstede’s model of cultural dimensions as a theoretical approach for the Profile is far from prescriptive. The Profile can accommodate other cultural models (indeed, even a mix of models) that correspond to a lecturer’s preferences. For example, it could be supported by S. Hall’s (1992, 1997a, 1997b) work on cultural representation, Foucault’s (1980) deliberations on power and knowledge, or Spivak’s (1988, 1999) engagement with postcolonial theory. The difficulty with using theories such as these, however, is that they are usually dense in their discipline-specific terminology and argumentation and, therefore, less likely to be embraced by busy lecturers who might want to understand more about cultural difference, yet may not have the time or interest to study culture-related concepts more thoroughly. For this reason, the essentialist cultural theories are more likely to be utilised by lecturers despite their limitations. For instance, in the case of Hofstede’s work, Dahl (n.d.) noted the following as an explanation of why it might appeal to those seeking to better understand everyday intercultural encounters:

The work of Hofstede is probably the most popular work in the arena of culture research. Although the work provides a relatively general framework for analysis, the framework can be applied easily to many everyday intercultural encounters. It is particularly useful, as it reduces the complexities of culture and its interactions into five relatively easily understood cultural dimensions. (Dahl, n.d., ¶ 9)
The danger of stereotyping

Whilst Hofstede’s model of cultural dimensions has some use for an understanding of the differences between cultures by comparing and contrasting their national characteristics, the Profile rightly cautions lecturers against using stereotypes when dealing with international students as individuals (see criterion Q3 A2 in Table 2.4). A number of writers, including Hofstede (2001) himself, have made this clear and their views are worth noting:

What is unfounded in any case is the application of stereotype information about a group to any individual member of that group. The valid part of a stereotype is a statistical statement about a group, not a prediction of the properties of particular individuals. Stereotypes are at best half-truths. (Hofstede, 2001, p. 14)

The literature related to teaching and learning and culture supports both the Profile and Hofstede (2001) in this regard. Cranton (2001) cautioned against generalising from ourselves to others and vice versa (p. 2). She said that it was important to distinguish the individual student with their unique and complex characteristics from the social construct of the typical student (p. 74). Reynolds and Skilbeck (1976) suggested that although cultural stereotypes are useful for interpreting experience, this is a fairly superficial way of understanding difference, and it goes little deeper than simply noting what is typical of one group (p. 2), for example, “all Chinese look alike; all Dutch are stingy” (Hofstede, 2001, p. 424). Of stereotypes, Said (1995) put the question “Who are the Arabs?” and then provided a common Western assessment of Arabs as lecherous, bloodthirsty, dishonest, “oversexed degenerates, capable, it is true, of cleverly devious intrigues, but
essentially sadistic, treacherous, low. Slave trader, camel driver, moneychanger, colourful scoundrel” (pp. 286-287).

Indeed, there is also the outsider’s stereotype of the typical Australian male as “the ocker Aussie in a singlet, stubby and thongs, beer can in hand” (Kenyon & Amrapala, 1991, p. 3) (see Figure 2.2). Of course, it is not suggested that the ocker Aussie shown in Figure 2.2 would in any way be a stereotype of the Australian male lecturer. The image most likely to be held by international students, according to Ballard and Clanchy (1997), is that the lecturer simply smells of “beer, beef and cheese” (p. 6) and “never wants us to get better marks than their own students” (p. 6).

Figure 2.2 The ‘typical’ Australian male
(Source. Mezger, 1992, p. 22)
Conversely, in the case of stereotyping Asian students, a lecturer might subscribe to the view, for example, that they are very quiet and shy, or particularly demanding, or that they do not critique anything (Nichols, 2003). Cannon and Newble (2000) described the stereotypical view of students from Confucian heritage cultures in Eastern and Southeast Asia as “rote learners” (p. 5). Biggs (2003) outlined some stereotypes of international students from Asia. He said they were often perceived as rote learners, did not think critically, were passive and would not communicate in class, did not respond to progressive Western teaching methods, focused excessively on assessment, did not understand what plagiarism was, formed ethnic enclaves, did not adjust to Australian academe easily, and considered lecturers to be gods (pp. 125-131). Biggs (2003) suggested that whilst some of these stereotypes are supported by evidence, others are also features of the local students and others, still, “are simply wrong” (p. 125).

For Ballard and Clanchy (1997), stereotyping indicated inflexible thinking. Instead, lecturers (and students) needed to recognise that “each is an individual within a different cultural setting” (p. 6). Khalidi (1997) said that general descriptions of a culture cannot account for the diversity of individuals within that culture, due to the way that factors such as “age, education, socio-economic class, religion, gender and personal experiences would influence a person’s values and behaviour” (p. i). Kenyon and Amrapala (1991) suggested that international students preferred to be treated as unique individuals in their own right, with their own personalities, interests, and abilities (p. 4). Race (2001) encouraged lecturers to avoid making assumptions based on gender, age, ethnic group, and perceived social status
(p. 167). Mezger (1992) stated that using stereotypes increased the likelihood of going “back to the square one [sic] of misunderstanding, resentment, frustration, or retreat and further stereotyping” (p. 23). International students, she suggested, have their own personalities, past experiences, needs, and desires. In addition, they also might well be operating outside their own cultural framework (Mezger, 1992, p. 23). This last point is particularly important and relates to the caveat clause suggested in the previous section should a lecturer choose to use an essentialist cultural theory to better understand the behaviour of their international students.

The strong message in this section is that whilst cultural theory may be useful for helping lecturers to better understand how culture broadly impacts on the workings of the international classroom, it is perhaps just as (or even more) important for lecturers to adopt an attitude of acceptance of cultural difference and develop the knowledge and skills to respond appropriately to the surprising conundrums that intercultural opportunities frequently provide. This was expressed well by Cope and Kalantzis (1997):

Instead of working according to neat formulas or stereotypical visions of the norm, we need to be open to unpredictability. We need to have the skills to read the complexity of the differences we encounter as the product of life history – this person’s culture as the accumulated and interrelated experience of a number of particular contexts. Then we will discover that the amount and significance of internal difference within countries will be greater than the average differences between countries. We will also discover that culture is dynamic. It is not a relatively fixed set of country attributes. Culture is a complex set of alternatives. It is a matter of change, creation, hybrid recreation, and responsibility. (Cope & Kalantzis, 1997, p. 258)

The view above suggests that it is important for teaching staff to be open-minded and not only know something of the cultures of their students but also, where
practicable, get to know individual students so as to move beyond likely stereotypical views. This would seem to be a reasonable expectation of a student-centred teaching and learning environment.

Culture-specific knowledge

Hofstede’s (2001) cultural dimensions as they apply to individual nations can be said to be one type of “culture-specific” (p. 428) information. As seen in the earlier section titled ‘Culture in the international classroom through the Hofstedian lens’, a lecturer can develop an idea of characteristics of national cultures by looking at the PDI, UAI, IND, MAS, and LTO scores. This is potentially useful in terms of gleaning an insight into the values and norms that are likely to be important features of national cultures. There is, however, a different sort of information that is also culture-specific and can help lecturers broaden their understanding of particular cultures. This concerns commonly-encountered behaviours that are part of daily life. Pedersen (1988) noted that culture-specific knowledge concerns a particular nationality, ethnicity, or cultural group (p. 5).

Hofstede (2001) said culture-specific knowledge was beneficial, for example, for future expatriates and their families because it familiarised them with their new country in terms of “geography, some history, customs, hygiene, dos and don’ts, what to bring - in short, how to live” (p. 428). Brislin and Horvath (1997), too, called this sort of factual information “culture-specific” (p. 335) and said it was useful for international students, business people, diplomats, and others who crossed cultural boundaries. It included information on climate, transportation, schooling, methods
for reducing conflicts in interpersonal relations, male-female dating patterns, and superior-subordinate workplace relations. Some examples of culture-specific information for China, for example, are presented in Table 2.8.

### Table 2.8 Behaviour & communication for business in China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour and communication traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Chinese do not speak with their hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large hand movements may be distracting to the Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact must be avoided at all cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is highly inappropriate for a man to touch a woman in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To point, do not use your index finger, use an open palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift giving is a delicate issue in China. Give gifts in private or to a group as a whole to avoid embarrassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality writing pens are considered favoured gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always arrive on time or early if you are the guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowing or nodding is the common greeting; however, you may be offered a handshake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applause is common when greeting a crowd; the same is expected in return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductions are formal, so use formal titles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Williams (2005).*

A range of useful culture-specific information is also available from Campbell (1995), Khalidi (1997), and Mezger (1992), plus many internet resources, including the comprehensive, on-line *World Factbook* produced by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA, 2005). Whilst information of the sort that is presented in Table 2.8 and in the aforementioned resources is likely to be of particular use to international students in terms of understanding their new environment, familiarity of the lecturer with such social norms, behavioural practices, and country features would at least give them some further insight into the likely cultural characteristics of their international students. Clearly, the idea is to use culture-specific knowledge to build awareness rather than having the lecturer jettison his or her own cultural
practices to conform to those of a multitude of others. This would be impractical and undesirable (if not impossible).

Whilst lecturers would find culture-specific knowledge useful, it is worth noting Schröder’s (2000) caution that “a person obviously cannot know all the ins and outs of all other cultures” (p. 49). Louie (2005) made a similar observation. For Teekens (2000d) also, knowledge of such “specific behaviour” (p. 29) was useful but not always helpful in terms of addressing the cultural differences that impact on communication in the educational process. To this end, culture-general knowledge is a useful companion to culture-specific knowledge. The former is different from the latter because it does not deal with information that is particular to a certain culture. Instead, it relates to matters such as the development of self-awareness and appreciation of difference, both of which are implicit to the Profile, and common responses to being in unfamiliar cultural situations (Hofstede, 2001, p. 428; Brislin & Horvath, 1997, p. 335; Pedersen, 1988, p. 5) (the idea of self-awareness will be developed further in the next chapter). Kohls and Knight (1994) acknowledged the usefulness of both culture-specific and culture-general knowledge in helping people make the most of their participation in intercultural settings (p. ix).

As a point of departure from this section, it is worth noting that there is no reference in the Profile to culture shock. Having an understanding of culture shock is a type of culture-general knowledge. Although culture shock is acknowledged by Schröder (2000), it is absent from the Profile itself, as well as Teekens’s (2000d) accompanying commentary. Given that it is widely acknowledged in the teaching
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and learning literature that lecturers need to have some awareness of the sorts of stresses that international students would most likely face as a result of living and studying in a new country, a criterion addressing culture shock could be included in any revision of the Profile (see Appendix D for a summary of the literature related to teaching and learning and culture which describes culture shock and supports the case for its inclusion as a criterion in ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’).

**Summary of Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences**

Whilst the concept of culture is the foundation feature of the Profile, the literature related to teaching and learning and culture (and the Profile itself) cautions against judging student behaviour in terms of expectations associated with cultural theories. Knowledge of culture-specific information might be useful to lecturers as a guiding framework to help explain student behaviour but the use of stereotypes is discouraged. Where possible, lecturers should get to know students on an individual basis. Overall, it is likely that the most useful strategy for working with cultural difference is for the lecturer to be aware of his or her own culture and combine this with an attitude of openness towards, and an appreciation of, different cultures.

Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching & learning styles

The criteria for this qualification are displayed in Table 2.9.
### Table 2.9 Criteria of Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching & learning styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 K1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 K2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 K3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 K4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 S1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 S2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 S3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 S4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 S5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 A1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 A2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4 A3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, pp. 31-32).

The previous qualification recognised the concept of culture as a keystone in the Profile's foundation. This fourth qualification focuses on the implications of cultural, language, and educational diversity for teaching and learning in the international classroom. The aim of the following discussion is to see how teaching and learning theory relates to the Profile’s claims. It begins with some observations about the activity and place of teaching in higher education. Following this, Biggs’s
Presage-Process-Product model of teaching will be introduced to describe the way that the Profile is situated with regard to teaching and learning processes. After this, different approaches to teaching and learning with regard to culture and tradition will be discussed. There will also be a consideration of the way that the Profile requires lecturers to meet the learning needs of international students. Whilst the Profile ostensibly requires lecturers to change their teaching approach depending upon the learning backgrounds of their international students, it is evident that in practice, international students still have to largely adapt to the requirements of the academic tradition of the host culture both in The Netherlands and in Australia. This being the case, some suggestions of how lecturers can support international students to do this are advanced. The discussion of this qualification concludes with an observation on whether or not the Profile as a representation of ideal and high quality teaching, is problematic when considered in light of theory advanced by Biggs (2003) and, implicitly, by Ramsden (2003).

**Teaching in higher education**

Knowledge criterion Q4 K1 states that “The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles” (from Table 2.9). In relation to this, Teekens (2000d) observed that “most lecturers in higher education have little knowledge of educational theory. They teach their subject from experience, often based on how they were taught themselves” (p. 31). This is an initial and significant hurdle. Further, it is compounded by the likelihood that although lecturers are engaged in teaching activities, their teaching practice may not be grounded in established education theory. This is clearly more widespread
than just being a feature of tertiary education in some parts of Western Europe. Dearn (2001) made the following observation about teaching in higher education in the United Kingdom:

Effective teaching requires the possession of both skills and knowledge and these have to be learned. University lecturers can be appointed without any experience or formal training in teaching and after that any staff development or training in teaching is usually at the discretion of the lecturer. Skills and knowledge are usually learned on the job, a process that can be ad hoc and prolonged. (Dearn, 2001, p. 11)

Ketteridge, Marshall, Fry, Laybourn-Parry, and King (2002) also commented on lecturing in the United Kingdom and suggested that university teaching had not been subjected to the sort of externally-verifiable notions of professional development that were required in other professions (p. 249). In Forest’s (1998) view, learning to teach “on the job, through trial and error” (pp. 36-37) was the norm for university lecturers in many countries. Kane, Sandretto, and Heath (2002) said that many university academics had little or no formal teacher education (p. 181). In the Australian context, Coaldrake and Stedman (1998) noted that academics have traditionally needed specific qualifications for research but not for teaching (p. 73); they have learned to teach “on the job” (p. 90). According to McShane (2002), Australian lecturers have, in the main, acquired their teaching skills through experience; “through learning by doing - as tutors, demonstrators, lecturers” (Introduction, ¶ 1). Whilst Race (2001, p. 1) and Cranton (2001, p. 40) both made the valid point that there is no single, ideal way to teach, it is clear that the approach chosen by an individual lecturer should nevertheless be educationally sound in order to impact positively on students’ learning. As suggested by Kember (1998), “an
academic needs to be a discipline expert and a teacher” (p. 23). In the international classroom, this would seem to extend to embracing internationalised curricula to support the learning needs of students from a diversity of cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. In this regard, this qualification requires lecturers to at least be familiar with approaches to teaching and learning in other cultures as well as their own (see criteria Q4 K1 and Q4 K4 in Table 2.9).

That fact that many academics who teach in higher education are not qualified to teach has to be appreciated from the broader perspective of the place of teaching in universities. In Australia at least, comparatively little attention has been paid to teaching until very recently (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998, p. 144). Although universities themselves refer to teaching as an important component of their core business, it has traditionally been overshadowed by the activity of research in terms of attention, prestige, and funding to the point where “the balance of priorities towards research is widely perceived as being detrimental to encouraging innovation and quality in teaching” (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998, p. 91). Research by Ramsden, Margetson, Martin, and Clarke (1995) concluded not only that minimum standards of competence for teaching were desirable, but also that many Australian academics did not think that their institutions valued good teaching (pp. vi-vii). Coaldrake and Stedman (1998) were particularly critical of the perceived failure of Australian universities to address teaching related issues throughout the 1990s. They said that the massification of university education towards the end of the last millennium had significant implications for university teaching but that the system remained best-suited to instructional rather than educational approaches to teaching (pp. 73-75).
Further, an instructional approach was poorly situated to respond to the learning needs of an increasingly diverse student body which included cultural and language diversity, with some students having low levels of English proficiency (Coadrake & Stedman, 1998, p. 78):

The most notable feature of the standard university teaching arrangements is that they are highly structured and designed more to suit the needs and the convenience of the institution and the teacher, rather than the student. Opportunities for interaction between students and teachers and for helpful feedback on student progress are limited, and becoming more limited as the system expands under financial constraint. (Coadrake & Stedman, 1998, p. 75)

In the opinion of Coadrake and Stedman (1998), much of the innovation in teaching in Australian higher education has been driven by enterprising, interested, and enthusiastic individuals working in isolation, rather than in response to centrally-promulgated, institution-wide initiatives. In relation to internationalising curricula in Australian universities, Martin (1999) noted that at her institution initiatives were instigated by “a few committed and imaginative staff members” (p. 61) with an interest in the backgrounds of international students. Webb (2005), commenting on the internationalisation of the curriculum in Australian higher education, commented that a more coordinated approach was needed to replace “the ad hoc and uneven efforts of a few enthusiasts” (p. 117). Teekens (2000d) noted much the same for the international classroom in parts of Western Europe, where developing internationalised curricula for teaching in the international classroom was left to the “fortuitous capacities” (p. 22) of highly motivated individual lecturers with “enormous amounts of goodwill and enthusiasm” (p. 22) who opted to be involved with little institutional support. Unfortunately, they had little influence on structural
innovations across the broader university. Coaldrake and Stedman (1998) painted a similar picture in Australian universities, where the efforts of independently-acting individuals across an institution did little to achieve substantial strategic change (p. 87).

Lately, however, there have been encouraging signs that more attention is beginning to be paid to university teaching in Australia. For example, a web-based search of the Australian public universities showed that all but a few of them now offer their academic staff a graduate certificate in tertiary teaching. In some universities, it is mandatory for new academic staff to undertake such a program. Coaldrake and Stedman (1998) said that government and public perception of the importance of teaching as a function of universities meant that it was going “from side show to main event” (p. 73). Concern about the quality of university education is a significant driving force for this. Against the backdrop globalisation, the commodification and commercialisation of education has led to increased scrutiny of university services and products from students (as consumers), governments (as funding and trade bodies), and institutions themselves (as service providers and competitors).

In terms of internationalising the curricula, Teekens (2000d) suggested that demands for greater quality will mean that all lecturers will ultimately have to be skilled to meet the teaching and learning requirements of the international classroom. Further, institutions themselves will increasingly play a role in ensuring that this occurs (p. 23). Overall, the Profile is a useful addition to the literature on
internationalisation and higher education because it “focuses attention on a topic that has been largely neglected, despite its importance. To question the qualifications required to teach in the international classroom is to challenge established notions of professional quality” (Teekens, 2000d, p. 39). This is an important observation.

*The Presage-Process-Product (3P) model of teaching & learning*

To meet the requirements of this qualification, lecturers need to have an understanding of the impact of culture in the classroom with regard to different approaches to teaching and learning. They have to be acutely aware of the assumptions that exist in their own culture about these activities as well as being familiar with how things are done in foreign education systems. Lecturers have to acknowledge that students enter the international classroom from a variety of cultural, language, and educational backgrounds and with different expectations of teaching and learning. Moreover, they have to respond to international students’ different social and learning needs with supportive curricula. This coupling of recognition and response is supported by Caffarella (2002), who insisted that it is not enough just to recognise how different people communicate, regard instructors, or take part in the educational process; lecturers had an obligation to design their education offerings to “fully engage people in learning who might have very different cultural traditions and expectations” (p. 27).
A model of university teaching and learning that is useful in relation to the requirements of this qualification is Biggs’s (1996) Presage-Process-Product, or 3P, model. It was developed to express the interactions between lecturers and students, from the point of view of the expectations that both would have of the teaching and learning process (see Figure 2.3). The Presage stage refers to individual (and institutional) states of being that foreshadow the educative process. At the individual level, it describes the worldview of each participant in the classroom. For example, the Student Presage state describes the learning-related characteristics of the student in terms of prior knowledge, abilities, preferred approaches to learning, values, expectations, and competence in the language of instruction (Biggs, 1996, p. 51).

![Figure 2.3](source.png) The 3P model, culturally modified
(Source. Biggs, 1996, p. 62)

7 It is not by accident that the work of John Biggs will feature significantly in the remainder of this chapter, both with regard to teaching and learning in higher education in general and teaching international students in particular. Dunkin (1998) commented that the “breadth and depth” (p. v) of Biggs’s work placed him “among the world’s leaders of research on learning and cognitive processes in institutional settings” (p. v) and represented a significant contribution to the understanding of teaching and learning in higher education.
The teaching and learning literature supports this view. Prosser and Trigwell (1998) stated that students’ approaches to learning are a function of their prior experiences in teaching and learning environments (p. 252). Ramsden (2003), too, indicated that a student’s approach to study would be influenced by their previous experiences (p. 65). Ballard and Clanchy (1997) believed that all students enter university with “expectations, knowledge and behaviour” (p. 10) which can be attributed to their individual personalities and their educational experiences. Correspondingly, according to Ballard and Clanchy (1997), “teachers, too, are shaped by their own cultural experience” (p. 9). The Teacher Presage state describes the lecturer’s competence as a communicator and an educator, the use of curricula (including teaching methods) that underpin teaching and learning, the classroom climate, assessment practices, and the medium of instruction (Biggs, 1996, p. 51).

Following the Presage stage in the 3P model is the Process stage. This describes the ways that student characteristics come into play in response to tasks set by lecturers. Biggs (1996) said that the Process stage referred “to the way students actually handle the task, which is determined by their perceptions of the teaching context, their motives and predispositions and their decisions for immediate action, all of which comprise their approach to the learning task” (p. 52). The Process stage leads to the Product stage of students’ learning and describes low- and high-level cognitive outcomes ranging from quantitative recall in the case of low-level outcomes, to correct and relevant answers, abstract thinking, and elegant conceptualisation of problems in the case of high-level outcomes (Biggs, 1996, p. 52). Importantly, the 3P model has a feedback mechanism to inform the lecturer
and students of changes that might have to be made to achieve desirable learning outcomes in any given educative process (see Figure 2.3).

The 3P model represents a closed system that can describe educative processes in any country with students from similar or different cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. It can depict a teaching approach which maintains the status quo. It can also portray an approach to teaching which changes and evolves in response to the learning needs of a diverse student group. This latter approach is supported by the Profile. If teaching practice ignored student needs (whether being aware of them or not), then the status quo would be maintained and the students would have to try to adapt to the requirements of the classroom. At worst, the expectation would be that the student had to adapt to the way things were normally done in the classroom and how such adaptation occurred would be their own concern. Elsewhere, Biggs (2003) referred to this way of teaching as typical of “pre-multicultural days of enforced assimilation” (p. 138). If, however, curricula which supported the learning needs of students were introduced into teaching practice, this would characterise the whole system as one which is responsive and progressive.

The 3P model will be revisited in the penultimate section of this chapter where the aforementioned different educative processes will be elaborated on in detail as Level 1 ‘teaching as assimilation’, Level 2 ‘teaching as accommodating’, and Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’. This will have great bearing on locating the Profile in terms of current educational theory. For the moment, however, it seems that lecturers would do well to take note of the particular needs of their students and
respond accordingly. In the case of international students, it seems logical to follow the same sort of advice that Pedersen (1988) offered for counselling across cultures, that is, the practitioner has two choices: “To ignore the influence of culture or to attend to it” (p. vii). Clearly, the Profile supports a model in which the teaching methods are responsive to the particular needs of international students.

**Approaches to teaching & learning in higher education**

The 3P model describes a responsive, supportive, and progressive classroom environment in which it would be beneficial for lecturers to have an awareness of the teaching and learning approaches and traditions of their own education system, as well as those of other cultures. Ideally, according to Ballard and Clanchy (1997), the best appreciation of student learning will be influenced by a lecturer’s ability to view a particular society’s teaching and learning approaches in relation to that society’s ontological and epistemological foundations. The connection is a logical one. If lecturers can discern and appreciate these fundamental philosophical roots, then they will be better placed to understand and support differences in student behaviour and expectations in the classroom. In Australian higher education, for example, Ballard and Clanchy (1997) pointed out that academic staff “work, inevitably, within the intellectual traditions which have grown out of and which in turn shape western [sic] society” (p. 10). This begs the question of what philosophy fundamentally shapes Western society. One answer to this is an interpretation of the mechanistic worldview of Cartesian-Newtonian science, the hallmark of which is “explanation … based on the principles of analysis and atomism” (O’Sullivan, 1999, p. 53).
Ballard and Clanchy (1997) suggested that the intellectual tradition which arises from Western scientific and philosophical knowledge is reflected in Einstein’s exhortation to be persistently open to revision and change in the pursuit of understanding the universe (p. 14). Whilst it is beyond the scope of this section to expand in detail on this, at least it directs the reader to likely notions of ontology and epistemology that correspond with such a worldview, as well as the sort of teaching and learning practices that might characterise a Western academic tradition such as that which exists in Australia, that is, one which is said to foster “innovative, creative, and independent thinking” (Australian Government, 2005c). Elsewhere, Kember (1998) suggested that the teaching-related goals of Western models of higher education were based on “critical thinking” (p. 7) and encouraged a “plurality of viewpoints” (p. 7).

Whilst it may be useful for lecturers to know the deeper, philosophical connections that ultimately underwrite approaches to teaching and learning in higher education, it is more likely that they will be reminded of how the local context might be perceived by some students (including local students) as perplexing and peculiar through their day-to-day encounters with international students. In the Australian setting, Ballard and Clanchy (1997) suggested that the biggest differences noticed by many international students about higher education in Australia boiled down to the very fundamental issue of approaches to teaching and learning (pp. 10-11). For an

---

[8] Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003) made the point that “local and international students do not arrive at university with a comprehensive understanding of critical thinking and the skills required to document evidence and argue issues” (p. 97). This is supported by Biggs (2003) who suggested that many local students find it difficult to bridge the academic cultures between high school and university (p. 121).
insight into this, consider Davies’s (1995) description of the strangeness of Australian education as experienced by students from Asia:

The contemporary learning processes of tertiary institutions in Australia, with their lists of possible readings, choices of assignments and vague outlines of study, apparently open to change by the subjective whims of fellow students. Teachers, often untidily or even poorly dressed, seem to the Southeast Asian students to have done little preparation for their classes and to rely on students to keep things going ... Diligence is scorned, even by the diligent. Success should appear to come effortlessly: ‘I didn’t do a scrap of work’ boasts the top students [sic]. (Davies, 1995, p. 22)

Such observations highlight some aspects of Australian higher education that have a strong cultural basis. They are representative of the unwritten rules of Australian and university culture. They are part of the hidden social and academic curriculum. Some are observations on quasi-academic culture. For example, Campbell (1995) noted the thoughts of a Japanese student’s first encounter with her Australian supervisor: “Surely such a young person couldn’t be a proper Professor? And he certainly wasn’t serious about his job - you could see that from his clothes and the way he laughed all the time” (p. 70). De Fazio (1999), too, pointed out the informal dress code generally found in Australian higher education and advised international students that “you may be surprised to find that some lecturers wear jeans” (p. 27).

Other observations, however, refer to more formal characteristics of Australian higher education. De Fazio (1999) listed a number of academic expectations that might be challenging for international students. For example, the way that discussion and sharing of knowledge is valued (p. 1), as well as critical
thinking, independent learning, researching, questioning, and communication (p. 2), and writing reports with little assistance from the lecturer (p. 28). Add to these the need for international students to accommodate Australian attitudes towards plagiarism, the expectation of interaction during tutorials, preferred presentation style, and referencing requirements, and it is clear that the majority of international students have to make significant changes to meet the expectations of the Australian academic tradition. As pointed out by Matthews (2003), in general “the Australian way of teaching appears to be different to what students from Confucian cultures are accustomed to” (p. 245). De Fazio (1999) said that such teaching-related expectations, however, are not necessarily made explicit (p. 28). Even although they represent the formal activities in Australian universities, many are also part of the hidden curriculum. As a result, as indicated by Matthews (2003), many international students find it a challenge to understand what is expected of them in the academic setting. In light of this, lecturers especially need to pay heed to criterion Q4 S1 which states that “The lecturer must know how to make his or her teaching methods and aims explicit to students” (from Table 2.9).

Some non-Western approaches to teaching & learning

In contrast to the Western attitude towards knowledge, Ballard and Clanchy (1997) offered two examples from other cultural traditions to demonstrate how the world might be interpreted in different ways and, thus, produce different approaches to teaching and learning than those which are found in the West. The first was through the Confucian ideal of “I do not invent … but merely transmit. I believe in and love antiquity” (p. 14). The second was the Islamic tradition’s view of a learned
person being able to accurately recite the Koran (Ballard & Clanchy, 1997). Lewis (as cited in Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005) said that Islamic epistemology after the fourteenth century was couched as “a corpus of eternal verities which could be acquired, accumulated, transmitted, interpreted, and applied but not modified or transformed” (p. 233). Implicit in these ways of thinking is a conservative and reproductive approach to knowledge. Whilst Ballard and Clanchy (1997) suggested that education in non-Western countries is changing somewhat due to global forces, they also believed that the “flavour” (p. 14) from earlier traditions continues to shape the behaviour of teachers and students. The crux of Ballard and Clanchy’s (1997) argument is that many international students arrive in the Australian academic setting having come from traditions that prefer a conserving attitude towards knowledge in teaching and learning that result in learning strategies that are reproductive rather than analytical and speculative (see Table 2.10).

Table 2.10  Teaching & learning strategies indicative of a conserving attitude to knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching strategies</th>
<th>Learning strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of teacher</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost exclusive source of knowledge</td>
<td>Memorisation and imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction/guidance</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Summarising, describing, identifying, and applying formulae and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic activities</td>
<td>Characteristic question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission of information and demonstration of skills</td>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt moral and social training</td>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>‘Correctness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests of memory recall and practical demonstration of skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on replication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geared to ranking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple (‘unconstructed’) transfer of knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Ballard and Clanchy (1997, p. 12).
Clearly, according to Forest (1998), there were significant differences between a Confucian approach to teaching and learning and one which reflected a Western, modernist approach (p. 38). Ballard and Clanchy (1997) outlined how a greater emphasis on the conserving attitude had a bearing on the way that many Asian cultures approached teaching and learning:

If a society places emphasis on respect for the past and for the authority of the teacher, if age is generally synonymous with wisdom, then classroom etiquette will reflect this emphasis. The classroom will not, therefore, be a setting in which it is appropriate to question what is taught, to raise objections, to argue a different view. (Ballard & Clanchy, 1997, p. 14)

The above view was confirmed by recent research on international students in Australia from a Confucian culture. Matthews (2003) found that they “were not accustomed to questioning a teacher even when they did not agree with what the lecturer had said … this was not an acceptable form of behaviour” (p. 259).

For many Australian lecturers, such characteristics form the basis of the view of the typical (indeed stereotypical) Asian student as one who is passive, compliant, assumes a low profile, rarely asks questions or volunteer answers, and hardly ever engages in criticisms of course content (Biggs, 1996, p. 47). They are often perceived to be shy, quiet, and lacking originality in their work. Further, because they are used to a didactic teaching approach, they venerate the lecturer as a source of wisdom, think that their own opinions are not as correct as those of their teachers, repeat what they have been told, and reproduce the words of their teachers and texts rather than create their own arguments (Kenyon & Amrapala, 1991, pp. 69-72). They can appear to lack confidence, be dependent upon lecturers for direction, and struggle with
independent learning (De Fazio, 1999, p. 28). Yap (1997), giving advice on teaching EAL international (presumably Asian) students in Australian universities, commented that “they want to rote learn and always want the ‘correct’ answer” (p. 55). It is not difficult to see how such behaviours (or perceived behaviours) would seem to be at odds with the requirements of the Western-style academic tradition that exists in Australia:

In Australia, students take an active role in the learning process. Our universities place great importance on developing the ability to think creatively and independently, read widely and critically, participate in debate and function in teams. These skills will give you an edge in a competitive and ever-changing world. (Australian Government, 2005b, ¶ 4)

In a similar vein to Yap’s (1997) earlier comment, Hudson and Morris (2003) suggested that the use of ICTs provided opportunities to cater for cultural diversity in the classroom by being able accommodate different approaches to learning:

Computer-aided learning makes it possible to factor in cultural differences, especially differences in cognitive styles and learning paces, into modes of educational delivery. Students from rote learning cultures such as Taiwan and Japan, for example, can be programmed differently from students from more analytically oriented educational cultures. (Hudson & Morris, 2003, p. 71)

Teekens (2000d), too, stated that because in some countries rote learning and the reproduction of facts are very important, “Students from such a tradition will not adapt easily to a teaching style which requires problem-solving and group work” (p. 31). This highlights the distance between Western and some non-Western approaches to teaching and learning. The challenge with such commentary, however, is that intentionally or not, it suggests that students from some non-Western (particularly Asian) cultures are coming into Western academe from an educational
background that is not only different, but somehow deficient and perhaps even inferior.

This “negative” (p. 53) view, according to Doherty and Singh (2005), is prevalent in higher education in Western countries. As put by Nandy (2000), in general, being non-Western is synonymous with being economically, culturally, and educationally underdeveloped (p. 115). Regarding culture and education, McInerney and McInerney (2002) said that the commonly-held view in Australia and New Zealand was that students from cultures which were more collectivist or group-oriented were poorly suited to Western-style education (p. 297). Clearly, however, the view of Asian students and education in Asian countries as substandard is unsupported in the teaching and learning literature, particularly through the ground-breaking, Asian-situated work of Biggs (1996) and Watkins (1996, 1998a). Their view is best summed up as follows: although the approach is different, the educational outcomes are sound. There is a fine line between appreciating difference and interpreting it from a parochial point of view. An expectation of the Profile is that the lecturer in the international classroom would have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to deal positively with this.

**Student approaches to learning**

If it is important for lecturers to appreciate the differences between varying approaches to teaching and learning, then it is vitally important for them to accept Burbules’s (1996) argument that different groups of people might pursue broadly common goals, but in different ways. Such a perspective essentially reflects the
findings from the work that Biggs (1996) undertook on educational outcomes in Confucian-heritage cultures. Biggs (1996) reported that Western observers “frequently complain that Asian students are prone to use rote-based, low-level, cognitive strategies, both in their own culture and overseas in the Australian tertiary setting” (p. 46). Biggs (1996) found, however, that despite these commonly-held opinions in the West, Asian classrooms produce educational outcomes, including high attainment and deep approaches to learning, which are comparable to, and at times exceed, those of Western educational settings (pp. 45-49). It is of great interest, then, to note Dobson and Hölttä’s (2001) observation that statistical analysis of student performance demonstrates that international students studying in Australia actually outperformed Australian students in business, arts, and science (including information technology) (p. 250). Also, as reported by Cannon and Newble (2000, p. 6) and Biggs (2003, pp. 125-126) there is a disproportionate number of Asian students who receive academic distinctions and prizes in Western institutions.

Further, Biggs (1996) suggested that what is often taken by Western observers to be rote learning is in fact a strategy of repetitiveness which is related to deep learning (p. 54). As noted by Hofstede and Hofstede (2005), what “Western minds interpret as rote leaning in fact may be a way toward understanding” (p. 216). To this end, lecturers in the international classroom would do well to be familiar with deep, surface, and achieving approaches to learning, in addition to knowing the visible characteristics of teaching and learning in other cultures such as large classes, teacher-centred direction, and seemingly compliant students. Such recommendations
concur with the Profile’s claim that lecturers should be familiar with educational theory and knowledge of other cultures.

Ramsden (2003) suggested that the idea of student approaches to learning (SAL theory) is one of the most influential concepts to have emerged from educational research in the past 25 years (p. 40). It is more concerned with what and how students learn, as opposed to how much is remembered (Ramsden, 2003, p. 41). Both Ramsden (2003) and Watkins (1996) referred to the work of Marton and Säljö in Sweden in 1976 as the impetus for the development of the SAL concept. Students were asked to read academic texts and then explain what they had learned and how they achieved this. Whilst some students understood the meaning that a particular text was intended to convey, others did not and, instead, just remembered some of its parts. This suggested that the two groups of students approached the task in different ways. One group employed a deep approach whilst the other used a surface approach.

According to Ramsden (2003), a surface approach to learning “is, at best, about quantity without quality; deep is about quality and quantity” (p. 45). Watkins (1998b) said that only the deep approach could result in high quality learning outcomes (p. 126). A third approach, the achieving approach, was identified in the 1980s. Students taking this approach would use any strategy, for example rote memorisation or understanding basic principles, in a bid to achieve high grades (Watkins, 1996, p. 7). The three approaches and underlying motives and strategies are displayed in Table 2.11.
Table 2.11  Three approaches to learning & underlying motives & strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student approaches to learning (SAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Utilitarian: main aim is to gain qualifications at minimum allowable standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Reproduce bare essentials often using rote learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Interest in subject and its related areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Understand what is to be learnt through inter-relating ideas and reading widely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achieving Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Obtain highest grades possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Achieve high marks by being a ‘model’ student, e.g. being punctual, doing extra readings, etc. or whatever else that is needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Watkins (1996, p. 8).

Rather than any one of these approaches being the particular domain of certain cultures, in all cultures there will be students who engage in one or more of the three approaches depending on their motivations, interests, needs, and importantly, according to Watkins (1998a) and Prosser and Trigwell (1998), the sort of teaching they receive. According to Prosser and Trigwell (1998), this has profound implications for teaching in higher education (p. 253). Familiarity, overall, with the three approaches to teaching and learning outlined in this section will help lecturers understand why students do the things they do (Biggs, 1996, pp. 58-59). Further, it is clear that approaches to teaching that promote deep learning will produce the best educational outcomes. It is the responsibility of the lecturer and, more broadly, the university, to provide such an environment. It is the expectation of the Profile, moreover, that all lecturers will have some knowledge of educational theory such as this to better understand teaching and learning processes.
Teacher-centred & student-centred teaching

Criterion Q4 S3 states that “the lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction” (from Table 2.9). Ramsden (2003) presented these as contrasting theories of university teaching (see Table 2.12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 2.12</strong> Theories of university teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Ramsden (2003, p. 115).*

Cannon and Newble (2000) elaborated further on the characteristics commonly associated with these theories (see Table 2.13). Teacher-directed characteristics are listed in the column titled conventional teaching in Table 2.13, whilst student-directed characteristics are listed in the column titled student-centred learning.

Whilst it is not entirely clear from the Profile itself or from Teekens’s (2000d) commentary, criterion Q4 S3 suggests that lecturers should meet the needs of students from different educational backgrounds in the way they are used to having their needs met. Students who are used to rote learning will best respond to a teacher-directed (centred) teaching approach. Conversely, students who are independent and critical learners will benefit from a student-directed (centred)
teaching approach. If this is indeed the rationale behind the criterion, then it is misinformed and misguided for the reasons outlined in the previous two sections. Whilst many Asian students might indeed come from a teacher-centred education background, they do not necessarily rote learn and they can respond well to teaching methods that encourage deep learning. Therefore, the criterion would be better presented as “The lecturer should have the skills to support students from all educational backgrounds to achieve the learning outcomes set for a particular subject.” Additional support for this universal suggestion will be provided in the penultimate section of this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.13  Distinctions between conventional teaching &amp; student-centred learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students often passive (no role in planning learning; sitting in lectures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most decisions made by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on learning this subject only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on receiving information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as expert dispenser of knowledge and controller of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation (grades/praise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual learning and competition between students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning confined to fixed teaching venues (lecture rooms, libraries, labs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively inflexible arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment seen as the responsibility of the teacher with examinations as an important focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term perspective: emphasis on completing assigned work and learning for the examination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Cannon and Newble (2000, pp. 17-18).
Whilst there is the suggestion throughout Teekens’s (2000a) book that the international classroom is an intercultural melting pot with an internationalised curricula, the idea that this also extends to a diversity of teaching approaches to suit individual learners is tempered by the observations made earlier in this chapter. In practice, the approach to teaching and learning in the international classroom in parts of Western Europe seems to fall into line with the Western academic tradition, that is, a student-centred approach. For the moment, it is enough to acknowledge that the sort of international classroom that the Profile calls for and what presently exists may well be two different things. This is an important observation about the Profile and it will be explored further in the following section.

Paradoxically, despite the assumption that contemporary teaching in the Western academic tradition is based on the student-centred model, Watkins (1998a) and Biggs (2003) noted that research had established that, in practice, much of the teaching at university in countries such as Australia and the United States was more about lecturers being knowledgeable about their subject and being able to impart this knowledge to their students. This was particularly so in the case of young, inexperienced lecturers. Further, poor learning outcomes were attributed to student deficiency rather than to teaching methods. It is ironic that this teacher-centred approach remains a feature of Western education, despite its tendency, according to Kember (1998), “to depress the use of a deep approach to learning” (p. 18). The commonly-held (Western) view is that teaching at Western universities proceeds in an altogether different way. The saving grace, perhaps, is that Watkins (1998a) also reported that experienced Western lecturers saw their role as facilitating high quality
learning by engaging students in activities that encouraged deep learning and conceptual change (p. 20). In other words, a teaching approach that was less likely to promote a surface approach to learning (Kember, 1998, p. 18). This lends some support to Teekens’s (2000d) claim that older, more experienced lecturers are better suited to teaching in the international classroom. Curiously, in light of Watkins’s (1998a) observations, it may well be the case that students in the international classroom do indeed experience both teacher-centred and student-centred teaching, although not in the way in which it is implied in the Profile, where a lecturer would change from one mode to the other depending upon the learner’s educational background.

An important point with which to conclude this section is that whilst a lecturer may subscribe to a student-centred learning model, there may be times, according to Kember (1998), when they “use methods such as lecturing and spend a proportion of their time communicating content and bodies of knowledge” (p. 20). This does not mean that they have abandoned their fundamental beliefs about student-centred learning: “The lecturing would be just one element in a wider effort to facilitate learning” (Kember, 1998, p. 20).

The impracticality of multi-reference grid curricula

The previous section commented on the suggestion throughout Teekens’s (2000a) publication that the lecturer in the international classroom should meet the learning needs of each individual student. Whilst this is hardly controversial, the way in which the Profile may intend this to be done could well be. It was noted earlier
that one of the reasons for the development of the Profile was the perception that curricula and education, as traditionally shaped by national needs, had to be reshaped to reflect regional and global perspectives.

Hudson and Morris (2003), commenting on possible directions for the internationalisation of Australian higher education, saw this sort of change as progressing from a “single grid referential” (p. 66) (monocultural and nationalist) state to a “grid multi-referential” (p. 66) (polycentric and international/global) state. A radical example of the latter is international students being taught and assessed in their preferred (including home) language by dual-language Australian lecturers whose pedagogy caters for the student’s “cognitive styles” (Hudson & Morris, 2003, pp. 68) and includes internationalised content. Upon first impression, such an environment seems fanciful. Indeed, Biggs (2003) labelled this extremely accommodating approach to teaching as “impractical” (p. 133) and “quite absurd” (p. 138). Ballard and Clanchy (1997), too, commented that it was “not feasible nor desirable to alter your whole course structure” (p. 27) to accommodate international students who, themselves, are not homogenous. Nevertheless, the Profile resonates to a degree with some aspects of multi-reference grid education. Consider, for example, the following criteria from Table 2.9:

**Criterion Q4 S3:** The lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction.

**Criterion Q4 S5:** The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given.)
Criterion Q4 A2: The lecturer must have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour. (For example, in some countries students stand when asking a question.)

The impression drawn from the criteria presented above is that anything goes in the international classroom and that the lecturer will have the wherewithal to satisfy students’ needs in the ways that the students are used to having their needs satisfied. Such a scenario corresponds with Winters’s (n.d.) suggestion that to achieve success in the new, globalised world “thou shalt light a candle, burn incense, honor [sic] ancestors, cover your head, spin prayer wheels, kiss the dragon … do whatever it takes … have respect … and always cover all bases” (Eleven Commandments for International Communication Success, ¶ 11). The confusion that would arise for lecturers (and students, too) of the practical application of this was portrayed by Mezger (1992) (see the left side of the illustration in Figure 2.4).

*Figure 2.4* Explaining social taboos
(Source. Mezger, 1992, p. 37)
The preferred course of action is displayed on the right side of Figure 2.4. The complexities of trying to be everything to everyone seem almost incomprehensible. It also neglects to consider the likelihood that many non-Western international students may well be seeking to be intellectually and socially stimulated in the Western academic tradition. For instance, Rizvi (2000) claimed that of the 60,000 Malaysian students who were studying abroad in 1997, a large proportion chose to do so because of a “strong preference for an international education” (p. 206). Elsewhere, research by Matthews (2003) established that Asian students come to Australia “with the expectation about knowing more about Western culture, lifestyle and learning” (p. 3).

Further, the multi-reference grid position also assumes that an international student’s tertiary education in their home country has the same approaches to teaching and learning as did their secondary education. Ballard and Clanchy (1997) cast doubt on this. As much as they believed that certain cultures favoured conserving or extending attitudes towards knowledge, they also believed that both attitudes were present in all cultures. One gave way to the other depending on the situation. For example, the predominantly conserving attitude in Australian primary and secondary schools gave way to the extending attitude in the tertiary setting (p. 11). Perhaps the most poignant observation about whether things should stay the same or change for an international student is contained in the observation that education is a transformative process: “Students do not go to university to stay the same” (Kalantzis & Cope, 2000, p. 46). What is needed above all else is for people to
be able to appreciate, accept, and work positively with difference, not to become everything that is different when difference is present.

If a lecturer is to encourage and accommodate multi-reference grid classroom-related behaviours and perspectives such as students standing when they want to ask a question or giving a long diatribe before answering a question, then perhaps it is also fair to expect lecturers accommodate culturally-based phenomena that relate to academic performance as well. One example of this is the way that different cultural approaches to presenting an argument are likely to be manifested in students’ use of English in essays and assignments. Both De Fazio (1999, p. 67) and Ballard and Clanchy (1997, pp. 48-49) referred to Kaplan’s work in the 1960s which first drew attention to distinctive cultural patterns of linguistic discourse. Figures 2.5 and 2.6 illustrate two examples of this in relation to passages written by international students about the experience of culture shock.

**What is culture shock?**

Everyone belongs to a group of people by nationality, religion or both. One may enter lots of cultural groups and experience lots of cultures with modern-day travel and technology. Travelling is a good thing even though it may be difficult at the time. It may be only when one returns home that an appreciation for a foreign culture is discovered and a new sense of culture shock may occur. It seems odd in one's homeland but it is possible.

*Figure 2.5* Sample of Asian writing convention *(Source: De Fazio, 1999, p. 69)*
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**Figure 2.6** Sample of Arabic writing convention
(Source: De Fazio, 1999, p. 68)

According to De Fazio (1999), the most likely response from an Australian lecturer examining these two passages would be to suggest to the students that they need to structure their writing differently. That is, to suit the Australian writing convention of making major points at the start of a paragraph to produce a greater impact and concentrating on the substance of the question rather than ‘waffling’ around it. The Asian student’s indirect approach in ‘circling’ the topic and the Arabic student’s use of parallelisms and would be discouraged (pp. 67-68). It is not what the Australian lecturer would expect and in all likelihood the international students’ work would be marked accordingly.
International students by and large have to adapt to the academic model that is dominant in their host country. This perhaps should not be unexpected given that the mass movement of international students is really only a fairly recent phenomenon. It began in earnest in the last two decades of last century and, because the expansion was rapid, societal and institutional readiness for anything beyond an educational model in which international students are expected to adapt to the local academic tradition may be a while in the coming. Correspondingly, therefore, it may also be some time before the host academic tradition uses the presence of international students as a transformative opportunity to change itself. This slow uptake reflects a reality based on the first sentence of the following comment by Martin (1999), rather than the transformative possibilities suggested by the second:

Once internationalization meant problems with students who were unable to speak English and who were used to doing things differently. Now it means an opportunity to learn from diverse experiences. (Martin, 1999, p. 61)

As it stands, because the movement of international students is predominantly from developing to developed countries, it is easy (for Westerners and international students alike) to interpret this as meaning that host institutions are offering superior curricula, quality, and educational outcomes. If anything, however, this “exposes and problematises the monocultural assumptions of national societies and the monocultural prejudices of existing teaching practices” (Hudson & Morris, 2003, p. 66). It elevates Western pedagogies as superior and reinforces the international students as the cultural (and academic) Other (Doherty & Singh, 2005, p. 53). It leads to EAL students in particular being seen to have come from a deficit model of education (Biggs, 2003, p. 136). In such a climate, the best that might be hoped for is
a lecturer with the types of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that the Profile promotes to assist international students not only to adjust to, but also to thrive in, the local setting. The Profile can accommodate this with minor modifications to temper its anything goes, multi-reference grid disposition.

_Meeting the needs of international students in the international classroom_

Although this qualification is essentially about recognising and meeting the learning needs of international students, it is surprising that none of the criteria really focus on this. This could be due to the creators of the Profile thinking that a lecturer who is skilled in the delivery of both teacher-centred and student-centred models of instruction (see criterion Q4 S3 in Table 2.9) is well-positioned to assist international students in this regard. As has been noted, however, not only does it seem that the approach to teaching in the international classroom in The Netherlands _in practice_ is typically Western (that is, supposedly, student-centred and encouraging critical thinking and challenging the views of others) but it also seems that teacher-centred models of instruction may not actually be necessary for, or desired by, international students themselves. In light of this, it was suggested earlier that criterion Q4 S3 in Table 2.9 could be modified at some point to having the lecturer support students from _all_ cultural backgrounds to meet the learning objectives of whatever subjects they undertook. The importance of this approach will become evident in the penultimate section of this chapter. With regard to international students, Race (1999) provided a number of examples of broad support strategies (see Table 2.14).
Table 2.14 Examples of practical strategies for supporting international students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrange specialist induction provision for international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce clear information for international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students from other countries to understand what is expected of them in assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help international students to understand what is expected of them in seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for ways of lessening the isolation of international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be sensitive on issues of religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students with special food requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider getting previous students from each country to write an introductory guide to local idiosyncrasies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise cultural differences regarding attitudes to alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the special facilities needed by students from other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the accommodation needs of students from other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer language support at appropriate levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help international students communicate with home, especially in emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make arrangements to celebrate (for example, graduation either at home or abroad)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Collated and adapted from text in Race (1999, pp. 42-44).*

Similar sorts of broad strategies were also mentioned by Ballard and Clanchy (1997), Kenyon and Amrapala (1991), and Mezger (1992). These writers also offered a number of specific teaching strategies for the classroom, similar those which Bretag, Horrocks, and Smith (2002) identified in the teaching and learning literature (see Table 2.15). Whilst Bretag et al. (2002) focused on the use of these sorts of strategies to support EAL international students, it is clear that they would also be relevant to international students whose first language is English. In fact, they are also appropriate for Australian students, regardless of whether English is their first language or if they come from an EAL background. For example, encouraging students to take advantage of support services offered on campus is good for all students. So is providing students with model answers to sample academic questions. So, too, is explaining discipline-specific vocabulary, eliciting responses from students and providing them with clear, written instructions for oral presentations.
Table 2.15 *Examples of practical teaching strategies for teaching international students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of teaching strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for international students to work with Australian students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inculcate students into Australian academic culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish names (including pronunciation) early in the semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide assistance with discipline-specific vocabulary, and when necessary, Australian idiom, slang and cultural expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for students to use their English writing skills for non-assessment tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit responses, rather than just wait for them to be volunteered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide explicit expectations about assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clear instructions for oral presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for success. For example, allow students time to discuss issues in pairs or small groups before speaking to the whole group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a staged assessment schedule to enable students to build skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to take advantage of support services offered on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide ‘model’ answers that are easily accessible to all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for students to speak as an expert (for example, about their own culture or personal experiences)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Tabulated from text in Bretag et al. (2002, pp. 59-61).

The universal nature of the strategies outlined in Table 2.15 reflect Mezger’s (1992) advice to teachers that “many you will already be using in your teaching practice. The acquisition of additional skills will improve the quality of your teaching for all students, not just international students” (p. 215). This point was also made by Ryan and Hellmundt (2003) who suggested that “such strategies will be of benefit not only to international students but also all learners in a diverse learning environment” (p. 1). Cannon and Newble (2000), too, supported this view (p. 149) as did Exley and Dennick (2004), and Mulligan and Kirkpatrick (2000). This observation will become a critical point in the following section of this chapter. Essentially, it describes a student-centred approach to teaching where, whilst learners are ultimately responsible for their own learning, teachers can assist students from a diversity of backgrounds to make the connections necessary to bring about meaningful learning outcomes (Fraser, 1996). As suggested by Exley and Dennick
(2004), teachers in higher education would “develop teaching approaches which will have a positive effect on the learning of the international students in the class” (p. 155).

It is clear from what has been presented in this chapter thus far that the impact of cultural, language, and educational diversity in the international classroom makes Prosser and Trigwell’s (1999) view on good teaching appropriate, that is, “teaching with an awareness of cultural diversity is simply good teaching” (p. 170). As suggested by Cannon and Newble (2000), the usual principles of good teaching apply to international students as they do for other groups of students, but the lecturer needs to acknowledge and respond to their specific needs (p. 149), just as they need to respond to the learning needs of all students in an increasingly diverse student body (p. 147). Despite the advances made within educational research over the past few decades, the views of Crary (1969) on the fundamental factors which have to be mastered in the profession of teaching have stood the test of time. They are outlined below:

1. A substantial understanding of a field of knowledge.
2. A practical skill in organization of a learning situation.

Such factors essentially underwrite the requirements of the Profile. Recognition of the third factor, in particular, has received prominence of late, given the increasing diversity of the student body, and indeed is one of the catalysts for the development of the Profile.
The fly in the ointment or something else altogether?

The preceding sections in ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’ have built a strong, literature-based case for lecturers to consolidate their teaching practice on sound educational theory. Of this there is no doubt. If they are going to help students achieve the learning objectives of their studies, they have to know how best to do this. The review of the teaching and learning literature also supports a case for lecturers to assist international students to adapt or adjust to the requirements of Australian academe by developing appropriate support structures (see Table 2.14) and using a variety of specific teaching strategies (see Table 2.15). Recent work by Biggs (2003) and, implicitly, Ramsden (2003), however, presented an interesting challenge to this body of literature bringing into dispute the issue of whether the ideal that the Profile is based upon is actually less than satisfactory in an educational sense and is more about teaching practice within a deficit model of education. A function of this penultimate section of the chapter, then, is to play the role of devil’s advocate against much of the prevailing literature on supporting and teaching international students and, consequently, some of the Profile’s claims.

In the preceding section, it was suggested that “teaching with an awareness of cultural diversity is simply good teaching” (Prosser & Trigwell, 1999, p. 170). Whilst this seems prudent, Biggs (2003) countered this view by exhorting lecturers to

---

9 Ramsden’s (2003) work implicitly supports Biggs’s (2003) assertions by simply making no reference at all to cultural diversity or international students. Whilst at face value this seems odd in a book on learning to teach in higher education, it makes sense if Ramsden’s (2003) position is focused on promoting Level 3 teaching from the outset (see the following section titled ‘Three levels of teaching’).
“teach better, and you’ll address the problems presented by ISs [international students]” (p. 138, emphasis added). For Biggs (2003), “ethnicity is beside the point” (p. 134). Further, Biggs (2003) viewed teaching strategies like speaking slowly, avoiding colloquialisms, and providing as much visual back-up to lectures as possible as “useful management tips” (p. 133) for teaching international students but “not about teaching itself” (p. 133). Whilst the position taken by Biggs (2003) seems to fly in the face of widely-accepted theory that supports internationalised teaching practice, it is nevertheless based on a view of teaching that is student-centred and focuses not on what students are but what they do in relation to their learning. Biggs’s (2003) argument is worth exploring, for it illuminates the Profile’s position in relation to leading teaching and learning theory in higher education. Indeed, engagement with this theory makes it possible to suggest the likely value of the Profile to each of three levels of teaching.

Three levels of teaching

Biggs (2003) stated that there are three levels of teaching. Level 1 is teaching as assimilation; Level 2 is teaching as accommodating; and Level 3 is teaching as educating. These levels and their fundamental characteristics are illustrated in Figure 2.7. At Level 1, the students have to assimilate into the way things are done in the host university. Moreover, the lecturer focuses on what the students are and stereotypes are a convenient way of interpreting their behaviour. Level 1 teaching, for Biggs (2003), is the crudest of the teaching approaches and represents a deficit model of education by focusing on students’ lack of knowledge and skills to work successfully in, for example, the Australian tertiary setting. Learning problems in
Level 1 teaching are seen as student problems and are not related to teaching methods at all. In relation to Biggs’s (1996) 3P model presented in Figure 2.3, Level 1 teaching focuses on student presage factors.

Figure 2.7 The focus in cross-cultural teaching  
(Source. Biggs, 2003, p. 124)

Rather than focusing on what students are, Level 2 teaching is instead concerned with what the lecturer does for international students by accommodating to the cultural and educational contexts of their home countries. In relation to Biggs’s (1996) 3P model (see Figure 2.3), Level 2 teaching focuses on teacher presage factors. For example, when teaching international students they may use teaching methods such as making tapes of lectures available to students, pairing international students with local students, and dropping a “humorous interpersonal style” (Biggs,
2003, pp. 132-133) because it might be inappropriate for some international students. Level 2 teaching, according to Biggs (2003), “means adapting one’s teaching towards meeting the preferred ways of ISs [international students]” (p. 132).

In the section titled ‘The impracticality of multi-reference grid curricula’, however, it was suggested that it is not desirable or even possible to accommodate students’ learning needs in a radical way by continuing to offer them the same sort of approaches to education that they have experienced in their home countries. Biggs (2003), himself, is a strong critic of a radical multi-reference grid approach to teaching, although he accepts that minor multi-reference grid accommodations can be made for international students. This remains, however, a deficit model of education because it focuses on lecturers having an inadequate range of appropriate teaching skills to meet the needs of international students in the ways they are used to having their needs met (Biggs, 2003, p. 133). Any problem with student learning is, therefore, blamed on the lecturer.

Whilst Biggs (2003) believed that Level 1 and Level 2 teaching “cannot be justified empirically or in principle” (p. 138), Level 3 teaching is put forward as teaching as educating and is inclusive because it focuses on what all students do, rather than on what some students are or what lecturers do for some students. Level 3 teaching is the most desirable form of teaching and it rests on the following propositions:
1. Persistent teaching problems lie not in the student but in the teaching.
2. In our teaching, we should focus on the similarities between students rather than on differences. Differences obviously exist, but to focus on them is counterproductive.
3. Accordingly, allowing for the needs of special groups, such as ISs [international students], is best done within the whole teaching system. (Biggs, 2003, pp. 138-139)

Level 3 teaching is labelled as “learning in context” (Biggs, 2003, p. 136) and is directed at helping students develop the necessary skills and cognitive processes to meet the learning objectives of their studies. It is based on the universality of the learning process and focuses on all the components of the 3P model (see Figure 2.3), especially what the student does at the process and product stages. Further, Level 3 teaching is predicated on the cultures of the international students and their prior educational histories as being irrelevant to their current, host-country education. This is despite whether the studies are undertaken, for example, in English in Australia or in Chinese in Taiwan. As long as there is alignment between the elements of curricula in terms of them being based on sound educational objectives, Level 3 teaching is not tied to location or culture. Such a view might be said to effectively make the notion of internationalised teaching practice largely redundant. Certainly, upon first inspection, this does not seem to resonate with the Profile’s position on meeting the cultural and educational needs of international students. Focusing on culture in the educational process, however, misses the point according to Biggs (2003).

To support his argument, Biggs (2003) drew on research which concluded that the main study-related difficulties reported by local and international university students in Australia were related to poor teaching, a mismatch between student and
staff expectations, lack of access to staff, and heavy workloads (Mullins, as cited in Biggs, 2003, p. 137). Biggs (2003) interpreted these findings to indicate that the fundamental difficulties faced by international students were essentially the same as those faced by Australian students as they made the transition to study at the tertiary level. He did, however, make two concessions. One was that the extent of the challenges was likely to be greater for international students. The other acknowledged that language was a big issue for EAL students.

*The implications of the three levels of teaching for the Profile*

Where does the work of Biggs (2003) and, implicitly, Ramsden (2003) leave the Profile? The answer to this question also reveals the likely value of the Profile at each of the three levels of teaching. It should be clear by this stage that the Profile does not advocate Level 1 teaching. For as much as Level 3 teaching holds that culture is invisible in the educative process, the likely value of the Profile to lecturers at Level 1 teaching is simply to highlight the existence of culture in the classroom and to make lecturers aware, for example, that stereotypes are not useful for explaining student behaviour and that many of them are in fact myths. Upon first inspection, it might also be suggested that the Profile does not advocate Level 3 teaching either. Level 3 teaching ostensibly makes culture invisible in the educative process, whilst the Profile does the opposite (more will be said about the Profile and Level 3 teaching shortly).

This leaves Level 2 teaching which is problematic in two respects. First, whilst Biggs (2003) held that Level 2 teaching is about lecturers accommodating to
the cultural and educational contexts of the home countries of the international students, this overlooks the likelihood that most lecturers might interpret this a way to assist international students to *adapt* or *adjust* to their new academic environment. If the Profile’s claims can be seen in this light, then it is not so much about lecturers *perpetually* accommodating international students in the way that Biggs (2003) has portrayed it, but rather about helping students make the transition to understanding the requirements and expectations of, for example, Australian academe. Biggs (2003) should have no qualm with this, for it is about what lecturers *do* in response to what students *do* (and not *are*). Indeed, it suggests a transition phase between Level 2 and Level 3 teaching. The idea of moving from one level to another by gradations has merit. Lecturers are not at one level one day and on another level the next.

Second, Biggs’s (2003) claim that teaching and support strategies specifically directed at assisting international students are “useful management tips” (p. 133) for teaching but “not about teaching itself” (p. 133) can be challenged. Whilst the support initiatives outlined in Table 2.14 might well fall in line with Biggs’s (2003) claim, the same cannot be said for the teaching strategies outlined in Table 2.15. Not only are they manifestations of curriculum process and context but, as noted in the previous section, they are *universal* in the sense that their use will benefit Australian students as well. In other words, they are about the better teaching that is encouraged by Biggs (2003). Accordingly, the Profile does not necessarily have to be seen as the ideal for teaching in a deficit model of education in the sense of deficit as portrayed by Biggs (2003). If lecturers use particular teaching strategies to help students make the transition to their new tertiary environment rather than using them as minor
multi-reference grid curricula adjustments on an ongoing basis, then deficit does not belong to the lecturers. It belongs to the students and it simply recognises the gap that has to be bridged between their prior and current educational settings. Despite this favourable resolution of Level 2 teaching in relation to the Profile, the suggested transition between Level 2 and Level 3 teaching still has an element of what teachers do in relation to teaching international students. In Level 2 teaching, culture has become a focal point in terms of lecturers being willing to use specific strategies to address international students’ learning needs. The fact that many of these strategies are universal is not, however, apparent to the lecturers. Still, this highlights the likely value of the Profile to Level 2 teaching. It provides a focus on approaches to teaching and learning in which culture has become apparent to lecturers in a different way than Level 1 teaching and they are open to responding positively to its presence.

What of the Profile and Level 3 teaching? Level 3 teaching focuses exclusively on the learning of all students and culture is not a consideration in the educative process. In opposition to this, the Profile positions culture centrally in the classroom and teaching activities revolve around it. There are two points to note here. First, any educational theory that holds that the concept of culture can be made invisible in the broad educative process in a classroom characterised by significant cultural, language, and educational diversity would appear to be on shaky ground. It could be accused of having a rather narrow interpretation of teaching and education. Second, the Profile’s overemphasis on culture in the educative process is as extreme as the first point, but in the exact opposite direction, in that it is sympathetic to the use of multi-reference grid curricula to satisfy cultural needs and does not recognise
the universality of the educative process. Whilst both Level 3 teaching and the Profile seem to go their separate ways in relation to culture in the classroom, there is an opportunity for reconciliation that respects both positions. This also reveals the likely value of the Profile to Level 3 teaching. The reconciliation requires an elaboration of Biggs’s (2003) notion of Level 3 teaching that at least recognises the place of culture in the classroom from both social and educational points of view. It also requires a revision of the Profile to align it to the transformationalist model of globalisation (see the section in Chapter III titled ‘Perspective 1: The Profile and globalisation theory’) to reduce any radical tendencies it has towards multi-reference grid curricula.

The outcome of the reconciliation is that lecturers would recognise and respect all cultures in the classroom and be committed to helping all students meet the learning objectives of their studies. This includes the use of whatever teaching strategies (given that these are universal) and support initiatives are necessary to assist all students in this regard. This respects both the uniqueness of the students as cultural and social beings and also the commitment of the lecturers to help all students develop so they can meet the learning objectives of their studies. This view is based on sound educational theory and respect for cultural difference. It means that the better teaching that Biggs (2003) called for is a worthy pursuit, just as is the claim by Prosser and Trigwell (1999) that teaching with an awareness of cultural diversity is simply good teaching. Paradoxically, the reconciliation simultaneously dismisses and reconstitutes the existence of internationalised teaching practice without precipitating a dilemma. The lecturer is free to concentrate on helping
students realise the learning objectives of their studies in a supportive, intercultural educational environment that respects cultural, language, and educational diversity.

At this point, and perhaps somewhat controversially, it can be suggested that the likely value of the Profile to Level 3 teaching is not what it offers in terms of teaching and learning theory (apart from suggesting that lecturers must have some basic knowledge of educational theory; see criterion Q4 K1 in Table 2.9), but in the way it encourages lecturers to better understand their own culture and to know something of the cultures of others. Even more importantly, it encourages lecturers to be open to the manifestations of cultural difference in the classroom and to accept this as an enrichment of social and educational life. In doing so, they also become open to transformative, cosmopolitan possibilities of their own and in this sense it gives them the opportunity to internationalise their personal and professional outlooks.

Although Biggs’s (2003) notion that “ethnicity is beside the point” (p. 134) when teaching international students is challenging upon first inspection, perhaps it is closer to good internationalised teaching practice than it seems. Given that the teaching strategies listed in Table 2.15 are universal, then a lecturer who utilises them and is also able to appreciate and be comfortable with cultural difference may simply look past or beyond such differences in the student group and treat each person as an individual with specific learning needs that have to be met to achieve the learning objectives of their studies. Paradoxically, the more internationalised the lecturer becomes in this sense, the less internationalisation means as a point of
distinction. The borders, or separation, that is inferred in the word *international* are dissolved to become universal. The challenge, nevertheless, is in how lecturers can develop such an ideal cosmopolitan attitude. In this regard, the Profile more or less stands alone in the contemporary literature on the internationalisation of higher education by providing a focus at the level of the lecturers which can direct them towards an engagement with the concept of cosmopolitanism. This is particularly so through the affective dimension of its Attitude category (see the section in Chapter III titled ‘Attitude category’).

Whilst the title of this section asked if the work of Biggs (2003) and, implicitly, Ramsden (2003) was the fly in the ointment as far as suggesting that the Profile is an ideal approach to working in a deficit model of higher education, engagement with this theory has resulted in a clearer understanding of the likely value of the Profile to the three levels of teaching. There is alignment between the Profile’s pragmatic approach and contemporary educational theory for each step. This three-step process is perhaps more than the creators of the Profile may have envisaged with regard to its usefulness to teaching in higher education.

*Summary of Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching & learning styles*

The review of the teaching and learning literature makes a particularly strong case for lecturers basing their teaching on educational theory. The Profile is well-supported in this regard. For example, theory such as student approaches to learning (SAL) and the differences between student-centred and teacher-directed approaches
to teaching are important foundations of teaching in higher education. The teaching and learning literature also suggests that multi-reference grid curricula cannot be used in the classroom beyond minor adaptations that are characteristic of Biggs’s (2003) Level 2 teaching which, in any case, might well reflect the use of universal teaching strategies.

Any orientation of the Profile towards a radical use of multi-reference grid curricula is not supported by theory. Whilst Biggs (2003) even viewed a less radical interpretation of multi-reference grid curricula as belonging to a deficit model of education which focuses on what the teacher does rather than what students do, the suggestion was made that the sorts of teaching strategies and support structures outlined in Table 2.14 and Table 2.15 can be used to help international students adapt or adjust to the expectations and requirements of Australian academe, rather than signify an ongoing commitment to teaching them in their own cultural context. A revised Profile that makes this explicit would enhance its usefulness to lecturers. The discussion of Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching resulted in the identification of the likely value of the Profile to lecturers at each level.

Conclusion to Chapter II

This chapter has contextualised the operation of the international classroom. It has also reviewed the four qualifications that relate to teaching international students. The review of the various bodies of literature in relation to the Profile’s claims has resulted in the following findings that are central to understanding how its foundations are supported by theory (Associated Question 1 of the Key Research
Questions). These findings will be revisited in the conclusions drawn from the overall investigation in Chapter VI.

1. Although significant cultural, language, and educational diversity is evident in the international classroom in Western Europe, in practice the educational setting reflects the Western tradition of higher education. Rather than being characterised by multi-reference grid curricula, the emphasis is on student-centred learning, independent study, critical thinking, interactive debate, and small group teaching. International students need to adapt or adjust to the education-related requirements of the host institution.

2. The teaching and learning literature supports the Profile’s general claims in relation to verbal and non-verbal communication skills that are required for successful teaching in the international classroom, that is, lecturers need to have good interpersonal and intercultural communication skills. What is not supported, however, is the idea of lecturers altering their personal and cultural behaviour because of the presence of students from other cultures (which is implied to a degree in the Profile).

3. The Profile neglects to focus on language-related issues and challenges for students who are learning in a non-native language. To this end, the teaching and learning literature suggests that the Profile significantly underestimates the implications this is likely to have both for students and lecturers. A revised Profile should address this oversight.
4. Both the Profile and the culture-related literature indicate that whilst knowledge of culture-specific information might be useful to lecturers as a guiding framework to help explain and understand student behaviour, this is best complemented by lecturers being aware of their own culture and its assumptions, as well as being able to appreciate and being comfortable with cultural difference.

5. The culture-related literature supports the Profile in cautioning against judging student behaviour in terms of expectations associated with cultural theories. The use of stereotypes is discouraged by this body of literature. Instead, where possible, lecturers should get to know students on an individual basis.

6. The teaching and learning literature strongly supports the Profile’s claim that lecturers should base their teaching on educational theory.

7. The teaching and learning literature does not support the radical use of multi-reference grid curricula for teaching international students. If the Profile is a normative claim for this sort of curricula, then it is a radical model of education. It is important to note the discrepancy between the international classroom in practice and any such normative claim (see Point 1 above).

8. The minor use of multi-reference grid curricula of the sort outlined by Biggs’s (2003) Level 2 ‘teaching as accommodating’ locates the Profile in a
deficit model of education. A revised Profile could stress that student-related teaching strategies and support structures should be utilised to help students adapt or adjust to the expectations and requirements of the host country’s tertiary academic setting, rather than being an ongoing commitment to teaching them in the cultural or educational contexts of their home countries. This locates the sense of deficit with both the international students and the local students as they make the transition to a new teaching and learning environment. It does not suggest that the education systems from which students come are inherently deficient or weak. Nor does it suggest that the students are incapable of making the transition to meeting the requirements of the new academic setting.

9. The discussion of Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching has resulted in the identification of the likely value of the Profile to lecturers at each level. At Level 1, the Profile encourages lecturers to recognise culture in the classroom by, for example, pointing out that stereotypes are not useful ways of interpreting student behaviour. At Level 2, the Profile helps lecturers respond to cultural difference in the classroom by, for example, promoting the use of teaching strategies that are perceived to specifically help international students adapt or adjust to the academic requirements of their studies. At Level 3, the Profile encourages lecturers to pursue a cosmopolitan outlook to the point where cultural difference is no longer a focus in the universal educative process.
It has previously been noted that the Profile is very thinly referenced with theory to substantiate its claims. The focus of the literature review carried out in this chapter has mainly been to work through and add substance to the Profile’s qualifications as stand-alone concepts. In doing so, some of the Profile’s strengths and limitations have been highlighted. Some areas for revision have also been suggested. A different set of critical observations on the Profile is presented in the following chapter when it is considered from the points of view of globalisation theory, internationalisation theory, transformative learning theory, and cosmopolitanism theory before returning to the Profile itself to consolidate its strengths and limitations.
Introduction to Chapter III

The previous chapter presented the context of the international classroom as well as a detailed analysis of the qualifications of the Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom that particularly relate to teaching international students. This chapter builds on the findings of Chapter II by investigating some major themes of the Profile which are also central to understanding how its foundations are supported by theory (Associated Question 1 of the Key Research Questions).

In this chapter, the Profile is considered from three perspectives, all of which provide a deep appreciation of its theoretical underpinnings. ‘Perspective 1’ investigates the location of the Profile in relation to globalisation theory. It is important to understand this because the Profile is a response to certain trends in global processes that are perceived by the creators of the Profile to have import for higher education. ‘Perspective 2’ is an examination of the location of the Profile from an internationalisation point of view, that is, where the Profile sits in relation to internationalisation theory as it applies to higher education. This is important because upon first inspection the Profile seems to make a unique contribution to the literature.

---

10 Whilst this investigation examines only the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students, the arguments advanced in this chapter also apply to those qualifications that are omitted from examination, that is, the Profile in its entirety.
in this area, not only in terms of its within-institution focus, but also from the point of view of it being a representation of transformative education theory and cosmopolitanism. To this end, one of the features of the discussion in this second perspective is a deeper consideration of what was suggested in the previous chapter as the real value of the Profile, that is, as a way to engage with Sinclair and Britton Wilson’s (1999) “inward journey” (p. 36) of personal discovery and the “outward journey” (p. 36) of learning about other cultures. This will be explored through Cranton’s (2001) notion of authenticity in teaching in higher education, as well as the concept of cosmopolitanism. After this, ‘Perspective 3’ returns to the Profile itself. It undertakes a deeper analysis of the categories of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude that are contained within the qualifications. As will be seen, the Attitude category in particular draws out the humanistic element of the Profile which is something that is largely absent in the contemporary literature on teaching in higher education. The third perspective also consolidates the Profile’s main strengths and limitations.

Perspective 1: The Profile & globalisation theory

The Profile has been developed as a practical response to changes that are being brought about by global forces. Whilst in Chapter II it was shown that theory supports a number of aspects of the Profile’s four qualifications, where it enters less well-charted waters is in the very premise that sustains it, that is, globalisation theory. Although Teekens’s (2000d) is reasonably explicit about what globalisation is, the following sections build a case to suggest that the creators of the Profile have simultaneously overestimated the impact of global flows and underestimated the strong influence that nations and local cultures continue to have in higher education.
Three ways of thinking about globalisation

To better understand where the Profile sits with regard to globalisation theory, it is helpful to transpose it onto each of three views of globalisation that were advanced by Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, and Perraton (1999). These views arose in response to Held et al. (1999) noting that apart from broad agreement that human activity was becoming more intensified and interconnected, by the end of the last decade there simply was “no cogent theory of globalization nor even a systematic analysis of its primary features” (p. 1). This was reflected in disagreement between various groups within the social sciences about its nature, its causal dynamics, and its likely direction. In a bid to clarify the argument, Held et al. (1999) distinguished between three different ways of viewing global processes; the hyperglobalist view, the sceptical view, and the transformationalist view (see Table 3.1). The hyperglobalists and sceptics occupy opposite positions to each other, whilst the transformationalists hold the middle ground between the two.

The hyperglobalist view

This section spends some time considering the Profile in relation to the hyperglobalist view of globalisation. This is because the Profile is strongly influenced by this view. The hyperglobalists, called radicals by Giddens (2002), deregulators by Koenig-Archipugi (2003), and globalists by Saul (2005), argue that contemporary global flows signify a new world order where global mechanisms are superseding the function of the nation-state as the chief geopolitical entity of the past two hundred years. Held et al. (1999) stated that the hyperglobalist world generally reflects neo-liberal, economic perspectives and a belief that the free market would
lead to a de-nationalisation of economies (p. 3). The nation-state would become obsolete (Callinicos, 2001, p. 18). Nations would become fictions (Giddens, 2002, p. 8). For hyperglobalisers, globalisation is the emergence of a truly global age “involving the triumph of global capitalism and the advent of new forms of global culture, governance and civil society” (Tickly, 2001, p. 153). Often associated with a hyperglobalist reading of the future is a sense of impending universalisation, indeed homogenisation, of culture, economies, and politics.

With regard to education, Teekens (2000c) said “what is needed is not a national or European perspective, but a global perspective” (p. 14). In the case of higher education, the terms global education and borderless education are expressions that suit the hyperglobalist position. Knight (2004) said that global education was worldwide in scope and did not rely on the concept of nation, that is, an entity defined by territorialised borders (p. 8). Advances in Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) in particular have opened up significant opportunities for traditional and non-traditional education providers to see the world as their oyster and not be limited to particular countries for their student base.

The hyperglobalist position holds that the global economy and global governance are changing the face of higher education, particularly in terms of the commercialisation and commodification of education under neo-liberalism. Examples are fee-based academic programs and the World Trade Organisation’s (WTO) proposition to open education markets to international competition through the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) (Teekens, 2000c, p. 16). For
Vitz (1998), such developments were the direct result of “the withering of the modern state” (p. 107) and are changing the way that higher education operates. Inayatullah and Gidley (2000) asserted that “globalism is a driving force … the bureaucratic structure forces one into a position wherein the university and the self become corporatized” (p. 7). This is reflected in descriptions of universities being sites of academic capitalism, university entrepreneurism, and new managerialism in, for example, the work of Currie (1998), Dudley (1998), Deem (2001), and Currie, DeAngelis, de Boer, Huisman, and Lacotte (2003). Another view of hyperglobalist education suggests having pragmatic curricula which meet the demands of the global market economy. For example, in an Australian business degree there might be a subject that focuses on real estate regulations and trends in, for example, Hong Kong and another subject that deals with international business communication skills.

The hyperglobalist view is evident in Teekens’s (2000c) claims that “in education, and especially in international education, we are dealing with the complex questions of how to deal with a future in which old borders have lost their meaning” (pp. 29-30) and “life in all countries, for all people, is becoming more and more similar” (p. 15). Such views, however, overestimate the impact and trajectory of current global processes. Although contemporary globalisation challenges the territorialisation and the autonomy of countries, old borders still matter. Nation-states remain immensely powerful, despite the transformations that are happening which dilute some aspects of their sovereignty. For example, the international student program in Australia is heavily regulated by the Australian Government, despite universities ultimately being responsible for where they choose to market their
academic programs as well as the day-to-day administration and education of their international students.

Table 3.1  Conceptualising globalisation: three tendencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hyperglobalists</th>
<th>Sceptics</th>
<th>Transformationalists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What’s new?</td>
<td>A global age</td>
<td>Trading blocs, weaker geogovernance [sic] than earlier periods</td>
<td>Historically unprecedented levels of global interconnectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant features</td>
<td>Global capitalism, global governance, global civil society</td>
<td>World less interdependent than in 1890s</td>
<td>‘Thick’ (intensive and extensive) globalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power of national governments</td>
<td>Declining or eroding</td>
<td>Reinforced or enhanced</td>
<td>Reconstituted, restructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving forces of globalization</td>
<td>Capitalism and technology</td>
<td>States and markets</td>
<td>Combined forces of modernity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern of stratification</td>
<td>Erosion of old hierarchies</td>
<td>Increased marginalisation of the ‘South’</td>
<td>New architecture of world order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant motif</td>
<td>McDonalds, Madonna, etc.</td>
<td>National interest</td>
<td>Transformations of political community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization of globalization</td>
<td>As a reordering of the framework of human action</td>
<td>As internationalization and regionalization</td>
<td>As the reordering of interregional relations and action at a distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical trajectory</td>
<td>Global civilization</td>
<td>Regional blocs/clash of civilizations</td>
<td>Indeterminate: global integration and fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary argument</td>
<td>The end of the nation-state</td>
<td>Internationalization depends on state acquiescence and support</td>
<td>Globalization transforming state power and world politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From Held et al. (1999, p. 10).

Whilst global processes are introducing new supranational infrastructures which transform the way power is reproduced and contested, Held et al. (1999) pointed out that, paradoxically, the nation-state remains the “near universal form of human political organization and political rule” (p. 425). Legrain (2003) stated that “national borders are not about to disappear” (p. 9). This is supported by the
observation that over 100 nation states have been established since the late 1960s, 18 of which have been officially recognised since 1991 (Green, 1997, p. 157). According to Saul (2005), nationalism and the nation-state are stronger now than they had been when contemporary globalisation began a few decades ago (p. 243).

Further, any view that peoples’ lives are gradually becoming more universalised is an oversimplification of what is occurring, despite developments in, for example, supranational governance, ICTs, and increased liberalisation of trade and markets. One site of great contestation in globalisation theory refers to the way in which localities and cultures have been invigorated to assert their independence and uniqueness in the face of the threat of universalisation through global processes. As pointed out by Hudson and Morris (2003), to “globalize the curricula … often assumes a premature globalist reading of contemporary economic developments” (p. 65). This is exactly the assumption made by the creators of the Profile. In all likelihood, they have overestimated the impact and extent of global flows, particularly in terms of politics, culture, and higher education. Metaphorically, this risks throwing out the baby with the bathwater. To start shaping social institutions on a purely hyperglobalist view of the world is impulsive given the strong influence of nation-states even in the face of contemporary global forces.

Apart from some of the Profile’s criteria suggesting a hyperglobalist perspective on teaching and learning, this worldview is also evident in the work of Schröder (2000) and Peters (2000), both of whom are contributors to Teekens’s
Schröder (2000) said the following in relation to the international classroom:

The classroom will first of all be a meeting place of cultural backgrounds requiring cross-cultural communication. Since there will probably not be a dominant culture regulating the communication, the student and lecturer will automatically - and largely unconsciously - create a blend of cultures and develop forms of transcultural communication. This may take some time, but it will surely take place. (Schröder, 2000, p. 53)

This hyperglobalist interpretation of the international classroom is an overestimation of the extent of contemporary global processes. It neglects to consider the deep hold that culture and language have over both local and foreign individuals. Indeed, criterion Q3 K3 in the Profile acknowledges that “culture is learned, and is very difficult to un-learn [sic]” (from Table 1.1). This is supported by Pedersen’s (1988) observation that “we do not give up our prevailing assumptions easily” (p. 20). In any case, individuals may not want to embark on the path of creating a blend of cultures and developing forms of transcultural communication. For many lecturers, even those sympathetic to the Profile’s claims, life is probably already busy enough, with teaching being one of a number of competing work demands, without adding to this the expectation of creating a new cultural reality in the classroom. For students, many may also want to experience something of the host culture on the way to obtaining their university qualifications.

Schröder (2000) also fails to recognise that the sort of transformation that he outlines is most unlikely to occur within the timeframe of, for example, a postgraduate diploma or a masters program, many which might be as short as one
year. Further, he fails to consider that, in the case of *internationaal onderwijs* in The Netherlands in practice (as described Chapter II), the Dutch and Western ways of looking at the world are still driving teaching and learning approaches and expectations in the international classroom. In The Netherlands, it is clear that teaching and learning is directed by the Dutch way of doing things. International students will find that many of their Dutch lecturers, even those who strongly support the Profile’s claims, will in all likelihood still promote Dutch and Western approaches to teaching and learning and themselves display Dutch cultural characteristics, for example, as portrayed by Hester (2005):

Despite being basically reserved, the Dutch have a manner of speaking that may startle you by its directness. They look you right in the eye and can sound very abrupt, especially when they are speaking English or another foreign language and cannot express all the shades of meaning they would be able to express in their own language. But even when they speak Dutch, they tend to come to the point quickly without first going through a series of conversational rituals. This directness and lack of subtlety is in fact seen by the Dutch as a positive personality trait (Hester, 2005, A direct way of speaking, ¶ 1).

In the immediate future, then, it is likely that there will be a dominant culture that regulates communication in the (Western) international classroom and it remains the local or host culture. This is reflected in the claim of McLean and Ransom (2005) that “in most universities, it is expected that international students perform in and are assessed against the conventions of the host country’s educational values and practices” (p. 45).

Perhaps the boldest of the hyperglobalist views presented in Teekens’s (2000a) publication that relates to teaching in the international classroom is provided
by Peters (2000) who described three phases of the internationalisation of a higher education institution. Phase One was “local but trying” (p. 93); Phase Two was “neither here nor there” (p. 94); Phase Three was “international” (p. 95). The third phase (see Table 3.2) is clearly based on a particular view of the globalisation (as opposed to the internationalisation) of higher education, that is, American-influenced universalism. As such, it represents the antithesis of the more commonly accepted views on the internationalisation of higher education such as, for example, the work of Jane Knight (Knight’s work is outlined in ‘Perspective 2: The Profile’s place in the literature on the internationalisation of higher education’).

**Table 3.2 The ultimate phase of internationalisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3: International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All courses are taught in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum is unified again and course content represents a variety of international situations, although much of it is American because of the high profile of American companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recruitment of permanent lecturers is global, and pay and conditions reflect global standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship with the local community declines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services are fully international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff reflects the internationalism of the student body, and the institution’s working language changes to English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate relations and media relations internationalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of programmes is increased to achieve economies of scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional internationalization takes place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Tabulated from text in Peters (2000, pp. 93-95, emphasis in original).

The extent of Peters’s (2000) hyperglobalist vision notwithstanding, perhaps from a European point of view it may well seem as if the nation-state is becoming passé in light of all the structural changes that have happened there since World War II. As reported by Held et al. (1999), considerable political capital and effort has been put into the construction of a European identity in the past 40 years (p. 374). Supranational governance (at the regional level), a common currency, and freedom
for European Union (EU) citizens to travel and work throughout the 25 EU member
countries would give the impression at the local level that significant changes were
afoot in politics, the economy, culture, and in higher education as well:

In many continental European countries, there is considerable interest in
debates in internationalization of higher education on the impact of the
European Union (EU) on higher education and its effects on the role of the
nation state, especially in terms of higher education policy and provision.
There has also been considerable interest in EU initiated student mobility
programs. (Harman, 2005, p. 121)

It is most likely the case that the hyperglobalist tendencies that are evident in
the work of Teekens (2000c, 2000d), Schröder (2000), and Peters (2000) are driven
to a great extent by the intense and novel activity that is exemplified by political,
financial, social, and educational developments in the EU. Borders do appear to be
losing their meaning for some people in the EU. The view of many from outside the
EU, however, is that in most places around the globe, national borders remain
primary regulators of human activity and nations still direct much of what happens in
education at all levels.

As a point of departure from the hyperglobalist view, despite the many
successes of the EU, Held et al. (1999) observed that there is little evidence
suggesting that people actually want to abandon their national identity in favour of
simply being European. This was reflected in the rejection of the EU constitution in
2005 by the peoples of France and (coincidentally) The Netherlands. It is perhaps
poignant from the point of view of global migratory and cultural flows that, in
relation to the Dutch rejection of the EU constitution, Reynolds (2005) reported that
part of the undercurrent of dissatisfaction amongst Dutch voters was “about immigration, about the expansion of the EU, about a feeling that a small nation’s traditions might be under threat” (Popular concerns, ¶ 2). Even in the so-called borderless EU, then, the issue of the cultural Other amidst a strong national culture remains threatening and divisive. Saul’s (2005) assessment of the immigration programs of many countries within the EU was that “there is no enthusiastic embracing of inclusive citizenship, which is the only way to make an inclusive idea of belonging work” (p. 254). National perspectives and issues, then, still drive many agendas in nations in the EU and elsewhere. For the moment, it seems that international education and the internationalisation of education are activities that are likely to remain largely defined through the lens of nation-states, rather than from multi-reference grid and global perspectives on higher education. The extent to which the Profile is committed to a hyperglobalist view of the world is also the extent to which it is out on a limb in terms of its relevance to contemporary higher education.

The sceptical view

In opposition to the hyperglobalists are the sceptics who believe that the old world order continues unimpeded through the pre-eminence and dominance of the nation-state. Hirst and Thompson (1996) called globalisation the “necessary myth” (pp. 1-17). The heart of the sceptics’ argument is that “all the talk about globalisation is only that - just talk … the world carries on much the same as it has done for many years” (Giddens, 2002, pp. 7-8). It is “old wine in new bottles” (Skelton & Allen, 1999, p. 1). The sceptics hold that nation-states remain in control of their own
interests and despite the emergence of global trade, economic interdependence is not historically unprecedented. They view talk of global governance as a Western project that seeks to maintain the hegemony of the world’s rich and developed countries (Held et al., 1999, p. 6). They see globalisation as merely “the latest stage in the exploitation of the third world by the West” (Giddens, 2002, p. xx).

Sceptics interpret an emerging world culture as an extension of Western culture. It could also be viewed more narrowly as “Americanization” (Prestowitz, 2003, p. 6). The sceptics would acknowledge that although higher education around the world is changing, the fundamental geopolitical unit of the nation-state still dominates the structure and function of institutions of higher learning. National interests still drive national education systems. This, of course, does not discount the flows of scholars, students, technologies, and ideas around the world. A sceptic would say, however, that it makes sense to speak of them as processes aligned with the internationalisation of higher education, and transnational and cross-border education, rather than the globalisation of higher education. Such terms emphasise the importance of national borders.

Inasmuch as nation-states are still the major regulators of much human activity, it also has to be recognised that the world is largely dominated by the Western worldview. There is a prevailing hegemonic order of nations, with those in the West (or North) being key drivers of the new knowledge economy or knowledge society in which higher education plays a significant role. In relation to higher education, Altbach (2002) noted that “the voices discussing internationalization are
largely Western” (¶ 10). Further, as Altbach (2004) also reported, English, the most widely studied foreign language in the world and also the most widely used second language, is the dominant language of international higher education (p. 10). These observations, based on a hegemonic West, reinforce the position of the sceptics. Paradoxically, however, even the sceptics would have to agree that a hegemonic order of nations leads to a degree of cultural, political, and economic universalisation of the sort that the hyperglobalists might celebrate. The Profile eschews the sceptical worldview. It is a call for an altogether different approach to teaching and learning in higher education that moves beyond the national perspective of the host country.

The transformationalist view

To this point in the discussion, the Profile is rather inconsistent in terms of where it is located with reference to globalisation theory. In the main, it embraces some hyperglobalist tendencies with talk of national borders disappearing, life everywhere becoming the same, and the international classroom generating an altogether novel, hybrid culture. Simultaneously, however, the Profile flies in the face of hyperglobalist cultural universalisation by respecting cultural diversity in the educational process to the point where lecturers are encouraged to embrace some form of multi-reference grid curricula. Whilst the quilted nature of the Profile seems to present a dilemma in terms of working out where it really stands in relation to globalisation theory, the transformationalist perspective can resolve the matter through its recognition of elements of both the hyperglobalist and sceptical views, whilst stipulating that globalisation is producing outcomes that are neither one extreme or the other. This third perspective is the one which best describes the
impact of contemporary global forces. Any revision of the Profile that engages with the transformationalist perspective will bring a balance to its claims and will make it more relevant to the contemporary higher education setting.

The transformationalist view on global processes is supported by both Held et al. (1999) and Giddens (2002).\textsuperscript{11} Indeed, the entire body of work by Held et al. (1999) is a criticism of the positions of the hyperglobalists and the sceptics (p. 441). Instead of signifying a totally new world order or reflecting more of the same as what has already passed, the transformationalists believe that it is something of both but with enough unique elements to distinguish itself from either. In the emerging global environment, nation-states and national policies remain crucial, but nations are open to international trends and cross-border influences to an unprecedented extent (Considine, Marginson, Sheehan, & Kumnick, 2001, p. 6).

In the absence of true global political governance, nation-states are not passé, despite some changes to their ability to fully regulate and control, for example, cultural, economic, and information flows. As suggested by Marginson (2002), nation-states have simply reorganised themselves to work with greater levels and layers of global interconnectedness. Rather than viewing globalisation as a singular condition or a linear process, transformationalists believe that it is a highly differentiated phenomenon across several domains of human activity and interaction (Held et al., 1999, p. 23). It is historically contingent and has massive transformative

\textsuperscript{11} The transformationalist view is also the position adopted by the author of this investigation, both in relation to globalisation processes and changes in higher education.
power that is causing a shake-out of societies, economies, institutions of governance, and the world order. Further, it is replete with contradictions, uneven in its application, and its ultimate trajectory is not yet explicit (Held et al., 1999, pp. 6-7). This view is supported by Appadurai (1996) who suggested that “if a global system is emerging, it is filled with ironies and resistances” (p. 29).

A transformationalist view of higher education recognises elements of both the hyperglobalist and sceptical positions and suggests that higher education is changing as a result of the interplay between supranational and national forces. This was well put by Marginson (2002):

Institutional identity is constituted by more than global systems: it is a product of history and retains national, local and disciplinary roots. The global dimension does not subsume the whole of the national dimension which enabled the modern university. Place-bound identities still matter, and in higher education are partly framed by national agents and systems. National government provides a large part of higher education funding, and nation-based businesses and national elites remain the principal users of the universities. What has happened is that the national dimension has become inter-penetrated with the global dimension in complex ways. (Marginson, 2002, p. 413)

Aspects of education can be global in their orientation (the hyperglobalist position) whilst simultaneously being influenced by national priorities (the sceptical position). Whilst catering for elements of both these positions, the transformationalists believe that the trajectory of the emerging educational milieu is not evident at this point. Indeed, some say that the future of the university is not even guaranteed. For example, Vitz (1998) noted that in the United States many leading academics have moved from universities into think tanks or independent institutes such as “the Heritage Foundation, the Hudson Institute, and the Ethics and Public Policy Center”
The British equivalents were listed by Smith and Webster (1997a) as “Demos, the Institute of Economic Affairs, and the Adam Smith Institute” (p. 106). The transformationalist account recognises that higher education is a contested area of human activity with uneven and contradictory outcomes. Perhaps the most important element of the transformationalist view of higher education, however, lies in its capacity to support new ways of thinking which are the result of the interplay of local, national, regional, and global activities. Such a transformative approach to education, according to writers such as O’Sullivan (1999), Slade (1998, 2002), and Vitz (1998), is ultimately necessary for the survival of humanity, for it will realign education to address the unique set of contemporary environmental, economic, and social challenges faced by all nations.

The review of the globalisation literature makes a case for a revision of the Profile to reflect the transformationalist worldview. This will support changes in teaching that move away from singularly national perspectives yet do not go as far as solely embracing the all-out hyperglobalist worldview, both of which are untenable given the characteristics of the current political, economic, and cultural milieu. The creators of the Profile have to recognise that any commitment it has to radical multi-reference grid curricula is on shaky ground. Instead, its engagement with multi-reference grid curricula has to be of the sort where lecturers use particular teaching strategies and support structures to assist international students to adapt or adjust to the expectations of the host higher education institution, so they can best go about developing themselves to meet their learning objectives. The transformationalist view allows the Profile to celebrate and respect cultural diversity within the
Chapter III - Examining the Profile’s theoretical pillar

overarching cultural framework of the host country and the subculture of its academic setting. It also is able to entertain curriculum content that imbues local and national perspectives with international and global themes. The transformationalist position can reconcile market-driven education imperatives with more traditional education philosophies. It is comfortable with non-traditional methods of delivery (for example, on-line and offshore) and with new ICTs to enhance learning outcomes.

Most importantly, the transformationalist view means that local and national cultures, education institutions, and even lecturers themselves are able to pursue their own transformational possibilities in the face of global forces. In the case of the Profile, this supports the idea of the internationalisation of the academic Self - an outcome that is at the very heart of the Profile. This resonates strongly with the existential perspective of internationalisation that is implied by the Japanese word kokusaika which means a process of self-change or self-reform. For the Japanese, kokusaika means that people change something about themselves due to outside influences (Horie, 2002). This teases out a critical theme related to both the Profile and also the transformationalist view; namely that self-change is a way for lecturers to internationalise their teaching practice and their outlook on life in general.

Summary of Perspective 1: The Profile & globalisation theory

The creators of the Profile have overestimated the impact of contemporary global flows and have assumed, therefore, that higher education must change to reflect the hyperglobalist worldview. What they fail to recognise, however, is the
strong regulatory role that nation-states still play in the lives of most people and the continuing influence they have over social institutions such as education. Similarly, they also fail to recognise the strong hold that culture has over the tenor of a country’s education system in terms of the value ascribed to certain approaches to teaching and learning. Having an understanding of globalisation theory is important because it acts as a predicate for matching suitable educational responses to the forces that are presently shaping much human activity. The transformationalist view is the best platform to support the Profile because it allows it to reflect aspects of both the hyperglobalist and sceptical positions, whilst allowing all stakeholders and participants to pursue their own transformative possibilities in response to the dynamic contestation between local, national, regional, and global forces.

Perspective 2: The Profile’s place in the literature on the internationalisation of higher education

The previous section located the Profile in relation to globalisation theory. This section considers the Profile in relation to the literature on the internationalisation of higher education. It does this in three logical and interconnected steps. The first step provides a sense of where the Profile is positioned with respect to the main concerns of the current literature. The major observation in this step is that the Profile is an expression of internationalisation at the within-institution level. The second step links the Profile to Cranton’s (2001) notion of authenticity in teaching in higher education. This step includes a brief description of transformative learning theory, the adult education theory that underwrites both Cranton’s (2001) work and the Profile itself. The third step then projects Cranton’s (2001) notion of authenticity
in teaching in higher education into the intercultural sphere. This step provides an overview of some important features of cosmopolitanism in relation to education. It is suggested that the Profile is ultimately an expression of the cosmopolitan lecturer in higher education. Despite the Profile’s creators not making this explicit in any way, it is important to view the Profile as such, not only because it extends the literature on the internationalisation of higher education, but also because it provides a greater understanding of the potential use of the Profile.

**Step 1: The contemporary literature on the internationalisation of higher education**

Much of the contemporary scholarly treatment of the internationalisation of higher education has dealt with formalising definitions and concepts as they apply to the organisational level of institutions. Whilst this has led to a greater understanding of what internationalisation means to universities, there has been less investigation into what it means for academic staff to internationalise their personal and professional outlooks, in other words, the internationalisation of the academic Self. The Profile is an important contribution to the literature in this area. To fully appreciate its importance and its place in the literature, it is useful to begin by locating it in comparison with perhaps the most widely-accepted and cited theory of internationalisation of higher education, the work of Jane Knight.

Knight’s understanding of the internationalisation of higher education has been evident in the literature since the mid-1990s (Knight, 2004). Whilst others have contributed slightly different perspectives to the concept of internationalisation in higher education, de Wit (2002) claimed that Knight’s (1997) work (developed in
collaboration with de Wit) “now seems to be increasingly accepted as a useful working definition and framework” (p. 115). Indeed, no other analysis has been as consistently adopted by such a wide range of stakeholders in Australian higher education. Harman (2005) noted that the work of Knight, along with her Dutch colleague de Wit, “has considerably influenced Australian thinking on internationalization and globalization” (p. 124). The Commonwealth Government, IDP Education Australia, and many Australian universities have taken on board Knight’s ideas. Also, a number of researchers and writers in higher education have made reference to Knight’s definition and conceptual framework. See, for example, Back, Davis, and Olsen (1997), de Wit (1997, 2002), Deardorff (2005), Dobson and Hölttä (2001), Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003), Eisenchlas, Trevaskes, and Liddicoat (2003), Gallagher (2002), Harman (2005), Hudson and Morris (2003), Leask (2003, 2004), Liddicoat (2003), Manning (2003), Page and Kupke (2001), Sanderson (2004), Teekens (2000a), Trevaskes, Eisenchlas, and Liddicoat (2003), Wang and Yanshi (2003), Woodhouse (2003), and Yang (2005).

**Knight’s updated definition of internationalisation**

The working definition of internationalisation in higher education that Knight employed from the mid-1990s until recently was “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight, 1997, p. 8). More recently, Knight (2004) suggested that a number of developments necessitated a review and update of both the definition and concept of the internationalisation of higher education. These developments included advances in ICTs, a growing international labour market, greater influence of the
market economy and trade liberalisation, a focus on the knowledge society, increased private and decreased public funding in education, and a greater emphasis on the importance of lifelong learning (Knight, 2004). According to Knight (2004), these developments have added to the complexity, importance, and confusion surrounding the international dimension of higher education. The updated concept, although still maintaining a focus on the institution level, has been expanded to include the higher education sector level and the national level. Internationalisation, as it applies to the three levels, is now defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11).

It is important to outline the scope of this new working definition. It has greater depth and breadth than the earlier definition and affords an appreciation of where the Profile is located in relation to Knight’s work. The depth of internationalisation is demonstrated by its stratification into national, sector, and institutional layers. Whereas the original definition focused largely on internationalisation processes at the institutional level, Knight (2004) believed that the national and sector levels have emerged to have significant influence over “policy, funding, programs, and regulatory frameworks” (p. 5) in higher education. Knight (2004) portrayed the national and sector forces as having a “top-down” (p. 6) effect on internationalisation processes, whilst the institution forces act in a “bottom-up” (p. 7) fashion, with a dynamic relationship existing between the three levels. Significantly, Knight (2004) also believed that despite the influence of national and sector forces, the “real process” (p. 6) of internationalisation is actually taking place in individual
institutions. The breadth of internationalisation is demonstrated through international, intercultural, and global flows. Whilst international and intercultural were key elements of Knight’s (1997) earlier definition, the addition of global in the new definition is indicative of the most extensive and pervasive reach of internationalisation. In this sense, internationalisation is both a response to, and reflection of, globalisation processes (Rizvi, n.d.). Knight (2004) commented that the earlier and updated definitions complement each other well. The earlier definition is still applicable at the level of the institution but it fails to capture the increasing interest in internationalisation and associated activities at the sector and national levels.

In sum, the scope of Knight’s (2004) new definition and concept of internationalisation can be expressed diagrammatically (see Figure 3.1). Although the updated definition is a welcome addition to the literature, the depth dimension of the reach of internationalisation is more dynamic and far-reaching than portrayed by Knight (2004). Including only three levels in this dimension does not take into account how other levels in this local-global continuum can impact on internationalisation processes overall. Four levels are absent. Two of them are supranational. They are the regional and global levels. The remaining two lie within the institution itself. They are the levels of the faculty/department and individual lecturers (see Figure 3.2).

---

12 It is recognised that this level also includes administrative and service departments of universities.
Figure 3.1  The depth & breadth dimensions of the reach of internationalisation in Knight’s (2004) definition

Figure 3.2  The Profile’s location in the true extent of the depth dimension of the reach of internationalisation
It is at the within-institution level that the Profile is located and in this sense it needs to be seen as a novel and important addition to an area of the literature on the internationalisation of higher education that has to this point been largely unexplored. Of course, this is not to ignore the valuable contributions of authors such as Ballard and Clanchy (1984, 1997), Kenyon and Amrapala (1991), Mezger (1992), Race (1999), Bretag, Horrocks, and Smith (2002), Ryan and Hellmundt (2003), amongst others, whose work was drawn upon in the previous chapter.

The limitation of Knight’s work for within-institution internationalisation activities

The expectation of theorists such as de Wit and Knight is that the more sophisticated the internationalisation framework of a university, the better placed its lecturers, students, and the institution itself should be to operate in an increasingly dynamic, complex, and competitive higher education environment. Despite the fact that Knight’s work has been broadly embraced in Australian higher education and elsewhere, however, it is actually very limited in terms of its utility for guiding some important within-institution internationalisation initiatives. Enequist (2005) described Knight’s (2004) most recent definition and concept of internationalisation as one amongst a number of “very general” (p. 15) offerings. This is despite Enequist (2005) also identifying Knight as one of the most eminent scholars in the field. Liddicoat (2003) said that Knight’s work “gives little concrete assistance to individual academics who seek to pursue the aim of internationalisation in their teaching practices, curricula and delivery of courses” (p. 4). Eisenchlas and

13 The dated nature of some of these publications is both a reflection of their ongoing usefulness and also of the relative paucity of literature on internationalisation at the within-institution level over the past 15 years.
Trevaskes (2003) also identified the limitations of Knight’s organisational approach to internationalisation:

Whilst Knight’s schema may provide a useful way of scaffolding broad programs and practices in university policy documents, it has a number of limitations of applicability to specific curricula content. First, it does not provide concrete examples of how educators, focusing on interculturality, implement the internationalisation of the curriculum. Second, it does not specify learning aims. Third, it gives no suggestion to the kind of learning tools that might be involved in specific programs. Fourth, it ignores the importance of communication as crucial to the process of internationalisation, particularly in relation to student interactions. (Eisenchlas & Trevaskes, 2003, p. 89)

These observations regarding the general nature of Knight’s work are important but they need to be qualified. Whilst Knight deals with the internationalisation of higher education, it would be unfair to criticise her work for failing to deliver in areas that are not its major focus. Knight largely concentrates on organisational approaches to internationalisation and does not attempt to instruct at the level of the individual actor, for example, a lecturer. This is not to say that her work is irrelevant to lecturers who want to better understand internationalisation processes in higher education. It is simply lacking in the sort of detail that would satisfy the needs that Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003) stated above. Once it is recognised that currently-favoured theory which focuses on internationalisation at the organisational level is largely limited in terms of dealing with the substance of how staff, themselves, might become internationalised, a conspicuous gap in the literature becomes apparent. This is despite the perceived importance of the area. The Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee, for example, declared that the internationalisation of university staff is “important in working towards international best practice in teaching, research and administration [and] necessary to prepare students
to operate effectively internationally” (AV-CC, 2001, p. 23). A consolidated body of contemporary theory on the internationalisation of staff, however, is not evident at this stage.

The fact that Australian higher education has generally embraced Knight’s work is perhaps an indication of it being appropriate for the time, that is, during the 1990s when there was rapid and dynamic engagement with a multitude of internationalisation activities at many levels and on many fronts. It would be fair to say that Knight’s thinking would have appeared as a beacon of explanation at a time when internationalisation approaches, processes, rationales, strategies, policies, and programs would have been more chaotic and less understood, particularly in those specific terms. Whilst Knight’s work remains important, relevant, and useful, the criticism that its depth dimension of the reach of internationalisation does not go far enough is more likely recognition that Australian higher education is entering a new, more mature phase of internationalisation which requires new concepts to deal with areas that have been less explored to this point. Quite simply, if the most cited definition and concept of internationalisation in the Australian tertiary landscape cannot adequately inform lecturers about internationalisation as it relates to their personal and professional outlooks, then guidance must be sought from elsewhere. This is where the Profile comes into its own as a valuable contribution to help fill the gap in the literature that has been identified in this chapter.
Step 2: The authentic teacher in higher education

The remainder of ‘Perspective 2: The Profile’s place in the literature on the internationalisation of higher education’ generates a conceptual framework that supports the Profile and, consequently, the internationalisation of the personal and professional outlooks of lecturers. This introduces a humanistic and existential appreciation of suitable internationalisation responses to current global processes and is a sophisticated representation of the essence of the Profile that is not evident in the literature. Precisely, it will discuss Cranton’s (2001) ideas on becoming an authentic teacher in higher education through critical reflection and critical self-reflection. This includes a brief discussion of transformative learning theory, the focus of which is teaching adult learners. Transformative learning theory supports the the Profile insofar as it is able to explain how people might approach its ideal. This is followed by a consideration of cosmopolitanism as an expansion of Cranton’s (2001) work. The notion of cosmopolitanism has only recently begun to be associated with the internationalisation of higher education and is a key concept to help understand what internationalisation means at the level of the individual actor, for example, a lecturer. Inasmuch as the Profile (at Level 3 teaching) is identified as a strong expression of cosmopolitanism, it, too, is likely to enjoy greater exposure and attention in theoretical and practical terms over the coming years.

Although having an understanding of other cultures is central both to the Profile and the idea of internationalisation at the level of the individual lecturer, the foundation for this is to initially appreciate how a person’s home culture produces and supports their personal, professional, and social worldviews. Eisenchlas and
Trevaskes (2003) put this well when they suggested that “first and foremost, cultural awareness involves processes of promoting the reflection upon one’s own cultural norms and values, and on how these shape social identities of individuals and groups” (p. 91). The Profile firmly rests on the assumption that lecturers who approach its ideal have engaged in such a reflective process. This is evident, for example, in the following three criteria from Table 1.1: The lecturer should reflect on the cultural context of his or her role as a teacher (criterion Q1 A3); The lecturer should be aware of his or her own culture and understand that this strongly colours his or her own views (criterion Q3 A1), and; The lecturer should realize [sic] that his or her own status as an academic is strongly conditioned by national and cultural values and be willing to reflect on this (criterion Q4 A1).

Moreover, Cranton (2001) believed that critical reflection and critical self-reflection on the basic assumptions of a person’s own culture and worldview can facilitate a transformative process which can result in greater self-awareness and self-acceptance. Cranton’s (2001) idea of the authentic teacher in higher education is the first step in understanding how internationalisation can be achieved at the level of the individual lecturer. It introduces existential and phenomenological themes into the discussion of the Profile. The following sections briefly outline the main aspects of Cranton’s (2001) work and elaborate on the central characteristics of transformative learning which is the body of knowledge associated with adult learning that supports both Cranton’s (2001) ideas as well as the broad position of the Profile.
Reflective practice in tertiary teaching

Reflective practice has emerged in recent decades as an important feature of teaching in higher education (Watkins, 1998a, p. 20). A model of reflective practice in relation to the theory and practice of teaching is presented in Figure 3.3.

The origin of contemporary engagement with reflective practice is generally attributed to the work of Schön (1987) who advocated its use to ameliorate the dissonance that often resulted between the instrumental, technical knowledge of the practitioner and their experience in the real world, the latter being described as a “swampy lowland [wherein] lie the problems of greatest human concern” (p. 3). The contemporary literature is replete with references on the importance of reflective practice to the practitioner. For example, Prosser and Trigwell (1998) stated that “good teaching involves reflection on the processes and consequences of teaching” (p. 254). Ramsden (2003) said that it was “a necessary condition for improving teaching” (p. 8). The Teaching and Educational Development Institute characterised reflective practice as a hallmark of effective university teaching, where the lecturer,
through critical self-analysis, is engaged in a progressive cycle of planning, action, observation, and reflection to improve their teaching (TEDI, 2005b).

Whilst the reflective process that underpins Cranton’s (2001) thesis deals more with personal and cultural values than knowledge and skills associated with teaching practice, it nevertheless complements reflection on teaching practice by providing lecturers with the opportunity to understand more about themselves. This, in association with reflection on teaching practice, provides a sound base for both the personal and professional development of individual lecturers.

_Deconstructing the Self_

The Self is commonly used to express existential and phenomenological themes in social science disciplines, particularly in philosophy, sociology, psychology, and education. It is also frequently encountered in discussions about identity, self-identity, and culture. For Cranton (2001), the Self indicated a person’s “basic nature, preferences, values, and the power of past experiences” (p. vii). A thorough understanding of the Self can empower individuals to make informed choices based on _who they really are_ which, in turn, can free them from “the constraints of uncritically assimilated values, assumptions, and social norms [of] the herd” (Cranton, 2001, p. vii). The Profile’s requirements reflect such a disposition. The objective of Cranton’s (2001) work was to encourage lecturers to reflect on the relationship between their personal value system and their culture in a bid to better understand their own worldview, or _Weltanschauung_. This process interprets culture in terms of Pedersen’s (1988) observation that:
Culture is not a vague or exotic label attached to faraway persons or places, but a personal orientation to each decision, behaviour, and action in our lives (p. vii) ... culture, like a network of traits, is located within the person. Like traits, culture provides a flexible disposition toward one or another perspective that changes from time to time, situation to situation, and person to person. Although a person’s culture can be known in part, there are core elements of our culture that are not known even to ourselves. (Pedersen, 1988, p. xi)

Pedersen’s (1988) view is consistent with the Profile’s focus on culture as related in Chapter II.

Cranton’s (2001) work leads readers through a number of interactive exercises designed to help them reflect on, deconstruct, critically analyse, and then transform (reconstruct) their personal value system. Again, this process is implicit to the personal journey that the Profile requires lecturers to make as they approach its ideal. The first step is for individuals to ask themselves “Who am I, really?” This question provides a mechanism to reflect on the constitution of the Self in terms of who they are, what they do, and what they value. This reflection on the content of the Self can be achieved, for example, by listing ten nouns or phrases that define the Self and then asking how it was that the person came to see the Self that way. This, in turn, is followed by an exploration of why each noun or phrase is important to the person (Cranton, 2001). After this, they can ask why they see themselves as such; why they do the things they do; and why they value certain things over others. This is referred to as process reflection and it leads people to question the premises that underwrite their definition of Self. It is a more critical approach than mere reflection (Cranton, 2001).
Cranton (2001) believed that the overall process by which people come to understand themselves is grounded in psychological type preferences and depends on how much their sense of Self is derived from the four functions of experience (sense), vision (intuition), logical choice (thinking), and values (feeling). To determine this, Cranton (2001) presented an exercise which constructs a picture of a person as either introverted or extraverted in terms of sensing, intuition, thinking, and feeling (pp. 10-11). Table 3.3 provides examples of some of these psychological type preferences. After the exercise is complete, people can then reflect on the nature of the composite Self and consider how they came to have such preferences and whether they are a useful way of thinking about their Self and their place in the social world.

Table 3.3  Examples of psychological type preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraverted sensing:</th>
<th>Down-to-earth</th>
<th>Nonreflective [sic]</th>
<th>Sensuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Factual</td>
<td>Sensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Fashionable</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted thinking:</td>
<td>Uncritical</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Susceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmonious</td>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Accepting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverted intuition:</td>
<td>Enigmatic</td>
<td>Mystical</td>
<td>Eccentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Mysterious</td>
<td>Quixotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prophetic</td>
<td>Psychic</td>
<td>Clairvoyant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverted feeling:</td>
<td>Amiable</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>Elusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Intense</td>
<td>Placating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enigmatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cranton (2001) also believed that a person’s experience plays an extremely important role in determining their values and how they see the world: “the way we make meaning out of experiences determines our habitual expectations and our habits of mind – our assumptions, beliefs, values, and perspectives” (p. 15, emphasis in original). Again, interactive exercises are utilised to contemplate major experiences and ask why they came to be significant and why they are important to the person at all (Cranton, 2001). With regard to values that influence behaviour and other aspects of the Self, Cranton (2001) said that many are “unquestioned or sometimes not even articulated. We take them for granted, and often they have been uncritically assimilated” (p. 21). This is a key theme in the Profile. Examples of such values are presented in Table 3.4.

### Table 3.4 Examples of values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal values:</th>
<th>Professional values:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Independence Love</td>
<td>Security Autonomy Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning Trust Openness</td>
<td>Job satisfaction Achievement Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage Integrity Comfort</td>
<td>Being with others Success Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Inner peace Equality</td>
<td>Expertise Responsibility Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Pleasure Relationships</td>
<td>Stability Competence Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem Compassion Religion</td>
<td>Quality Hard work Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty Beauty Possessions</td>
<td>Efficiency Authority Being liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualization Development Empowerment</td>
<td>Social change Growth Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Cranton (2001, p. 23).*
Once again, Cranton (2001) offered interactive exercises as a way for people to make their values explicit. After listing ten cherished values, they are then asked to reflect on how they came to have such values, before working through a series of questions about why each value is important.

Thus far, this section has concentrated on outlining the sort of reflective processes that are promoted by Cranton (2001) for teachers in higher education to have a better appreciation of who they are as individuals, why they see the world the way they do, and the role that social forces have played in helping to construct their personal identity or Self. This is important from the point of view of understanding how individuals who are self-aware and self-accepting might be able to better comprehend, accept, and work with cultural Others, a key requirement of the Profile and, according to Liddicoat (2003), interculturality (p. 19). Cranton’s (2001) work encourages individuals to take a step back from how they view their place in the world and interrogate why it is so. This process is potentially transformative in the sense that it can provide new ways of looking out through looking in. It is the acquisition of a heightened knowledge of what is ‘outside’ by more deeply knowing what is ‘inside’ and is perhaps the fundamental activity that Said (1995) would promote as being critical to understanding Otherness. The various self-assessment tasks outlined by Cranton (2001) would be valuable exercises in any professional development setting which sought to assist lecturers to internationalise their personal and professional outlooks in ways that are suggested by the Profile.
Reconstructing the Self to be an authentic teacher in higher education

This section brings together Cranton’s (2001) observations on how a personal transformation through deep and critical reflection can contribute to authenticity in teaching in higher education. Authenticity is a key theme in the Profile. It is, however, implied rather than made explicit. Cranton (2001) noted that the literature is replete with ideas about what constitutes good teaching and that anyone who tried to meet the many requirements of the multitude of views would fall perilously short of fulfilling them. They could, however, become better teachers by being true (authentic, genuine) to themselves. Cranton’s (2001) advice was for a person to focus on the “teacher within” (p. 47) (the Self) rather than try to be the “teacher without” (p. 50) that is represented by all other teachers and various approaches to teaching (for example, those based on behavioural psychology, humanism, John Dewey’s functionalism, Kolb’s experiential learning, or Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences in the classroom). A person would be inauthentic if they were to ignore their Self and instead try to mould their idea of good teaching on a multitude of different teachers and teaching approaches:

The authentic teacher understands who she [sic] is as a teacher, works well and clearly with her own style, and continues to reflect on her practice, grow, and develop (p. 36) [and] we each, individually, find our own place within these perspectives through questioning, contemplation, and reflection on our basic nature, preferences, experience, and values. (Cranton, 2001, p. 41)

Another important observation in Cranton’s (2001) work is that authenticity implies the merging of the Self and the teacher. This expectation is implicit to the Profile. Cranton’s (2001) description of “Self as teacher, teacher as Self” (p. 43) indicates a whole-of-person approach to both teaching and living. The Profile
is clearly sympathetic with this outlook. Cranton (2001) believed that the teacher as a person defines the teaching and learning experience. Good teaching and learning is not achieved if the teacher simply plays the role of good teacher during work hours.

This view distinguishes between what Suits (1978) called native and proprietary parts. The former is a person’s real-life role whilst the latter is playing a part. The native part conveys no misinformation about one’s identity, whereas the proprietary part, whilst not necessarily perceived by others as conveying misinformation, entails dislocation between the Self and the part that is played. As put by Patterson (1973), “the genuine teacher is, then, not using a method or a technique as something outside himself [sic], for his methods or techniques are an integral part of himself” (p. 103). The Self as teacher, teacher as Self is an expression of authenticity that allows individuals to genuinely engage with others in teaching and in life in general (Cranton, 2001). Critical reflection and critical self-reflection are important mechanisms by which individuals can remain aware of the context in which they live and work. Finally, whilst Cranton’s (2001) work does not explicitly mention intercultural engagement, this possibility is nevertheless supported: “Authentic expression leads to further self-understanding as we encounter people and situations at odds with our Self” (Cranton, 2001, p. 114).

**Transformative learning theory**

Cranton’s (2001) work draws upon Mezirow’s (1991, 2000) deliberations on the concept of transformative learning which has emerged over the past two decades as a “powerful way to understand how adults change their beliefs, values, and
perspectives” (Cranton, 2000, p. 21). Whilst there is no indication in Teekens’s (2000a) publication of any particular educational theory that acts as the foundation for the Profile, transformative learning theory is a particularly good fit. This section briefly covers the main features of this theory. Mezirow (2000) said that transformations often occur after individuals clarify meaning from events such as:

1. A disorienting dilemma.
2. Self-examination with feelings of fear, anger, guilt, or shame.
4. Recognition that one’s discontent and the process of transformation are shared.
5. Exploration of options for new roles, relationships, and actions.
6. Planning a course of action.
7. Acquiring knowledge and skills for implementing one’s plans.
8. Provisional trying of new roles.
10. A reintegration into one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s new perspective. (Mezirow, 2000, p. 22)

A number of the events mentioned above can be associated with teaching international students. Mezirow’s (2000) work is very much concerned with the individual qua existent and the ways in which they interpret the world to give their lives meaning and avoid “the threat of chaos” (p. 3). The prime focus of transformative learning is “to become critically aware of one’s own tacit assumptions and expectations and those of others and assessing their relevance for making an interpretation” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 4). Its import for the Profile is evident, particularly when viewed against the criteria in ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’ and ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’.
For both Mezirow (2000) and Cranton (2001), a greater understanding of the Self can lead to authenticity which is the “expression of one’s genuine Self in the community and society” (Cranton, 2001, p. viii). Such a view reflects the fundamental aspects of existentialist thought where much value is placed on the idea of the aware Self as a thinking being with beliefs, hopes, fears, desires, the need to find a purpose, and a will that can determine one’s actions. An existential approach takes a first-person or subjective consideration of ultimate questions and believes each self-aware individual understands their own existence in terms of their experience and their situation, that is, their station in life. Authenticity, in the existentialist view, is the best expression of a worthwhile life. Individuals are expected to confront their challenges and flourish in the process of dealing with them. This is clearly an expectation of the Profile.

As well as having an existential aspect, transformative learning theory also has a critical element. This is evident in the meaning attached to the terms critical reflection and critical self-reflection. Brookfield (2000) noted that the terms reflection and reflective practice are commonly used in contemporary educational discourse. An undesirable outcome of this, however, has been the conflation of the processes of reflection with critical reflection, with the latter often taken simply to be a deeper, more profound form of reflective practice (pp. 125-126). Brookfield (2000) believed that critical reflection was qualitatively different from just reflecting deeply on something. To this end, he suggested that it is important that critical reflection be associated with the intellectual tradition of critical theory that was developed by
scholars at the Institute of Social Research at the University of Frankfurt (known as the Frankfurt School) in the 1930s.

In its strongest form, critical theory deals with concepts of hegemony, power, control, legitimacy, privilege, equity, social justice, struggle, conflict, autonomy, advocacy, contradiction, and values. A central theme of critical theorists, therefore, has been to articulate a view of theory which utilises dialectical means to emancipate people from the positivist domination of thought through their own understandings and actions. It seeks to have people treated as subjects rather than objects and ends rather than means (Comstock, 1982, p. 371; Prunty, 1985, p. 136). The Profile also seeks to treat participants in the international classroom in the same fashion, especially in light of Teekens’s (2000c) observation that “globalization will make education more technological and thus systems-oriented, and less student- and teacher-centred” (p. 16).

For Brookfield (2000) and Cranton (2001), the process of reflection is simply thinking about things. Critical reflection and critical self-reflection, however, require people to seek an understanding of why those things are the way they are, from the point of view of their construction as part of a social reality that is sustained by hegemonic power(s). The outcome that is desired from critical reflection and critical self-reflection is individual and social emancipation which is not only intrinsically valuable as an end in itself, but also provides the ability to understand the mechanisms that bind some groups to uncritically accept irrational and distorted ideas about their social reality (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, pp. 96-130; Rizvi, 1986, p. 3).
This is the heart of Cranton’s (2001) thesis and transformative learning theory. Whilst a strong criticalist approach is not necessarily a feature of the Profile, the reflection and self-reflection it promotes, particularly in terms of the Self in relation to culture, leaves the door open for this possibility.

From authenticity to cosmopolitanism

The sections that have dealt with Cranton’s (2001) idea of authenticity and teaching are not so much about detail associated with pedagogy, but more to do with understanding the Self through an active and conscious deconstruction and reconstruction of personal value systems. As indicated earlier through the view of Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003), this process is a vital step in understanding others, particularly cultural Others.

Being able to critically reflect on one’s own value system is fundamental to being able to dismantle the barriers which obstruct a legitimate understanding and acceptance of others. This process is at the very heart of the Profile and examples from the literature which acknowledge this are worth relating; “Before we can recognize the ‘Other’, we have to know ourselves well” (Stromquist, 2002, p. 93). “Only when we have clearly defined our own person and identity are we able to understand other identities” (Breuer, 2002, p. 15). “A degree of confident self-awareness is not necessarily to be seen as a conservative force in society. It can be a pre-condition for a sustained program of social or economic revival” (Milner, 1996, p. 17). “Respect for the other presupposes that a person has considerable self-awareness” (Djebar, 2002, p. 229). “If one is to understand others, one must first
understand oneself” (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century, 1996, p. 93). “Harmony with others depends on knowing ourselves and our cultures” (Pedersen, 1988, p. 74). “The best thing we can do for our relationships with others … is to render our relationship to ourselves more conscious” (Hollis, as cited in Cranton, 2001, p. 74). Finally, “in order to learn about another culture, we need to learn about our own” (McLaughlin & Liddicoat, 2005, p. 6). Whilst it is not the case that one has to completely understand oneself (if, indeed, this was possible) before an appreciation of the Other can be gleaned, the general message from the previous passages contain a certain wisdom which underwrites the Profile’s position.

Cranton’s (2001) work is indeed all about the challenge from Socrates to know thyself through critical reflection and critical self-reflection within the framework of one’s own culture. For Bredella (2003), however, the ultimate expression of a person’s self-awareness is to expand the reflective framework to include other cultures; not just their own (p. 227). In a world characterised by greater intercultural contact through global flows, the use of a bigger and more inclusive framework to better understand the Self is a sensible thing and this premise is fundamental to the Profile. The next step, then, is to project Cranton’s (2001) notion of the authentic teacher in higher education into the intercultural realm through the concept of cosmopolitanism. Together, both authenticity and cosmopolitanism support the idea of the internationalised lecturer in higher education who has made a decision to change (develop) in response to outside forces (kokusaika). This is the very essence of the rationale for the development of the Profile.
Step 3: Cosmopolitanism

The remainder of ‘Perspective 2: The Profile’s place in the literature on the internationalisation of higher education’ provides an overview of the main aspects of cosmopolitanism and how it articulates with internationalisation in higher education and the Profile. Whilst Mehta’s observation (as cited in Gunesch, 2004) that cosmopolitanism “is a protean term with a complex history” (p. 255) is acknowledged, the object is not so much to become immersed in the many and varied elements of the concept, but to provide a focused appreciation of the sort of cosmopolitanism ideals that have import for lecturers in higher education who teach international students.

Introduction to cosmopolitanism

It is no coincidence that cosmopolitanism has recently re-emerged to be viewed as a possible way forward for individuals, communities, and political governance. The unique set of global forces and flows throughout the 1990s and into the current millennium have, in one way or another, led to qualitative and quantitative increases in interconnectedness and interdependence for many countries and people around the world. In terms of the implications of this for humanity’s immediate future, G. Pascal Zachary (2000) argued that the degree to which cosmopolitanism is embraced will decide the fate of nations and their peoples. Giddens (2002) hoped that a cosmopolitan outlook would prevail in the Twenty-First century to counter the potentially destructive forces of fundamentalism which threatened democracy. Indeed, Held (2003) believed that “globalisation without cosmopolitanism could fail” (p. 182). There is clearly something about
cosmopolitanism that is attractive, perhaps even indispensable, particularly at a time when globalisation has created “overlapping communities of fate” (Held, 2003, p. 180). Therefore, the extent to which the Profile is ultimately an expression of cosmopolitanism will also determine its likely usefulness to the educational setting.

Whilst the cosmopolitanism debate is evident in political science (for example, see Held, et al. 1999; Giddens, 2002; Held, 2002; Held, 2003; Keane, 2003), as well as in education in terms of speculating about the role it might play in developing global citizenship (for example, see Nussbaum, n.d.; Popkewitz, 2001; Singh, 2002), the literature on the internationalisation of education and cosmopolitanism as linked and complementary concepts is exceptionally barren. An extensive literature search found nothing which drew together internationalisation, cosmopolitanism, and teaching in higher education. The only entries that made explicit reference to cosmopolitanism and international education were the very recent and useful offerings from Gunesch (2004) and Matthews and Sidhu (2005) which focused on the international student experience.14

Upon first inspection, the absence of literature seems paradoxical, for the ideal of cosmopolitanism is compatible with the thing that most proponents of internationalisation of higher education are passionate about, that is, a moral and ethically-founded spirit of internationalism. One definition of internationalism is “the view that the nations of the world should co-operate politically, economically, culturally, etc [sic] and work towards greater mutual understanding” (Manser

14 These are discussed in a later section titled ‘Cosmopolitanism and education’. 
& Thomson, 1995, p. 672). The discourse of internationalisation and higher education is more often than not based on a philosophy of being a grassroots, bottom-up, ethical response to top-down global forces, particularly in a bid to ameliorate the effects of neo-liberal globalisation and the hegemony of the West/North. The possibilities, then, for incorporating cosmopolitan ideals and ideas into the internationalisation debate in higher education appear to be manifold. To this end, the remainder of ‘Step 3: Cosmopolitanism’ consolidates the relationship between internationalisation and cosmopolitanism themes in education. The following sections introduce the concept of cosmopolitanism and outline its main features. The relationship between education and cosmopolitanism is provided and the work of Gunesch (2004) is used to suggest a reason why internationalisation and cosmopolitanism have not been linked to any extent in the literature thus far. Following this is a brief outline of some limitations of the concept of cosmopolitanism and, to the extent that the Profile is ultimately an expression of cosmopolitanism in higher education, of the Profile as well.

*The concept of cosmopolitanism*

Manser and Thomson (1995) listed a standard definition of *cosmopolitan* as “belonging to, or representative of, all parts of the world” (p. 289) and “free of national prejudices; international in experience or outlook” (p. 289). The term is frequently employed in general usage simply as an adjective that describes something or someone being worldly, well-travelled, sophisticated, or urbane. For example, it can depict places. Australia’s capital cities are promoted to potential tourists as cosmopolitan sites (ATS Tours, 2004). Cosmopolitan describes cuisine.
For instance, Humphreys (2001) noted that young Singaporeans were developing “a more cosmopolitan outlook” (p. 70) with their culinary tastes, being as comfortable in a pub with a plate of spaghetti bolognaise as they are with a bowl of tom yam soup in a hawker centre. With few exceptions these days, the cosmopolitan place, cuisine, experience, image, lifestyle, disposition and person are generally portrayed as attractive and desirable states, neither restrained nor constrained by being simply local.

There are also some sporadic references to the term *cosmopolitan* in the higher education literature. Lewis and Altbach (2000) used cosmopolitan to describe the opposite of staff whose outlook was exclusively local. Hudson and Morris (2003) believed that it was important to ensure that internationalisation efforts at Australian universities did not foster a thinly veneered “facile cosmopolitanism” (p. 73). Singh (2002) expressed the hope that Australian higher education curricula that were more oriented towards global perspectives might result in a “cosmopolitan multiculture [*sic*]” (p. 5) that could make and remake identities. Elsewhere, Singh (2005) referred to the “cosmopolitan outlook” (p. 23) of a new student identity as a result of being a “transnational worker, global/local citizen and worldly learner” (p. 23). Kalantzis and Cope (2000) spoke of the “benefits of an open, tolerant and cosmopolitan university experience” (p. 31). Appadurai (as cited in Marginson and Mollis, 1999/2000) referred to peoples’ identities as being “ever-more multiple, hybrid, cosmopolitan and changeable” (p. 56). Teichler (1998) commented that nations often viewed higher education as a way to strengthen themselves in the face of international competition, “rather than to become genuinely cosmopolitan” (8. Future challenges
of higher education, ¶ 5). There are also implicit expressions of a cosmopolitan outlook in the literature, as evidenced in Power’s (2000) consideration of global trends in education:

Global processes will not only make our societies increasingly multicultural and ever more intercultural as the interactions among cultural groups intensify, but also they will force shifts in our educational and development priorities as we assume multiple cultural identities. (Power, 2000, p. 152)

Although examples such as those provided above convey a sense of what cosmopolitan means in contemporary (particularly Western) life, the interests of this investigation actually lie in the concept of cosmopolitanism, which Manser and Thomson (1995) defined as the “belief in a cosmopolitan outlook” (p. 289, emphasis added). A distinction, therefore, is made between the fleeting, superficial, popular, and spontaneous use of cosmopolitan and a deeper appreciation of, and subscription to, cosmopolitanism as a way of life. This is more consistent with the Profile’s expectations.

Kleingeld and Brown (2002) stated that “the nebulous core shared by all cosmopolitan views is the idea that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, do (or at least can) belong to a single community, and that this community should be cultivated” (¶ 1). The outcome of such thinking would be a widespread manifestation of what Gunesch (2004) noted to be a catchcry in the current literature on the subject, that is, “feeling at home in the world” (p. 256); crudely put, to be able to live anywhere and get on with anyone. More specifically, a cosmopolitan outlook was usefully described by Tomlinson (as cited in Matthews & Sidhu, 2005) as “an
intellectual and aesthetic sense of openness towards people, places and experiences from different cultures, especially those from different nations” (p. 53). This is a key theme in the Profile and it raises an interesting question about the cosmopolitan individual and their allegiance to the local-cum-national level on the one hand, and the regional-cum-global level on the other. Does cosmopolitanism necessarily require the abandonment of local and national affiliations in favour of a borderless, globetrotting existence even if only through a sympathetic and vicarious appreciation of what lies beyond one’s locality and nation?

In response to the question above, this investigation subscribes to a particular view of cosmopolitanism which relies on both the local and the global as constituting the logic of the concept of cosmopolitanism. It is not a case of being one or the other. To explain the hybrid nature of this sort of cosmopolitanism, this investigation draws upon Saul’s (2005) statement that “many people may want to have an international side to their lives, but they want to live in their communities” (p. 272, emphasis in original). Essentially, this describes the position of rooted cosmopolitanism as an arrangement that requires both the local and everything beyond the local to constitute its meaning. The alternative would be to abandon the local in favour of a (hyperglobalist) universal moral cosmopolitanism. This, for many, is both illogical and undesirable for it commits a person to being universal and nothing less. Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) said that people should not become “all alike” (p. 365), but instead “at least aspire to becoming more cosmopolitan in our thinking” (p. 365). The following observation from Marginson and Mollis (1999/2000) serves as a warning for any iteration of the Profile that subscribes to an all-out hyperglobalist position:
It is important not to fall into a universalistic ‘globalisation’ which loses locality, contingency and cultural context amid a supposedly transcendent ‘world-culture’ subject to continuous reinvention. (Marginson & Mollis, 1999/2000, p. 56)

Gunesch (2004) drew on the work of Hannerz, Friedman, and Pollock to emphasise the point that for cosmopolitanism to thrive, localities, too, have to prosper rather than disappear. The logic of cosmopolitanism relies on at least two local cultures. No local, no cosmopolitan! Sylvester (2005), whilst tracing the history of international education, cited Gutek as speculating on a form of cosmopolitanism that embraces both national and global identities (p. 142). Such a position was also expressed by G. Pascal Zachary (2000) who eschewed universal moral cosmopolitanism in favour of “the global me: local people who are neither limited to their particularities nor doomed to an empty we-are-the-world universalism” (p. xv). In his view, rooted cosmopolitanism reconciles two seemingly opposites; roots and wings (p. xvii). A person’s roots are found in their heritage, whilst their wings enable them to relate to life beyond their locality. A revised Profile based on the transformationalist view of globalisation can support this position.

Gunesch (2004) noted that whilst this way of considering cosmopolitanism was “black-and-white” (p. 257) through focusing largely on opposite poles of a local-global continuum, other entries in the literature recognised that the journey from neophyte to seasoned cosmopolite meant transiting the places and spaces along the continuum that were more “shades of grey” (p. 257). For Gunesch (2004), who believed that cosmopolitanism straddles the local and the global, this introduced a sense of dynamism to the development of cultural identity. This is a useful way to
appreciate a person’s cosmopolitan development. It is also a useful way to appreciate a lecturer’s personal and professional development as they approach both the ideal of the Profile and Level 3 teaching.

Cosmopolitanism & education

The contemporary worldwide setting sees humanity experiencing the Dickensian notion of the best and the worst of times. The International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996) said that the transition into the new millennium evoked “both anguish and hope” (p. 14), given that the twentieth century had been as much “one of sound and fury as of economic and social progress” (p. 14). The present milieu is unique in terms of the Earth’s expanding human population, the level of degradation of the world’s ecosystems, the impact of technology on communications and modes of transport, and the inequities associated with resource consumption and ownership of wealth. The next 100 years is literally a make or break time for humankind and much of the Earth’s ecosystem (O’Sullivan, 1999; Slade 2002; Suzuki, 1998; Suzuki & Dressel, 2004). The International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996) emphasised that “it is no exaggeration … to say that the survival of humanity” (p. 18) depends upon the ability to confront and overcome the following seven tensions:

1. The tension between the global and the local.
2. The tension between the universal and the individual.
3. The tension between tradition and modernity.
4. The tension between long-term and short-term considerations.
5. The tension between the spiritual and the material.
6. The tension between the need for competition and the concern for equality of opportunity.
7. The tension between the extraordinary expansion of knowledge and peoples’ capacity to assimilate it. (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century, 1996, pp. 17-18)
Whilst the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996) did not wish to promote education as a miracle cure or magic formula which might solve all of these challenges, the fundamental purpose of the UNESCO document was to better deal with the outcomes of globalisation through education (Slade, 1998). To this end, the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996) advanced four pillars which were promoted as the foundations of education:

1. Learning to live together (being able to understand cultural Others).
2. Learning to know (having sufficient general and specific knowledge).
3. Learning to do (having skills for the contemporary workplace).
4. Learning to be (being independent and taking responsibility). \(^{15}\) (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century, 1996, pp. 22-24)

The International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996) held that the first pillar, learning to live together, is the most critical of the four due to current global flows of economy, technology, travel, migration, and culture making the world a smaller place. As a result of growing enmeshment and interconnectivity, there is a need for all individuals, communities, cultures, and countries to understand, accept, embrace, tolerate, respect, and work with cultural diversity. The interests of this investigation lie first and foremost in the implications this has for individuals (in this case, lecturers) as fundamental constituents of institutions, localities, communities, nations, and broadly, a shared humanity. To this end, Rizvi and Walsh (1998) noted that “a more comprehensive awareness of

---

\(^{15}\) The statements in parentheses are a précis of the text of the central theme of each pillar as outlined by the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996, pp. 22-23).
difference and its implications for personal and social development has come to be seen as a profound feature of contemporary life” (p. 8). Kalantzis and Cope (2000) believed that all students, for example, needed to become “comfortable with cultural diversity” (p. 31). Luke (2004) argued that teachers need to reinvent themselves as cosmopolitans not only in response current global forces, but also because of the impact of neo-liberal, market-driven forces on their profession and education in general:

The ethical and moral demands on education, as well as the changed conditions of human capital production … are requiring broader critical engagements with globalization, with cross- and trans-cultural knowledges, and with the complex synergies between geo-political, economic local events and knowledges. Simply, while new economic and geopolitical conditions are requiring a new teacher with critical capacities for dealing with the transnational and the global, current policies have turned the teacher into a generic consumer of multinational products with a narrowly local, regional and national epistemic standpoint. What is needed is nothing short of the reenvisioning of a transcultural and cosmopolitan teacher: a teacher with the capacity to shunt between the local and the global, to explicate and engage with the broad flows of knowledge and information, technologies and populations, artefacts and practices that characterise the present historical moment. (Luke, 2004, pp. 1438-1439)

Luke’s (2004) comment above is a succinct expression of the Profile’s ethic, just as Goeudevert’s (2002) claim that “encounters with the unfamiliar, concrete experiences of difference, incongruities and inequalities will continue to increase, not despite, but because of globalisation” (p. 45) is a rationale for the Profile’s usefulness. Bauman said that the challenge of the current era is “how to live with alterity [sic] – daily and permanently” (as cited in Marginson, 1999/2000, p. 5). G. Pascal Zachary (2000) believed that individuals and organisations that choose to ignore this will be a “lonely lot” (p. 278) who will “grow lonelier still” (p. 278). The message from these writers is that to stand fast on fundamentalist or localised or
nationalistic grounds is to risk becoming an anachronism. To fail to move forward is to continue play with the same old deck of social cards of isolationalism, prejudice, bias, and bigotry that are antithetical to notions of openness, interconnectivity, interdependence, reciprocity, and plurality; the very tenets of cosmopolitanism and of the Profile itself.

To this end, education has been called upon to play an important role in preparing people for a life which will be impacted upon by Otherness more than ever before (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century, 1996). This is also expressed in the observation by Matthews (2003) that a primary aim of education in the Twenty-First century should be to promote “understanding and acceptance of difference” (p. 18). The Profile rests easily with these observations and is a positive response to transforming education to meet the needs of current times.

The call for people to embrace a cosmopolitan ethic is couched in the literature as a need to develop “intercultural knowledge, awareness, and skills” (Eisenchlas & Trevaskes, 2003, p. 87). Not surprisingly, these are the same areas that are generally found in curricula associated with cross-cultural training and multicultural education (Brislin & Horvath, 1997), intercultural communication and cooperation (Hofstede, 2001), and multicultural awareness (Pedersen, 1988). The

16 Whilst little distinction is apparent in the teaching and learning literature at the level of the individual between terms such as multicultural, cross-cultural, and intercultural, the contemporary use of the latter term is most closely matched to the interests of this investigation. Liddicoat (2003) spoke of interculturality as being primarily concerned with the “issues of identity and engagement” (p. 19) and contained “both a culture-general component and a culture-specific component” (p. 19). This is a succinct description of way that the Profile approaches culture in relation to teaching and learning.
emphasis is on the need for people to be exposed to, and competent in, this emerging and important area. It is interesting to note, however, that the call for students and lecturers to embrace intercultural perspectives, or a cosmopolitan ethic, is Janus-faced. On the one hand there is the largely instrumental view that being able to understand and work with other cultures is a prerequisite for success in the global market economy. On the other hand there is a broadly humanistic view that is based on shared understanding, acceptance, mutual respect, and world peace. The two are not necessarily incompatible, either in education in general or in the Profile in particular.

Whilst the focus in the contemporary literature is mainly on curricula that assist students to be proficient in what Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003) termed “interculturality” (p. 87) in order to satisfy both instrumental and humanistic ends, it presupposes that lecturers are equipped, both personally and professionally, to bring about such educational outcomes. This is a big presupposition given that very little investigation has been done on the competency of lecturers in this area, but it at least portrays the possibility that lecturers (and students) who embrace cosmopolitanism as a way of life will be the sort of agents who can help create what the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996) called the “necessary Utopia” (p. 22) in which, above all else, people will have learned to “live together” (p. 22). Surely this has to be one of the hallmarks of cosmopolitanist thought and the Profile’s ethic and it is succinctly captured in the following statement by Held et al. (1999):
In the millennium ahead each citizen of a state will have to learn to become a 'cosmopolitan citizen' … a person capable of mediating between national traditions, communities of fate and alternative forms of life. Citizenship in a democratic polity of the future … is likely to involve a growing mediating role … which encompasses dialogue with the traditions and discourses of others with the aim of expanding the horizons of one’s own framework of meaning, and increasing the scope of mutual understanding. (Held et al., 1999, p. 449)

To conclude this section, it is useful to report briefly on the offerings from Gunesch (2004) and Matthews and Sidhu (2005) whose work represents the first forays into considerations of cosmopolitanism, the individual and international education in the literature. Both interpreted international education in the narrow sense of the international student experience. Gunesch (2004) researched a small sample of 11 multilingual international students and identified three types of cosmopolitanism which he termed Advanced Tourist, Transitional Cosmopolitan, and Interactive Cosmopolitan.

Perhaps the most important aspect of Gunesch’s (2004) work from the point of view of this investigation is his view that outcomes for individuals engaged in international education should be “rooted in the concept of cosmopolitanism, rather than internationalism” (p. 253), for the latter term is more aligned with outcomes at the organisational level. Here, then, is a possible explanation for why cosmopolitanism has not surfaced to any degree as yet in the literature on internationalisation and higher education. The focus on the organisational level thus far (in Australia at least) has meant that internationalisation has been institutionalised but has yet to be individualised. The extent to which there is an absence in the literature of cosmopolitan themes as they apply to internationalisation may well be
the extent to which there has been little attention paid to internationalisation at the
level of the individual actor, that is, the Self. This is why the Profile should be seen
as an important contribution to the literature. It, along with the work of Gunesch
(2004) and Matthews and Sidhu (2005) could reflect the sea change that was alluded
to in an earlier section in this chapter, where it was suggested that Australian higher
education may be entering a more mature phase of internationalisation.

Whilst Gunesch’s (2004) contribution has broken new ground and is
extremely useful, it should be noted that whilst internationalism is indeed an
undercurrent in the internationalisation of higher education, so are more instrumental
ends associated with neo-liberal and hegemonic imperatives. Coincidentally, this
very thing was noted by Matthews and Sidhu (2005) who conducted research into the
international student experience in Australian state schools through the lens of
cosmopolitanism:

The tendency for education institutions such as schools to privilege narrowly
instrumental cultural capital perpetuates and sustains normative, national,
cultural and ethnic identities. In the absence of concerted efforts on the part
of educational institutions to sponsor new forms of global subjectivity, flows
and exchanges like those that constitute international education are more
likely to produce a neo-liberal variant of global subjectivity. (Matthews
& Sidhu, 2005, p. 49)

Matthews and Sidhu (2005) identified with the sort of cosmopolitanism to
which this thesis is aligned, that is, a rooted (although they call it grounded)
cosmopolitanism that utilised Turner’s concept of cosmopolitan virtue which
expresses a prior commitment to a place, coupled with reflexive distance from that
place (as cited in Matthews & Sidhu, 2005, p. 54). Moreover, it was important to
Matthews and Sidhu (2005) that cosmopolitanism be primarily based on ethical and moral considerations (p. 55). Their exploratory study was termed a *desperate search* for a cosmopolitan subjectivity in an international education environment which they believed to be dominated and motivated primarily by economic considerations (Matthews & Sidhu, 2005, p. 51). Further, their research suggested that “international students do not experience Australian schools as sites for sponsoring new forms of global subjectivity and imagination” (p. 62). This is an important, although perhaps unsurprising, finding. It demonstrates the continuing agency of the nation-state and its various cultural and nationalist agendas in determining education-related outcomes. This is despite the significant impact of global forces.

*Critical observations of the concept of cosmopolitanism*

Whilst the link between internationalisation and cosmopolitanism heralds an exciting development in terms of the possibilities it could raise, there are some critical observations of cosmopolitanism that also need to be considered. This section introduces four such observations with some being expressed as limitations of, or challenges inherent in, the concept of cosmopolitanism. Given that the Profile is an expression of cosmopolitanism, it, too, is predisposed to the same limitations and challenges.

The first observation is articulated through Gunesch’s (2004) suggestion that cosmopolitanism is a personal and individual choice (p. 267). It is reminiscent of the anecdote that asks how many psychologists it takes to change a light bulb. The answer, of course, is ‘One, but the light bulb has to *want to* change’. Self-change can
be assisted and even driven by external forces but the measure of success will be determined by how much the individual embraces the idea of personal and professional development. This reliance on an individual’s positive disposition towards embracing the Profile’s ideal is clearly a limiting factor. Further, it does not appear that university curricula ostensibly promote personal and professional development in the cross-cultural or intercultural sphere as cosmopolitanism (Gunesch, 2004, p. 254). This is likely also to be the case for professional development and staff training activities in this area. Professional development workshops that educate staff about teaching international students are more likely to be hints and tips sessions focused on knowledge and skills rather than about attitudinal change on the lecturer’s behalf with respect to fostering a spirit of cosmopolitanism. In sum, these points indicate a certain fragility and tenuousness about the promotion of cosmopolitanism.

As much as a deep cosmopolitan outlook may be promoted as a “salvation theme” (Popkewitz, 2001, p. 122) necessary to meet the needs of current times, the degree to which it could become a widespread feature is constrained by it being a personal choice and, to this point in time, an insignificant focus in educational curricula. This point is well made by Kleingeld and Brown (2002) who maintained that “what all individuals share is a fundamental striving for self-preservation, and the universality of this striving does not amount to a fundamental bond that unites (or should unite) all humans in a universal community” (1.2 Early Modern and Enlightenment Cosmopolitanism, ¶ 2, parentheses in original).
The second observation made in this section is related to the first. It is based on Slade’s (2002) reminder that the kind of philosophical self-awareness and critical self-reflection required for such introspective engagement with Otherness (such as through cosmopolitanism) is neither a feature of contemporary life in Australia, nor the current focus of education at any level. The rhetoric may be that of openness, pluralism, tolerance, flexibility, and transparency, but the challenge is to see how this is reflected in social and educational practice. The implication of this observation for the Profile is that the capacity of Australian lecturers to embrace the Profile’s ethic might be influenced to some degree by Australia’s modern history.

Australia has an enigmatic history when it comes to dealing with difference as embodied in ideas associated with the cultural Other, especially in relation to the “complex fears [Australians have] of their Asian neighbours” (Pilger, 2002, p. 21). Colonisation of the continent by the English in the late 1700s established an outpost of the British Empire at the edge of the Asian landmass and this has, according to Keating (2000), “shaped our sense of threat and opportunity ever since” (p. 1). Unfortunately, the Anglo-Celtic Australian difficulties with Asian-ness are intertwined with a history of difficulty with cultural difference in general. From the (continuing) decimation and subjugation of the Aboriginal population, to the White Australia policy; from prejudices inherent to the post-WWII European immigration program to Hansonism and the One Nation Party; from the ramifications of recent events such as illegal migration to major terrorist attacks in the United States in 2001 and Indonesia in 2002, 2004, and 2005; Australia’s success in dealing with cultural diversity can be described as having shaky foundations. This is so despite Sharp’s
(1996) claim that Australia is “a country which has had the foresight to welcome the strangers knocking at her door, and the courage to embark on an experiment with multiculturalism” (p. 3). As suggested by Goeudevert (2002):

> If we brush aside the buzzwords, we discover that most of us live ‘in one spot’, that we have remained what Schlegel once described as nothing but – more or less – rational oysters. Immobile and inward-looking, rigid, tight-lipped, and tormented by fears of loss, we hide our ‘pearls’ away without realizing that the value of these riches can only truly be appreciated through the eyes of others and in dialogue with them. (Goeudevert, 2002, p. 44)

It has to be the case that the history which has shaped Australian society in terms of national attitudes and values will have great bearing on the worldview of many of the nation’s individuals. It follows, then, that the way in which the Profile’s requirements are regarded, particularly with reference to openness and acceptance of cultural difference, is actually somewhat at the mercy of historical circumstance.

The third observation is related to the first and the second observations in this section and it is simply that any effort to imbue an ethic of cosmopolitanism into individuals and social institutions is a significant challenge. As posited by Luke (2004), “to rebuild teaching as a cosmopolitan form of work requires a major rethinking of teacher education. It would entail an exploration and articulation of the ethical and moral dimensions of teaching as work in relation to globalized flows and economics” (p. 1439). The challenge is to instigate this sort of change in a Western university setting which, according to Smith and Webster (1997b) is “narrowly instrumental, one can say passive” (p. 4). To effect such change would have to be seen as a long-term undertaking.
The fourth observation is about the conditions that would have to be satisfied for a person or an organisation to be described as having a cosmopolitan outlook. In the current milieu, people, objects, images, and ideas are being transported around the globe at unprecedented speeds and levels. It is easy to take the apparently cosmopolitan for more than what it is. Matthews and Sidhu (2005) referred to this as “banal cosmopolitanism” (p. 53):

Banal cosmopolitanism stands accused of producing little in the way of commitment to globally oriented citizenship. Banal cosmopolitanism, the consumption of global brands, icons, peoples, heroes, public figures, foreign travel and multicultural food, does not necessarily include an awareness of global issues such as world peace, global warming, environmental destruction and global human rights. It does not necessarily extend to ethical and moral considerations commitments to a global community. (Matthews & Sidhu, 2005, p. 53)

The deep engagement with cosmopolitanism that is promoted both by Matthews and Sidhu (2005) and the Profile is not of the banal kind. It is not the sort of cosmopolitanism that fits Wildman’s (2000) description of “the new cosmopolitan elite of ‘symbolic analysts’ who control the technologies and forces of production” (p. 107). It is not the sort of cosmopolitanism that is necessarily brought about by tourism. As suggested by Hofstede (2001), tourism “represents the most superficial form of intercultural encounter” (p. 452).

Further, the extensive overseas work of some university administrators, academics, and marketers does not guarantee deep engagement with cosmopolitanism. Campbell’s (1996) analogy of people being either frogs or snails with regard to dealing with other cultures is interesting in this regard. The frogs are
happy to jump headlong into the cultural pond and let diversity and difference wash over them. This attitude it is clearly inherent in the Profile and it resonates with Giddens’s (2002) belief that cosmopolitans welcome and embrace cultural complexity. The snails, however, carry their houses (their culture) on their back wherever they go, hardly exposing themselves to other cultures at all. The cosmopolitanism of the snails is a banal, facile illusion of cosmopolitanism. It is similar to the sort of elitist cosmopolitanism of the European aristocracy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that revelled in the exotica of faraway places but did not engage with diversity and difference in any meaningful, reciprocal, humanistic way at all. People who are snail-like in their approach to life at home and travel and work in other countries reinforce Hofstede’s (2001) observation that “intercultural contact does not automatically breed mutual understanding” (p. 424, emphasis in original).

Despite the four preceding observations, the concept of cosmopolitanism sits well with the sort of individual internationalisation that is promoted by the Profile’s ideal. As much as it may be a test for individuals to incorporate a deep cosmopolitan outlook into their lives, the general tenor in the literature is that global forces require something akin to cosmopolitanism incorporated into a broader and revised cosmolology if humanity is to progress, indeed flourish, past the immediate future (O’Sullivan, 1999; Keane, 2003; Slade, 2002; Suzuki, 1998; Suzuki & Dressel, 2004). This sentiment is expressed well by Saul (2005):

The more complicated our national and international relationships are, the more all of us will need to use our most complicated sense of belonging both
to feel at home and to find multiple ways to be at home with the widest variety of people and situations. (Saul, 2005, p. 280)

Summary of Perspective 2: The Profile’s place in the literature on the internationalisation of higher education

Whilst Knight’s work has had a big impact on how internationalisation is interpreted in Australian higher education, it is oriented more towards broad organisational outcomes than within-institution activities. The Profile, then, is an important contribution to the internationalisation literature at the within-institution level. Further, it is a unique offering in this area by virtue of it being ultimately a consolidated, whole-of-person approach to internationalisation practices in higher education. The Profile requires lecturers to understand their own culture. To this end, it is supported by the literature on transformative education theory and Cranton’s (2001) views on authenticity in teaching in higher education. The Profile also requires lecturers to be open to the different values and behaviours of those from other cultures. To this end, it is supported by the literature on the concept of cosmopolitanism. In fact, the Profile should ultimately be viewed as an expression of the cosmopolitan lecturer in higher education. Such a disposition is not only supported by the literature on what type of lecturer is best-suited to working in contemporary higher education, but also the type of citizen that is best-suited to life in the Twenty-First century.

Perspective 3: Return to the Profile

This perspective revisits some central characteristics of the Profile as it is presented by Teekens (2000d). It is essentially a summary of the Profile’s strengths
and limitations. This is a fitting way to conclude this chapter in preparation for an examination of the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students by means of research on actual teaching practice.

The categories of Knowledge, Skills, & Attitude

The categories of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude are central to the Profile and are explored here in greater depth compared to their introductory treatment in Chapter II. The three categories are explained in terms of the cognitive and affective domains of Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives (Bloom, Krathwohl, & Masia, 1971; Bloom, 1974). It is suggested that the Attitude category, in particular, is an important feature of the Profile because of the way that it incorporates the concept of value into its framework. This sort of dialogue is not overly prevalent in the contemporary literature that guides the work of lecturers in higher education. Whilst there is no mention of any theoretical background which supports the categories of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude either in the Profile itself or in Teekens’s (2000d) accompanying commentary, it is fitting that the categories be transposed onto Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives. Moseley, Baumfield, Elliott, Gregson, Higgins, and Miller et al. (2005) referred to Benjamin Bloom as a “towering figure in the field of instructional design” (p. 45) and commented that he, along with his colleagues, have produced a theory of learning that “has certainly proved to be meaningful and useful to teachers and other educational professionals” (p. 54). Given that the Profile has risen from practice to inform practice, its pragmatic nature complements Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives.
Knowledge & Skills categories

The Profile’s Knowledge and Skills categories are representative of Bloom’s (1974) cognitive domain, the original hierarchical taxonomy which has been modified in light of advances in cognitive psychology since Bloom’s original work in the early-to-mid 1970s. The cognitive processes associated with the taxonomy are now described as (1) remembering, (2) understanding, (3) applying, (4) analysing, (5) evaluating, and (6) creating knowledge (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 268). In addition, different types of knowledge have now been identified (see Table 3.5).

The major types and sub-types of knowledge in Table 3.5 are all represented in the Profile’s criteria. It is expected that lecturers would have factual knowledge relating to teaching practice as well as culture (for example, culture-specific knowledge). They would also have a command of conceptual knowledge in terms of knowing about theories of teaching and cultural theory (for example, deep and surface approaches to learning and Hofstede’s model of cultural dimensions). Procedural knowledge would be the basis for their intercultural communication and teaching skills, and metacognitive knowledge would give them the capacity to reflect on their teaching practice and to understand the assumptions of their own culture and the cultures of others. Moreover, it is expected that lecturers would be able to engage in the six cognitive processes listed by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) (listed in the previous paragraph) in order to utilise their knowledge for the best outcomes.

For Bloom (1974), the best use of knowledge was to help people solve problems and to respond to situations. To do this, it had to be used in conjunction
with specific techniques or skills. Together, knowledge and skills represented “abilities” (Bloom, 1974, p. 38). It is recognised that knowledge, skills, and abilities are critical components of intercultural competence (Hofstede, 2001), multicultural training (Pedersen, 1988), cross-cultural training and education (Brislin & Horvath, 1997) and, clearly, the Profile.

Table 3.5 *Major types & sub-types of the knowledge dimension*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major types and sub-types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Factual knowledge – The basic elements students must know to be acquainted with a discipline or solve problems in it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA. Knowledge of terminology</td>
<td>Technical vocabulary, musical symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB. Knowledge of specific details and elements</td>
<td>Major natural resources, reliable sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Conceptual knowledge – The interrelationships among the basic elements within a larger structure that enable them to function together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA. Knowledge of classifications and categories</td>
<td>Periods of geological time, forms of business ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB. Knowledge of principles and generalizations</td>
<td>Pythagorean theorem, law of supply and demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC. Knowledge of theories, models and structures</td>
<td>Theory of evolution, structure of Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Procedural knowledge – How to do something, methods of enquiry, and criteria for using skills, algorithms, techniques, and methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA. Knowledge of subject-specific skills and algorithms</td>
<td>Skills used in painting with watercolours, whole-number division algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB. Knowledge of subject-specific techniques and methods</td>
<td>Interviewing techniques, scientific method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC. Knowledge of criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures</td>
<td>Criteria used to determine when to apply a procedure involving Newton’s second law, criteria used to judge the feasibility of using a particular method to estimate business costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Metacognitive knowledge – Knowledge of cognition in general as well as an awareness and knowledge of one’s own cognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA. Strategic knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge of outlining as a means of capturing the structure of a unit of subject matter in a textbook, knowledge of the use of heuristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB. Knowledge about cognitive tasks, including appropriate contextual and conditional knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge of the types of tests particular teachers administer, knowledge of the cognitive demands of different tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC. Self-knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge that critiquing essays is a personal strength, whereas writing essays is a personal weakness; awareness of one’s own knowledge level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Anderson, Krathwohl, Airasian, Cruikshank, Mayer, Pintrich, et al. (2001, pp. 27-31).*
Attitude category

Whilst knowledge, skills, and abilities feature prominently in the literature on teaching in higher education, it is more difficult to locate information on attitude with regard to teaching practice in general and internationalised teaching practice in particular, yet one of the main features (and strengths) of the Profile is this very category. In Chapter II, attitude was defined as a way of thinking or behaving. Synonyms include “feeling, disposition, mood, point of view, opinion, view, outlook, perspective, [and] approach” (Manser & Thomson, 1995, p. 79). Hofstede (2001) subscribed to the view that attitudes and beliefs were “specific mental software” (p. 5). Patterson (1973) identified “attitudes, values and feelings” (p. 159) as important for “good behaviour” (p. 159). In a similar way to the Profile’s Knowledge and Skills categories being covered by the cognitive domain of Bloom’s (1974) taxonomy of educational objectives, the Attitude category is covered by the taxonomy’s affective domain, the hierarchical arrangement of which is presented in Table 3.6.

Patterson (1973) referred to Bloom’s affective taxonomy as being concerned with the development and internalisation of “values, attitudes, or beliefs” (p. 162). Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) pointed out that the original separation of cognitive and affective domains underestimates the fact that nearly every cognitive objective also has an affective component (p. 258). Despite the advances made in value theory in recent decades, Table 3.6 still usefully illustrates the point that the Attitude category in the Profile is ultimately grounded in the concept of value, that is, as
suggested by Hofstede (1991), “broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others” (p. 35) which are the “core element in culture” (p. 35).

Table 3.6 Categories & sub-divisions of the affective domain of educational objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-division</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Receiving (attending)</td>
<td>AA. Awareness</td>
<td>conscious of, and taking into account, a situation, phenomenon, or object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB. Willingness to receive</td>
<td>willing or tolerant of a given stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC. Controlled or selected attention</td>
<td>differentiating aspects of a stimulus from adjacent impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Responding</td>
<td>BA. Acquiescence in responding</td>
<td>behaviour is compliant but passive in terms of its initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB. Willingness to respond</td>
<td>voluntary response of consent from own choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC. Satisfaction in response</td>
<td>a certain behaviour brings an emotional response of pleasure and satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Valuing</td>
<td>CA. Acceptance of a value</td>
<td>ascribing worth to a phenomenon, behaviour, or object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB. Preference for a value</td>
<td>commitment to a value such that it is pursued, sought out and wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC. Commitment (conviction)</td>
<td>firm acceptance of a value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Organisation</td>
<td>DA. Conceptualisation of a value</td>
<td>how a particular value relates to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DB. Organisation of a value system</td>
<td>bringing together a complex value system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Characterisation</td>
<td>EA. Generalised set</td>
<td>a cluster of values and attitudes that guide action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB. Characterisation</td>
<td>internally consistent attitudes, values, beliefs and ideas that define a person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Bloom, Krathwohl, and Masia (1971, p. 95) and supplemented with text from pp. 95-185.

Keeping the idea of value in mind, the types of attitudes that are evident in the Profile are being accepting, aware, flexible, interested, understanding, open-minded, reflective, respectful, supportive, and tolerant. In terms of dealing with cultural difference, they describe the responses in the column titled openness in Figure 3.4, as opposed to those in the column titled discomfort. In particular, the Profile’s idealised nature (that is, at Level 3 teaching) corresponds specifically with
‘E. Characterisation by a value or value complex’ in Table 3.6. It is an internalised, self-referentially consistent value system which is, according to Bloom, Krathwohl, and Masia (1971), “so encompassing that [it tends] to characterize the individual almost completely and underwrites one’s philosophy of life, one’s Weltanschauung” (p. 185, emphasis in original).
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**Figure 3.4** Responses to “You’re different from me”  
(Source. Sinclair & Britton Wilson, 1999, p. 22)

The attitudes expressed in the Profile paint a picture of a person’s disposition rather than a teaching method or technique. Following this theme, Schwen (1998)
noted that in discussions with people about what they remembered of the good
teachers they had experienced, there was no particular teaching technique or style
that shone through. Instead, “they invariably had in common certain attitudes toward
their craft or subject and toward their pupils as well. They moreover had certain
qualities of character in common – integrity, truthfulness, compassion, dedication,
empathy, attentiveness and love were frequently mentioned” (p. 75). This view is
supported by Patterson (1973) who suggested that good teaching is not simply about
knowledge and method; the “person of the teacher is more important than the method …
how they teach and how they act [is] more important than what they teach” (pp. 97-98).
Similarly, for Stanton (1978), good teaching which led to sound learning
outcomes seemed to be a function of a lecturer’s “personality” (p. 22) rather than any
particular method of teaching.

It may well be that the reason why it is difficult to locate contemporary
eamples from the higher education literature which exemplify the types of attitudes
that are evident in the Profile is because of the diminished role of affective education
has been a subordination of moral and ethical training to the production of job skills”
(p. 1438). Whilst the literature is abundant with references about knowledge and
skills for teaching, some time ago Patterson (1973) noted that a goal of education is
to produce self-actualising people who not only have scientific and technological
knowledge but also a capacity to manage human relationships (p. 159). He suggested
that from the 1950s, however, curricula have been directed more towards cognitive
ends than helping people develop humanistic values. This, in Patterson’s (1973) view, was unsatisfactory:

For though we face difficult scientific and technical problems in society, our greatest problem is that of living together in peace, of creating a society of self-actualizing persons. Yet we have made no concerted effort to educate people in how to live together, how to understand, respect, and love each other. (Patterson, 1973, p. 160)

Although Patterson’s (1973) reflections were made over three decades ago, they are more relevant than ever in this current period of globalisation. In fact, it is somewhat deflating to contemplate his observations in light of humanity ostensibly still struggling to produce such affective outcomes at a time when the world has become a smaller and more interconnected place. Still, given O’Sullivan’s (1999) claim that the ends of contemporary education are largely instrumental in a bid to perpetuate the “progress [of the] technological-industrial society” (p. 49), this should not come as a complete surprise. It is little wonder that it is difficult to find a contemporary, cohesive, and comprehensive body of knowledge in higher education theory and research that relates to the value-based category of Attitude as it appears in the Profile, given the current diminution of the role of affective education and its attendant capacity to develop self-awareness, as well as “awareness of others, exploration in interpersonal relationships and the fostering of good interpersonal relationships characterized by empathetic understanding, respect, warmth, and genuineness” (Patterson, 1973, p. 163). This is despite the critical role that values obviously play in the internationalisation of higher education.
In response to Webb’s (2005) statement that “internationalisation of the curriculum … incorporates a range of values, including openness, tolerance and culturally inclusive behaviour” (p. 110), it has to be asked how universities encourage their staff and students to embrace such values, for it is not more than superficially apparent in the literature nor in the public discourses arising from the universities themselves. Therefore, the extent to which the Profile incorporates an affective component into its fabric should be seen as one of its major strengths, for it draws attention to values that underwrite an individual’s internationalised personal and professional outlook. This is timely, given the claim made by the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996) that there is “every reason to place renewed emphasis on the moral and cultural dimensions in education, enabling each person to grasp the individuality of other people” (p. 19).

**Consolidating the strengths & limitations of the Profile**

The remainder of this chapter consolidates the Profile’s strengths and limitations.

**The Profile’s strengths**

Thus far, Chapters II and III have established the following as strengths of the Profile. First, the Profile has a strong practical origin and orientation. This does not, however, mean that it is intellectually barren in a scholarly sense. Whilst the Profile is thinly referenced, the literature review in Chapter II and Chapter III has shown that many of its claims reflect what the literature suggests is good teaching practice in general. Further, if it is accepted that the good internationalised teaching practice it
espouses is directed at helping international students adapt or adjust to the academic expectations of the host institution, then the Profile is also largely supported by educational theory.

Second, the Profile is a valuable contribution to internationalisation theory and higher education. It is particularly important because it focuses on the within-institution level of internationalisation whereas the dominant body of contemporary literature largely focuses on internationalisation at the organisational level. Third, the fundamental foundations of the Profile are supported by transformative learning theory as well as the concept of cosmopolitanism. Both of these concepts, whilst not made explicit by the Profile’s creators, nevertheless shore up and complement the Profile’s intent and provide a pathway to embracing its ethic. This pathway is grounded in practice that is both self-reflective and critically self-reflective.

Fourth, when considered in association with Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching, the Profile’s ideal can be interpreted as a staged process which has value for lecturers at each level. This is a pragmatic outcome that can help lecturers at Level 1 teaching to recognise culture in the classroom in ways that are neither negative nor dismissive. It can help lecturers moving through Level 2 teaching to utilise specific teaching strategies that are recognised to be useful for assisting international students as they adapt or adjust to the local teaching and learning framework. It can also help lecturers heading towards Level 3 teaching to accept and appreciate cultural difference in such a way that the focus in the teaching process is not on differentiation between cultures, but instead on the universality of the
educative process. Fifth, the Profile introduces an affective dimension to teaching in higher education which is ultimately characterised by a whole-of-person approach to teaching practice. The values that underpin a lecturer’s teaching practice cannot be separated from the life values of the lecturer.

Pondering on humanistic education, Patterson (1973) said that “while many writers have criticized teachers for not being humanistic, none have described the characteristics of the humanistic teacher” (p. 115). The same might well be said of the internationalisation of teaching practice in relation to teaching international students. Whilst the internationalisation of curricula has been a topic of discussion in recent years, very little has focused on what this really means for university lecturers beyond perhaps a need to internationalise curriculum content. To this end, the Profile is a timely addition to the literature on the internationalisation of university teaching and transformative, cosmopolitan themes in education. It provides a unique and instructive insight into the changing university environment, particularly in relation to teaching and learning which acknowledges cultural, language, and educational diversity. This is especially so in the way that the Profile centres culture and intercultural communication as important features of contemporary teaching and learning. At the very least, the Profile should raise awareness and generate discussion amongst a variety of stakeholders in higher education. It should also support lecturers who are progressing towards Biggs’s (2003) Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’.

As was made apparent in the discussion of Cranton’s (2001) authenticity in teaching in higher education, plus the concept of cosmopolitanism and education,
part of the Profile’s uniqueness is that it ultimately advocates a whole-of-person approach to teaching. This is not new to the literature. Johnson (1996), for example, offered suggestions to lecturers about how to manage their time at home and their family budget, with the view that a balanced life in general provides the foundation for good teaching practice. Most of the literature concerned with teaching international students, however, is presented as hints and tips for better practice. Although it is understandable why this is so, it assumes that the lecturer also has an attitude that will sustain an expanded repertoire of practice, that is, as mentioned previously, life values such as openness, respect, interconnectivity, interdependence, reciprocity, and plurality. This is where the Profile is of great educational benefit. It is a consolidated view of the sort of person that would be able to respond to the challenges of lecturing in a classroom characterised by cultural, language, and educational diversity. As put by Patterson (1973), “the genuine teacher is, then, not using a method or a technique as something outside himself, for his methods or techniques are an integral part of himself” (p. 103). In this regard, the Profile is well-positioned to guide lecturers to be amongst the cosmopolitans of the Twenty-First century. It offers something worthwhile to aim for, both personally and professionally.

**The Profile’s limitations**

Whilst the Profile has a number of strengths, it also has some limitations. Two of these were noted in Chapters II and III. One is that the Profile neglects to fully consider the difficulties that EAL students will most likely encounter in an English-speaking education environment. This is an oversight that must be addressed
in any revision of the Profile. The second limitation is that the Profile is somewhat ambiguous with regard to how it sits with globalisation theory. Whilst it has been suggested that the transformationalist view of globalisation can rescue the Profile from its (at times contradictory) hyperglobalist tendencies, the degree to which the Profile subscribes to a multi-reference grid educational outlook is a weakness arising from an overestimation of the outcomes associated with contemporary global forces. What has been emphasised in Chapters II and III is that national borders still have a great degree of influence on the makeup of educational settings and as a consequence international students have to make significant adjustments to fit in with the expectations of Western academe. Whilst the transformationalist view of globalisation accommodates some hyperglobalist possibilities for higher education, the continuing strong agency of nation states means that the best that might be achieved in the immediate future is a willingness on the part of Western institutions and individual lecturers to embrace the opportunity for their own transformative, cosmopolitan possibilities in the midst of the cultural, language, and education diversity.

Apart from the observations made above, the Profile has other limitations. With regard to structural matters, it was noted throughout Chapter II that some of the Profile’s criteria seem poorly worded given the categories in which they are located. In particular, the way that criteria Q1 A2, Q2 A2, Q2 A3, and Q3 A1 (all in the Attitude category) are literally expressed makes them more suited to the Knowledge category, for they are about being aware of things rather than being expressions of attitudes towards those things. It is not difficult to transform each criterion into a
corresponding statement of attitude and any revision of the Profile could address this. Further, whilst many of the Profile’s criteria are concise, general statements of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, they are invariably based on complex concepts. For example, criterion Q1 S1 states that “The lecturer must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs” (from Table 1.1). Whilst this is a reasonable expectation, it does not present the reader with any particular skills to satisfy the statement’s requirements, nor does it lead them to literature that outlines the types of skills that could be employed.

It could also be argued that another limitation is the Profile’s ideal appearing as an end state, or end point. Whilst this is ameliorated somewhat if the Profile is viewed as a set of staged ideals in the Biggsian sense, there are at least three associated challenges with the notion of an ideal as an ultimate expression of a state of being. First, the Profile has an abundance of requirements. This is a challenge from a practical point of view, given Teekens’s (2000d) observation that the real world places “limitations and constraints” (p. 38) on what lecturers and institutions might ideally want to achieve. Second, the Profile offers no advice on how to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are evident in its qualifications and criteria. Whilst this does not diminish the value of the Profile per se, more detailed information at this intermediate step is crucial if the Profile’s requirements are to be pursued. Whilst the Profile makes a big leap from the likely station of most lecturers to that of an ideal lecturer, it is evident that changes in knowledge, skills, and

---

17 Meyer (1998) introduced this term.
attitudes will need to be initially and subsequently brought about by an awareness of the constituent parts of those very categories, as well as the relationships between them. To this end, it is clear that professional development has a critical role to play in helping lecturers internationalise their personal and professional outlooks. For most individuals, the only way to become cosmopolitan educators is to learn about the virtues of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan teaching practice and to be encouraged to embrace its ethic.

Third, in light of Pedersen’s (1988) claim that multicultural development is a continuous learning process (p. 8), it is a mistake to think of the Profile’s ideal as having arrived. There is a need for ongoing awareness through lifelong learning to continually reinvigorate lecturers’ personal and professional outlooks, regardless of their competence at a particular point in time. Even for lecturers at Level 3 teaching, there is always something to learn.

A further limitation of the Profile is the fact that it focuses solely on the individual lecturer. This is despite Teekens’s (2000d) accompanying commentary which recognises that a teamwork approach would be crucial given the fact that it would be difficult for any one individual to fully realise the breadth of knowledge, skills, and attitudes inherent in the Profile (p. 38). Whilst Teekens (2000d) did not elaborate any further than the mention of team teaching and working in groups to develop internationalised curricula for teaching, there is much to be said for a group of like-minded professional educators working together from the point of view of general support for each other, sharing of responsibilities, and the pursuit of common
educational goals. This applies at the departmental level as well as within networks which extend into other academic, service, and administrative departments across the university and, indeed, beyond the university itself. Although the suggestion by Teekens (2000d) about the lecturer being part of a team and the importance of creating support networks is absent from the Profile itself, it certainly should feature in it. The Profile is a revolutionary way of thinking about the lecturer as an individual practitioner, but as attested by the English metaphysical poet, John Donne, “No Man is an Island, intire of it self” (Edwards, 2001, p. 130). The traditional view of a teacher as a “lonely and autonomous practitioner in his or her self-contained classroom” (Engeström, 1994, p. 44) is passé. To this end, a revised Profile might include the following Attitude criterion: The lecturer should have a positive orientation to building supportive networks of like-minded colleagues and associates both within and beyond the university.

**Countering a possible counter-argument to the Profile’s usefulness**

The Profile is a response to a rapidly changing and volatile world. Whilst its creators may have overestimated the extent of current global flows, the growing cultural, language, and educational diversity in Australian higher education institutions nevertheless presents a strong case for universities to take heed of the Profile’s claims, not only in terms of the core business of teaching that is undertaken in universities, but also in relation to the university as an organisation in the early days of the Twenty-First century. The discussion throughout Chapters II and III (see, in particular, the section in this chapter titled ‘Cosmopolitanism and education’) has made a strong case for the relevance of the Profile to contemporary higher education
from the point of view of the individual lecturer. This in itself should be sufficient to address any possible counter-argument to the Profile’s usefulness. Still, an argument might be made that insufficient engagement by Australian universities qua organisations with the subject matter of the Profile could indicate that it lacks relevance to contemporary higher education. This section, then, anticipates this counter-argument and briefly formalises a response.

In the mid-1990s, IDP Education Australia predicted that international students would comprise 26 per cent of total Australian higher education enrolments by 2010 (IDP Education Australia, 1996). By 2004, onshore and offshore enrolments of international students had almost reached the predicted figure, representing 24.2 per cent of total enrolments in Australian higher education (Australian Government, 2005d, Citizenship, Overseas). Many Australian lecturers (and Australian students) now work with hitherto unprecedented numbers of students from different cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. Despite Biggs’s (2003) assertion that good teaching (Level 3 teaching) makes ethnicity irrelevant in the educative process, cultural differences are conspicuous by their presence in most classrooms. Many lecturers will either be busy helping international students adapt or adjust to the requirements of the academic setting or be trying to understand how they might do this. There is a need, then, for universities not only to support lecturers to become better teachers, but to do this within a framework of engagement with the significant cultural, language, and educational diversity in their midst. In doing so, Australian higher education will open itself to its own transformative possibilities.
Another argument in support of the Profile relates to the concept of productive diversity in the workplace that was expounded by Cope and Kalantzis (1997) in response to the unprecedented changes in work in particular and in the world in general. The concept utilises diversity as an organisational resource and makes a strong case for embracing the sort of cosmopolitan ethic that is ultimately promoted by the Profile:

We need to be able to live and work with this paradox of an increased social interconnectedness that throws differences into sharper relief, and of shared tasks and experiences which make dealing with differences more critical in our everyday lives. (Cope & Kalantzis, 1997, p. 3)

This way of thinking is similar to the substance of the discussion in the section titled ‘Cosmopolitanism and education’ earlier in this chapter but the focus is on the way that diversity boosts the capital of organisations in the global business environment. It is a practical response to the changing nature of business and work and it is just as pertinent for organisations as it is for individuals. An organisation that fosters a cosmopolitan outlook amongst its employees so that they might engage positively with diversity is going to be better placed to take advantage of the opportunities brought about by current global flows. Given that the Profile encourages lecturers to develop a cosmopolitan outlook that appreciates and is comfortable with diversity, universities would do well to consider how it might best be utilised so that lecturers can engage with its substance.
Summary of Perspective 3: Return to the Profile

The Profile’s Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude categories can be transposed onto Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives. The Knowledge and Skills categories are identified with the cognitive domain, whilst the Attitude category is identified with the affective domain. The Attitude category is a particular strength of the Profile because it draws attention to values that underwrite an individual’s internationalised personal and professional outlook. These include being accepting, understanding, aware, flexible, interested, open-minded, reflective, respectful, supportive, and tolerant. Such values are highlighted in the literature related to culture and cosmopolitanism as being necessary for work and life in the Twenty-First century. Apart from the Profile’s affective dimension being one of its strengths, other strengths were also noted. For example, the Profile is a valuable contribution to internationalisation theory at the within-institution level. It has a strong practical origin and orientation and many of its claims are supported by educational theory. Further, the fundamental foundations of the Profile are supported by the concept of authenticity in teaching in higher education as well as by the concept of cosmopolitanism.

The Profile’s strengths notwithstanding, a number of limitations were also listed. The Profile neglects to fully consider the difficulties that EAL students will most likely encounter in an English-speaking education environment. The Profile’s (at times contradictory) hyperglobalist tendencies are an overestimation of the impact of global forces. Some of the Profile’s criteria seem poorly worded given the categories in which they are located. Whilst many of the Profile’s criteria are
concise, general statements of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, they invariably invoke complex concepts. The Profile does not elaborate to any extent on the meaning of its criteria; nor does it lead the reader to any literature that might assist in this regard. The Profile’s ideal appears as an end state and this has at least three associated challenges. First, the Profile has an abundance of requirements. This is a challenge from a practical point of view. Second, the Profile offers no advice on how to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are evident in its qualifications and criteria. Third, rather than thinking of the Profile’s ideal as having arrived, lecturers need to be lifelong learners to continually reinvigorate their personal and professional outlooks. Another limitation of the Profile is the fact that it focuses solely on the individual lecturer, despite the fact that there is much to be said for a group of like-minded professional educators working together from the point of view of supporting each other, sharing responsibilities, and pursuing common educational goals.

Conclusion to Chapter III

The focus of this chapter has been to build on the findings of Chapter II to determine how the foundations of the Profile are supported by the various bodies of literature upon which it draws. The three perspectives which have been the focus of this chapter have engaged with the substance of the Profile in a way that exceeds the conceptual analysis presented in Teekens’s (2000a) edited publication. It has provided a sophisticated understanding of the Profile through a deep consideration of its location in the literature on globalisation theory and internationalisation theory in relation to higher education. Its relationship with authenticity in teaching in higher
education, transformative learning theory, and cosmopolitanism has also been made evident. Further, the main strengths and limitations of the Profile have also been made clear. What is heartening about the conceptual framework that has been generated around the Profile in both Chapters II and III is the fact that despite the Profile’s limitations, there is a certain logic which has emerged from the theoretical and research literature that supports many of the Profile’s claims. This augurs well for the relevance of its original aim as a useful mechanism to enable various stakeholders in higher education to appreciate the qualities that are required by lecturers working with the cultural, language, and educational diversity that is fast becoming a hallmark of the contemporary higher education milieu.

The review of the literature in this chapter in relation to the Profile’s claims has resulted in the following findings that are central to understanding how its foundations are supported by theory (Associated Question 1 of the Key Research Questions) (they will be revisited in the conclusions drawn from the overall investigation in Chapter VI):

1. The creators of the Profile have overestimated the impact of contemporary global flows and have assumed, therefore, that higher education must change to reflect the hyperglobalist worldview. This fails to recognise the strong regulatory role that nation-states still play and the continuing influence they have over social institutions such as education. Similarly, it also fails to recognise the strong role that culture plays in a country’s education system in terms of the value(s) ascribed to certain approaches to teaching and learning.
2. The Profile is an important contribution to the internationalisation literature at the within-institution level. Further, it is a unique offering to the literature in this area by virtue of the fact that it advocates a whole-of-person approach to internationalisation practices in higher education at the level of the individual lecturer.

3. The literature on transformative education theory and Cranton’s (2001) views on authenticity in teaching in higher education supports the Profile’s claims.

4. The literature on cosmopolitanism generally supports the Profile’s claims, although rooted, or grounded, cosmopolitanism is more appropriate than the universal cosmopolitanism that the Profile seems to espouse. The Profile should ultimately be viewed as an expression of the cosmopolitan lecturer in higher education. Such a disposition is not only supported by the literature on the type of lecturer that is best-suited to working in contemporary higher education, but also the type of citizen that is best-suited to life in the Twenty-First century.

5. The Profile’s Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude categories can be transposed onto Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives. The Knowledge and Skills categories are identified with the cognitive domain, whilst the Attitude category is identified with the affective domain. The Attitude category is a particular strength of the Profile because it draws attention to values that underwrite an individual’s internationalised personal and professional
outlook, such as being accepting, understanding, aware, flexible, interested, open-minded, reflective, respectful, supportive, and tolerant. Such values are highlighted in literature as being necessary for work and life in the Twenty-First century.
CHAPTER IV
EXAMINING THE PROFILE’S PILLAR OF PRACTICE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY & METHODS

Introduction to Chapter IV

This chapter describes the research methodology and methods that are used in the part of the investigation which examines the pillar of the Profile that is related to teaching practice. It begins by acknowledging the diversity of approaches to educational research and supports the view that whilst there is room for all approaches, it is important that the methodology and methods for any particular investigation should be determined by the nature of the phenomena being studied. Following this, the research approach of this investigation is located in the qualitative tradition and a brief outline is provided of some of the defining characteristics of that approach. The particular research specialisation is then identified as a version of phenomenography which seeks to describe the ways that lecturers in the allied health department relate to the Profile’s criteria as discrete phenomena. Following this, the issue of validity in qualitative research is addressed. Features of the qualitative case study are then described, for this is the fundamental form of this part of the investigation.

Details are also provided about the design of the case study and the sampling technique. Discussion then extends to the practicalities of undertaking the actual research, for example, how access to the research site was negotiated, as well as the mechanism for recruiting research participants. An explanation is given as to why particular data-gathering methods were favoured over others. The strengths and
limitations of the data-gathering methods are also discussed and the process for
determining how meaning will be established from the interview data is outlined.
The pre-testing and pilot-testing of the research instruments is described and ethical
issues associated with this part of the investigation are made clear.

To avoid confusion, throughout the chapter, the term methodology refers to
the theoretical approaches and traditions that underwrite this part of the investigation.
The term method(s) refers to particular ways of gathering information such as survey
questionnaires and interviews. This follows the convention adopted by Silverman
(2000). Throughout this chapter, the author of this investigation is designated as the researcher.

Choosing a research approach

Carspecken (1996) commented that a room filled with social researchers
would be a cacophony of cliques, with each exhorting its own distinctive jargon and
cultural style (p. 1). For de Landsheere (1997), this reflected the growing diversity
and complexity in research approaches (p. 15). Keeves, too, (1997) noted this trend
in contemporary educational research:

There is now a greatly increased variety in the strategies and tactics employed
in research into educational problems, as well as in the methods, theoretical
perspectives and analytical procedures that are being used to investigate the
processes and practices, the context and conditions, and the products and
policies which occur in the field of education. (Keeves, 1997, p. xv)

An initial challenge for all researchers would appear to be the question of
where to locate themselves in terms of a specific approach to their research. More
often than not, their decision is informed by what they know from their training as well as by following the lead of their peers, colleagues, associates, and experts in the field (Paul & Marfo, 2001, p. 527). These thoughts were echoed by Slade (2002) who suggested that choosing a research approach largely boiled down to “cultural preference, … peer group pressure (the adult, professional kind), available skills, interests, traditions, conventions and individual levels of comfort and confidence” (p. 98, parentheses and ellipsis points in original). Selecting a particular methodology because of reasons such as these, however, does not necessarily imply a solid rationale for one’s position. The starting point for any researcher should be to reflect on their own worldview, what they want to investigate, and why they want to do this. Considered and honest answers to questions such as these will help determine the most suitable methodological approach and the most appropriate methods for generating data. The most important thing is to be rigorous, self-referentially consistent, and flexible enough to do justice to the proposed investigation.

**Different research approaches**

Educational research includes several approaches or traditions, of which two are most prominent. The first is the largely scientific approach deriving from natural science which was dominant throughout most of the 1900s. This approach has been variously classified as the quantitative, scientific, positivist, empirical, logical empiricist, or objectivist way of undertaking research. Its interest lies in explanation in causal terms, or “Erklären” (Keeves, 1997, p. 4). The second prominent approach includes newer perspectives and methods offered by humanistic researchers since the early 1970s (although its roots go back to the beginning of the last century). This
approach is sometimes described as the qualitative, interpretive, humanistic, or subjectivist approach to research. Its main interest is in interpretation and understanding, or “Verstehen” (Keeves, 1997, p. 4). It should be noted that there exists a diversity of ontological, epistemological, and methodological positions not only between each approach but also within each approach. It is also important to recognise that it is not so much the distinction between different approaches that is critical, but the degree to which the observations and findings ultimately benefit the human condition (Keeves, 1997, p. 3).

Whilst it is important for a researcher to be grounded in a particular research approach, they should not become so defensive of that approach that they ignore or denigrate the ability of other approaches to assist in providing a broader explanation or interpretation of reality. For Appadurai (1997) this extended beyond just Western ways of thinking and knowing. As Burns (1999) suggested, “there is more than one gate to the kingdom of knowledge. Each gate offers a different perspective, but no one perspective exhausts the realm of ‘reality’ – whatever that may be” (p. 11). Keeves (1997) recognised the tensions between proponents of the various research approaches over the years. He suggested that this has actually hampered the outcomes of investigation into educational problems (p. 1). To this end, the position adopted in this investigation is to acknowledge that there are pluralistic views of knowledge that characterise educational research and that this calls for a collaborative research culture (Paul & Marfo, 2001). As de Landsheere (1997) insisted, it is no longer either-or, but both as “the scientific approach is seen to be complementary to the anthropological, historical, phenomenological, or humanistic
approach” (p. 9). A unity of purpose in educational research respects the capacity of quantitative, qualitative, and other viewpoints to help add clarity to explaining and understanding human behaviour and the real world. It is logically possible for the qualitative and quantitative approaches to work collaboratively in social science and educational investigations. Husén (1997) made this clear by use of an example of research from teaching which mixed approaches constructively to demonstrate how human behaviour in a single classroom could be interpreted in a national or international context (by quantitative means) as well as describing the classroom itself as a unique phenomenon (by qualitative means) (p. 20).

Regarding the question of which research approach is best for a particular investigation, Keeves (1997) said that the methodology and methods selected for educational enquiry should “be influenced by the nature of the problems being considered” (p. 6). Silverman (2000), too, said that the research approach selected should “depend on what you are trying to find out” (p. 1). This common sense view is exactly the position outlined below by Bereiter (1994) and one to which this investigation subscribes:

There is no basis for claiming one view or another gives us a better account of how things really are, and so we are free to choose or to mix-and-match in whatever way gains us an advantage in solving problems. The pragmatically best choice for an educator would not necessarily be the best choice for a neuroscientist. Indeed, the choice for a science educator might not be the same as for an educator concerned with the study of literature. (Bereiter, 1994, p. 21)
The broad research approach used in this investigation

The Profile’s focus on the level of the individual lecturer as outlined in Chapter II and Chapter III, plus the decision to undertake a case study on a small teaching department to examine teaching practice in relation to the Profile’s claims, necessarily directs the research methodology and methods that are utilised in this investigation. Given that the overall investigation is located in the areas of humanistic and transformative education, it is naturally predisposed to regarding existential and phenomenological aspects of the individual actor, or the Self. This, in conjunction with the use of research methods that best suit a small sample, characterises the research as a qualitative investigation. This section briefly points out the main characteristics of the qualitative research approach to provide some perspective on the ontological and epistemological foundations of this investigation.

Strauss and Corbin (1990) said that the term *qualitative research* meant different things to different people. For them, it generally indicated a “nonmathematical [sic] analytic procedure” (p. 18) which produced findings from sources such as observation, interview, documents, books, videotapes, and even quantified data. A more expressive description of the essence of the qualitative approach was provided by Denzin and Lincoln (2000):

> Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretative, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretative, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 3)
Qualitative research is an umbrella term that describes a variety of research approaches and methods. de Landsheere (1997) cited anthropology, sociology, politics, history, linguistics, and philosophy as examples of disciplines in which researchers commonly employ a qualitative or humanistic approach to research (p. 8, p. 13). As well as being regularly encountered within these (and other) disciplines, there are also qualitative research approaches that span disciplines, such as “interactionism, feminism, postmodernism and ethnomethodology” (Silverman, 2000, p. 8). Despite the diversity within the qualitative tradition, there are nevertheless some common themes that characterise qualitative research and these are presented in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1</th>
<th>The preferences of qualitative researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A preference for qualitative data – understood simply as the analysis of words and images rather than numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A preference for naturally occurring data – observation rather than experiment, unstructured rather than structured interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A preference for meanings rather than behaviour – attempting ‘to document the world from the point of view of the people studied’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A rejection of natural science as a model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A preference for inductive, hypothesis-generating research rather than hypothesis testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Silverman (2000, p. 8).*

The roots of qualitative forms of enquiry lie in hermeneutics which originally described the interpretation and understanding of scriptural texts. This term has come to be used more widely to include the interpretation of human actions, customs, and social practices (Williamson, 2000, p. 141). Qualitative researchers, sometimes

---

18 Regarding the fourth point in Table 4.1, although natural science does have a place in the research of certain phenomena, other phenomena are more suited to qualitative enquiry, for example, the case study that is the focus of this part of the investigation. Miles and Huberman (2002) advocated that qualitative research offered “better, more powerful methods of data analysis[sic] that illuminate the web of local causality [than] conventional statistical canons” (p. 395).
called interpretivists or internalists, use constructs such as culture, social context, and language to describe the social world. They maintain that social reality is shaped through social interactions (Silverman, 2000). Implicit in the qualitative notion of existence is intentionality which refers to a state of being in the world. This infers interdependence between thought and lived experience, predicated on meaning deriving from social interactions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Sarantakos, 2005). Because they have this view of existence, qualitative researchers are committed to an epistemology that embraces social constructivism and knowledge as meaning in context that is made possible by social interaction (Williamson, 2000).

Social knowledge is not something that exists independently or external to people, waiting to be discovered by untainted sensory perception. There is no unmediated access to social reality. Instead, the ontology of qualitative researchers is that the social world is mind-dependent. Accordingly, qualitative research appeals to philosophical notions of relativism, existentialism, and phenomenology.

Qualitative research studies individual cases or small groups intensely. It is ideographic rather than nomothetic because its emphasis is on understanding particular and individual behaviour (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000, p. 7). Given that the overriding concern is “to catch the subjective meanings placed on situations by participants” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000, p. 139), qualitative research takes an emic rather than an etic approach. The descriptive data produced by qualitative investigation are thick and rich. Richards (2005) referred to records of qualitative data as a “thick description” (p. 51) of the investigated situation which
“contains detail of recall and imagery, interpretive comment and contextual knowledge” (p. 51). Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000) said that the thick descriptions in qualitative data avoided “simplistic interpretation [through] reductionism” (p. 22).

Qualitative research is also field-focused and natural social settings are the direct source of data. Further, the researcher is the key data-gathering and data-producing instrument. As a result, qualitative researchers are encouraged to be reflexive about their involvement in research. It is important for a researcher to be self-aware of their presence in the field and to constantly monitor the effect and influence this may have on the research participants, the data that is generated, and, consequently, the reality that is described (Richards, 2005; Sarantakos, 2005; Silverman, 1997; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Furthermore, data generation and analysis occur simultaneously and theories are generally developed inductively by means of the evidence that is generated (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 1992, pp. 29-32). As suggested by Silverman (2000), data analysis in qualitative research happens throughout the research project rather than towards its final stages.

Whilst qualitative researchers view their approach as being better suited than the quantitative approach for researching aspects of social reality, it is also important to note some limitations and criticisms of qualitative research. In Silverman’s (2000) view, most of these stem from differences between the research processes associated with the two approaches, particularly in terms of issues such as reliability and
validity. Sarantakos (2005), too, noted some criticisms of qualitative research and these are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Common criticisms of qualitative research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Qualitative research is unable to study relationships between variables with the degree of accuracy that is required to establish social trends or inform social policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Qualitative research is based on small samples and hence does not produce representative results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalisability</td>
<td>Since qualitative studies are not representative, their findings cannot be generalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>The methodological approach does not ensure objectivity, and hence the quality of the findings is questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity and reliability</td>
<td>The research structure and procedure do not ensure the validity and reliability of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretations</td>
<td>There is no way of assuring that the researcher fully and correctly captures the true meanings and interpretations of the respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparability</td>
<td>Qualitative data do not produce data that allow comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicability</td>
<td>Given the individualist and subjectivist nature of this research model, replicability of studies is not possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>The nature of research that allows close contact with respondents can lead to ethical problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of data</td>
<td>Often, the nature of data collection leads to the production of large amounts of useless information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything goes</td>
<td>The lack of strict research procedures and the high level of subjectivity gives the impression that ‘anything goes in this research’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Qualitative enquiry is very time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Qualitative research is relatively very expensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sarantakos (2005) believed that because qualitative research has features which “represent the opposite of quantitative research” (p. 45), most of the criticisms leveraged against the former are underwritten by the assumption that the latter is a more legitimate form of enquiry. This, Sarantakos (2005) suggested, misses the point entirely because many of the criticisms of qualitative research actually highlight its strengths as a fundamentally different way of looking at the world.
The particular research approach used in this investigation

This part of the investigation will use a phenomenographic approach to generate data from phenomenologically-situated in-depth interviews. The subtle distinction between the terms *phenomenography* and *phenomenology* is important to note. Philosophers, for example, engage in phenomenology by investigating their own experiences whilst phenomenographers study the experiences of others (Marton & Booth, 1997, p. 116). As such, Marton (1981) said that phenomenography is a “second-order” (p. 177) perspective. Limberg (1999) affirmed this:

> The object of phenomenography is to explore people’s different ways of experiencing or understanding or thinking about phenomena in the world. This means that it is not phenomena in the world as such that are the objects of interest but instead people’s conceptions about phenomena. (Limberg, 1999, Phenomenography, ¶ 2)

Whilst this part of the investigation does not adhere to the classical interpretation of the phenomenographic method, it is nevertheless important to briefly highlight its background to contextualise phenomenographic data and its significance for research in higher education.

Phenomenography was developed in Sweden in the 1970s as a way of tackling education-related questions. One of its main proponents is Ference Marton, a researcher whose work was discussed in Chapter II. Marton, along with Säljö, undertook the initial research which resulted in the development of the highly-influential Student Approaches to Learning (SAL) theory. Despite phenomenography only having emerged as a research approach since the 1970s, it has been widely embraced in higher education research as a way of documenting how teachers and
students relate to real world phenomena. Lee (2005) noted that teaching and learning theory in higher education in Australia has been dominated by the phenomenographically-based work of John Biggs, Paul Ramsden, Michael Prosser, and Keith Trigwell. The work of all of these authors was featured in the literature review in Chapter II of this investigation.

Marton and Booth (1997) stated that the “unit of phenomenographic research is a way of experiencing something” (p. 111, emphasis in original) and that the objective of the research is to describe the variation in ways that people experience phenomena. An example of this is provided by Biggs (2003) who drew on research concerning lecturers’ experiences with international students. In one interview, a lecturer in dentistry said that “students from Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong [sic] appear to be much more inclined to rote learning. Such an approach does not help problem solving [sic]” (p. 122). This is the lecturer’s perception of the reality in the classroom. Another lecturer might have a different view and believe that international students engage in less rote learning than their local peers. The interest of the phenomenographer lies in the different interpretations of the two lecturers on approaches to learning of international students. Given a suitable sample size, discrete categories could be determined from the variation in the lecturers’ responses. This is how Marton and Säljö, for example, developed the categories of deep and surface approaches to learning, or SAL theory.

In this particular investigation, whilst the lecturers’ responses to the Profile’s criteria are bound to be characterised by variation, the aim is not to form discrete
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categories of variations from which to develop theory. In this sense, this investigation departs from the classical phenomenographical approach. The researcher’s prime interest is in the lecturers’ responses to the various criteria from the point of view of how such responses collectively relate to the Profile’s claims. The overriding aim of this part of the investigation, therefore, is to determine how teaching practice in the department as a department supports the Profile’s claims. More on the phenomenographic approach to working with interview data will be covered in the section titled ‘Establishing meaning from the interview data using a phenomenographic approach’ later in this chapter.

Ensuring quality in qualitative research

It is important to clarify notions associated with the validity of qualitative research, for this has great import for the credibility of this investigation. This is whether or not the term validity is used or is replaced by truth-value, trustworthiness, authenticity, goodness, transferability, dependability, or rigour. The main point to note is that despite the existence of differences between qualitative and quantitative approaches to research and the terms that are commonly used in each, the legitimacy of both approaches relies on “rigorous, critical standards that should be applied to any enterprise concerned to sort ‘fact’ from ‘fancy’” (Silverman, 2000, p. 12). Without this, any research approach could be accused of being “a patchwork of likes and dislikes, rules of thumb, analogy and prejudice, half-truths and old wives’ tales” and the “folklore of unjustified assumptions about behaviour and woolly armchair philosophising” (Burns, 1999, pp. 4-5).
The model of validity criteria for qualitative research produced by Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001) is adopted by this investigation to ensure its rigour, credibility, and quality (see Figure 4.1).

**Figure 4.1** Contemporary synthesis of validity criteria in qualitative research (Source. Whittemore, Chase & Mandle, 2001, p. 530)

This model is a contemporary synthesis of validity arising from a reconceptualisation of the main themes that have been apparent in the qualitative research literature. The term validity is used but its criteria “are reflective of the tenets of the interpretive perspective” (p. 527). With regard to validity in qualitative research, Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001) distinguished between techniques (see Table 4.3) and criteria (see Table 4.4), maintaining that the former are a
selection of methods to “diminish validity threats” (p. 528) whilst the latter are “standards to be upheld as ideals in qualitative research” (p. 528).

Table 4.3  *Techniques for demonstrating validity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of technique</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design consideration</td>
<td>Developing a self-conscious research design; Sampling decisions (i.e., sampling adequacy); Employing triangulation; Giving voice; Sharing perquisites of privilege; Expressing issues of oppressed group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data generating</td>
<td>Articulating data collecting decisions; Demonstrating prolonged engagement; Demonstrating persistent observation; Providing verbatim transcription; Demonstrating saturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td>Articulating data analysis decisions; Member checking; Expert checking; Performing quasistatistics [sic]; Testing hypotheses in data analysis; Using computer programs; Drawing data reduction tables; Exploring rival explanations; Performing a literature review; Analyzing negative case analysis; Memoing [sic]; Reflexive journaling; Writing an interim report; Bracketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Providing an audit trail; Providing evidence that support interpretations; Acknowledging the researcher perspective; Providing thick descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001, p. 533).*

The criteria are divided into primary and secondary categories. The primary category contains criteria that relate to all forms of qualitative enquiry. The secondary criteria provide “further benchmarks for quality” (Whittemore, Chase, & Mandle, 2001, p. 529) and are flexible depending on the nature of a specific enquiry. The adoption of this model not only guides the design and implementation of this investigation (including the critical literature review that was carried out in Chapters II and III), but it also provides a method for judging the quality of this investigation as a whole. The implementation of these validity criteria will be addressed in the conclusions drawn from the investigation in Chapter VI.
Table 4.4 *Assessment of primary & secondary criteria of validity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Do the results of the research reflect the experience of participants or the context in a believable way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>Does a representation of the emic perspective exhibit awareness of the subtle differences in the voices of all participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticality</td>
<td>Does the research process demonstrate evidence of critical appraisal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Does the research reflect recursive and repetitive checks of validity as well as a humble presentation of findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitness</td>
<td>Have methodological decisions, interpretations, and investigator biases been addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
<td>Have thick and faithful descriptions been portrayed with artfulness and clarity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Have imaginative ways of organising, presenting, and analysing data been incorporated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughness</td>
<td>Do the findings convincingly address the questions posed through completeness and saturation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>Are the process and the findings congruent? Do all the themes fit together? Do the findings fit into a context outside the study situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Has the investigation been implemented in ways that are sensitive to the nature of human, cultural, and social contexts?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001, p. 534).*

The qualitative case study

This investigation is based in an Australian university and focuses on lecturers in a particular teaching department that is peer-recognised as an example of leading practice in teaching international students. Given that the investigation is dealing with a single academic department, its bounded nature characterises the research as a case study, that is, the study of a particular group or case. Stake (2000) called this “a specific One” (p. 436). Knight (2000) said that it is a study of “one of something” (p. 41). This section outlines the main characteristics of what is required to undertake a case study. It also weaves the particulars of this part of the investigation into the theory of the qualitative approach to studying cases.
According to Sturman (1997), Burns (1999), and Stake (2000), although case studies are not solely confined to the qualitative research approach, they have become a common way of conducting qualitative enquiries. For Diesing, case studies were located in the “holist tradition of scientific enquiry” (as cited in Sturman, 1997, p. 61). In this tradition, the whole to which various parts of the whole belong determines the characteristics of each of its parts and the parts together constitute the whole. Both the whole and its parts are expressions of the interrelationships that exist between them. This is similar to Salom on’s view of the systemic approach to educational research where changes in discrete elements of complex educational phenomena resulted in changes to the whole, because all elements were interdependent and inseparable (as cited in Sturman, 1997, p. 61). To this end, Sturman (1997) said that holists or case study researchers, being more interested in observed patterns than deductive reasoning, arrived at explanations of a unified system by means of “a rich description of the case and an understanding of it, in particular the relationship of its parts” (p. 62). The interest lies in understanding the integrated system of the case, be it “functional or dysfunctional, rational or irrational” (Stake, 2000, p. 436). Ultimately, according to Burns (1999), the case study captures “the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events” (p. 460).

Stake (2000) distinguished three types of case study. The first is the intrinsic case study, which is undertaken so that the researcher can better understand the particular case being studied. The case is of interest in itself and there is little concern in studying it to generalise the findings to other cases. The second type of
The design of the case study

Burns (1999) posited that there are four main steps in designing a case study. He used the shape of a funnel as an analogy to describe the process. The funnel’s wide mouth represents the start of the study and its thin neck corresponds to the refinement in focus as the study progresses. The first step is to develop an initial set of case study questions. In this investigation the initial questions revolved around the researcher’s interest in issues concerning the internationalisation of Australian higher education from the point of view of lecturers who teach international students. Part of this first step was “trawling around, scouting for possible places, looking for clues
on how to start, and the feasibility of it all” (Burns, 1999, p. 464). The second step is the study proposition. It is more concrete than the general position of the first step. In this investigation, the more succinct proposition revolved around examining the Profile’s claims against the experiences of Australian lecturers. The third step, according to Burns (1999), is to determine the unit of analysis within the bounded system that will comprise the case to be studied. Once this is done, then specific units of analysis within the parameters of the bounded system can be located. In this investigation, a teaching department at an Australian university was chosen as the case and individual lecturers in the teaching department were its specific units. The fourth step of Burns’s (1999) analogy is to interpret the research findings by linking data to various propositions and criteria. At the beginning of most case studies, reported Burns (1999), this step is usually the least developed of the four because it relates to the future activity of data analysis. (In qualitative research, however, data generation and data analysis are simultaneous activities).

This particular case study is more directed than those that go into a research site and develop theory *ab initio* (for example, a grounded theory approach) because it uses four of the Profile’s qualifications as a template. The Profile provides a ready-made framework which supplies the specific research focus as well as the initial interview questions. In short, this case study is employed to examine existing theory rather than to generate it. To a large extent, then, the scope and depth of the research is predetermined. The use of four of the Profile’s qualifications also sits well with Sturman’s (1997) observation that case studies are better approached with guiding theories and hypotheses (p. 62). The four qualifications of the Profile and their
associated criteria give this case study an immediate shape and specific focus and also provide a way to approach the fourth step in the funnel analogy used by Burns (1999) above. The Profile’s four qualifications and associated criteria will be used as a template upon which the data will be laid out in Chapter V. This also goes some way to satisfying Silverman’s (2000) concern that a research project should have a limited body of data with which to work.

The sample of the case study & gaining access

The information which outlines the main processes and procedures associated with the development and design of this part of the investigation is drawn from records that form an audit trail of all research-related activities. Burns (1999) suggested that this sort of record-keeping increases the reliability of the research and helps others replicate the study. Richards (2005) said it was vital to keep a “log” (p. 22) of the research activity and process to allow others to assess “where you got to and how you got there [and] to validate your analysis” (p. 22). Appendix E through to Appendix P, and Appendixes R and S are records of the audit trail kept in this investigation.

Given that the Profile’s pillar that related to educational practice would be best investigated by comparing its claims against leading practice in teaching international students, an area where this activity took place had to be identified. Therefore, the sampling method was purposive rather than a random sample or a sample of convenience. Burns (1999) said that “purposive, purposeful, or criterion-based” (p. 465) sampling are examples of the “non-probability” (p. 465) sampling
that normally characterise case studies. According to Cohen and Manion (1994), purposive sampling selects cases on the basis of their “typicality” (p. 89) in terms of the specific research focus. Burns (1999) called this “reputational” (p. 465) sampling. Given the leading practice nature of the department that was sought, this sampling approach might also be what Keeves and Sowden (1997) described as “exemplar” (p. 296) sampling. The following criteria were compiled by the researcher to underpin the purposive sampling exercise of locating a teaching department that was likely to engage in leading practice in relation to teaching international students:

- The teaching department should have significant experience with large numbers of international students from a diversity of cultural, language, and educational backgrounds;
- The teaching department should be able to demonstrate that it has developed particular initiatives or strategies in relation to the learning needs of its international students;
- The staff in the teaching department should have undertaken some form of education or teaching-related studies;
- The staff in the teaching department should have engaged in professional development activities in relation to teaching in general and teaching international students in particular;
- The teaching department should have engaged with its experience with international students in a scholarly way, for example, by staff giving conference presentations and/or publishing in journals;
- The teaching department should be considered to be an example of leading practice in relation to teaching international students by parties external to the department itself.

Several departments in Australian universities were considered in selecting an appropriate case study, but one in particular appeared to have the potential to meet most, if not all, of the above criteria. Hence, the researcher introduced himself to the Head of the department by telephone and arranged a meeting to discuss the suitability of the department for the research project and to determine their interest in being involved. The following characteristics of the department were established.
There were seven full-time teaching staff. All were female and were registered allied health practitioners. The department was responsible for undergraduate and postgraduate academic programs in an allied health discipline. These consisted of an undergraduate bachelor degree and a postgraduate coursework masters degree. The department had an enrolment of approximately 50 international students in a population of 100 students in total spread across both academic programs. Although the vast majority of the international students came from Singapore, Malaysia, and Hong Kong, there were also students from other Asian countries, as well as Europe, the Middle East, and Africa.

In addition to being qualified at the tertiary level in the allied health discipline, the seven staff members either had qualifications in education or had undertaken the non-award teaching course which was run by the university’s Professional Development Department. In addition, any contract lecturers who were externally sourced from allied health practice were strongly encouraged to undertake this course. The Head of the department indicated that several initiatives had been developed to assist the international students to adjust to the requirements of their academic programs and to maximise their likelihood of success. These included mentoring programs, focused tutorials, and a two-week orientation program that dealt with life and study skills.

It was reported that the academic staff in the department participated in professional development activities such as workshops and symposia related to

---

19 To maintain anonymity, this is not the real name of the department.
teaching, international students, and working with cultural diversity. They had also been invited to present sessions on teaching international students to other departments in their faculty. In addition, staff had attended national and international conferences to present on their work with international students, as well as to elaborate on related initiatives developed by the department.

The Head of the department said that other departments in the university, particularly in the medical and allied health field, regarded it as a leader in teaching international students. Importantly, the researcher independently confirmed this from two sources. Rather than these sources being asked directly if they thought the allied health department was an example of leading practice in teaching international students, the researcher posed the question in a more oblique manner. The Head of School in which the allied health department was located and a senior academic in the university’s Professional Development Department were both asked which departments they considered to be examples of leading practice in teaching international students. Both independently mentioned the allied health department in their responses. Lastly, during the course of this investigation, the allied health department was nominated for an ‘excellence in teaching’ award at their university, based on their work with international students.

The positive response from the meeting between the researcher and the Head of the department cleared the way for a formal approach to be made to proceed with the research. A letter of introduction was sent to the Head of the department (see Appendix E). The correspondence also included a copy of the research project’s
ethics document to familiarise the Head with the study’s parameters and debriefing avenues for potential research participants.

The question of whether the sample size would be large enough to do justice to the proposed research is not difficult to answer. Given that the seven lecturers represent the entire population of staff in the allied health department, the maximum size of the sample is both predetermined and sufficient to portray the department as a case study, that is, as a whole. Clearly, the more lecturers that could be encouraged to take part in the research, the greater likelihood there would be of gathering enough data to understand how the teaching practice in the department supported the pillar of the Profile that is the concern of this part of the investigation. This reflects the view of Liamputtong and Ezzy (2005) that the decision as to how many research participants would be sufficient is determined by the researcher being “satisfied that the data are rich enough to cover enough of the dimensions they are interested in” (p. 49). This outlook is also supported by Richards (2005). Again, in this part of the investigation the more lecturers that can be encouraged to take part in the research, the greater likelihood there will be of achieving this data-related outcome. It is expected that four to seven research participants, for example, will be better than one to three research participants.

Recruitment of staff

The recruitment of academic staff in the department was made by posting each an envelope which contained a letter of introduction from the researcher’s supervisor (see Appendix F) and a letter of support from the Head of the department
(see Appendix G). This introductory information described the nature of the investigation, encouraged participation, stressed confidentiality issues, and provided instructions for those staff who were interested in volunteering to participate in the research. A survey questionnaire was also included in the posting to obtain some personal details of the lecturers as well as some information that related to their teaching work in the university (see Appendix H). The survey questionnaire also included a section where staff who were interested in participating in the series of interviews could provide informed consent to be involved. Upon completion of the questionnaire, the staff were directed to place the relevant documents in the stamped, addressed envelope that was provided so that the information could be returned to the researcher by mail. One week after the correspondence had been sent, the researcher arranged for an email to be posted to the academic staff in the department to encourage them to participate in the research (see Appendix I). As it eventuated, six of the seven academic staff in the department were available to participate in the research project and all six returned the questionnaire and volunteered to participate in the interviews.

Sources of evidence: questionnaire & interviews

As previously mentioned in this chapter, the two methods that were used to gather research data were a single questionnaire and multiple in-depth interviews. Technically, this represents a mixed methods research approach to data generation which, according to Zeller (1997), allows the researcher to utilise the strengths of both methods, whilst simultaneously addressing the limitations of each one. Further, Zeller (1997) suggested that “it is more difficult to be misled by the results that
triangulate multiple techniques … than it is to be misled by a single technique which suffers from inherent weaknesses” (p. 828, ellipsis points in original). Overall, this maximises the degree to which the research outcomes reflect real world phenomena. Although this research investigation used mixed methods, it should be acknowledged that whilst the questionnaire indeed allows some data to be checked for within-subject and between-subject consistency, it actually plays a supporting rather than a major role in the generation of data compared to the multiple in-depth interviews with each lecturer. This is because the small sample and the qualitative nature of the investigation make the use of interviews as the primary data-gathering instrument much more appropriate than the questionnaire.

*The strengths & limitations of questionnaires*

Whilst the questionnaire only plays a supporting role in the generation of data, it is nevertheless important to recognise the strengths and limitations of questionnaires, particularly in relation to interviews. Burns (1999), Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000), O’Kane (1998), and Williamson (2000) reported that questionnaires have a number of advantages over interviews. They are, for example, less time consuming for the research participant to complete. They do not require skilled interviewers. They can be less costly to administer. They can be constructed with a view to minimising interviewer bias. They can be used efficiently to gather data from large samples. Also, respondents complete questionnaires in their own time and at their own speed.
Questionnaires also have some limitations. Response rates are generally low, questions may be misinterpreted or missed altogether, other people may fill in the questionnaire, and it is more difficult for a respondent to verify the meaning of a question with the researcher. O’Kane (1998), Sarantakos (2005), and Williamson (2000) also pointed out that the design and layout of a questionnaire should follow strict guidelines to maximise its use as an efficient instrument for data generation. For example, it should be well-presented in terms the accessibility of the information and its visual impact. Detailed thought needs to be given to the type of questions asked (for example, open-ended questions or closed questions or a mixture of both) and their order of presentation. The language should be simple and unambiguous and avoid the use of technical jargon. Further, the questionnaire needs to be accompanied by an introductory letter which describes nature of the investigation, provides instructions, and stresses any confidentiality issues.

Using interviews as the primary source of data

Burns (1999) commented that one of the main techniques for gathering data in the case study is the interview (p. 460). Indeed, he thought that interviews were essential in case studies that involved people. Knight (2002) said that case studies were “very human – very person centred” (p. 42, emphasis in original) and that the objective was to engage in dialogue with the research participants at the personal level or “face-to-face” (p. 50). The choice of using interviews as the primary source of data, however, initially seems at odds with the views of Burns (1999) and Eisenhardt (2000) who believed that case studies generally combine data generation methods such as observation, document analysis, interviews, and questionnaires. (As
stated, although this investigation uses a questionnaire, it plays a minor role in the data generation.) In the literature, the term *methodological triangulation* describes the use of a number of methods to glean a thorough understanding of what is being studied (Denzin, 1978). This is particularly useful in building theory, where researchers are trying to reach a point of “data saturation” to support the emergent nature of what they are attempting to describe and understand (Burns, 1999, p. 466).

A different perspective on methodological triangulation, however, is offered by Silverman (2000) who stressed that qualitative researchers should, above all, “keep it simple” (p. 50). Although Silverman (2000) said that multiple methods can be used, the complexity of doing so well may outweigh the benefits of doing so at all. Instead, one data set done well may suffice. In Silverman’s (2000) view, researchers often desired to use multiple methods to pinpoint as many aspects of a phenomenon as possible. This, he suggested, could also indicate a failure to narrow down the topic. In the case of this investigation, the topic has been deliberately and sufficiently narrowed down (by examining four of the Profile’s qualifications).

In addition, the multiple in-depth interviews with the research participants provide their own data triangulation framework that supports the research in the absence of two or more equally-weighted data-generating methods. The data from each individual lecturer from a particular interview will be checked for consistency both with data from other interviews with that lecturer and, where possible, with data from the interviews with other lecturers in the department. This, along with the use of the small questionnaire, provides an adequate framework for making a judgement.
on the consistency of reporting of information by the lecturers (see Figure 4.2 for a representation of this framework).

Seidman (1991) supported within-lecturer and between-lecturer triangulation design as a way to increase the validity of interview data. On within-lecturer triangulation, Seidman (1991) said this “places participants’ comments in context [and ensures] the internal consistency of what they say” (p. 17). On between-lecturer triangulation, Seidman (1991) commented “we can connect their experiences and check the comments of one participant against those of others” (p. 17). In Figure 4.2,

---

20 This example shows the triangulation framework in the case of three lecturers participating in a series of five interviews. The process remains the same, however, for two or more interviews with two or more participants.
the grey arrows represent the possible pathways for cross-checking the consistency of the information that is reported by the lecturers.

The within-lecturer triangulation is represented by the vertical arrows that run through a particular lecturer’s series of interviews and the questionnaire. For example, if an individual lecturer expressed great confidence in one interview in terms of having a bank of strategies for teaching international students, yet in another interview could not demonstrate any of these strategies when asked, then the researcher would be alerted to an inconsistency in the reported data and could seek clarification. Another example of within-lecturer triangulation is using the questionnaire data to check the interview data for consistency (and vice versa). For instance, if a lecturer reported in the questionnaire that they had taught at university level for between two and five years, yet in the interview they mentioned they had taught at university level for nine years, the researcher would be alerted to the discrepancy and would follow this up.

The between-lecturer triangulation is represented by the horizontal and diagonal grey arrows in Figure 4.2. These signify any combination of interviews across the pool of research participants. An example would be if two lecturers reported that the department had guidelines for making assessment expectations clear to students, whilst another lecturer denied that such guidelines existed.

It should be noted that the researcher considered using up to two other methods in conjunction with the multiple in-depth interviews and the small
questionnaire in the event that the number of research participants was smaller than anticipated. Until the number of research participants was known, these two methods were kept on standby. This demonstrates the flexible and emergent nature of qualitative research design (Silverman, 1997, 2000; Sarantakos, 2005). One method that was considered was a focus group. This is effectively a group interview with, for example, between four and seven participants. An advantage of this is that it enables the researcher to maximise his or her time by simultaneously generating data from a number of participants. In addition, the sorts of data that may be generated in a focus group might be different from those gleaned from interviews with individuals alone (Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005, p. 96). A disadvantage of focus groups is that peer group pressure sometimes leads to some participants being swayed by others to views they do not privately support. Also, they simply might not want to express their real views in a public forum (Williamson, 2000, p. 241).

A second method that was considered was observation of the lecturers in live teaching situations to look for consistency between their teaching practice and the claims they made in the interviews. Participant observation, according to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000), enables researchers to “discern ongoing behaviour as it occurs [and] make appropriate notes about its salient features” (p. 188). The researcher’s view was that whilst participant observation might be useful, it was limited by how much it could engage with the majority of the Profile’s criteria compared with the interview method.
When it became known that six academic staff would take part in the multiple in-depth interviews, the researcher considered that this, in conjunction with the use of the small questionnaire and the within-lecturer and between-lecturer triangulation framework, would not only be adequate to provide the necessary data but would also represent the upper limit of the resources that the researcher had at his disposal for this part of the investigation. This decision is also supported by Silverman’s (2000) view mentioned earlier that with a sufficiently narrow topic, one data set done well may be satisfactory.

_The strengths & limitations of interviews_

Burns (1999, pp. 582-583) outlined a number of advantages of interviews which made them an attractive and suitable survey instrument for generating data for this part of the investigation. Interviews are an excellent way to gather data from comparatively small samples. Therefore, given that there were six research participants in this investigation, the interview format was considered most suitable. The face-to-face nature of the interview is a human interaction which is conducive to candid conversation and a comprehensive (deep and rich) expression of what the interviewee thinks about certain matters. Further, there is greater opportunity for respondents to express themselves more fully in an interview compared with, for example, a questionnaire. The interview is a flexible medium which allows questions to be repeated and their meaning clarified. The interviewer can probe respondents for other angles to their responses. The interviewer can take note of non-verbal communication such as the use of body language. The interviewer is also able to express appreciation to the interviewee upon conclusion of the interview. The main
limitation of interviews, according to Burns (1999), is that only a limited number of people can be interviewed due to time and financial constraints. This limitation was also observed by Seidman (1991) and Liamputtong and Ezzy (2005). As an example, see Table 4.5 for an estimation of the time associated with a single interview in this part of the investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time required</th>
<th>Interview-related activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5 hour</td>
<td>Organisation for interview (reflection on the last interview, review, and rehearsal of interview questions, and gathering of materials, for example, stationery, cassette tape and recorder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 hour</td>
<td>Travel to and from interview site (within the city in which the university is located)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 hour</td>
<td>Early arrival at interview site. Set-up and checking of cassette recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 hour</td>
<td>The actual interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 6.0 hours</td>
<td>Verbatim transcription of 1 hour of ‘real time’ interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 hour</td>
<td>Coding of each interview by qualitative analysis software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 hours</td>
<td>Estimated total time for one interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that 32 interviews were carried out with six staff members from the teaching department, the total time associated with the interview process was approximately 320 hours, or 40 eight-hour days, or eight five-day weeks, or two months. That is just to get to the stage of having compiled the raw data in readiness for more detailed analysis. Whilst the actual data generation was not packaged as concisely as it is represented above, (for example, the interviews and associated activities were spread over approximately 16 months - see Appendix J for details), the above calculations demonstrate the significant amount of time that was associated with the interviews and related activities.
In addition to resource limitations, Burns (1999) also said that interviewers need to have good interpersonal skills and be good at interviewing. As pointed out by Fontana and Frey (2000), “asking questions and getting answers is a much harder task than it may seem at first” (p. 645). Interviewing is a real-time skill which seeks to provide conditions conducive to free-flowing conversation and sharing of thoughts, opinions, and experiences. As such, Burns (1999) suggested that “high inter-rater [sic] reliability is difficult to achieve” (p. 583), that is, different interviewers with different levels of interpersonal skills and interviewing techniques and abilities may well make for different results. Note that in this particular investigation, however, the researcher undertook all the interviews. Burns (1999) also said there is the possibility of an “interviewer effect” where an interviewee may respond positively or negatively to the interviewer’s questions because of reasons such gender, age, ethnicity, experience, personality, and interview technique (p. 583). At times, too, the respondent may feel as if they are being put on the spot by the interviewer. Also, because the relationship between the researcher and the respondent is based on trust, empathy, equality, and the subject-as-friend to engender rapport (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 1992, p. 52), interviewers have to be constantly reflexive about their role in the interview.

Research funding was secured for professional transcription services for the final 14 of the 32 interviews that were undertaken with the academic staff. See Appendix K for the transcription conventions the professional transcriber had to follow, plus the anonymity and confidentiality measures they had to uphold. The researcher also checked each transcript provided by the professional transcriber
against its respective audio tape(s). In addition, each of the 32 transcripts was sent to the respective lecturer for scrutiny before releasing them to be used as data for the investigation (see Appendix L). Richards (2005) called this “‘respondent validation’ and ‘member checking’” (p. 22) and said it increased the validity of the interview data. This analytic technique is listed in Table 4.3 as a way to demonstrate validity in qualitative research.

The use of multiple in-depth interviews

Seidman (1991) said that in-depth interviews were primarily used to understand “the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 3). Whilst the interview framework of this investigation does not exactly correspond with the schedule suggested by Seidman (1991) for in-depth interviewing, it nevertheless shares a number of similarities. An important one is the increased validity that comes from interviewing a number of people a number of times. Seidman’s (1991) idea of an in-depth interview schedule was a series of three one-and-a-half hour interviews. His advice to interviewers was that “a one-shot meeting with an “interviewee” whom they have never met tread[s] on thin contextual ice” (p. 10). In the case of this investigation, the number of criteria to be examined from the Profile’s four qualifications made it impractical to cover them all in a single interview. As such, it was decided to let the lecturers know that they would be involved in between four and six one-hour interviews. The decision to have one-hour interviews was largely the result of the lecturers’ availability on any given interview day. Holding between four and six interviews with each lecturer also made it
possible for the researcher to revisit any particular issue that became apparent during the review of the transcripts of one or more prior interviews.

Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006) said that in-depth interviews provide an “opportunity for researchers to learn about social life through the perspective, experience, and language of those living it” (p. 128). Liamputtong and Ezzy (2005) said that this form of interviewing was variously described as “focused interviews, unstructured interviews, non-directive interviews, open-ended interviews, and semi-structured interviews” (p. 56). In this investigation the interview questions were initially determined by each of the Profile’s criteria (see Appendix M). Seidman (1991) called this the “interview guide” (p. 69) approach. After each directed question was asked, however, the researcher let the respondents’ conversations develop along the lines of the emerging themes. For example, in ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’, criterion Q3 S1 says that “The lecturer must be able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework” (from Table 1.1). Accordingly, the initial question to the interviewee was: “Are you able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework?” The researcher was then able to explore different themes associated with the criterion depending upon the respondent’s answer. This sits well with Seidman’s (1991) belief that whilst the interview guide approach can be used, in-depth interviews are more about getting participant’s to “reconstruct their experience and to explore their meaning” (p. 69).
Rather than examine the Profile’s criteria from the very beginning, the first interview was directed at each lecturer’s experience with teaching at university in general and teaching international students in particular. The researcher thought this would be a suitable way to begin and would provide some useful data to compare to the lecturers’ responses to the Profile’s criteria in the interviews that were to follow (see Appendix N for a list of questions for the first interview as well as the pre-interview information read to each research participant). Also, the researcher told each lecturer that he was investigating part of a model of internationalised teaching practice that originated from Europe. They were not told that the model in its entirety was called the Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom because it was thought that this would either be intimidating for the lecturers, or cause them to feel as if they had to live up to the Profile’s claims.

Seidman (1991) suggested that the interviews with each participant “worked best” (p. 15) when they were held between three days to a week apart from each other. Clearly, this was not the format that was followed in this investigation (again, see Appendix J for specific details). This was partly due to the lecturers being less available at certain times of the year due to workload. It was also partly due to competing demands faced by the researcher from other elements of the investigation, ranging from an ongoing commitment with the literature review to the labour-intensive (yet useful and desirable, according to Seidman, 1991, p. 88) process of making verbatim transcriptions of the interviews and engaging in data analysis. In this regard, Seidman’s (1991) own words provided some solace for the researcher:
As yet there are no absolutes in the world of interviewing. Relatively little research has been done on the effects of following one procedure over others .... Remember that it is not a perfect world. It is almost always better to conduct an interview under less than ideal conditions than not to conduct one at all. (Seidman, 1991, p. 15)

Towards the conclusion of the series of in-depth interviews the researcher sought and gained permission from the lecturers to use email messages to either seek extra information from them about things they had said or to clarify information in the transcripts that was unclear or ambiguous. Fontana and Frey (2000) called this “virtual interviewing” (p. 666). Whilst they pointed to a number of limitations of this approach, these apply mainly to whole data sets being generated, for example, by email. Clearly, the use of email in this investigation was of a different sort and whilst the amount of information sought was not substantial, it did assist in the analysis of the data (see Appendix O).

*Establishing meaning from the interview data using a phenomenographic approach*

This section outlines how a phenomenographic approach is used to elicit meaning from the interview data. It was noted earlier that the primary source of interview questions was the Profile’s criteria themselves. This both sets the context for the discussion and acted as a reference point for each conversation around a particular criterion. To maximise the validity of the interview responses, the researcher must ensure that the questions are not only explicit expressions of the likely intent of each criterion, but that this intent is also understood by the respondents. The overall aim is to enable the respondents to align their experiences and opinions with subject matter from the Profile. This, along with the use of the
previously-described within-lecturer and between-lecturer triangulation framework, will help make sense of the interview data in relation to the Profile’s requirements.

Beyond what is mentioned above, the researcher will fundamentally “let the interview breathe and speak for itself” (Seidman, 1991, p. 89). This is compatible with the claim by Lyle and Robinson (2002) that the phenomenographic approach to data analysis is based on the research participants being able to “accurately express their experiences and conceptualizations” (p. 1189) if the researcher can create an interview climate that allows respondents to feel at ease and report information that closely resembles their “actual experiences” (p. 1189). The vast amount of data that are collected from interviews must be read again and again for the researcher to understand and make meaning of the respondents’ experiences (Marton & Booth, 1997).

Further, according to Seidman (1991), the data have to be “winnowed down” (p. 89), to passages that are “interesting” (p. 89) in terms of the object of the investigation. The use of the Profile’s criteria as reference points is particularly helpful in this regard, for they focus each conversation on a particular theme. Of the data that are collected for each criterion, the researcher will use his judgement as to which parts of a lecturer’s overall dialogue is most relevant in relation to the criterion at hand. Seidman (1991) said that researchers need to have confidence in recognising meaningful “chunks” (p. 89) of data and not spend time “agonising over” (p. 89) levels of semantic analysis: “She [sic] affirms the role of her judgement in the process. In short, what is required in responding to the interview text is no different
from what is required in responding to other texts – a close reading plus judgement” (pp. 89-90).

Note that the analysis of interview data was enhanced by the use of qualitative data analysis software called NVivo which was developed by QSR International. The software enabled the interview data to be coded to help analyse the conversations that took place around each of the Profile’s criteria that were examined. The use of computer software in data analysis is listed in Table 4.3 as a way to demonstrate validity in qualitative research. Examples of how NVivo software was used in the investigation are presented in Appendix P.

Pre-testing & pilot-testing the questionnaire & interview instruments

There is some equivocation in the literature about the meanings of *pre-test* and *pilot-test* or *pilot-study*. This investigation adopts the views of O’Kane (1998, p. 60) and Doordan (1998, p. 94) who suggested that the pre-test involves circulating draft survey instruments to associates and colleagues to seek their comments on their suitability. The pilot-test or pilot-study, on the other hand, administers the draft survey instruments to a small sample of people who share some characteristics of the target group for a small scale trial run to further refine procedures and to obtain other preliminary information. The pre- and pilot-testing of the questionnaire developed for this investigation was carried out simultaneously. Copies of the questionnaire were distributed to six academic staff in the researcher’s academic unit (the School of Education at Flinders University). As well as responding to the questionnaire...
items as they were presented, the staff were also encouraged to comment on the questionnaire layout and indicate if any items were confusing or ambiguous.

The comments from the test respondents were valuable in helping refine the layout and presentation of the questionnaire. The interview was pilot-tested with the cooperation of two academic staff members from the sample who undertook the pre- and pilot-test of the draft questionnaire. This exercise was extremely useful for giving the researcher first-hand experience in the mechanics of the interview such as organising the interview questions and the cassette recorder, as well as the actual exercise of engaging in an hour-long interview.

Ethical issues

This section outlines two perspectives on ethical matters in relation to this investigation. One concerns the measures taken to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of the research participants who volunteered to participate in the study. The other concerns the researcher’s obligation to remain reflexive throughout the course of the investigation about his role as a data-generating instrument in the field. Together, these two perspectives are brought into sharp relief when confronted with Gallagher’s (1998) reminder that research takes the researcher into the “private lives … innermost thoughts, feelings, [and] hopes” (p. xii) of the research participants and Stake’s (1998) observation that “researchers are guests in the private spaces of the world. Their manners should be good and their code of ethics strict” (p. 103). The following measures were taken to ensure the anonymity and
confidentiality of the university, the teaching department, and the research participants:

- The real name of the university that is the focus of this investigation is not used in the thesis and associated publications. Instead, it is designated as the university. Any reference to the institution is in general terms only. Further, the real names of departments in the university are not used. Instead, they are replaced by a pseudonym.

- The real name of the teaching department that is the focus of this investigation is not used in the thesis and associated publications. Instead, it is designated as an allied health department.

- Pseudonyms are used in place of the lecturers’ real names in the thesis and associated publications.

- In the case of a professional transcription provider being employed to transcribe the interviews from audio tapes, that person (or persons) is obliged to sign a confidentiality agreement to ensure that the anonymity and confidentiality measures built into this investigation are respected at all times.

The second ethical perspective concerns the researcher’s role as a data-generating instrument in the field and the need to remain reflexive about this. Fontana and Frey (2000) noted that in qualitative research there is a “tremendous, if
unspoken, influence of the researcher as author” (p. 661). From the point of view of phenomenography, the researcher has to be focused on creating an interview environment in which the respondents can relate their experiences of phenomena as clearly as possible. The interviewer cannot be disrespectful, ungracious, rude, or pursue agendas that distort a respondent’s reporting of their experience of certain phenomena. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000) pointed out that researchers have to conduct interviews “carefully and sensitively” (p. 279) and be reflexive about their presence in the interview in terms of dynamics of power and possible harmful effects on the respondent as a consequence of their participation.

Conclusion to Chapter IV

This chapter has used theory to justify the research methodology and methods that characterise the part of the investigation which examines the pillar of the Profile that is related to teaching practice. It has acknowledged that although there is a diversity of approaches to educational research, it is critical that the methodology and methods for any particular investigation are determined by the nature of what is being studied. Accordingly, the research approach of this investigation was located in the qualitative tradition and an outline of the defining characteristics of that approach was provided. The particular research methodology adopted in this investigation was identified as phenomenography. Following this, the issue of validity in qualitative research was addressed. Features of the qualitative case study were described and details were provided about the design of the case study and the sampling technique.
Discussion also extended to the practicalities of undertaking the actual research such as how access to the research site was negotiated and how research participants were recruited. An explanation was then provided as to why particular data-gathering methods were favoured over others. The strengths and limitations of the data-gathering methods were also discussed and the ways that meaning will be established from the interview data was made clear. The pre-testing and pilot-testing of the research instruments was described. Ethical issues associated with this part of the investigation were outlined. Throughout this chapter, reference has been made to a number of appendixes that provide details of the audit trail and key research items and documents associated with the investigation. These appendixes reflect the technical approach that the researcher has taken to increase the validity of the research (see Table 4.3).
CHAPTER V

EXAMINING THE PROFILE’S PILLAR OF PRACTICE: PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

Introduction to Chapter V

This chapter presents and discusses the data collected from the academic staff in the allied health department. The presentation highlights not only the research findings, but also their implications in terms of the themes associated with the key research questions that were presented in Chapter I and which will also be addressed in Chapter VI. The information in this current chapter is easily accessible because it is structured around a chronological treatment of the four qualifications from the Profile which particularly relate to teaching international students. A number of strategies are adopted with regard to the presentation and discussion of the research results. First, although the discussion of the interview data provides commentary on the research findings in its own right, reference will also be made, where applicable, to related material from the conceptual framework of the investigation that was presented in Chapter II and Chapter III. Second, the term *stand-out comment* will be given to particularly noteworthy statements made by individual lecturers in relation to themes associated with teaching international students. Third, the presentation of the lecturers’ verbatim quotes follows an adaptation of Silverman’s (2000) convention for reporting dialogue in interviews (see Appendix K).

In this chapter, there are two levels of treatment or sifting of data with regard to refining their focus to enable conclusions to be drawn. The first level is the reduction of the raw data from each interview. This allows the main points that were
made by each lecturer to be reported in relation to each criterion. The second level is a concise overview of the first level data. This provides a summary of what is happening in the department in relation to each criterion that is examined. Each second-level summary also answers the question as to how a particular criterion is supported by teaching practice in the department. This information will be collated in the conclusion of this chapter to help answer Associated Question 2 of the Key Research Questions which seeks to establish how the Profile is supported by the teaching practice in the allied health department.

Attributes of academic staff in the allied health department

Table 5.2 (see page 258) provides some attributes of the research participants in the teaching department. The information was collected by the questionnaire that sought demographic details from the lecturers. Each lecturer’s attributes provide a snapshot of some of their important characteristics in relation to the research interests. These attributes will be referred to throughout the discussion of the interview data.

**Qualification 1 (Q1): General**

**Q1 Knowledge criteria**

Table 5.1 lists the two Knowledge criteria of ‘Qualification 1 (Q1): General’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1 Qualification 1 (Q1), Knowledge Criteria K1-K2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1 K1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1 K2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 25).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Bronwyn (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Dahlia (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Larissa (pseudonym)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position title</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of employment</td>
<td>Contract, full-time</td>
<td>Contract, full-time</td>
<td>Contract, full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education qualifications</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University’s tertiary teaching course</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification (in progress or gained)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching at university</td>
<td>2-5yrs</td>
<td>2-5yrs</td>
<td>≤ 1yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly student contact during semester</td>
<td>10-14hrs</td>
<td>5-9hrs</td>
<td>5-9hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly workload during semester</td>
<td>≥ 50hrs</td>
<td>20-39hrs</td>
<td>40-49hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students in class</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
<td>10-19%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest group of international students</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd largest group of international students</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd largest group of international students</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Ruth (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Ursula (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Samantha (pseudonym)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English, plus one other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position title</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of employment</td>
<td>Contract, full-time</td>
<td>Tenure, full-time</td>
<td>Tenure, full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education qualifications</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University’s tertiary teaching course</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification (in progress or gained)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching at university</td>
<td>2-5yrs</td>
<td>10-19yrs</td>
<td>6-9yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly student contact during semester</td>
<td>10-14hrs</td>
<td>≤ 4hrs</td>
<td>5-9hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly workload during semester</td>
<td>40-49hrs</td>
<td>≥ 50hrs</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students in class</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest group of international students</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd largest group of international students</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd largest group of international students</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualification 1, Criterion K1 (Q1 K1)

“The lecturer must be a good academic, with ample teaching experience and a thorough knowledge of the subject” (from Table 5.2). All lecturers were at least 46 years of age and had worked as allied health practitioners for a number of years either before moving into teaching at university or in conjunction with their university work. All lecturers had either completed or were currently enrolled in doctoral programs in the field of their allied health discipline. Ursula and Dahlia finished their doctorates in 1996 and 1997 respectively. Larissa and Bronwyn completed their doctorates during this investigation. Ruth and Samantha were enrolled in doctoral programs at the time of this investigation.

Ursula and Samantha were the most experienced teachers at the tertiary level. Ursula, the longest serving staff member, said she had taught at university for at least 18 years and regarded herself as an experienced academic. She had also been a qualified allied health professional since 1978. Samantha, the second longest serving staff member, said she had close to 10 years of teaching experience at university. She commented that she had also worked for about 20 years as an allied health practitioner. The remaining four staff members had each taught at university for five years or less. On the surface, this does not appear to satisfy criterion Q1 K1’s requirement of having ample teaching experience. Ruth said, “I’ve been teaching here for four years and had done some teaching prior to this. However, a lot of this has only been part-time and limited in class size. I would describe myself as somewhat experienced.” She had also been an allied health practitioner “since 1975. That’s 30 years.” Larissa also reported that she had been an allied health practitioner
for 30 years. She said that she had a teaching background of “many years” in other education sectors but was “fairly new to the tertiary level.. on the steep learning curve.” Although Larissa believed that she was “becoming more experienced”, she said that she still had a lot to learn. Bronwyn did not categorise herself as a very experienced teacher. She said, “I’d say medium. I’d consider myself now beyond new or beginning so I’d put myself in a middle ground somewhere (pause) slightly experienced in some areas.” She had been an allied health practitioner since 1976. Dahlia had been an allied health practitioner since 1977. Although she had not been teaching for a long time, she questioned whether experience necessarily inferred good teaching practice. “You could get up and deliver the same things year after year after year and we’ve all experienced teachers who do that at school and you recognise them immediately. I hope I wouldn’t be seen like that.” Dahlia’s comment relates to the point made in the discussion of ‘Qualification 1 (Q1): General’ in Chapter II that experience in itself may not guarantee that a lecturer also has a passion for teaching and an interest in the dynamics of the classroom.

Criterion Q1 K1 also required lecturers to have a thorough knowledge of the subjects (discipline content) they taught. Bronwyn responded, “Yes, I would have to agree that I have a thorough knowledge of my area.” Ursula said, “Yes, I would say so. Obviously it becomes increasingly difficult as knowledge expands.” Samantha replied, “Well, as best I can” and said that her lengthy experience as an allied health practitioner assisted in this area. Larissa believed that she had a thorough knowledge of the areas that students needed to know. She commented, “I do have a thorough knowledge of that.” Dahlia reported that she had a thorough knowledge “in the areas
that I participate.. lecture to students. Yes, definitely.” Ruth believed that although she generally had a thorough knowledge of the subjects she taught, she worried about her knowledge of specific diseases. Having said this, Ruth said “However, we have good inbuilt systems in our course to ensure up-to-date knowledge such as involving experts in the area in our teaching, and developing our reading materials.”

**Qualification 1, Criterion K2 (Q1 K2)**

“The lecturer should be aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in his or her field may differ substantially in other academic traditions” (from Table 5.2). Ursula’s response to this introduces a theme that will flow through this chapter and is a foundation for the department’s teaching and learning activities. This refers to the strong Western and scientific assumptions that underwrite both the allied health discipline as well as the pedagogy associated with the department’s academic programs. This is evident in the following exchange:

Researcher: Do you recognise other ways of thinking and knowing and that knowledge differs in other academic traditions and across cultures?

Ursula: Um, yes … I’m certainly aware that’s the situation. I guess I don’t necessarily know a great deal about other traditions but I’m aware that our knowledge tends to be fairly linear and particularly in the science area we tend to value a certain sort of evidence and a certain way of thinking and writing. Other cultures perhaps.. and indeed in other disciplines.. have different approaches.. perhaps a much more circular or a much more lateral approach to thinking.

Researcher: So, in [the allied health discipline] evidence-based practice or knowledge.. something with a scientific justification is fairly well the way things are run here?

Ursula: Absolutely. Yeah, yeah. Obviously, [the allied health discipline] is a science.. and so there’s a lot of fairly straight science but of course we also have sociologically-based topics around behaviour.
Samantha responded to the first question in the above series of exchanges by saying, “I’d say so. Our indigenous people would be a classic example. Yeah, more traditional, more tribal, more culture. Yeah, I think culture informs knowing heaps.” Larissa said, “I am aware, yes.” Ruth’s comment was, “Yes, I think it is true.” Dahlia acknowledged that she was “sure there are different ways of thinking, and there’s no doubt about that.” She also believed that without living and working in places with different dominant traditions, it would “be very hard to sort of pick [that] up and understand [it] to any great extent.” Bronwyn said, “Look I probably haven’t dwelt much on it” but then proceeded to reflect on differences in approaches to learning between cultures. She believed that whilst Australian students demonstrated critical thinking skills, she did not see much evidence of this in students from Asia:

I have noticed with the Asian students that (pause) oh, there have been exceptions, but they … tend to be fairly sure of the actual knowledge.. the facts, as it were (pause) They seem to have them fairly well off pat and they’ll go back to those. They won’t sort of tend to make the associations or draw the analogies that perhaps the Australian students do … It’s a cultural experience.. and the educational experience they’ve had in high school.

Bronwyn’s summation of this approach to learning by Asian students in the department will be a recurrent theme throughout this chapter. Similar sentiments were expressed by other lecturers.

Ruth said that different ways of thinking and knowing across cultures were evident in the cultural diversity in the classroom. She believed that learning in the Australian classroom was structured around an “evidence-based, scientific-based” approach. Whilst Ruth questioned whether students from “a Chinese culture”
extensively rote learned, she said that the department’s teaching philosophy was “more on application of knowledge and applying... learning principles and applying them (pause) using processes, rather than rote learning.” Regardless of whether there were other ways of thinking and knowing, the “absolute endpoint”, according to Ruth, was that all students had to meet the assessment criteria of their respective academic programs. She believed that successful students were those who became skilled in the application of processes to different situations, rather than just learning the facts. In a subsequent interview, the researcher asked how Ruth had formed her opinion on Confucian-heritage students and rote learning. She commented that another lecturer in the department had given a presentation at a departmental meeting and had referred to a paper that cast doubt on whether Chinese students extensively rote learned. Although Ruth could not recall the specifics of the theory, it may well have been the work of Biggs (1996, 2003) that was discussed in Chapter II. The possibility that the lecturers might at least be aware of such theory is a positive sign, for it would indicate a reasonable level of engagement with important issues related to teaching international students. In addition, the fact that the staff meeting was a venue for such discussion is also a positive sign of engagement in this area.

Samantha accepted that students processed the learning experience “in their own way.” She took this “as a given” which “reflected the diversity of the classroom.” She continued, “But I guess I flow along with the common idea that they do go about their learning differently, and they do come from a tradition that’s much more about the repeating of information and storing and regurgitation of facts and less so about critical thinking or creative thinking.” Dahlia said that whilst she
acknowledged that there were other ways of thinking and knowing, and that knowledge differed across cultures, she had not reflected on how it might impact on the understanding and learning of international students.

Summary of lecturers’ responses to Knowledge criteria Q1 K1-K2

Criterion Q1 K1: “The lecturer must be a good academic, with ample teaching experience and a thorough knowledge of the subject” (from Table 5.2). All lecturers were mature-age academic staff who are either presently studying for, or have completed, doctorates in their allied health discipline. The data from the ‘Years of teaching at university’ entry in Table 5.2 shows that there is a possible maximum of 44 years of experience of teaching in higher education between the six lecturers. Although this is not a long time, particularly given that two staff account for well over half of this collective experience, this is balanced by the wealth of experience that exists between the six lecturers as qualified allied health practitioners. On this latter count, there is approximately 150 years of collective experience. It is little wonder that they feel they have a thorough knowledge of the subjects they teach.

This extensive practitioner base may also work in a positive way to counteract the lack of tertiary teaching experience of four of the six staff in particular. As will become more evident as this chapter progresses, a feature of the allied health profession is the centrality of interpersonal communication skills that supports client/patient-centred, reflective practice. It is likely that this ethos is transferred into the teaching and learning environment in the allied health department, given that the lecturers are the embodiment of their professional allied
health practice and are training students to develop similar qualities. Such a professional culture is naturally predisposed to supporting a student-centred learning environment that is responsive to a diversity of student needs. How is criterion Q1 K1 supported by the interview data? The interview data is insufficient to establish whether the lecturers are ‘good’ academics. Two lecturers have extensive experience teaching in the tertiary setting. Although the remaining four lecturers are reasonably new to teaching at university, their mature age, extensive practitioner experience and the supportive, client-centred nature of the allied health profession represent forms of experience that could contribute to that part of the criterion that stipulates ‘ample teaching experience’. All lecturers reported that they have a thorough knowledge of the subject matter they teach.

Criterion Q1 K2: “The lecturer should be aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in his or her field may differ substantially in other academic traditions” (from Table 5.2). The lecturers’ responses raise some important issues in relation to culture and approaches to teaching and learning. These will also percolate throughout the discussion in the remainder of this chapter. Already, it is apparent that whilst the lecturers acknowledge that there are other ways of thinking and knowing, their knowledge about these different approaches is not comprehensive. What is also evident is the Western ontological and epistemological model that underwrites the department’s approach to teaching and learning. The profession gives primacy to evidence-based allied health practice. This is perhaps unsurprising, but what will be critical to note as this chapter progresses is the way that the department and individual lecturers work with this reality. In terms of the Presage-Process-Product
(3P) model of teaching and learning, and Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching that was presented in Chapter II, it remains to be shown how the lecturers approach teaching students from diverse cultural, language and educational backgrounds. How is criterion Q1 K2 supported by the interview data? *All lecturers acknowledge that they are aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in their field may differ substantially in other academic traditions. Most lecturers interpret such difference in terms of their experience with teaching international students.*

**Q1 Skills criteria**

Table 5.3 lists the two criteria in the Skills category of ‘Qualification 1 (Q1): General’. These both refer to different aspects of curricula. Whilst Teekens’s (2000d) accompanying commentary did not make explicit reference to either of these criteria, it is reasonable to suggest that the curricula of the international classroom are meant to support the learning needs of students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. As such, criterion Q1 S1 can be taken to refer to curriculum process (how teaching and learning occurs) and curriculum context (where, when, and to whom content is taught, and why). Criterion Q1 S2 refers to curriculum content (what is taught).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 S1</th>
<th>The lecturer must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 S2</td>
<td>The lecturer must be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 25).
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**Qualification 1, Criterion S1 (Q1 S1)**

“The lecturer must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs” (from Table 5.3). To gather data for this criterion, the researcher asked lecturers to list up to five teaching strategies they each used to support the learning needs of international students. Their responses are grouped under the following general headings:

**Language-related strategies**

Bronwyn said she concentrated on “just trying to speak clearly.” Larissa, too, said that she helped international students by “speaking slowly.. clearly.” Bronwyn also addressed the use of colloquialisms when teaching international students. She said, “If I use a word and I have a thought that perhaps they wouldn’t know what that was (pause) if it’s a bit of an idiom or a bit of slang, then I deliberately use a few other words that might tell them what it is.” Samantha said that she concentrated on “speaking clearly, speaking slowly, interpreting slang, providing explanation, being careful about acronyms and saying them out fully.” Ruth mentioned that she spoke “slower, clearer and [used] less slang. Less Australianisms … or if I do use them, I explain them.”

**Contextualising information**

Samantha thought it was important to provide some context to the information that was presented to international students because they were unlikely to be familiar with aspects of the Australian allied health environment. She said, “So I guess it’s presenting information in as clear a way and with a tiny bit of background
that I think Australian students might have, to help the equity situation of them [the international students] starting off not knowing.. not having that background.”

*Interpersonal communication strategies*

For Ruth, learning the names of the international students was important. She stated that “One of the things I personally work really hard on now is getting to know their names cos I just find that, to me, that makes such a difference. I feel so awkward if I can’t pronounce their names properly or I can’t tell the difference between one or another, you know, it’s really embarrassing.”

*Accessibility strategies*

Bronwyn encouraged international students to contact her by email. She believed that “Allowing them to email you allows them to think about their questions a bit more clearly.”

*Provision of extra help*

Larissa helped international students by “spending a bit more time [with them than] perhaps one would with Australian students as far as (pause) the local knowledge [is concerned].” Ursula gave extra time to international students in two ways. One was “providing them one-to-one [help] if necessary if I see them struggling.” Another way was to explain assessment tasks. She elaborated:

Some assessment tasks (pause) are particularly problematic and so I try to make myself available for a couple of hours in the classroom to actually take questions and talk about the assignment and clarify things and help try to conceptualise. And I often will do things like give out a sheet of paper that says, ‘Essays that get a distinction or a high distinction have got these
characteristics. Or students that have done well in this topic last year did this, this, this, and this.’

**Encouraging participation**

Two types of strategies were listed under this heading. One was encouraging students to participate by letting them be the ‘expert’ about issues related to their home country. Ruth said, “If it’s relevant I invite them to share information about (pause) their own culture.” Ursula suggested that she would often “try to pick things to ask them that I think that they’ll know (pause) Things that relate back to their home country (pause) I know that they’re pretty likely to have something to contribute.” The second type of strategy related to small group work. Ruth encouraged her students to “have a chat in pairs or groups of three or whatever and make sure you’ve got a mix of Australian and international students.” Ursula invited international students to participate, “especially if we’re in small group stuff. I don’t try and put them on the spot too much in the big classes.”

**Simulation strategies**

Larissa used case studies to give international students an opportunity to simulate student-patient interactions. She said, “We’ll look at the notes. We’ll talk about things and we’ll discuss potentially what could be done (pause) [for] that particular patient.. what actions and potential scenarios. So ‘what if’ scenarios and we’d spend, you know, an hour or more on that discussion.”
Clear presentation of information

Samantha thought it was important to present international students with “very clear information.. verbal, documented.. so that the topic booklets and particular assessment tasks are really clear.”

Awareness of available resources

Bronwyn commented that it was important to check if international students understood the study resources at their disposal.

Checking for understanding

Bronwyn said it was important to check if international students were “on the same wavelength” in terms of understanding the expectations related to their academic programs.

Early assessment opportunities with feedback

Ursula commented that all students in the department had assessment tasks soon after starting their studies and received feedback on their performance. Ruth also mentioned this strategy:

We’ve moved the assessment forward so that we have.. we have an early assessment with a low-ish weighting where we.. some of which we look at those specific skills that we think are going to be an issue for the international students and we can pick up the students who are at risk very quickly.
Encourage, applaud and celebrate risk-taking in class

Samantha had a great deal of respect for the international students in the department. She said, “I think they are incredibly courageous because it would have been a lot easier for them to be in a cultural milieu that’s a lot more familiar to them, but they have chosen to put themselves out in a much more confronting situation.” To this end, one of Samantha’s strategies was to encourage, applaud, and celebrate risk-taking in class:

I make a big deal of that and I demand that for myself in order to make the class work. I demand. request that and I reward it immensely with a lot of cheering and acknowledgement. And I feel like they get that. They get what I want.. what I’m asking of them and I do think that they want to.. it’s not that they want to please, but they actually want to be good students, and they want to be helped to be good students and being a good student, or performing student here and it’s not about sitting quietly and then doing well in exams. It’s about participating.

In total, the individual strategies that are evident in the 12 categories above are presented in the following list:

1. Speak clearly.
2. Speak slowly.
3. Explain idiom.
4. Explain acronyms.
5. Contextualise information.
6. Use email for communication.
7. Ensure that students know the learning resources at their disposal.
8. Check for understanding.
9. Clear presentation of written and verbal information to students.
10. Discuss case studies before seeing patients.
11. Spend more time with international students.
12. Get to know students’ names.
13. Pronounce students’ names correctly.
14. Enable international students and Australian students to work together in small groups.
15. Let international students be the experts by relating their experience from their home culture.
17. Explain assessment requirements, for example, what it takes to succeed in essays and assignments.
18. Provide one-to-one support where applicable.
19. Encourage international students to actively participate in small group activities.
20. Encourage, applaud, and celebrate risk-taking in class.

The above list contains the sorts of practical teaching strategies for teaching international students that were outlined in Table 2.15 in Chapter II. In relation to Biggs’s (2003) notion of deficit in Level 2 ‘teaching as accommodating’, each lecturer was asked whether they used such teaching strategies because that was the way international students were used to being taught in their home countries or whether they used them to assist international students to adapt or adjust to the teaching and learning framework in the department. *All lecturers chose the latter option.* This indicates that the lecturers’ focus with international students is to help them make the transition to the teaching and learning framework in the department. Further, although Samantha was the only lecturer to make the observation that the strategies she used were also useful for Australian students, it can be seen that most of the 20 strategies listed above do not preclude Australian students from benefiting from the same sorts of assistance, that is, they have universal application. Collectively, the list of strategies satisfies the requirements of criterion Q1 S1 which asks that lecturers “must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs.” Of particular interest was Dahlia’s response to this criterion. She did not list any specific strategies at all. Instead, her approach was to assess international students in terms of “where they’re at and (pause) what support they need.” Despite the short time Dahlia has spent teaching at university, her approach resonates with the part of Biggs’s (2003)
Chapter V - Examining the Profile’s pillar of practice

Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’ which holds that ethnicity is largely irrelevant in teaching international students.

Qualification 1, Criterion S2 (Q1 S2)

“The lecturer must be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used” (from Table 5.3). What became immediately apparent from talking with the lecturers was the fact that the curriculum content of the department’s academic programs was focused on providing graduates who could work in the Australian health system. Whilst the allied health qualifications could also be used for employment in many overseas countries, their curriculum content was driven by national needs and moderated by the professional association which represented the allied health discipline. This is in stark contrast to Teekens’s view (2000d) that was presented in Chapter III of a world in which “old borders have lost their meaning” (pp. 29-30). As put by Dahlia, “The bottom line is that they come out with an Australian degree which makes them eligible to work in the Australian health system.” She continued, “This course was really designed for Australians to meet [the professional allied health association’s] standards … So in terms of the course design, delivery and things, it’s done as how we want it to do … to develop the sort of professionals that we’re aiming to do.”

Samantha agreed that the content of the degrees was fundamentally set by the requirements of the Australian context “except for what is called independent studies … the freedom for students to undertake their own area of study.” In addition,
Ursula, Ruth, and Bronwyn referred to a topic that students undertook on socio-cultural issues related to the allied health discipline. Of interest, Samantha saw this topic as having its own set of challenges for international students because it was “very discursive and ideas-oriented... [For international students] to know how to write like that and to know how to think and express themselves like that is challenging.”

Despite the directed nature of the bulk of curriculum content towards national ends, some lecturers made efforts where possible to encourage international perspectives. Ursula reported that she had made attempts “to give students options, for example, in assessment tasks... to pursue... use data or guidelines or whatever from their own country.” Even this, however, was potentially problematic. Ursula said, “Students haven’t taken that offer up partly because the level of data... the quality and the access to it is much more limited than in Australia.” The compounding challenge, according to Ursula, was that “There are also issues around me marking and assessing them because I have the same problem with accessing the information and it’s stuff that I’m not familiar with. So, it requires me to almost prepare a teaching session on it before[hand].” This is an important point which demonstrates that internationalising the curriculum entails more than just infusing internationalised content into subject material. It requires the lecturer to be knowledgeable about the material itself.

When Ruth was asked if content examples from various cultural and educational settings were evident in the department’s curriculum, she said, “I
wouldn’t say that it’s a major thing by any means, but it is certainly there. It would be more minor things than major.” When the researcher asked whether she thought that this had something to do with the requirements of the Australian association which represented the profession of the allied health discipline, Ruth gave the following reply:

That’s right, it’s an Australian qualification with Australian competencies defined, and you know there’s just.. it’s a very full course and so there is a limit to what you can put in and we’re really choc-a-bloc full. So you put in anything you have to take something out and so while it would seem to be nice, it’s almost viewed as a bit of a luxury, really, in some ways. In the topics that I teach I probably have a little bit more international stuff in it than some of the other topics, but that’s just the nature of the topic. It’s not because I’ve chosen to do that. The topic this lends itself to it a bit and I still wouldn’t say that there’s a huge amount in, but there’s some.

Summary of lecturers’ responses to Skills criteria Q1 S1-S2

Criterion Q1 S1: “The lecturer must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs” (from Table 5.3). Five of the six lecturers reported using a range of teaching strategies to support the learning needs of international students. Many of these are the sorts of strategies that are promoted by the literature (as evidenced in Chapter II) to help international students adapt or adjust to the teaching and learning approach in Australian universities. How is criterion Q1 S1 supported by the interview data? Five out of the six lecturers could describe specific strategies they used to support international students in the academic setting. Many of these strategies have universal application to all students.
Criterion Q1 S2: “The lecturer must be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used” (from Table 5.3). It is evident that the subject content is largely oriented to meet the requirements of the professional association of the allied health discipline which, in turn, commits the department to meeting the needs of the Australian health setting. As a result, there are limited opportunities to imbue the content of the academic programs with international perspectives. The international students who choose to study the department’s programs, therefore, have to fit in with this model despite the nature of the health setting and the cultural particularities that might exist in their home countries. It appears that the best that the lecturers can do in this situation is to support the international students to become familiar with the characteristics of the Australian health setting and the way that ‘Australian culture’ puts its own distinctive stamp on that environment. How is criterion Q1 S2 supported by the interview data? *Whilst some internationalised curriculum content is imbued into the allied health academic programs, this is not a strong feature of the department’s educational offerings.*

**Q1 Attitude criteria**

Table 5.4 lists the three criteria in the Attitude category of ‘Qualification 1 (Q1): General’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 A1</th>
<th>The lecturer must be open, flexible and interested in the teaching and learning customary [sic] in other cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 A2</td>
<td>The lecturer should be aware that some students ascribe him or her [sic] a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or she has been used to within his or her own tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 A3</td>
<td>The lecturer should reflect on the cultural context of his or her role as a teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 25).
“The lecturer must be open, flexible and interested in the teaching and learning customary [sic] in other cultures” (from Table 5.4). Criterion Q1 A1 is awkward in its literal presentation, especially given that Teekens’s (2000d) commentary which accompanied this qualification did not ‘unpack’ its meaning. Its substance, however, appears to want lecturers to be open to, flexible with, and interested in different approaches to education in other cultures. The researcher felt that this criterion could be best answered by asking the lecturers if they were open, flexible, and interested in teaching learners from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. Whilst still documenting their attitudes towards difference in general, it makes the object of enquiry the international student as the product or embodiment of different approaches to teaching and learning in other cultures and, indeed, other cultures themselves. Larissa’s succinct response to the amended question was, “Yes, all three. I think I’m open to.. I’m flexible and I’m interested.” Dahlia, too, commented that she was open, flexible, and interested in international students, but to this point the focus of her interest had not been on cultural issues:

I certainly call myself open. I think I’d hope I was flexible, but in terms, I guess, to be honest, I haven’t gone out of my way to investigate what I should be doing specifically for those students to help them. I guess I use what I use in other ways, but I think I would be more.. I certainly believe I have understanding. I’m certainly interested in wanting them to achieve their goals, but in terms of.. I haven’t put effort into investigating how they perceive things. So I haven’t really looked at trying to understand.

Dahlia said she could see her students progressing and “learning a lot.” If she noticed they were not moving forward she would reflect on her teaching and ask, “What do I need to do?” Despite the few years that Dahlia has taught at university,
plus her frank admission about not having investigated cultural dimensions associated with broader teaching and learning processes, it is clear that she engages in reflective practice in relation to the progress of her students. Biggs (2003) might well say this is indicative of ‘teaching as educating’.

Bronwyn said that she was “quite keen to teach culturally diverse students” but was not as flexible as she would like to be because of “the time precious thing. That’s where it means spending a bit more time thinking.. consulting.” Ursula, too, described herself as being open, flexible, and interested in teaching culturally diverse learners, but “the everyday reality of managing within limited resources though sometimes makes translating that interest into best practice quite difficult.”

When questioned about the nature of the limitations, Ursula referred to the number of students that had to be managed in relation to the overall workload demanded by her senior position in the department. Part of the interest in teaching international students for Ursula was that “They bring a level of, um, enjoyment often into the classroom I think.” To explain this, she drew a distinction between the largely independent Australian students and the international students who often needed more support. Ursula said, “I mean, sometimes they [international students] bring a level of frustration and, and a feeling of helplessness in me because I don’t know.. I don’t feel I know what to do to help.” This is a bold disclosure from Ursula, the most experienced lecturer in the department. International students, she said, caused her “to think more about how students learn and, you know, and you pay attention to that in the classroom and, and look for ways of supporting students.”
felt like she made a difference to their learning and they made a positive difference to her teaching: “So, I think they add a different dimension of personal satisfaction in, in the teaching.” These last two observations are stand-out comments from Ursula.

Ruth said that she had “moved to” being open, flexible and interested in teaching culturally diverse learners after initially being “a bit anti-international students.”

Ruth’s stand-out comment is significant and is worth relating in full:

I have to say when I first started teaching, I probably wasn’t very open to it and really to be honest, I was, because from a teaching point of view, what happens is, it changes the way you teach in a classroom, and when I first started teaching, and when I was based at the [major city] hospital and only doing a little bit of work here, we had a small number of international students and a lot of Australian students, and so it was.. they were largely ignored probably to be honest, and it didn’t change the way you taught the whole group because they were just a few quiet ones within the group. But as the numbers have increased, cos we’re now sitting on fifty percent.. and as the numbers have increased you can’t ignore that. And if you go into a tute and you have fifty percent of students who are Australian and will open up and communicate really well, and another fifty percent who won’t open their mouths, then it changes the way the whole tute interacts … And I think that kinda forced me to be a bit more interested and to learn a bit more about how to best encourage international students and how to tap into some of their strengths etcetera, because I found that you just couldn’t keep using the same kind of teaching techniques. And so I became a bit more interested then, and I feel I know very little about it, so I like to think I’m a bit sort of open and flexible as to what might help in the future.

Ruth’s comment above expresses a transformative experience in her approach to teaching in response to increasing greater numbers of international students in her classes. It is encouraging to hear her wanting to tap into the strengths of the international students. Overall, her stand-out comment implies a reflective process and the flexibility to pursue an expanded repertoire of teaching strategies to help address the learning needs of members of the student group.
When Samantha was asked if she was open, flexible, and interested in teaching culturally diverse learners, she said, “Yes, I think so. I guess as.. particularly as an immigrant to this country and having come from South East Asia.” She said that she was keen to see Australia, her “new country[,] become more and more multicultural and for that to be manifested in every area. So the classroom is one of them.” As will be shown in the remainder of this chapter, Samantha’s upbringing in another country and culture has had a big impact on her outlook on life and her approach to teaching. Samantha also commented that the focus in the department up until recently had been largely on teaching and learning issues. It was only beginning to acquire a research focus. A lot of the department’s energy to this point, therefore, has been invested in understanding teaching and learning processes. Such a focus would appear to bode well for all students in the department.

Qualification 1, Criterion A2 (Q1 A2)

“The lecturer should be aware that some students ascribe him or her [sic] a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or she has been used to within his or her own tradition” (from Table 5.4). In Chapter II it was shown that the focus of this criterion related to gender and age and was a specific note directed to young, female lecturers in terms of how they might be perceived by male students from different cultures. The responses to criterion Q1 A2 from lecturers in the department, however, were more aligned to the teaching and learning backgrounds of international students rather than cultural issues surrounding age and gender. Bronwyn said, “I think the Australian students probably would question my knowledge base more than international students [who] expect you to be the fount of
all knowledge. I don’t know that Australian students do. Knowledge is up for grabs a little bit with them.” Bronwyn believed that the cultural and educational background of international students explained this. “It has come out of their.. probably their family background and the educational context that they’ve come from.” Larissa had a similar view. She said that international students “are used to more the didactic type of teaching. They expect that teachers will tell them things and that what they say is correct and you can’t question.” Larissa believed that the educational background of international students led them to being “more accepting of what a teacher is saying and not critically look at it and I think that’s probably.. well, it is a function of their own education system and their culture and their respect for a teacher or someone older.” Ruth offered similar thoughts to Bronwyn and Larissa:

Oh yes, I think the perception could be quite different … It is often to do with the schooling and the sort of relationship they have had with their teachers. So whether they view you as an authority figure or whether they view you as somebody to interact and sort of more a partner in their learning … The international students in my limited understanding of it is that they come from a background where the teacher is much more authoritarian and much more respected … The students don’t challenge the teacher as much, but also they don’t view them as partners in their learning. So I think for me, what they are looking for is somebody who tells them the facts.

The idea of the lecturer and the student having a ‘partnership in learning’ is an evocative description of the student-centred, or student-directed, approach to teaching and learning that was discussed in ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’ in Chapter II. Samantha and Ursula also thought that the way international students initially presented in the Australian classroom had a lot to do with their previous experiences. Samantha said, “They will filter the experience, their learning experience, through that.. all that
cultural context.” She believed that all students expected lecturers “to be experts.. reasonably expert. That’s the hat you wear.” Ursula believed that students would perceive her role in terms of what they experienced in their home culture. “It’s about different education systems in different countries. Different cultural approaches and issues.” Ursula said that when international students felt uncomfortable addressing her by her given name, or called her Dr Ursula, she presumed that “it’s perpetuated by.. that cultural approach to authority or the hierarchical nature of organisations within other cultures translates into the educational system … Learning in a system where the teacher’s word is final … so the teacher takes on this authority role as the person who keeps the information.” The comments from the lecturers note the differences in approaches to teaching in different countries. Nowhere is there the suggestion that these different approaches are deficient in any way.

Dahlia’s response stood out from the contributions of the other lecturers. She said, “I’d definitely say that’s not something that I’ve really thought about, how they might perceive me … cos I guess they get what they get from me, you know. I don’t change how I present myself depending on who I might be talking to. I might change what I say and phrase it differently. Does that make sense?” It is clear that Dahlia expects students to take her at face value. “I guess how I come over, they would perceive that differently, and I can’t change how they feel themselves.” Whilst Dahlia’s comments give the impression that she could be dismissive of the needs of international students, her conversations throughout the multiple interviews were peppered with her desire to be approachable and supportive of all her students. She said, for example, “I would hope that everyone would feel comfortable about
approaching me” and “I hope I wouldn’t brush them off or ignore them.” In another interview Dahlia reported, “I’ve had students certainly express appreciation of support given. Certainly on more the one-to-one.. sort of, you know, a bit of a mentoring relationship. They appreciated that. Um, I would hope that they would see me as approachable, supportive, understanding, um, fair. Ah, um, but probably set high standards.” Dahlia’s response indicates a grounded sense of Self that relates to Cranton’s (2001) notion of authenticity in “being yourself” that was discussed in Chapter III.

Qualification 1, Criterion A3 (Q1 A3)

“The lecturer should reflect on the cultural context of his or her role as a teacher” (from Table 5.4). When Bronwyn was asked whether she did this, she replied “Yes, I think I do sometimes” and couched her answer in terms of the cultural differences that international students might notice. She said that some had expressed to her that although they found it “quite acceptable … that we allow them to talk with us” and “being on first-name basis with them”, such behaviour “wouldn’t be acceptable back home.” Bronwyn also said that she was “quite happy to tell them that I don’t know the answer to something.” By demonstrating to the international students that “We’re just here to show you where to get the information but more importantly to teach you skills to assess the information that you collect”, Bronwyn was referring to the likelihood that international students came to Australia with different expectations of lecturers. Ruth gave a similar response. She emphasised to international students that her main role was to guide them in their learning rather than to provide the answers. She said, “I acknowledge right from the beginning that
we’re not going to cover everything that they need to know and so we set up this sort of lifelong learning kind of process and put a lot of emphasis on process and the students finding out information for themselves.” Ruth viewed herself “much more as a facilitator of learning than I would as a, you know, stand up the front and pearls of wisdom drop from my lips.”

Whilst Ursula hoped that she would be seen by the students in a similar vein, that is, “a facilitator or a manager of learning”, she also thought that her senior role in the department meant that “there are some issues for students around my approachability … I think I’m seen as the person.. the big cheese … If the ‘riot act’ has to be read to anybody or if there are issues (pause) professionalism or issues of dealing with difficult students (pause) I’m wheeled in as the person to sort it out.”

Larissa said that she reflected on the cultural context of her role as a teacher. She worked mainly one-on-one with students in the clinical setting and described her role as a “self-directed, self-initiated activity” which was hospital-based and physically remote from the office of the allied health department at the university. Although her interactions with students were characterised by dialogue and negotiation, there were “certain times that I would definitely say ‘this is what needs to happen’ … I’d discuss it and we’d talk about other alternatives but in that sort of example, students need to have a certain number of hours [of clinical practice].” Although Larissa engages in dialogue with students and is open to negotiating study-related arrangements, she also directs students, if necessary, to ensure that they have the best chance of satisfying the assessment criteria. When Samantha was asked if
she reflected on the cultural context of her role as a teacher she replied, “I can’t say that I do a lot, actually … but I suppose I’m really.. I’m aware of power.. power differentials and really, I guess conscious about power, and wanting to work from a framework of empowering students.” She did not consider herself or the department in general to have an authoritarian ethos:

The first word that popped in was egalitarian. I mean, I think we lecture in much the way we live. There is a general egalitarian kind of flavour as in the first name, you know, fairly casual.. the freedom to ask questions. We don’t see ourselves as sitting on the top of this pinnacle of knowledge, and therefore we admit to not knowing things or being quite casual about that … [It] demystifies the expert status a bit.

Samantha said she saw new international students coming into the department as being “shy I suppose. I see them coming in shy and very deferring to authority.” Dahlia’s response to criterion Q1 A3 was “I would say probably I haven’t reflected on that. I guess I use stuff from my own experience, which is deeply seated in Australian culture, as a fourth-generation Australian who lived nearly all my life in [name of Australian city]. I did spend two and a half years travelling and experienced a wide range of cultures.” When the researcher asked Dahlia why she had not reflected on the cultural context of her role as a teacher, she replied “I reflect on the interactions I have with students and I guess I don’t sort of reflect on them in terms of the wider.. about how my cultural background has determined how I act I guess … I’m not sure whether that’s going to help me.” Dahlia perceived her role as a teacher to be a guide and facilitator who assisted students and acted as a resource “but not to provide all the answers.” She said she was approachable and steered students in a certain direction and let them know guidelines and things that had to be achieved, but
“I don’t see myself as a didactic authoritarian … a peer to a degree. I mean not totally that.” Again, Dahlia’s grounded sense of Self shines through.

**Summary of lecturers’ responses to Attitude criteria Q1 A1-A3**

Criterion Q1 A1: “The lecturer must be open, flexible and interested in the teaching and learning customary in other cultures” (from Table 5.4). The lecturers agree they are generally open, flexible, and interested in teaching learners from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. For some, their interest in this area is limited by the time they can spend exploring this further because of competing demands in the workplace. Lecturers such as Dahlia, Bronwyn and Ruth indicated that although they engage with international student-related teaching issues, what they know of this area is reasonably superficial. There is evidence from the data from Ruth and Ursula that they have had transformative experiences as a result of their engagement with international students. The catalyst for Ruth to change her teaching practice to better support international students has been the increasing number of students from other countries in her classes. Ursula’s comment that she made a difference to the learning of international students and they made a positive difference to her teaching is particularly significant. How is criterion Q1 A1 supported by the interview data? *All lecturers state that they are generally open, flexible, and interested in teaching learners from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds.*

Criterion Q1 A2: “The lecturer should be aware that some students ascribe him or her [sic] a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or
she has been used to within his or her own tradition” (from Table 5.4). The lecturers’ responses to this criterion concern the teaching and learning backgrounds of international students rather than cultural issues surrounding age and gender. Their observations are consistent with the comments they made for criterion Q1 A3 (see the following criterion). How is criterion Q1 A2 supported by the interview data? 

The lecturers are aware that some international students may see their teaching role in a different light based on their previous experience in educational settings in their home countries.

Criterion Q1 A3: “The lecturer should reflect on the cultural context of his or her role as a teacher” (from Table 5.4). To greater and lesser extents, all lecturers have reflected on the cultural context of their role as teachers. With the exception of Dahlia, a catalyst for this appears to have been their engagement with international students. In alignment with the student-centred learning model, they see a ‘teacher’ as synonymous with facilitator, someone who empowers students, a guide, a partner-in-learning, a mentor, and someone who manages and negotiates learning rather than dictates it. In addition, they interpret the likely differences in expectations of international students towards them as teachers as being largely determined by the students’ previous cultural and educational experiences.

The lecturers said students from Asian countries are likely to have experienced a teacher-centred, or teacher-directed, model of learning in which teachers are seen as authoritarian figures that dictate content and are not open to being challenged by students in the learning process. Note that although such
differences are noted by the lecturers, their interview data do not suggest that this represents a deficit model of education. Rather than expecting students to merely assimilate into the teaching and learning model that is utilised in the department, the focus of the lecturers is on assisting all students to adjust to teaching that is aimed at producing rich (deep) learning outcomes such as contextually synthesising and applying a body of knowledge rather than just ‘learning the facts’. How is criterion Q1 A3 supported by the interview data? To greater and lesser extents, all lecturers have reflected on the cultural context of their role as teachers. A catalyst for this has been the presence of international students in their classes.

Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction

Some criteria in this qualification are not relevant to the Australian university setting and they were not examined (see the explanatory notes at the bottom of Table 5.5, Table 5.6, and Table 5.7).

Q2 Knowledge criteria

Table 5.5 lists the three criteria in the Knowledge category of ‘Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction’.

Table 5.5 Qualification 2 (Q2), Knowledge Criteria K1-K3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2 K1</th>
<th>The lecturer must have a very good oral and written command of the language of instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 K2</td>
<td>The lecturer must be capable of writing general texts, scientific reports and articles in the language of instruction and, where required, policy papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 K3</td>
<td>The lecturer must know the terms in the language of instruction that are used for teaching the subject in question, and be familiar with the jargon in his or her field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1. Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 27).

Note 2. Criteria Q2 K1-K3 were not examined. The lecturers’ knowledge in relation to these is self-evident.
In Chapter II it was shown that a fundamental feature of the international classroom in parts of Western Europe is that it operates in a language other than the lecturer’s first language. Clearly, this is not the experience of any of the lecturers in the allied health department under consideration. All are native English speakers who have either completed, or are studying for, doctorates in the allied health discipline. In addition, all have extensive experience as practitioners in an allied health discipline that places a great deal of importance on communication with patients, clients, and medical and allied health professionals in the Australian health system. Further, all lecturers are, to lesser and greater extents, experienced teachers in the tertiary setting. Whilst aspects of their skills and attitudes associated with language in the classroom are explored in this qualification, the researcher considered it unnecessary to examine the three criteria listed in Table 5.5 because the lecturers’ knowledge in this area, whilst bound to vary in terms of levels of experience and expertise, is self-evident. They are mature-age, experienced, qualified allied health practitioners with tertiary qualifications and they use their native language in their work which is situated in their own cultural setting. Further, the fact that all lecturers are either presently studying or have completed a doctoral degree should hold some currency when it comes to making a claim on their behalf that they have the knowledge to satisfy the requirements of the criteria listed in Table 5.5.

Summary of lecturers’ responses to Knowledge criteria Q2 K1-K3

By virtue of the characteristics of the lecturers in relation to the above discussion, it is expected that their language-related knowledge in this area would satisfy the Profile’s requirements. How are criteria Q2 K1-K3 supported by the
interview data? All lecturers are expected to be able to satisfy these three criteria without this having to be substantiated by interview data.

**Q2 Skills criteria**

Table 5.6 lists the criteria in the Skills category of this second qualification. Whilst the lecturers’ knowledge of the English language in relation to their work at university and in their allied health profession is self-evident, other teaching skills associated with communication cannot be assumed. To this end, all but one of the criteria in Table 5.6 were examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.6 Qualification 2 (Q2), Skills Criteria S1-S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S1 The lecturer must be able to use the language of instruction in such a way that the natural flow of speech is not impeded by unnatural use of the voice, such as speaking very loudly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S2 The lecturer must be aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, but not use it in an extreme manner, such as making exaggerated movements to support spoken language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S3 The lecturer must be able to say things in different ways, rephrasing sentences that are not understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S4 The lecturer should use audio-visual aids in support of spoken texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S5 The lecturer must never use two languages at the same time, for example to explain something quickly to some of the students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1.* Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 27).

*Note 2.* Criterion Q2 S5 was not examined because it is not relevant to the department under consideration.

**Qualification 2, Criterion S1 (Q2 S1)**

“The lecturer must be able to use the language of instruction in such a way that the natural flow of speech is not impeded by unnatural use of the voice, such as speaking very loudly” (from Table 5.6). This criterion concerns voice control and projection. Most lecturers interpreted this criterion in terms of being able to be heard,
that is speaking loudly enough. Dahlia responded, “Yes I do. I think I can speak and project my voice.” She attributed her skill in this area to “a long history of standing up and having a say in sort of large meetings and things.” Ruth questioned her voice control and projection skills. She said, “It’s not something I have thought about. I don’t know that it would be a reasonable skill but I don’t get complaints from people about that.” Her strategy in large classes was to use a microphone to address the students as well as “making sure they all sit down in the first three or four rows so that we don’t have people scattered all the way up the back.”

When Larissa was asked if she had good voice control and projection, she said, “At times (laugh).” She continued, “I’ve never been taught that so it’s more informal and more self-taught.” Ursula thought she had good voice control and projection in the classroom. She said “In actual fact, a number of my [formal teaching evaluations by students] actually comment on that. My student comments say that ‘She has a clear and loud voice’.” The researcher asked Ursula if that was a skill that had been developed through a course. She responded, “No, it’s probably just innate. I just talk loudly.” Ursula said that she was “also aware that I talk very quickly and I try really hard not to do that.” A strategy she used to address this was to ask students to “just put up their hand and attract my attention and I won’t speak to them, but it will just be a signal to me to slow down.” Bronwyn thought that she had “reasonable voice control and projection” and that her skill in this area had been “learnt over many years from tutes and lectures.” She said that this included knowing “how to pace the talk so that it is the right speed, making sure that the tone is varied.”
Samantha made the following responses in relation to having good voice control and projection:

Yes, I would say reasonable. I would be reasonably satisfied. I don’t think I’m a soft speaker and having worked in community [allied health discipline] for a long time where we do a lot of group education and group talks, I think I’ve learnt over those many years to project my voice and have, I think, noticed that improve over the years. Probably started off as maybe a softer speaker.

*Qualification 2, Criterion S2 (Q2 S2)*

“The lecturer must be aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, but not use it in an extreme manner, such as making exaggerated movements to support spoken language” (from Table 5.6). The first part of this criterion is critical, that is, it is important to find out whether or not lecturers understand the role of body language in their communication with students. The expression of this part of the criterion makes it more of a Knowledge statement. The second part of the criterion was not examined. It is an odd, skills-related requirement which perhaps reflects the belief of the creators of the Profile that conservative body language is universally more acceptable than exaggerated body language. Teekens (2000d) provided no evidence to support this claim.

The lecturers were asked if they understood or reflected on how body language might be interpreted by international students in the classroom. Dahlia said, “For myself... no.. to be frank, honest, no.” She felt that she projected herself in a fairly open manner in terms of body language and said that “I’ve never had anybody to come and watch me and say yea or nay on that, or comment on that.” The
researcher put the example to Dahlia of an Australian lecturer sitting on the table and
dangling their legs and asked her if she had thought of the reaction this might evoke
for some international students:

Well, I haven’t thought of, no. I haven’t thought that that [sic] could be, say,
offensive. I guess I just conduct myself in a way that I think should be
appropriate for whoever. I mean I might sit on a desk, and I have sat on a
desk. I would sit with my knees together and would I sit up straight, and I just
do that so I am not standing all the time. Just as a bum prop really.

Again, from Dahlia’s comment, there is the strong impression that ‘what you
see is what you get’ in terms of the way she presents in the academic setting. Further,
the presence of international students does not seem to have been a catalyst for her to
reflect on cultural issues related to non-verbal communication. It is important to note,
however, that Dahlia’s interview data to this point also shows that this disposition is
not one of arrogance or one which is dismissive or unsupportive of international
students.

When Ruth was asked if she considered the role of body language in the
classroom, she responded, “Not hugely. A little. I remember an international student
once years ago, telling me that in her culture it was very rude to sit on a table,
whereas I do that all the time. You know, if there is a table out the front and I am
walking and I sort of just rest my bottom on it.” Ruth also commented on the body
language of the international students in terms of eye contact. She said that some
make eye contact whilst others do not: “I wouldn’t say that there is a trend overall
with international students anymore, I think there is a mix the same as there is with
Australian students.” This comment about a mix of behaviours from students even
from the same country is something that is pervasive throughout the interview data from the lecturers in general. More will be said about this in the consideration of criterion Q3 A2 which concerns stereotypes. For the moment, it can be said that the extent to which individual differences of students are appreciated and acknowledged is a positive indication for the support of all students in the department’s academic programs.

Larissa’s response to criterion Q2 S2 was, “Yes, I am aware and try to be sensitive to this particularly when talking individually with a student from another culture.” Samantha thought that body language played “a very large part of [sic] communication” and indicated that in some cultures “things like eye contact is not highly prized. Yeah, you know, I guess touch would be of concern in some cultures. Over-familiarity. Yeah.” Samantha said that she was aware of these things “probably at a fairly unconscious level. I’m not very self-conscious about body language while I’m teaching.” She used body language to project enthusiasm and wanted her students to pick up on her excitement about what was being taught. Ursula said, “Sure, yes, I think so”, when asked if she understood the role of body language in the classroom. She said she changed her body language depending upon whether she was giving a lecture or a tutorial. In the lecture, Ursula moved around. “I don’t just sort of stand in one place.” In the tutorial, she tried to “make eye contact and face students, and I certainly try not to turn my back on the class - those kinds of things.” When it was put to her that some international students might be surprised to see lecturers lean against or sit on desks, Ursula made a particularly important comment on authenticity and teaching:
But is that a problem? … I guess my view is (pause) I need to be authentic. I need to be me, and I need to be culturally sensitive. But I don’t think it’s appropriate for me to consciously try and change my basic personal style, because other peoples’ response to that will be very variable and there’s no doubt that for some students in the class that would prefer a more casual style and find someone who’s more casual more approachable and other students will have the opposite reaction. So I think that you have to be yourself. You have to be authentic, because I think people pick up on that pretty quickly, if you’re not.

Ursula’s stand-out comment reflects the fundamental thinking of Cranton’s (2001) notion of authenticity in teaching in higher education that was outlined in Chapter III. It is expressed in a more sophisticated way than Dahlia’s ‘take me as I am’ statements. The thinking of these two lecturers in this area is different from the multi-reference grid curricula undercurrent in the Profile of trying to be ‘everything to everyone’ that was noted in the section titled ‘Meeting the needs of all students in the international classroom’ in Chapter II. Ursula’s comment that she had to be ‘herself’ and ‘culturally sensitive’ is indicative of the sort of self-assessment that could sustain a rooted cosmopolitan outlook. It is a particularly refined appraisal of (her)Self in a context characterised by cultural, language, and educational diversity.

Bronwyn agreed that she was aware of the role of body language. Her awareness of this was “learnt from observing others giving talks and seminars.. also some university teaching skills seminars.” Bronwyn said that there were “cultural issues” involved in the interpretation of body language and she gave some examples from the classroom: “Making eye contact or not. Not being too familiar. Encouraging questions during the lectures may succeed if the body language does not discourage students. This is particularly an issue for some Asian students used to formal lecturers.” The sort of body language Bronwyn used to encourage students was
“pausing sufficiently when asking for questions” so that there were gaps for students to respond. Whilst this might be classified by many as a skill related to verbal delivery, Bronwyn conflated both verbal and physical cues to construct the pause: “The body language is also saying that here is a chance to interrupt and ask what you do not understand, here is some time to think, reflect and digest about what we are talking about.” The pause in speaking was accompanied by “stepping forward a little, smiling encouraging, extending an arm and nodding to gesture ‘Yes, that is good question’ or point.. keep going’.”

Qualification 2, Criterion S3 (Q2 S3)

“The lecturer must be able to say things in different ways, rephrasing sentences that are not understood” (from Table 5.6). This skill is likely to be self-evident given that the lecturers are native English speakers. Bronwyn commented that although rephrasing was useful when communicating with all students in the class, “I probably do more rephrasing with international students, especially if it appears that they are puzzled and if I use an expression that I realise they may not understand.” Larissa felt “very confident” in this area and indicated that she rephrased sentences when it was clear that the students did not understand something. She sometimes attributed this to differing cultural expectations (see also criterion Q3 A1). Ruth, too, believed that she could say things in different ways but she did this only when she was aware that students needed such support. When asked if she was skilled in this area, Dahlia thought she “probably had a moderate skill … I mean, I certainly do try to explain things in different ways to people to make it
understood. And perhaps to use examples to... different examples to try and illustrate what I’m meaning.”

Ursula believed she was skilled in this area and referred to student feedback indicating that she was “very good at explanations. That I can restate it in a different way. That I can explain things clearly and logically and I’m very conscious of that in the class.” In addition, Ursula used examples and anecdotes to help make information clearly understandable to students. Samantha thought she was “reasonably good” at saying things in different ways so people could understand a point of view. She used different approaches like “sight, auditory, visual, kinaesthetic, etcetera ... not just using one... not just saying ‘do you see what I mean?’ or painting ideas in visual pictures, but using a range of modalities.” Samantha also used examples to help provide students with a clear picture of what she was trying to explain.

*Qualification 2, Criterion S4 (Q2 S4)*

“The lecturer should use audio-visual aids in support of spoken texts” (from Table 5.6). When asked about this criterion, Dahlia responded, “Yes, I always have... always using PowerPoint,²¹ overheads. So I always have and make them [hard copies] available to students.” She said that handing out printed materials was a strategy to stop students from spending their time “just scribbling down” and instead to “listen and reflect on what I’m saying.” Bronwyn reported that she used

---

²¹ PowerPoint is a computer software application that creates ‘slides’ that can be projected onto a screen and/or printed as hard-copy notes as handouts for students.
PowerPoint “and occasionally use on-line material.” Larissa used “mainly overheads and PowerPoint.” Ruth said, “Yes, sort of routinely, I would use PowerPoint. So we would usually be in a lecture theatre with the overheads projected up onto the screen and then the students get a handout that is a copy of all the overheads.”

Samantha stated she had moved away from using the overhead projector to using PowerPoint because a lot of students used the same software and it also provided the facility to use “images or to use graphics more.” Samantha reported that she “cannot absorb information if it’s purely auditory. I have to see information as well as hear it and I use that principle a lot. So I never speak without images.. you know, the words up in images.” When Ursula was asked if she used audio-visual aids to support her presentations, she responded, “Yes, and try and give written notes as well, put notes on the Web, and then have overheads.”

Qualification 2, Criterion S5 (Q2 S5)

“The lecturer must never use two languages at the same time, for example to explain something quickly to some of the students” (from Table 5.6). Samantha was the only lecturer who indicated that she spoke another language (see Table 5.2). Her skill with this language was “a bit rusty these days.” She did not use it when teaching students who spoke this language. This criterion, as a result, was not examined beyond establishing this point.
Summary of lecturers’ responses to Skills criteria Q2 S1-S5

Criterion Q2 S1: “The lecturer must be able to use the language of instruction in such a way that the natural flow of speech is not impeded by unnatural use of the voice, such as speaking very loudly” (from Table 5.6). All lecturers were satisfied with their voice control and projection skills and have developed these skills ‘by doing’. The data to this point in the chapter show that ‘learning from experience’ or ‘learning on the job’ is a feature of the development of their teaching. This finding is consistent with the literature on university teaching that was reported in Chapter II in the section titled ‘Teaching in higher education’. How is criterion Q2 S1 supported by the interview data? The lecturers are confident that they are skilled in the use of voice control in their teaching activities.

Criterion Q2 S2: “The lecturer must be aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, but not use it in an extreme manner, such as making exaggerated movements to support spoken language” (from Table 5.6). Only the first part of the criterion was examined. Bronwyn is the only lecturer who has had some training in this area. Other lecturers vary in the degree to which they note the role of body language in their teaching. For example, Dahlia said she has not given this any thought. Ruth expresses “a little” familiarity with this. Ruth, Samantha, and Bronwyn provided examples of body language in the classroom when they indicated that international students might not like eye contact from the lecturer. Overall, the data indicate that the lecturers use normal body language that is associated with teaching in the Australian tertiary setting. Succinctly, they are true to themselves. Ursula’s stand-out comment about having to be culturally sensitive yet remain
authentic to herself is particularly noteworthy for it demonstrates an appreciation of cultural difference whilst operating from a grounded sense of Self. How is criterion Q2 S2 supported by the interview data? *Most lecturers are aware of the role of body language in their teaching but they do not change their body language because of the presence of international students.*

Criterion Q2 S3: “The lecturer must be able to say things in different ways, rephrasing sentences that are not understood” (from Table 5.6). All lecturers are confident in their ability to say things in different ways in order to enhance students’ understanding. How is criterion Q2 S3 supported by the interview data? *All lecturers are confident that they can say things in different ways and rephrase sentences that students do not understand.*

Criterion Q2 S4: “The lecturer should use audio-visual aids in support of spoken texts” (from Table 5.6). All lecturers indicated that they use audio-visual aids in their group teaching. PowerPoint was a popular visual adjunct to the delivery of lectures and tutorials. Three of the six lecturers said they also distribute hard copy notes of the lecture material to students. How is criterion Q2 S4 supported by the interview data? *All lecturers indicate that they use audio-visual aids in their group teaching.*

Criterion Q2 S5: “The lecturer must never use two languages at the same time, for example to explain something quickly to some of the students” (from Table 5.6). This criterion was not examined beyond establishing that Samantha did
not use her second language in her teaching. How is criterion Q2 S5 supported by the interview data? *No lecturers use two languages in their teaching.*

**Q2 Attitude criteria**

Table 5.7 lists the five criteria in the Attitude category of ‘Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction’. Similar to the criteria in the Skills category of this qualification, the Attitude criteria revolve around communication skills of lecturers in the international classroom. Criteria Q2 A4 and Q2 A5 (and a different perspective taken on Q2 A1) introduce issues associated with the English language as the medium of instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.7 Qualification 2 (Q2), Attitude Criteria A1-A5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A1 The lecturer must be aware of the fact that he or she is not using his or her native tongue and reflect on this fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A2 The lecturer should be aware that body language and other non-verbal aspects of communication have a great impact on the way he or she is understood (or misunderstood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A3 The lecturer must be aware of the role of humour in communication, but also that humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined spheres of personal identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A4 The lecturer must be aware that different levels of language proficiency within the group may account for differences in performance, but should not simply ascribe attitude to language (a ‘silent’ person may be shy, not interested, incompetent, bored, full of respect for the teacher or one of a whole range of explanations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 A5 The lecturer should be open to suggestions as regards [sic] the use of language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1. Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, pp. 27-28).*

*Note 2. Q2 A1 was not examined because it is not relevant to the department under consideration.*

**Qualification 2, Criterion A1 (Q2 A1)**

“The lecturer must be aware of the fact that he or she is not using his or her native tongue and reflect on this fact” (from Table 5.7). Criterion Q2 A1 is not relevant to this case study in its stated form and is not examined. In Chapter II,
however, it was suggested that the Profile underestimates the language-related challenges that would be faced by students whose first language is not the language of instruction. As such, the researcher determined that it would be instructive to briefly explore the language-related issues that lecturers were aware of in the classroom. This theme, expressed as an attitude, will also be taken up by criterion Q2 A4.

The lecturers thought that language issues impacted on a number of academic tasks for international students. Dahlia made reference to “colloquialisms and the loose terms that we often use that they don’t understand.” She also indicated that “because of their language, just managing the amount of reading that they have to do” was a big issue for international students. Ruth took up this point and suggested that conversational fluency in English may not help students with academic English. This observation is consistent with the literature presented in the section titled ‘Language and students in the international classroom’ in ‘Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction’ in Chapter II. Ruth elaborated, “The sort of feedback that I get from our international students is that the volume of reading is huge (pause) It takes them a longer time than the Australian students to read the material.” Ruth said that achieving the minimum IELTS (International English Language Testing System) score to enter the department’s academic programs might not sufficiently reflect a student’s capability to handle academic English. According to Ursula, the current minimum IELTS score that international students had to meet to enter the university was “probably well below what is required to perform comfortably in our program.”
The issue of language proficiency in clinical placements was also raised. Larissa said that understanding Australian colloquialisms as spoken by the “average patient” was a major issue for EAL students. Ursula expanded on the language challenges inherent to the clinical placement setting:

It’s not just a matter of reading and writing. They have to have good enough language skills to be able to communicate directly with a member of the public and [interviewee emphasis] at the same time interpret what they’re saying and [interviewee emphasis] formulate [an allied health] care plan and a response in their head and that’s very complex communication.

Another dimension of the use of language in clinical placement, according to both Larissa and Ursula, was translation. They suggested that some students translated between English and their first language in real time in the clinical setting and that this was potentially problematic. Larissa said that when international students were talking to the patients they “translate what they are going to say in their own language into English and then say it to the patient (pause) in an appropriate way. So, that takes time so there’s a delay in the conversation. Um, as well as (pause) when they have to write in a note (pause) it takes a little longer because of the language.” Ursula believed that “If you’re at the stage where you’re still having to translate some things back into your own language to make sense of them and translate them back again to make a response it must be just so incredibly difficult. Um, so I think (pause) language is a major issue.” Samantha summed up the academic and clinical language challenges for international students in the department particularly well and her comments are presented in full:

I just think language is a point of difference for our international students from South East Asia. So putting aside their intelligence, which I think is
different to language, language, written and verbal, is for most international students barring the ones from Singapore, where English is the first language, but even for them it’s not of the same level or standard as Australian-born students. That language is difficult and [the allied health discipline] is a very, very.. you know, after the acquisition of knowledge and skills we are primarily a communication-based profession, and so being able to verbally communicate.. and then for us academically to communicate in writing is difficult. So they never do as well, basically.. rarely do as well. We have some outstanding students who do, but in the main, as an assessor, the grammar, syntax is generally not of as high a standard, and sometimes the difficulty in communication means that the communicating of ideas.. like sometimes I think they are intelligent, but get so muddled up in the communication that as an assessor I can’t get the point of what they’re wanting to say. And that’s really unfortunate because I am sure in their own language they would probably have been able to communicate those ideas so much clearer.

Samantha’s stand-out comment demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the language-related challenges faced by international students in the allied health department. She also acknowledged that the depth of thinking of EAL students is likely to be much greater than what they can express in English. The need for such awareness was promoted in the section titled ‘Flexibility towards use of the language of instruction’ in ‘Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction’.

\textit{Qualification 2, Criterion A2 (Q2 A2)}

“The lecturer should be aware that body language and other non-verbal aspects of communication have a great impact on the way he or she is understood (or misunderstood)” (from Table 5.7). The way this criterion reads makes it best suited to the Knowledge category rather than the Attitude category. Information about the lecturers’ knowledge about body language as it applies to their teaching was discussed earlier in criterion Q2 S2.
Qualification 2, Criterion A3 (Q2 A3)

“The lecturer must be aware of the role of humour in communication, but also that humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined spheres of personal identity” (from Table 5.7). In response to this statement Bronwyn said, “I do use humour to relax the group or break up a hard section of ideas, but a few laughs are enough in an hour.” She believed that “humour needs to be culturally sensitive and avoid ‘strine’ and colloquial words. It should be confined to universally funny material, not Australian politics, sex, religion, or football.” Bronwyn used humour in overhead presentations, such as a cartoon which depicted a puppy dressed up as a human child to get across a message related to the allied health discipline. This, said Bronwyn, was using “universally funny things the international students enjoy … If the picture can transcend language it will be more likely to succeed.” Dahlia said, “I’m not innately.. I’m not one that tells jokes a lot. I’m not very good at it either, you know, off-the-cuff.” She preferred to use anecdotes “to illustrate how peoples’ behaviour.. that it is sort of a bit weird. People are doing one thing on one hand and then doing something that totally contradicts.” The researcher asked Dahlia if she could see how people from different cultures may not quite understand Australian humour. She replied, “Oh, I can fully appreciate that they could well be lost. I think, it’s not just sort of Caucasian, Asian, Australian.. every culture has its own humour, which is deeply embedded in that [culture].”

Larissa agreed that humour could be culturally specific and misinterpreted by people from a different cultural background. To this end, it had the potential to be “interpreted wrongly and taken as offensive.” She said she sometimes used humour if
it related to a particular situation, for example, when demonstrating a point to students. Ruth said that she sometimes used humour in her teaching: “Not a big part, but yes, I can think of times when we’ve used that in class quite well.” When she was asked if she was aware of the role of humour in relation to international students and their home cultures she replied, “They don’t get it … When you are suddenly being a bit sarcastic, or something and you suddenly realise that they just haven’t got it at all.” Ruth said, “When I’ve deliberately used humour in a situation … I’m a bit more careful about making sure that it’s culturally appropriate or something that they.. most people will understand.” When Samantha was asked if she was aware of the role of humour in relation to culture, she responded, “Not necessarily in relation to culture, but I think humour is an important part of human interactions.” She thought that humour “lightens human interactions” and she tried “making light of things or finding a little funny spot in something.” To the researcher’s question of whether people from different cultures always understood her humour, Samantha replied that perhaps this was so for “simple humour”:

I guess my impression is that simple humour, you know, very simple as in quite childish humour… childlike humour, you know, as in the humour of making a mistake or dropping something or getting things back-to-front and, you know, ridiculing is probably too great, but sort of using humour to apologise for myself. I feel that our international students in some ways respond more to that than I’ve noticed the Australian students who might sit bored at that kind of interaction.

Ursula said that she used humour “a little bit, but it’s not something that I cultivate, particularly. I do try to tell stories or examples.. use examples a lot, but I don’t deliberately try to make students laugh.” The researcher asked Ursula if she was aware that some students found it difficult to understand the Australian sense of
humour. She responded, “Yes, absolutely. I mean, again, that’s a very.. even within our own culture there can be an enormous variation in what people find funny or amusing, and it can depend on their mood on the day, too.”

**Qualification 2, Criterion A4 (Q2 A4)**

“The lecturer must be aware that different levels of language proficiency within the group may account for differences in performance, but should not simply ascribe attitude to language (a ‘silent’ person may be shy, not interested, incompetent, bored, full of respect for the teacher or one of a whole range of explanations)” (from Table 5.7). This is a compound statement that revolves around language proficiency and culture. The first part is a knowledge-related statement that requires lecturers to be aware that differences in student performance may be the result of their proficiency in the language of instruction. The second part is a ‘personality’- and culture-related statement that requires lecturers to distinguish between language proficiency and a student’s disposition or the way they ‘present’ in class. The data gathered for this criterion also support the findings that were presented for (the different perspective taken on) criterion Q2 A1 which collected data on language-related challenges faced by EAL students.

Samantha suggested that student participation and performance was not solely attributable to language proficiency. “It’s quite complex and it’s many things.” She said, for example, that a student’s confidence in the content and knowledge of a subject would be one factor which may limit their ability to converse in class. Samantha believed that cultural norms also played a part and in Asian and African
cultures it was normal behaviour for students to listen to the teacher as an expert rather than contribute to discussion. She empathised with students and considered that if she were to study in another country, culture, and language she would initially “hold back somewhat. It is with comfort, familiarity, confidence that I reveal more and more of myself. So I fully understand them holding back somewhat and checking things out … it’s quite appropriate for them to be in receptive mode for as long as they need to until they’re ready.”

Bronwyn commented that different levels of language proficiency impacted on student performance “in multiple ways.” She said that if a student struggled to understand the content of a lecture, “the whole session can be devalued as they get further behind.” From the lecturer’s point of view, Bronwyn said that such a student “may appear to be bored, exhibit anxiety and request to talk with you one-on-one as they did not understand the lecture [or] session. Or worse they may try to avoid attending.” With regard to not equating language proficiency with attitude, Bronwyn believed that although there were “behaviour continuums in many cultures”, in her experience Asian students were quieter than Australian students. The view of students from Asian countries as quiet or shy is pervasive throughout the data gathered from the interviews. Bronwyn thought that “Maybe it is a factor of their secondary schooling as much as culture and this may alter as they Westernise their cultural ways and also learning ideas and values.” Whilst Bronwyn’s last comment might be taken to indicate that she thought that international students should give up their existing cultural values in favour of Western values, elsewhere (see criterion Q3 A3) she stated that it is more a process of complementing their existing values
with other ways of thinking. Dahlia agreed that different levels of language proficiency may account for different performances from students in class:

Oh, definitely, yes. I mean if English is a second language, I think.. I mean, I admire these students tremendously.. come away from home and their support networks, foreign language etcetera, foreign culture. I mean, I think how would I ever manage to go to and live and try and study where the first language I am using is not my native language. Yes, I do appreciate very much that.

Having said this, Dahlia did not necessarily ascribe student behaviour to language proficiency. She said that a quiet EAL student might reflect “much wider cultural issues” such as “the teacher is the person in authority to be listened to and their word is gospel, so to speak.” Ursula also had great respect for the EAL international students in the department. In part, this was based on her own experience in trying to learn a second language: “So I have some understanding of how incredibly difficult it is to express yourself and think in another language.” When the researcher added, “And also in the academic context”, Ursula responded “Oh, yes … I cannot even begin to imagine doing something academic in [the language I studied].” Ursula also made the point that different levels of language performance did not necessarily indicate a student’s disposition towards their studies:

Just because the student is not talking in class, doesn’t mean to say that aren’t listening, they aren’t engaged, they aren’t responding.. that they don’t understand what you’re saying, and that they’re not going to perform well in assessable tasks related to that teaching. But it can certainly limit their capacity to show their true potential. I’ve got no doubt about that. You know, if only I could get them to write it in Mandarin and then I could actually read it. I’m sure I’d see probably quite a different level of performance in some cases.
The last observation in Ursula’s comment above is similar to the one made by Samantha in criterion Q2 A1 which indicated that a student’s language proficiency should not be taken as a measure of their intelligence. In response to criterion Q2 A4, Larissa said, “Yes, definitely” when she was asked if she was aware that different levels of language proficiency may account for different performance between students. She related this to the clinical environment: “It has a huge impact. I was just thinking of one student who.. unfortunately her English was not very good and that had a huge impact. Because basically the patient could not understand what she was saying and she could not understand what the patient was saying.” Larissa also said that “there are other factors such as preferred style of learning [and] cultural aspects, for example, listening to the teacher, not questioning what is being taught … what the student is used to.”

Samantha, too, reinforced the fact that the allied health academic programs were challenging for EAL students: “Definitely. We see that in their written pieces of work and in their verbal pieces of work. Because [the allied health discipline] training or [the allied health discipline itself] is such a communication profession, then proficiency in English really sets apart our students.” Samantha believed that language proficiency also affected student performance in assessment and their willingness to participate in class. She concluded that, “It has a profound effect on the experience of teaching and learning; the experience of teaching for us and experience of learning for our students.” This is a stand-out comment from Samantha. Similar to Ruth’s earlier comment about having to change her approach to teaching based on the characteristics of international students, this observation from
Samantha also recognises a willingness to reflect on her approach to teaching to support the needs of the students.

Ruth was also acutely aware that different levels of language proficiency may account for different performances from students. To criterion Q2 A4 she responded, “Yes, what else can I say? It has such an impact for us, being a profession where we rely so heavily on communication.” For Ruth, language proficiency “makes a huge difference not only in class, but then for us the following year when they go out on placement, and they’re having to relate to people.” In her experience, although some international students seemed proficient with English in the academic setting, they still struggled in the clinical setting: “You hear they [Singaporean students] are running into problems because they are not confident with their English, or they’re speaking too quietly.” This is an important observation, for it might be easy to assume that Singaporean students are ‘not really’ EAL students because of the prevalence of English in Singapore’s education system. This awareness was also expressed in criterion Q2 A1 by Samantha who suggested that even although English is the “first language” in Singapore, “even for them it’s not of the same level or standard as Australian-born students.” With regard to the part of criterion Q2 A4 that says lecturers should not simply ascribe attitude to language proficiency, Ruth made the following comment:

I think in the early stages of my teaching I had a stereotyped view of international students and I was probably inclined to do this. However, I now realise that it certainly is not true all the time. Some of the less language proficient are argumentative. Many of the quiet ones are simply respectful.
Ruth’s comment that individual students did not necessarily conform to stereotypes echoes the comment she made earlier in response to criterion Q2 S2 when she said that she did not think there was “a trend overall with international students anymore” in relation to their body language. Ruth, like Dahlia and Ursula, sympathised with EAL students having to study in English when she said, “Gosh, I’d hate to do this in a different language.” Again, this is an indication from the lecturing staff in the department of awareness of EAL students’ language-related challenges.

**Qualification 2, Criterion A5 (Q2 A5)**

“The lecturer should be open to suggestions as regards [sic] the use of language” (from Table 5.7). Although there is no clue in Teekens’s (2000d) commentary that sheds light on what this criterion means, it can be interpreted from the four following perspectives, with formal assessment tasks perhaps being the ultimate litmus test of what flexibility exists with regard to students’ use of English:

- Written English for non-assessment tasks.
- Written English for assessment tasks.
- Spoken English for non-assessment tasks (for example, general conversation).
- Spoken English for assessment tasks.

Although the lecturers made it clear that all students had to meet the language-related requirements that are expected in all forms of assessment, they did indicate that there was some flexibility around this. Bronwyn showed “a little
flexibility” with written work. She was guided by a departmental guideline that said “It has got to be readable and it should be like an Australian student’s work... a good Australian student’s work.” She also said, “Um, but you do make some allowances … if you can understand the meaning… so we correct some but we don’t correct all of it.” If the piece of work had many mistakes or was not able to be understood, Bronwyn said that the student would be referred to the university’s Student Study Skills Department \(^22\) for “help with spelling and grammar” before resubmitting the paper. In Samantha’s opinion, whilst assessment criteria were not negotiable, there was some flexibility with regard to assessment processes that took into account the English language proficiency of EAL students:

All students have to perform the same assessments and their competencies are measured against the same assessments and the same criteria. We don’t make dispensations for proficiency, but in another way I think there is a real understanding about that, and therefore, patience around our interactions with students. I think when students go out on practicum, the placement educators and the clinical tutors pace their learning more slowly for international students in order to take into account the gap in proficiency in English.

Samantha indicated that the department provided students with guidelines for written work that made content and presentation expectations very clear. Although most of the marks for any given piece of work reflected students’ capacities to get their ideas across in relation to the question or task, a small percentage of marks was also given for presentation in terms of grammar and spelling. Further, if the grammar and spelling was poor, Samantha would give the students feedback on the mistakes.

\(^{22}\) To maintain anonymity, this is not the real name of the department.
Because the allied health profession was so reliant on written and spoken communication, Samantha said the department had high expectations of its students in terms of English language competence. Having said this, she also said that lecturers in the department were probably more sympathetic to EAL international students’ English proficiency and were possibly less strict in deducting marks for less than exemplary use of English. “It is the area of grey in assessment. I think consciously or unconsciously we would mark an international student differently to an Australian student in that little five or ten per cent. that’s the area we will give them … grace or … some leeway … with an expectation they’re not at the same standard. But not in terms of the content of what they’re saying.” For spoken assessment, Samantha said that she applied the same principles as written work. There had to be a reasonable level of clarity and the ideas had to be easily understood.

Ruth stated that written and verbal work that mimicked “a task they may well be asked to do in the workforce” would require “English to be at an acceptable standard … This is because the qualification is an Australian standard … and I strongly believe that English that is acceptable at a professional level is part of the package.” She was more flexible with the use of English for “a different sort of assessment task where our aims might be different, for example, more knowledge-based.” Ruth was also “reasonably flexible” with the use of English in written and verbal non-assessment tasks but she had “to be able to understand and follow it.” With regard to general conversation, Ruth said she was “Very flexible although this
sort of conversation gives you an overall impression of that person’s language ability.”

Given that Larissa’s work entailed practical aspects of clinical placement, she did not formally assess students’ written work. She did, however, check students’ medical case notes to ensure that they could be understood by others. Although she was open to some inconsistencies in grammar, she said that the notes “had to be clearly understandable.” With regard to students’ spoken English during clinical assessment, Larissa said, “There can be some flexibility, which depends upon the patient’s understanding and tolerance. For example, some may become frustrated with the difficulty in understanding the student and intervention is required.” Larissa said she was “very flexible” with students’ use of English for non-assessment dialogue, for example, in general conversation.

Dahlia expected a high level of English language proficiency with assessable written work. She said if students missed out the odd ‘a’ or ‘the’ or got the tense wrong or mixed up singulars and plurals, she would point this out. Dahlia, like Ruth, stated that the students were being prepared to meet the requirements of the Australian health system and “if they’re writing materials for clients it projects a professional image.. if there are a lot of errors in it.. mind you, there are a lot of Australians out there who wouldn’t be able to pick them up (laugh).” Most of the written English for non-assessment tasks were drafts of soon-to-be-assessed work and Dahlia said she saw this as “an opportunity to point out their English and I would just actually.. if it was just odd ones [mistakes] I’d correct them. If it was
consistently throughout the document I might make an overall comment about checking plurals or checking the tenses.” Dahlia was sometimes involved in oral assessment. She said that whilst she probably would not mark down a student for the odd English language transgression, for example, expressing the singular as plural, if the student’s level of English was below what she expected she would express this to them after the presentation. Dahlia was flexible with spoken English and acknowledged the “richness of … different language.” She said the accents and ‘different English’, such as Indian English, was a rich contribution to dialogue.

In Ursula’s view, written work submitted for assessment had to be clearly understood in terms of its meaning and message. She said “I would certainly not fail them on the basis of poor written English. However, I would not probably give a distinction or high distinction.” Ursula referred to assessment criteria that existed in the department which guided lecturers to allocate between 10 and 15 per cent of the maximum possible marks on the basis of the presentation and format of a piece of written work. Where necessary, Ursula said she would provide international and Australian students with feedback on English language presentation. For non-assessment written work, Ursula’s main concern was that she could understand the message without having to spend an unreasonable amount of time working it out. For spoken assessment, students’ communication had to be clearly and easily understood to her as the assessor and, where appropriate, by the client or patient as well. For non-assessment spoken communication, Ursula commented that she was completely flexible and that understanding each other was the important thing.
Summary of lecturers’ responses to Attitude criteria Q2 A1-A5

Criterion Q2 A1: “The lecturer must be aware of the fact that he or she is not using his or her native tongue and reflect on this fact” (from Table 5.7). This criterion was not examined in its stated form because the lecturers in the study use their native tongue as the medium of instruction. What was examined, however, was their experience with EAL students. The summary of the findings will be discussed in conjunction with criteria Q2 A4 and Q2 A5, given that it relates to the themes of those criteria. How is criterion Q2 A1 supported by the interview data? The criterion as it is presented in the Profile was not examined because it is not relevant to the research participants.

Criterion Q2 A2: “The lecturer should be aware that body language and other non-verbal aspects of communication have a great impact on the way he or she is understood (or misunderstood)” (from Table 5.7). Given that criterion Q2 A2 is expressed as a knowledge statement, the reader is referred to the summary of the lecturers’ knowledge of body language in relation to their teaching that was presented for criterion Q2 S2 in the section titled ‘Summary of lecturers’ responses to Skills criteria Q2 S1-S4’. How is criterion Q2 A2 supported by the interview data? It was reported earlier (see criterion Q2 S2) that although the lecturers are aware of the role of body language in their teaching, it is likely that this awareness is not contextualised to any great extent in terms of ‘Other culture’.

Criterion Q2 A3: “The lecturer must be aware of the role of humour in communication, but also that humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined
spheres of personal identity” (from Table 5.7). Although all lecturers reported that they used humour in their teaching, most expressed the point that this was not a big part of their teaching approach. All lecturers agreed that humour has a cultural perspective and most said that they were careful to use it appropriately to avoid misunderstandings and possibly offending students. Bronwyn, Ruth and Samantha focused on what they took to be the ‘universality’ of humour in the sense of it being presented in images (Bronwyn); something that most people would understand (Ruth); and ‘childlike, simple’ humour (Samantha). Although it is not known what reference points informed this claim of universality, it is anticipated that they might be drawn from what the lecturers ‘think’ is universal, based on their experiences in the classroom. Ursula’s point that even within Australian culture there are variations in what people find funny or amusing was well made. How is criterion Q2 A3 supported by the interview data? All lecturers reported that they used some humour in their teaching. A number of lecturers were mindful of avoiding humour that might be offensive in a culturally-diverse setting.

Criterion Q2 A4: “The lecturer must be aware that different levels of language proficiency within the group may account for differences in performance, but should not simply ascribe attitude to language (a ‘silent’ person may be shy, not interested, incompetent, bored, full of respect for the teacher or one of a whole range of explanations)” (from Table 5.7). The lecturers’ responses to this criterion demonstrated that they did not necessarily ascribe a student’s disposition in class to language proficiency. Samantha, Bronwyn, Dahlia, Larissa, and Ruth alluded to cultural norms as having something to do with student behaviour in class. Whilst
Ursula did not mention the impact of culture in this regard, her response was couched in terms of being open to the possibility that *any* quiet student could be engaged with the teaching at hand. Whilst such awareness was widespread in the department, all lecturers also believed that language proficiency was *indeed* a factor in student performance.

At this point it is appropriate to briefly summarise the lecturers’ responses to (the variation of) criterion Q2 A1 which canvassed their experiences with EAL students’ English language proficiency. Dahlia and Ruth believed that it took most EAL students a lot longer to get through the list of readings. According to Ruth and Ursula, the academic use of English was particularly challenging for most EAL students. Both said that the current IELTS entry score was below what was needed to function “comfortably” in the allied health academic programs. Samantha, Larissa, and Ursula focused on the clinical and communication-based nature of the allied health programs and indicated that high-level language and cognitive skills were required of EAL students when interviewing patients. Further, EAL students who engaged in ‘self-talk’ translation between English and the language they spoke best were likely to place themselves (and the patient) under significant strain. The fact that Ruth, Dahlia, Samantha, and Ursula sympathised with the EAL students having to undertake tertiary studies in English is a positive indication that these lecturers are aware of the language-related difficulties and challenges faced by the students. How is criterion Q2 A4 supported by the interview data? *The lecturers are aware that different levels of language proficiency within the student group may account for...*
differences in performance. Further, they do not simply ascribe a student's attitude to language proficiency.

Criterion Q2 A5: “The lecturer should be open to suggestions as regards [sic] the use of language” (from Table 5.7). This criterion builds on the language-related focus of criterion Q2 A4. On the matter of lecturers being open to suggestions regarding students’ use of language, it is clear there was some flexibility in the department about the use of English. Whilst assessment criteria are non-negotiable, there was some leeway for Australian and international students in terms of written and spoken assessment tasks. For written work, a departmental guideline led lecturers to allocate a small percentage of marks to grammar and spelling. Whilst this conflicts to some degree with Mezger’s (1992) (TAFE-situated) suggestion that students should not be penalised for “minor grammatical errors and poor sentence construction” (p. 220), it is clear that the lecturers in the allied health department do concur with the continuation of her advice that “they should focus on their thinking and understanding” (p. 220). For assessable oral tasks (for example, clinical interviews), one of the assessment criteria was that the students had to make themselves clearly understood and demonstrate that they could clearly understand what was said by patients. In Larissa’s view, minor grammatical discrepancies were acceptable in oral assessment as long as mutual understanding was a feature of, for example, the student-patient interview. All lecturers were flexible in terms of written and spoken English for non-assessment tasks. The main requirement was mutual understanding. How is criterion Q2 A5 supported by the interview data? Whilst
assessment criteria are not negotiable, the lecturers exhibit some flexibility about the use of English in written and spoken assessment and non-assessment tasks.

Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences

Q3 Knowledge criteria

Table 5.8 lists the four criteria in the Knowledge category of ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’.

Table 5.8 Qualification 3 (Q3), Knowledge Criteria K1-K4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3 K1</th>
<th>The lecturer should know that culture can be defined in different ways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K2</td>
<td>The lecturer should know that formal education is one of the most important features of a national culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K3</td>
<td>The lecturer should know that culture is learned, and is very difficult to un-learn [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K4</td>
<td>The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of the culture(s) of the students in the group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Qualification 3, Criterion K1 (Q3 K1)

“The lecturer should know that culture can be defined in different ways” (from Table 5.8). Although the precise meaning of culture in criterion Q3 K1 in Table 5.8 is not evident from the statement itself, in Chapter II it was established that the use of the word in Teekens’s (2000d) text which accompanies this qualification relates to the lived experience of personal and group behaviour as manifested through the value systems of individuals and societies. There are differences in peoples’ worldviews that are very much shaped and influenced by their value systems. When presented with this criterion, Bronwyn said, “Yes, I recognise there are differing interpretations and expectations.” Larissa’s response was, “I haven’t
thought about that. I suppose the way that one thinks of culture as a person’s belief systems within culture. The way that you interact with other people, older people than yourself, younger people.. the way you address people is one aspect. I’d just have to think about [it].” She said it was “a sort of view of the world how you interpret that.. and it’s influenced by a range of factors, religious beliefs as well.”

Ruth said “Culture is … sort of where everything meets. It’s the sort of background and religion, politics and food, and you know.. it’s sort of traditions and folklore and of course it’s going to be defined in differently by different people.” She added “I wouldn’t say that I have a good enough knowledge of those cultures to be able to tell you what the differences are, really.” Samantha commented that since moving to Australia from Singapore almost three decades ago, she used indigenous Australians as her benchmark of cultural difference more than anything else, “because without a doubt, they see the world differently to white folks.” This reminded Samantha “not to assume anyway that we all see the world in the same way.” For Ursula, criterion Q3 K1 was self-evident. She said, “It sort of has to be, doesn’t it? Because all of those sorts of concepts are defined culturally so culture will be defined differently by different cultures.” Dahlia indicated that a person’s culture had a big impact on the way they behaved: “They’re doing that [a particular behaviour] because that’s how they were brought up. That’s been their life. That’s the way they do things.”
Qualification 3, Criterion K2 (Q3 K2)

“The lecturer should know that formal education is one of the most important features of a national culture” (from Table 5.8). Bronwyn thought that formal education was “taken for granted here. I think Australian students (pause) Australian culture takes it for granted.” She said that whilst most young Australians could access senior high school, in “some of the Asian countries (pause) maybe really only the middle class or more wealthy people can access that level of education.” This, she concluded, would lead “those countries probably [to] value formal education more than we tend to. We have an expectation. We think it’s a right here. They probably still regard it as a luxury.” Bronwyn thought that the families of international students “sacrificed themselves” to send their children overseas. An outcome of this was that it placed a lot of pressure on the students to perform: “I always feel how hard it is for them because they’ve had to come to a culture that’s foreign and grapple with that as well as deal with family expectation.”

Education, in Larissa’s view, was important for everybody but “particularly for students from overseas, it’s seen as very important. Having a qualification is extremely important. Studying is very important and doing your very best because it’s not only for yourself. It’s for everyone at home, your family.. your performance reflects upon your family in some cultures.” Larissa said this had been reinforced to her during “chats [with] students that aren’t doing very well … You know, ‘What happens if I fail? This is going to be a big issue. How am I going to go home and tell them? What am I going to do?’” Larissa said the students had made her aware that when they finished their studies they “will be earning a living for their family and
“feel they are very privileged and they obviously have a totally different view of it [than other students who] don’t appreciate it to the same extent.”

Similar to Bronwyn’s thoughts, Ruth said that although she certainly recognised that formal education was an important feature of a national culture, “I think it means much less to Australians than it does to a lot of international students … It’s accepted in Australia as it’s almost your right to go on to university.” Ruth continued, “But it just made me think about the shame on these families if they don’t pass.” Samantha’s response to criterion Q3 K2 shared some similarities with the responses from the other lecturers:

The first thing comes to my mind is the importance of getting this degree … Having come to this country often at great… some great personal cost for our students, some more so than others … I’m particularly struck by those students for whom if they fail there is enormous shame. Far greater shame than I think our Aussie students experience. And so I guess I get a sense that this is part of their formal education, and it means a lot to them. And if I remember growing up in Singapore, there was a lot of status for children of families who went overseas to study. You know, there was more status than staying.

Ursula thought that education was “one of the important ways that our culture is operationalised.” She said that the massification of Australian tertiary education meant that “going to university isn’t perhaps as big as what it might be for some people from some cultures.” Reflecting on the importance of education other countries, Ursula commented that she was aware that in Singapore “the kindergartens have graduation ceremonies where the four year-olds wear little mortar boards and
gowns … Achieving educationally is valued extremely highly.” Ursula said that “families invest heavily to support their children’s education” in such countries.

Qualification 3, Criterion K3 (Q3 K3)

“The lecturer should know that culture is learned, and is very difficult to un-learn [sic]” (from Table 5.8). Dahlia, Bronwyn, Larissa, and Samantha acknowledged this statement in terms of international students needing to adapt to the way things are done in the Australia tertiary setting. Dahlia said, “I certainly agree with the statement.” She continued, “I guess I haven’t sort of thought of it in those terms, but I’ve certainly thought about it. Well, I understand this is the way they’re used to doing things.” Dahlia believed that because international students were used to doing things a certain way, “It is going to be difficult for them to change. So, yeah, I have reflected on that, that, you know, the way they address people, they approach people, they see you as the total authoritarian, well not in a bad sense, but you know.” She continued, “I mean, you see the international students change in the time … to be a bit more overt. I mean in terms of interacting with people, not to be so shy.”

Bronwyn thought that the criterion was “a reasonable statement. It [culture] is difficult to unlearn.” She said this difficulty manifested itself “when you hit a problem. I think the easiest thing we do as human beings is to react in a predictable manner. Or we get threatened in some way (pause) we may react in a predictable way.” For Bronwyn, ‘unlearn’ was better expressed as ‘change’: “It’s not so much unlearn it, but probably it’s change. I think you can change … Obviously they have
to change to fit into the Australian context.” Criterion Q3 K3 also evoked in Bronwyn how she had changed through teaching international students: “I think you have to change a little bit with international students. It doesn’t mean you make it easier but you change the way you teach. It makes you think a lot more about the.. what you’re doing and why you’re doing it.” This is a stand-out comment. Similar to the responses from Ruth and Ursula that were presented in criterion Q1 A1, the presence of international students in the classroom had been a catalyst for Bronwyn to reflect on her approach to teaching.

When asked what she thought of criterion Q3 K3, Ruth responded, “I really agree with that.” She, like Bronwyn, also said, “It’s interesting that often when they’re [international students] in times of stress is when they will revert back to things, you know, … the practices that would be strong in their own culture.” Larissa said that although some international students “are more sort of familiar with our culture than other students, they do need to learn about our culture and how things work, how we communicate, what we mean when we’re saying things. When we say certain things it’s not.. shouldn’t always be taken at face value. The words that we use don’t necessarily reflect what we mean.” Here, Larissa is referring to the subtleties and intricacies of communication from a cultural point of view: “When they [international students] say things and it seems way out.. way out.”

Ursula’s reaction to criterion Q3 K3 was, “Yeah, I think so. We are very, very much products of our cultural background. Our cultural backgrounds have [indiscernible words] very basic ways we view the world and operate in the world
and much of that is at an unconscious level and unlearning that is quite difficult.” She also added, “I don’t really want them to unlearn their own culture. I don’t think they should. I don’t think that is appropriate. But I guess what they have to do when they want to operate successfully is learn some aspects of our culture and learn how to operate across both.” This stand-out comment reflects Bronwyn’s thinking in criterion Q2 A4. Samantha, too, agreed with criterion Q3 K3: “Definitely culture is learned.” When asked what implications criterion Q3 K3 had for international students as learners, Samantha gave the following insightful response:

We ask a lot of them to adapt to our cultural way of learning in one year. In one month even. It’s like [interviewee snapped her fingers] from the minute they arrive we hit them with a very, very intense, very rapidly moving program which is assessed very, very quickly, and they have to perform and they have to deliver very, very quickly. And so I think, if I were to put myself in their shoes, they are working damn hard, and I know they are.. to try and adapt.

Samantha’s stand-out comment hints at both the adaptive capacity of international students as well as the demanding requirements of the educational environment in which they are immersed. It also highlights an important point in relation to the support provided to international students in the department, that is, the lecturers are responsive to their learning needs. Indeed, this responsiveness and support has emerged as a consistent theme in the data to this point. Whilst this is so, it is clear that the nature of the support is geared to helping international students adapt to the particular teaching approaches utilised in the department. Whilst this is unsurprising, recognition of this is important because it formally discounts the use of the multi-reference grid curricula approach to teaching and learning that was outlined in Chapter II.
Qualification 3, Criterion K4 (Q3 K4)

“The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of the culture(s) of the students in the group” (from Table 5.8). Bronwyn agreed that she had a basic knowledge in this area which she had “obtained from travels, tv, media, work, family and friends who have travelled and lived in other cultures as well as discussions with students.” Larissa’s response to criterion Q3 K4 was “Very basic. I think I’ve got some basic knowledge.” She said that this came from working with her international students and “having some understanding from my earlier life, because we moved around a lot.” Larissa was not born in Australia and said her family spent time in “Europe and a bit of Africa and Saudi Arabia. Up to … about 18 [years of age] or so I’ve lived in different cultures. That’s made a big difference.” Dahlia believed that she “had an understanding at a fairly basic level” of the cultures of the international students in the department. She said “I wouldn’t assume that I know.. I’ve got a general idea.” Dahlia said her understanding of this initially came from her travels “as a backpacker in Asia” as well as reading and talking to students. She was curious about different customs and said she would often ask students about their festivals.

Ruth’s response to criterion Q3 K4 was “Very limited really … bits and pieces, places where I might have travelled, which hasn’t been very much. But you learn bits, although sometimes that can be a bit different to what actually happens in the country as well. And, really, just sort of feedback from students.” Samantha thought that her knowledge of the cultures of the international students in the department was “reasonable”, although perhaps dated. Like Larissa, she drew on her experience of growing up outside Australia:
A lot of my knowledge is quite historical now. But yes, I feel like compared to even my colleagues who have a traveller’s knowledge of South East Asia, I actually have a living knowledge of South East Asia. Like it's in my bones, in my blood, in a way that it isn’t for them and I guess I reasonably transfer that to the Vietnamese and the Indonesians who.. I mean I know Malaysia and Singapore reasonably well, albeit of a slightly outdated idea. I know the Africans far less well.

Ursula believed that although she did not have knowledge of all the cultures that were present in the international student group, she had a “working knowledge” of most of the South East Asian cultures because she had “travelled in most of those areas.” She was far less familiar with the cultures of the African and Middle Eastern students, saying that her understanding would be largely from what she has “gleaned just as a person who reads newspapers and watches the news and has a general interest.” Ursula thought that “the more that we can learn about other cultural perspectives the easier it is or the more effective we are at trying to facilitate their learning.”

Summary of lecturers’ responses to Knowledge criteria Q3 K1-K4

Criterion Q3 K1: “The lecturer should know that culture can be defined in different ways” (from Table 5.8). Each lecturer accepted that there were differences between various cultural groups. Whilst agreeing with this criterion, Larissa had not thought about it much and Ruth did not think she had enough knowledge to point out what such differences might be. How is criterion Q3 K1 supported by the interview data? Each lecturer accepts that there are differences between various cultural groups.
Criterion Q3 K2: “The lecturer should know that formal education is one of the most important features of a national culture” (from Table 5.8). Bronwyn, Dahlia, Ruth, and Ursula believed that many international students valued the opportunity to study at the tertiary level much more than many Australian students. Larissa, Ruth, Samantha, and Ursula were aware how much was at stake for international students and other stakeholders. Bronwyn was aware of the pressure on international students to perform satisfactorily. How is criterion Q3 K2 supported by the interview data?

The lecturers understand that formal education is an important feature of a national culture. In addition, there is a widespread belief that people from some other cultures place greater value on education than many Australians.

Criterion Q3 K3: “The lecturer should know that culture is learned, and is very difficult to un-learn [sic]” (from Table 5.8). All lecturers agreed with criterion Q3 K3. This was generally couched in terms of new international students bringing with them certain expectations related to the academic environment and then having to adapt to the demands of Australian academe. Quite correctly, Ursula (and Bronwyn in criterion Q3 A3) pointed out that international students were not expected to unlearn their culture, but that it was more a matter of adapting to the requirements of the Australian academic setting. In this sense, international students would be complementing their home culture worldview with other perspectives. How is criterion Q3 K3 supported by the interview data? All lecturers acknowledged that culture is learned and is very difficult to unlearn.
Criterion Q3 K4: “The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of the culture(s) of the students in the group” (from Table 5.8). Bronwyn had “a basic knowledge.” Larissa’s comment was “Very basic. I think I’ve got some basic knowledge.” Dahlia believed that she “had an understanding at a fairly basic level.” Ruth said “Very limited really … bits and pieces.” Samantha said her knowledge was “reasonable”, although perhaps dated. Ursula had a “working knowledge” of most of the South East Asian cultures. Between them, the lecturers reported that travel, working and living overseas, reading and talking with international students were sources for their criterion Q3 K4-related knowledge. How is criterion Q3 K4 supported by the interview data? The lecturers have a basic knowledge of the cultures of their international students.

Q3 Skills criteria

Table 5.9 lists the three criteria in the Skills category of ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.9</th>
<th>Qualification 3 (Q3), Skills Criteria S1-S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 S1</td>
<td>The lecturer must be able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 S2</td>
<td>The lecturer should be able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, for example knowing whether a student is only shy or feels that it is not appropriate to ask a question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 S3</td>
<td>The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 30).*

Qualification 3, Criterion S1 (Q3 S1)

“The lecturer must be able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework” (from Table 5.9). Bronwyn had no formal training in this
area. When the researcher offered the example of Hofstede’s theory of cultural dimensions, she responded, “Never heard of him.” She said she was “very keen to learn about their cultures, because I do. I actually worry sometimes that we’re offending them in the way we teach, or the way we say, or the way we’re so dogmatic. But that doesn’t explain. so no, I don’t have any knowledge of cultural framework to examine.” Larissa’s response to criterion Q3 S1 was, “I don’t know if I would be able to do that. I don’t think so at this stage.” When asked if she thought it was important to be able to do this, she replied, “I think so” but that “it is a big ask and also there is that danger that if you are trying to apply a theory in culture, you may not always take account of the individual person.” Larissa has pre-empted the importance of not stereotyping characteristics of cultures to individuals (see criterion Q3 A2). She was not familiar with Hofstede’s work. Dahlia laughed when she was asked if she was able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework and then said, “No, no.” She said she had not studied in that area and did not have that skill set. Although she had not heard of Hofstede’s work, Dahlia said she could understand the benefit of being able to use a theoretical framework: “It gives a framework to explain yourself … it simplifies the complexity.”

Ruth stated, “I don’t think I do” when asked if she was able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework. She continued, “I’ve really only got a very superficial.. I wouldn’t say I had a theoretical sort of framework at all really.” When asked if she thought she needed one, Ruth said, “I think all of that sort of information would help, whether you need it or not, it would enhance it. It’s just a question of, you know, how much time and interest people
would have in going after it really.” When asked if time was an issue in the pursuit of this type of skill, Ruth replied, “Yes, it is.” Ruth was not familiar with Hofstede’s work. Ursula believed that she did not “have enough educational or sociology background to be able to provide any sort of academic analysis within the theoretical framework of the Australian culture let alone an international culture. I mean I’m a scientist, not a sociologist.” Despite the science focus, Ursula said, “I’m committed to education. I’ve done some basic educational qualifications, but it’s pretty.. that’s the limit of it. So, you know, if I was to have professional development in that area (criterion Q3 S1) it would need to be in a fairly accessible, you know.. I’d need to be pretty much spoon-fed, I think.” When Samantha was asked if she was able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework, she said, “I would have to say no, clearly not formally. I guess mine is a constructed, you know, lived experience, understanding.” Once again, Samantha was drawing strongly on her upbringing in South East Asia as a reference point for the way she relates to the Profile’s criteria in this qualification. Ursula and Samantha were not familiar with the detail of Hofstede’s work.

Qualification 3, Criterion S2 (Q3 S2)

“The lecturer should be able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, for example knowing whether a student is only shy or feels that it is not appropriate to ask a question” (from Table 5.9). When asked if she had this skill, Bronwyn gave the following reply:

I think I do try to do that. You’ve got to make allowance for the fact that just because you think a culture is generally very polite and quiet, there are going to be personality differences. So, I don’t just assume that. I mean, we get
some very quiet Asian students, and that probably is their personality as well as their culture. So they are doubly quiet, if you like. We get some very noisy Australian students and some very quiet Australian students. And I guess the only way you would know the difference between culture and personality is from having a reasonable experience of a lot of them, all living in their cultures, which I’m not able to do. So, I think over the years, even over two years of seeing international students, it becomes apparent that they.. a general trend for the Asian students [is] to be a lot quieter than the Australian students, but there will be variations within that.

Although Bronwyn notes that Asian students are generally quiet, she is also aware that some individuals may not conform to that observation.

Dahlia’s response to criterion Q3 S2 was, “That’s actually an interesting question. I don’t think I’ve thought about it to an extent. I think the two are too deeply entwined to be able to.. and I think you’d have to know someone quite well. I think the danger of perhaps saying it’s a cultural trait … is that you actually label somebody, putting them in a box and not seeing them as an individual.” Dahlia, like Larissa in the previous criterion, and Bronwyn in this criterion, is thinking about criterion Q3 S2 in terms of avoiding stereotyping people based on ‘culture norms’ (again, see criterion Q3 A2). She also noted that “We’re getting one or two students from the more diverse places.” An example was a student from Oman. Of the student’s culture, Dahlia admitted, “I would know nothing.. I still know very little having had her here for two years.” The researcher suggested that, “Without any reading about the culture of Oman, you wouldn’t know whether she’s exhibiting culturally-based behaviour or personal trait-based behaviour.” Dahlia responded, “No, no. And I guess it is important to know, probably yes … have some understanding. Well, I guess the other thing is to be open, not to make a judgment.” Dahlia’s reflection that although she has interacted with the student from Oman for
two years, she still knows very little about the student’s culture is interesting. Whilst the student may not have been forthcoming with such information in their interactions, it is probable that Dahlia openly accepts people for who they are, just as she expects people to take her for who she is. This personal approach of Dahlia’s was established in criterion Q2 S2. Whilst she has an interest in her students and cares about them, Dahlia’s relationship with students does not appear to extend to reflection about their culture and how this might impact on their learning, nor the sorts of demands it might place upon her teaching.

The researcher suggested to Larissa that “A cultural difference might be that many students from South East Asian countries are quiet in class, but it might also be a personal trait. A person who is less.. one’s extroverted [and] one’s introverted. Would you be able to distinguish between these?” Larissa said, “I probably would, except I haven’t been in that situation. Most students that I work with, I work with in small groups. So it’s a much.. they tend to talk much more than in a larger class situation.” For Larissa, small group work meant that students had to communicate, regardless of whether their cultures or personalities lend themselves to this behaviour or not. Such communication is a requirement of the academic program. She said that if international students were quiet it generally indicated that they were having a problem.

When Ruth was asked if she was skilled in being able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, she drew on her experience with exchange students who had stayed in her family home: “It’s been really interesting that … what I’ve
thought of as personality traits have actually been quite deep cultural traits.” Ruth continued, “If you end up with a large number of students from the same country [Singapore], particularly over the years, you can start to distinguish some of those a little bit more. So for example, not all Singaporean students are like that [reserved]. Some of them are quite outgoing and so like everything else, there is the spectrum, isn’t there?” Ruth also reflected on the difficulty of ascribing cultural characteristics to individual students. She said of her experience with Chinese students, “We’ve had a couple who.. you know, one has been really, really outgoing and the other who’s been very quiet and shy. And then you start wondering, well, have they spent a significant amount of time out of China? Did they study in America? And then where does culture fit there, cos you get that kind of layering effect. It’s very difficult to separate it out, really.” This response from Ruth shows capacity for reflection and a willingness not to prejudge the behaviour of international students.

Samantha said that she was able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits “to some extent” but did not consider herself being “an avid student of cultural difference.” She said that she had “a framework in my head of kind of, what I understand cultural difference to be when I am relating to an Aboriginal person.. when I am relating to an international student” and she interpreted behaviour through “that kind of filter.” Samantha related the example of having an indigenous person come to her house for lunch:

One of my pre-lunch reflections … was that I find aboriginal people a bit tetchy [sic] to be around because they invariably have had a life history of pain. And so there is a lot of sensitivity and trust is a difficult issue. Now I make concession for that then. I start the relationship knowing that trust is going to be an issue. There going to be a bit of tetchiness, sensitivity. So I
therefore account for personal behaviours with that sort of cultural framework. And so I use... so I’m making an assumptions like that based on in what I know, I suppose.

In this instance, Samantha demonstrates reflection and sensitivity in her dealings with cultural difference. A slightly different angle was pursued by Ursula. Whilst she was sympathetic to the idea of being able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, in her view the most important thing to note was whether a student’s behaviour inhibited learning, whatever the basis of the behavioural characteristic. This is a stand-out comment that is characteristic of Biggs’s (2003) Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’. To this point in the chapter, Ursula’s data suggest that she is focused on helping all students develop skills which relate to the educational outcomes of their academic program.

Qualification 3, Criterion S3 (Q3 S3)

“The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account” (from Table 5.9). The researcher asked Bronwyn, “Have you helped students become aware of cultural differences within their groups? Has any time been spent looking at the group of students and making them aware that this is a culturally diverse classroom?” She replied, “It was probably done first of all in the orientation, which I didn’t have a great deal to do with.” The orientation Bronwyn referred to is a departmental initiative for its international students. More will be said about this in criterion Q4 A3. Bronwyn interpreted criterion Q3 S3 in terms of cultural differences as they applied to the allied health discipline in different countries, rather than the cultural differences between students in the classroom. She said, “We’ve utilised the fact that
they are from different cultures. I have encouraged Australian students not just to tell the Asian students about [things related to the allied health field in Australia] but to listen when the Asian students give their [stories about things related to the allied health field in their countries].”

Dahlia was asked if she facilitated an understanding of cultural difference in a culturally-mixed class. She responded, “I would certainly, you know, if the topic was relevant to this topic, I would certainly ask students from different cultures to describe their experiences, and what their understanding of the issue would be and what the impact of what we’re talking about might have in a culture, certainly. And I think that’s important.” Larissa said, “I think I would be able to. I haven’t necessarily done that.” The researcher asked, “Is it desirable in any way, do you think?” to which she replied, “I think so. It’s that sharing of that knowledge of the cultural differences.” The researcher asked, “Would you see that as being done formally or best done informally?” Larissa responded, “I think probably informally once they get to know each other.” From the interview data, it can be seen that Bronwyn, Dahlia, and Larissa do not explicitly make students aware of the cultural differences within the group with intention of such knowledge helping them work together in the classroom or in small groups.

When presented with criterion Q3 S3, Samantha responded, “I guess my first reaction was one of caution around not stereotyping or not making an issue with it where there doesn’t need to be an issue and not ghettoizing students into needing special treatment or.. so I don’t draw attention, I suppose. I think I work by
applauding behaviours that I want rather than trying to set up safety nets or compensate for behaviours I don’t want.” This way of looking at the criterion is different compared to the responses from Bronwyn, Dahlia, and Larissa. Samantha’s view appears to be a deeper consideration of the implications of formally making students aware of cultural difference. She also pointed out that to do so would need “some sort of theoretical framework … So I guess I wouldn’t have the confidence to know what next, if you did that.. if you drew attention to the students and asked other students to make special concessions or treat them in a special way. What’s the next step other than highlighting difference? Highlighting difference is not necessarily the most useful thing.” This is a well-considered opinion because to this point in the examination of the Profile’s qualifications, while it is clear that the lecturers in the department all have varying degrees of experience in teaching international students, the interview information suggests that they do not have a depth of knowledge about the characteristics of other cultures.

Ruth’s reaction to criterion Q3 S3 was, “Do I make them aware of it? I wouldn’t have thought in the conscious way.” When the researcher followed this with “Or a formal..”, Ruth cut across with, “No, I don’t think so. How would people do that?” The researcher gave the following example:

Before you even start teaching about (the allied health discipline), you say, ‘There’s different cultural groups in this room and that means something. And what you are going to find is that when you work together, there’ll be sometimes.. what you might be thinking inconsistencies in the way people are dealing with each other..’. So that’s a real stepping back from your discipline and looking at the reality of the classroom.
Ruth reflected, “I don’t do that in my topic. There’s another topic, socio-cultural issues, where they work in groups right from very early on, and it might actually be done there. I’m not sure.” When it was suggested to Ruth that other lecturers had not indicated that they formally implemented criterion Q3 S3 into their teaching practice, and that one of them didn’t want to make cultural difference obvious, she remarked laconically, “Well, it is obvious enough already.” Ruth indicated that making students aware of cultural differences within the group was appropriate in small group work if “we run into problems with working together, and I don’t routinely address that before it starts but if it becomes an issue then we address it.” She said that the department might have written resources that instructed students about how to work in groups together:

We might actually have some guidelines for working in small groups in one of our topic workbooks or course booklets or something, that might say things like, respect for others in different culture. I think it is done in a very sort of general kind of way, but it might be something like that … It’s not a university thing. If it does exist it would be something that our department does and kind of just recognising that if you are quiet and not saying much, it might be because of the cultural background rather than the fact that you haven’t got anything to say.

Ursula’s perspective on criterion Q3 S3 was similar to Samantha’s position of being sensitive about pointing out cultural difference. She said, “I think it depends a bit on the context. I mean, it’s easy to do in some respects … if you’re talking about … culturally-related (allied health-related) practices.” This was the perspective alluded to by Bronwyn and Dahlia. Moreover, Ursula was conscious about how criterion Q3 S3 might impact on the privacy of students: “I don’t want to be too intrusive and, you know, most of the students are fairly shy and, you know, it’s hard
enough to get them talking about coursework stuff let alone personal stuff … I don’t bring a halt to some activities and talk about learning styles.”

Summary of lecturers’ responses to Skills criteria Q3 S1-S3

Criterion Q3 S1: “The lecturer must be able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework” (from Table 5.9). None of the lecturers used a theoretical framework to analyse cultural differences. None were familiar with Hofstede’s theory of cultural dimensions. Bronwyn, Larissa, Dahlia, and Ruth believed that being able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework would be a useful skill to develop. Bronwyn, Ruth, and Ursula believed that time is a scarce resource in relation to developing such a skill. Ursula said that if she was to become skilled in this area, the training had to be “fairly accessible.” This comment is indicative of why it is likely that an essentialist cultural theory such as that developed by Hofstede would appeal to busy lecturers. How is criterion Q3 S1 supported by the interview data? There is a discrepancy between the requirement of the criterion and the interview data. No lecturers use a theoretical framework to analyse cultural differences.

Criterion Q3 S2: “The lecturer should be able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, for example knowing whether a student is only shy or feels that it is not appropriate to ask a question” (from Table 5.9). Given that none of the lecturers were familiar with any theoretical framework to help them better understand differences (and similarities) between cultures, their understanding of the cultures of their international students had to be on the basis of their responses to
criterion Q3 K4, that is, through their experiences with them in the classroom or through activities like travel for leisure or work, television and reading. Bronwyn, Dahlia, and Ruth recognised that there were individual differences within cultures but that Asian students were generally quiet. Having said this, these three lecturers also expressed a desire to treat all students as individuals and to avoid stereotypes. Samantha said that she was able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits “to some extent” but did not consider herself to be “an avid student of cultural difference.” Ursula’s stand-out comment is worth reiterating. She was sympathetic to the idea of being able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits but in her view the most important thing to note was whether a student’s behaviour inhibited their learning, whatever the basis of the behavioural characteristic. In terms of teaching international students, this is an expression of Biggs’s (2003) Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’, where the focus is on helping students meet educational objectives rather than focusing on cultural or personality differences. How is criterion Q3 S2 supported by the interview data? The lecturers express a desire to able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits but for some this is dependent on the degree to which they know both the students’ cultures as well as the personal traits of individual students.

Criterion Q3 S3: “The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account” (from Table 5.9). The interview data show that the lecturers did not explicitly make students aware of the cultural differences within the group with the intention of using such knowledge to help them work together in the classroom or in small groups.
Further, the responses from Samantha and Ursula demonstrated a conscious decision to *not* highlight different cultures as a point of difference. Instead, the data show that the lecturers worked with cultural difference in the classroom in an informal manner. This is a fundamentally different approach than what is encouraged by the Profile.

How is criterion Q3 S3 supported by the interview data? *There is a discrepancy between the requirement of the criterion and the interview data. The lecturers work with cultural difference in the classroom in an informal manner rather than make students aware of such difference.*

### Q3 Attitude criteria

Table 5.10 lists the three criteria in the Attitude category of ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.10 Qualification 3 (Q3), Attitude Criteria A1-A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3 A1</strong> The lecturer should be aware of his or her own culture and understand that this strongly colours his or her own views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3 A2</strong> The lecturer must try to avoid thinking in stereotypes, and to behave and express opinions without resorting to such generalizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3 A3</strong> The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments for cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of other group members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 30).*

**Qualification 3, Criterion A1 (Q3 A1)**

“The lecturer should be aware of his or her own culture and understand that this strongly colours his or her own views” (from Table 5.10). Of all the criteria examined by this research, this one is perhaps the most expressive of the substance of transformative learning theory, that is, a desire for individuals to have a critical
appreciation of how their own culture underwrites their worldview. Bronwyn said, “I am aware and try to reflect. I find that discussions with other cultures often makes me see things very differently, for example, Muslin women wearing head dress. They are proud to wear it and resent us saying that they are forced to wear it.” Dahlia’s response to this criterion was, “I have reflected to a small degree, but I would say no, not to a huge amount. I wouldn’t call myself a highly sort of reflective person really. I get on with.. I mean, yeah.. I probably do it more than I realise.” Here is an insight into many of Dahlia’s interview responses to this point in the chapter. She does not consider herself to be a reflective person, preferring instead to ‘get on with it’.

Larissa’s comment on criterion Q3 A1 was, “Yes, I think so.. I think so. I tend to be more aware of it when I’m talking to individual students or groups of students and I may say something and then I think ‘Well that’s the way because of my background’. they may think something different, and I may rephrase what I said.” She also related an experience from clinical practice that made her aware how a person’s culture determined their response to a situation: “Things like getting students to … assess a patient which involves … getting a patient semi-undressed, taking measures, is an issue for some international students (pause) I had four international students last year doing that sort of thing. Before[hand] we … chatted about that. Whether they felt comfortable and we omitted it a couple of parts of the body … because they didn’t feel comfortable.”

Ruth’s response to criterion Q3 A1 was, “In a limited way. I wouldn’t say I’m strongly aware of it like some people would be.” When she was asked to give an
example of the awareness she had, Ruth responded, “Well, it’s just the way you view things based on your upbringing, your religion and all that sort of stuff that makes up culture, and it is quite different to other people, especially international students.”

With regard to students in the classroom, Ruth explained that culture determined “what’s rude, what’s not rude.” Ruth continued, “Yes, all sorts of differences. You know, the way we perceive fail or pass or a pass mark, you know, it’s quite different to how it is perceived by some groups I think.” Samantha responded to criterion Q3 A1 by saying, “I mean, I am aware of who I am. I have a very strong sense of identity and I think identity is culture... kind of synonymous. But I no longer define my culture in ethnic terms alone. I think culture is class, is experience, is all sorts of things.” Consistent with her statements in Q1 A3, Samantha said, “I think power is an issue for me that I am aware of. I think part of the culture of being a teacher is about expert status and kind of conferred power versus earned power or mutually agreed power.” Ursula’s response to criterion Q3 A1 was succinct. Although she agreed that she was aware of her own culture and its assumptions, she commented, “But I don’t have any formal training in that side of things, you know.”

Qualification 3, Criterion A2 (Q3 A2)

“The lecturer must try to avoid thinking in stereotypes, and to behave and express opinions without resorting to such generalizations” (from Table 5.10). When Bronwyn was asked if she avoided thinking in stereotypes, she said “No, I do think in stereotypes, I think, in the way that’s easiest for me to think probably.” Bronwyn thought that individual interactions with “someone from another culture” made her reassess her impressions of people: “So I think you do think a little bit differently as
a result of that, but you know, if you’re tired and you’re grumpy, and you’ve had a really bad day you may tend to flip back to the most convenient way of thinking about things.” Of thinking in stereotypes, Bronwyn said, “I think it’s something that you learn from very early age. And I do think you can unlearn it.”

When Dahlia was asked if she avoided thinking in stereotypes, she replied, “I try to be aware that’s what I’m doing.” She reported that a way to get around thinking in stereotypes was by “asking, talking to them [international students], interacting with them, finding about … personal circumstances … some are quite wealthy, but some not so wealthy, some have had different experiences in Australia and so I guess I’ll try and find out more about them.” Larissa said that although it was hard to avoid using stereotypes, she tried to relate to the individual person with whom she was communicating. This is similar to the approach taken by Bronwyn and Dahlia. On stereotyping people, Larissa said, “You meet someone, you think okay, and you know a bit about what they do or the background and you have various assumptions that are really unconscious.” On meeting a new student, Larissa said, “In my head I would have.. not a list but there’d be like a list of issues that I may need to or.. things I need to take account of … So I keep that in mind but then adapt it according to the student.” With regard to international students, Larissa said, “Even if they come from the same country, so you can’t sort of think, ‘Oh well, everybody’s like this’. It’s very individual.”

When Ruth was asked if she thought in stereotypes, she replied, “I probably do to be honest. I think it’s easy to do that … and what changes that is if you get to
know students really well and then you can tap into their personal strengths and weaknesses and style of learning or whatever.” For Ruth, however, getting to know the students at this personal level was more difficult as the international student numbers increased:

We’re lucky we’ve only got that number of students [fifty]. There would be a lot of lecturers who would be lecturing to a lecture theatre with two hundred in it and you wouldn’t have a hope of getting to know them. But certainly years ago, when we would be down around the thirty five [number of international students], it was easier to do that, whereas at fifty it just gets harder and harder.

In a similar way to Larissa, Ruth said, “I don’t consciously stereotype people, but I think subconsciously I do do that. And then, what makes that change is when you get to know them on a personal level.” Although Samantha thought she “aspired to” avoid thinking in stereotypes, she said, “It’s quite useful to make generalisations but to.. what is the point when a generalisation becomes a stereotype? And I think that there is a lot of area grey in there. So while I do generalise, I wouldn’t like to stereotype. I might sometimes.” Ursula said that she consciously tried to avoid thinking in stereotypes. Instead, she focused on students as individuals. This is consistent with a number of other statements made by Ursula in this chapter.

Qualification 3, Criterion A3 (Q3 A3)

“The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments for cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of other group members” (from Table 5.10). The intent of this criterion shares some similarity with criterion
Q4 A2 which stipulates that “The lecturer must have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour. (For example, in some countries students stand when asking a question)” (from Table 5.13). Also, the extent to which lecturers can demonstrate the attitude sought by criterion Q3 A3 would depend on how well they met the requirements of criterion Q3 K4, that is, “The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of the culture(s) of the students in the group” (from Table 5.8). In that particular criterion it was shown that five out of the six lecturers in the department felt they had a limited understanding of the cultures of their international students. Despite this limited understanding, what has also been gleaned from the interview data to this point is that the lecturers are very supportive of all students with respect to the teaching and learning framework used in the department, regardless of their cultural background. This resonates strongly with Biggs’s (2003) notion of Level 3 teaching.

Ursula responded to this criterion by saying that “in some respects the within-individual differences can be as big as the between-cultural differences.” She thought it was important to focus on the person rather than cultural stereotypes. This focus on the ‘station’ of the student in relation to the requirements of their academic program has been a consistent feature of Ursula’s interview data to this point in the chapter. Bronwyn’s response to criterion Q3 A3 was that although she tried to make adjustments for cultural differences in the classroom, she did “not apologise for the fact that international students will have to make bigger adjustments than the local students.” She saw this adjustment as “a very beneficial part of the experience of being an international student. The ability to be flexible and fit into a new culture is a
great skill for life.” Bronwyn had the same sort of expectations of her own children when they went on university exchange programs. Reflecting on her daughter’s forthcoming year in Denmark, she said, “I embrace the effort and challenges they will have to make and expect they will have a hard year, but very rewarding if they work hard.” Similar to the comment made by Ursula in criterion Q3 K3 that she did not expect international students to unlearn their own culture because they were studying in Australia, Bronwyn observed, “International students do not lose their identity just because they have to change their perceptions, reactions and learning style.”

In response to criterion Q3 A3, Dahlia said, “I guess I haven’t had teaching experience where I really needed to do that type of thing.” She said she was happy to spend more time with international students when there were content or practice issues with a strong cultural component which made it “more difficult for them perhaps to get understanding.” Dahlia’s view was that until she knew students well, it was difficult to tell whether they were either “too shy or they don’t know or they’re just being lazy” when they did not make any attempt to contribute in class. This observation demonstrates that she is aware that, for example, a quiet student might indicate one of a number of dispositions.

Larissa was open to making adjustments for cultural differences, while at the same time respecting such differences. The researcher gave the example of someone putting a hand up in class when they wanted to speak in a tutorial. Larissa responded, “If someone were to do that, that’s fine.” The researcher continued, “Or if they stood
up to ask you a question.” Larissa said, “I probably wouldn’t think about. I think I would just respond.” When Ruth was presented with the example of a student standing up in class to ask a question she replied, “I wouldn’t find that at all a problem to tolerate. No, I think I’d probably make adjustments for that. I mean, we work fairly hard on trying to get all of the students to interact, particularly when we are working in small groups and you do have to make much more openings for some of the international students to interact.” Ruth would accept this behaviour on the basis that the student wanted to be involved and participate. Another adjustment Ruth spoke about was the department’s policy of providing early assessment with low weighting and significant feedback. This, she suggested, was “so that they get used to the style of what we’re doing. Because the last thing we want is to have an assignment worth thirty per cent, that three-quarters of the way through the semester, that they stuff up because they don’t know how to do assignments.” Whilst this would no doubt benefit all students in the class, Ruth believed that this initiative took “into account culture in the departmental sense of.. that’s a policy really that we will have assessment early and low weighting and lots of feedback.”

Samantha was asked if there was any way she made adjustments to cultural difference within the student group. She responded that whilst her classes “tended to rely on very high degrees of participation … I don’t push the international students to participate if they don’t want to.” Samantha’s strategy if students were reluctant to participate was to “find ways to really encourage them to participate and applaud them when they do and really make participation much more a norm. And so, sort of, in friendly kind of way, I hope, nudge them to participate but never appear to be
irritated or upset if they don’t.” In a particularly striking way, Samantha explained how she catered for student differences within the broader, non-negotiable assessment criteria of the academic programs:

The assessments are the measures of students, you know, demonstrating their competence and their acquisition of knowledge and the skills and so forth and that is non-negotiable. So those are the hoops that we insist that they pass and if they don’t pass they go back and re-do it. But what I find, I guess.. what I find I have a lot of scope to negotiate is the process by which they learn. So the assessment is non-negotiable but if there can be as wide a scope in the process of learning to embrace the different needs of students, then I hope that, you know.. I guess I’m making an assumption that if the process is wide enough to be inclusive of them and then they will be able to achieve these milestones.

Samantha’s response is a stand-out comment that portrays a student-centred approach to teaching and learning. It recognises the non-negotiable assessment requirements but then provides scope for individual differences between students to work towards achieving the goals of the academic program.

**Summary of lecturers’ responses to Attitude criteria Q3 A1-A3**

Criterion Q3 A1: “The lecturer should be aware of his or her own culture and understand that this strongly colours his or her own views” (from Table 5.10). Whilst the lecturers agree they are aware of their own culture and how this strongly shapes their own views, they have reflected on this to varying degrees. Dahlia and Ruth have reflected on this, respectively, to a “small degree … not to a huge amount” and “in a limited way.” This is consistent with a number of culture-related comments they made earlier in this chapter. In a similar fashion, Ursula said that although she was aware of her own culture and its assumptions, she did not have any formal training in this area. The responses from Bronwyn, Larissa, and Ruth demonstrated
that their interactions with international students from other cultures had made each
more aware of the expectations of their own (Australian) culture. Samantha’s “very
strong sense of identity” in relation to culture, class, and issues of power
demonstrated a deeper engagement with the substance of this criterion. There is the
likelihood that Samantha’s upbringing in Southeast Asia and the subsequent shift her
family made to Australia may have contributed to her awareness of her own values in
relation to culture. The same might be also said of Larissa having spent her youth
living in parts of Europe and the Middle East. How is criterion Q3 A1 supported by
the interview data? *The lecturers believe they are aware of their own culture and
understand that this strongly shapes their own views but they reflect on this to
varying degrees and from different perspectives.*

Criterion Q3 A2: “The lecturer must try to avoid thinking in stereotypes, and
to behave and express opinions without resorting to such generalizations” (from
Table 5.10). The prevailing view in the department is that stereotypical views are
replaced by concrete views of individual students once more about those individuals
becomes known. Ruth’s comment that it is becoming harder to ‘know’ each
individual as the class sizes became larger is a poignant observation. How is criterion
Q3 A2 supported by the interview data? *Whilst five of the six lecturers said they tend
to think in stereotypes, such views are replaced by concrete views of particular
individuals once more about those individuals becomes known.*

Criterion Q3 A3: “The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments for
cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these
differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of
other group members” (from Table 5.10). Overall, the data suggested that the
lecturers had respect for cultural difference. Rather than making adjustments for this
in the academic environment, however, their prime focus was on helping all students
meet the objectives of their academic programs. In this sense, whilst the lecturers
respected cultural difference, the issue of culture was actually secondary to the issue
of supporting the international students to adjust to the teaching and learning
framework in the department. Related to this, Bronwyn noted that international
students had to make bigger adjustments than Australian students but that the
extended skill set this produced was very beneficial to them. The data also showed
that lecturers like Ursula, Larissa, Ruth, and Samantha were happy for international
students to ‘be themselves’ as long as they made a commitment to participate in the
educative process and progress towards the desired outcomes of their academic
programs. How is criterion Q3 A3 supported by the interview data? *The lecturers
respect cultural difference but rather than making adjustments for this in the
academic environment, their prime focus is on helping international students meet
the learning outcomes related to the teaching and learning framework in the
department.*

Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching & learning styles

*Q4 Knowledge criteria*

The Knowledge criteria of ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’ are listed in Table 5.11.
Table 5.11  Qualification 4 (Q4), Knowledge Criteria K1-K4

| Q4 K1  | The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles |
| Q4 K2  | The lecturer should realize that professional identity is closely related to the hidden curriculum |
| Q4 K3  | The lecturer must understand that the learning process is affected by a student’s own personal and social development, and pay sufficient attention to individual differences |
| Q4 K4  | The lecturer should know that students’ learning strategies are a result of instructional models, and that procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined |

*Note.* Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, pp. 31-32).

Qualification 4, Criterion K1 (Q4 K1)

“The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles” (from Table 5.11). Dahlia and Ursula were the only lecturers who had tertiary qualifications in education (see Table 5.2). Dahlia reported that she had “a very basic knowledge” of educational theory and different approaches to teaching and learning through “having done the grad cert [graduate certificate] in tertiary education.” She continued, “So, you know, all that literature is there if I wanted to do more and really.. if I was going to perhaps work more in the teaching industry.” Dahlia worked more in a supervisory capacity with postgraduate students rather than giving lectures. In another interview she said, “My teaching is a bit more on a one-to-one basis than in a group.” Dahlia did not make a connection between supervision and teaching. Ursula indicated that she had the same education qualification as Dahlia and that the formal study had provided her with basic knowledge of educational theory and different approaches to teaching and learning. She believed that this gave her a theoretical framework for learning and teaching.

Despite having no tertiary qualifications in education, when Larissa was asked if she had a basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and
learning approaches, she responded, “I think I do, yes.” The researcher asked where she had obtained this knowledge. Larissa said, “From reading. Also doing the [university’s teaching course through the Professional Development Department] … plus doing more reading. Talking to other people.” Ursula said that the university’s teaching course took one year and comprised of a number of modules which covered basic education theory for teaching adult learners. The course culminated with participants having to undertake a project which related their teaching practice to what they had learned from the course. Whilst all new lecturers to the university were generally encouraged to participate in this program, Ursula said a decision had been made at the departmental level that all new lecturers in the allied health department had to undertake the program during their first year of work. This also extended to allied health professionals from external worksites that were contracted to give guest lectures to the students. This departmental decision demonstrates a strong commitment to its teaching practices and learning outcomes. Larissa said, “I found it [the university’s teaching course] really useful. It sort of helps you fit what happens into the theory rather than the reverse.”

Ruth, Bronwyn, and Samantha had also undertaken the university’s teaching program. This, said Ruth, provided her with “a limited knowledge” of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles: “But really I imagine only very briefly compared to what you’d get in an undergraduate teaching degree. I’ve got an awareness of it. So they actually talked quite a lot in that course about different styles, different teaching and learning strategies. But I’m sure there are way more out there than I know about.” Bronwyn’s recollection of the course was that it was
“excellent and I learnt lots of strategies to use in everyday teaching and learning environments. International students were on the … agenda and we explored the myths as well as lots of open discussion about assessment and the increased risk of plagiarism. It covered teaching for student-centred learning and other styles.” The course complemented “some very basic educational theory” that Bronwyn had studied at another university in the past. When asked if she had a basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles, Samantha gave the following reply:

A little. I mean, I think at a very superficial level. I have taken part in the university’s teaching course] and subsequently then gone on to the whole raft of workshops at the [Professional Development Department]. I think that they provide a lot of the cutting edge of tertiary education. So I guess I’ve got a lot from there and as I said before I was doing the theoretical subjects for my masters in [another allied health area] [and] I based some of my work on education which meant that I got the opportunity then to read, albeit in a specific area of tertiary education. So I have now a theoretical framework about tertiary education and as I said before about it being constructivist… being about active learning, about deep learning … about lifelong learning, generic skills. Yeah.

When asked if she had any knowledge about different teaching and learning styles in other cultures, Samantha replied, “No, I have to say big no to that.” She did, however, refer to “a very kind of crude schema … a model that talks about learning styles, about memorising and conserving information and then moving to critical and analytic thinking and then into the creative.. creating new thinking.” This sounds very similar to Ballard and Clanchy’s work that was outlined in the section titled ‘Some non-Western approaches to teaching and learning in higher education’ in the discussion of ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’ in Chapter II.
Qualification 4, Criterion K2 (Q4 K2)

“The lecturer should realize that professional identity is closely related to the hidden curriculum” (from Table 5.11). Besides the actual statement of this criterion, there is nothing in Teekens’s (2000d) accompanying text that specifically deals with its content. Nevertheless, given the strong tenor of the Profile in relation to lecturers being critically aware of their own culture, it is most likely the case that this criterion concerns the professional identity of lecturers and how this is situated in the Australian education context. When Bronwyn was asked if she realised that professional identity was closely related to the hidden curriculum, she replied, “No. I am not too sure about this.” The researcher then informed Bronwyn of the likely intent of the criterion to which she responded, “Yeah, I do know what you mean” and proceeded to relate the criterion to the allied health profession:

It’s a very uncomfortable feeling. I think a lot of other health professionals used to see us as almost a nuisance, wowsers, spoilsports. There would be certain surgeons that think that we just want to make their patients’ lives miserable and they’d avoid us.. avoid using us. But I think probably our professional identity has changed a bit. [The allied health discipline] is extremely fashionable now.

The responses of the remaining five lecturers in the department were directed at the education setting. Dahlia said, “It makes sense. It makes a lot of sense, and I guess, well, I haven’t thought about it in terms of well, okay, that’s what it is. That’s the hidden curriculum. But I guess, you know, I am aware that there are things that you actually don’t get told about and know about and I guess I’m inexperienced … coming in as a new teacher to the university.” Again, Dahlia has had to align her thinking to the novel framework provided by the Profile. She continued, “In the field
that I’m working in, I’ve worked in it for so long that all these things just become natural to me and you forget, that’s not the case for other people. So you have to go back to basics and I guess it’s, well.. you just know those things, but it’s realising that other people don’t know.”

When presented with criterion Q4 K2, Larissa said, “Let me think about this. I don’t think I.. just off the top of my head I don’t think I would have thought about that necessarily in that way … I am aware of all of those things … I’d need to think about that bit more.” Larissa’s reaction is similar to the initial responses from Bronwyn and Dahlia to criterion Q4 K2. It makes her reframe her thinking to the way the criterion is stated. Ruth acknowledged that criterion Q4 K2 was part of the “social fabric” and that it particularly had implications for international students who might not fully appreciate the role of the lecturer in the Australian context: “Sometimes that clarifying role can be fairly important to them, I think. And yet interesting enough, it’s not something we consciously do.” Ruth then reflected that “maybe we do at some level” and said that the department’s orientation for international students included telling them “about different teaching and learning strategies, and so as part of that it’s what’s our role as a lecturer, and also in some of our course book material, we have a departmental philosophy and goal and what-not, and we talk a bit about that sort of thing there” (see Q4 A3 for a discussion of the department’s orientation program as a strategy to help international students become aware of, and adjust to, the department’s teaching and learning framework). Samantha related positively to criterion Q4 K2 and offered the following stand-out comment:
The hidden curriculum, I think it’s a fabulous idea. I love it, and I’ve come across it before. And I like it simply because I think so much of culture is unsaid and is implicit rather than explicit. So without a doubt I think we must have a hidden curriculum. And I think the more transparent we are to ourselves, the more insight we have into what are the values underpinning our work and what’s the philosophical base and so forth, then our hidden curriculum has a chance to become more and more explicit … I think it’s a really important idea and even if I don’t think you’ll ever get rid of a hidden curriculum, to become aware of it more and more to not make it hidden to ourselves as much.

In the course of discussing this criterion, Samantha said, “And myself, I really like reflection and insights and the like. I thrive on those kinds of opportunities.” This comment reinforces the impression from her interview data thus far that she engages in reflection and critical self-reflection about culture and teaching and learning. Ursula’s response to criterion Q4 K2 was to couch it in terms of the department making its approach to teaching and learning very explicit in the context of the allied health profession: “Well, we try very hard to actually make as much of that explicit as we can, because its always been my philosophy that I’m training [allied health professionals] and that they need to understand why we ask them to learn things. And why we ask them to learn things in particular ways with respect to what they actually learn to do as [allied health professionals].” Ursula said that the department put “quite a lot of energy into helping them understand how.. what they’re learning and the way they’re learning, in particular, is going to be relevant to them when they’re practicing … I mean it helps students to engage and participate if they understand why you’re asking them to do things.” Ursula’s comments indicate not only a desire to make the department’s teaching and learning processes transparent to the students, but also to relate such a practice to the allied health practice as a profession.
Qualification 4, Criterion K3 (Q4 K3)

“The lecturer must understand that the learning process is affected by a student’s own personal and social development, and pay sufficient attention to individual differences” (from Table 5.11). Given that the teaching approach used in the department is based on student-centred learning (see, in particular, criterion Q4 S3), the lecturers are predisposed to take into account and support the diverse learning needs of the students. Indeed, to this point in examining the four qualifications from the Profile, the interview data suggest that, in the main, the lecturers are very supportive of the learning needs of their students, despite perhaps the cultural dimension of their knowledge and skills being somewhat limited. Therefore, the researcher concentrated on the part of the criterion that states that lecturers must understand that the learning process is affected by a student’s own personal and social development. This was done to gauge the lecturers’ cognisance of the impact of culture on the students’ social and personal development.

The lecturers’ responses were a mix of opinions and their answers mostly focused on the students’ personal and social development in terms of their fitting into the Australian education setting. Previously, in criterion Q1 K2, it was reported that Bronwyn noticed that compared with Australian students, most students from Asian countries focused on learning the facts rather than making associations between bits of knowledge. This, she believed, was due to their cultural and educational background. Dahlia’s response to criterion Q4 K3 was, “Obviously their social.. personal circumstances are going to affect their learning.” She said that the level of their personal development would determine how they interacted with people in
terms of “sharing and trust … and until they feel comfortable about doing that it’s
difficult for them to work in groups.” Dahlia indicated that it was her role to assist
students who had challenges in this area. This information correlates strongly with an
observation that Dahlia made in another interview when she was asked what she
enjoyed most about teaching:

It’s actually seeing students develop and gain knowledge. But also to develop
as individuals. To understand concepts and to apply them. So I guess overall,
seeing students’ progression and development as, um, in their selected field,
um, but also their professional development.

Larissa, too, agreed with the substance of criterion Q4 K3 and couched her
response in terms of the differences in teaching and learning between Australia and
their home countries: “I think the way students learn, and the way they have learnt to
learn, one could say I suppose in their own country.. is at times, very different to the
way that we actually expect students to learn.” In response to the question “Do you
understand that the learning process is affected by a student’s own personal and
social development?” Ruth replied, “Oh, absolutely” and proceeded to relate this to
the stresses that impacted on international students in the Australian tertiary
environment:

We see a lot of stresses on the international students on a personal level. And
it really does impact on their learning and I think the social development side
of it is really important as well, because if you are very isolated or if you are
palling-up with somebody from your own culture and you never go outside of
that and never experience it, particularly in our course … it really does hinder
their learning.
Samantha’s response was perhaps more aligned to the intent of the criterion in that it considered the histories of international students prior to arriving in Australia as making them more or less ‘ready’ for their tertiary studies:

Yeah, yeah, for sure. Social and personal development. Sure, insofar as I guess their social and personal development has taken them to this point and depending on what that pathway or that journey was, determines their readiness to be here, their readiness to learn, their readiness to take on the professional mantle or take on the professional attitudes and competencies, as well as the technical knowledge that they need.

Ursula said she was aware that a student’s personal and social development affects their learning processes. She said, “Absolutely, and we talk to the students about that, too.” Opposite to Samantha’s retrospective perspective on the question, Ursula adopted a prospective view when she said that the communication skills that would be taught to the students “will flow over into their personal lives and I would see the two years with us as an opportunity for personal growth as well as professional and academic growth.” In response to Ursula, the researcher said, “The way, I guess that I interpret this is that from an international student’s point of view is that their learning processes are obviously heavily conditioned from their social development and their personal outlook from their own country.” Ursula responded “Sure, but also, I mean, their time in Australia is not just an academic time. It is also a personal time and there’s enormous advantages.. enormous number of things to be learned just about living away from home and living in another country. I mean, many of these students have never lived away from home before. So there’s all that stuff going on in the background as well.” Ursula’s view corresponds with Bronwyn’s thinking that was outlined in criterion Q3 A3 when she said that
international students would extend their worldview by living and studying in Australia.

**Qualification 4, Criterion K4 (Q4 K4)**

“The lecturer should know that students’ learning strategies are a result of instructional models, and that procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined” (from Table 5.11). It was suggested to Bronwyn that the international students’ home country experience with assessment would have been defined by their culture and their national education system. She was then asked, “Do you think that they then necessarily fit neatly into the assessment ways of the department?” Bronwyn replied, “Probably some of them do but I think a lot of them don’t.” The researcher then suggested that many international students might not have had significant experience with essays in particular. Bronwyn responded:

Some of them do well. Some of them do a reasonable job. Some of them really struggle. And the ones that really struggle probably haven’t written much at all in their formal education and it really shows. They’ve got to learn how to write essays or how to reference and you just feel for them. Family expectations, different culture here, plus they have got to completely rethink their ability to handle an education setting. Because they.. you can’t just tick boxes or answer multiple choice. We ask you to resynthesise information in essays, reference it.

Dahlia said, “Yes, definitely” when asked if she thought that international students’ learning strategies were tied to the instructional modes of their culture. She continued, “Mm, yep. I mean, that’s something that’s discussed widely and to the extent that it is now integrated into the program for the new students. Special
sessions to help them to adjust and things” (see criterion Q4 S3). Dahlia recognised that the students not only had to adjust to the academic expectations of the Australian university setting, but did so in a time of personal upheaval of settling into life in Australia in general. Also, she reflected that the international students saw the lecturers in the department in terms of their perceptions borne from their home country experience:

So yes, very much aware, and.. so building in to help them.. to guide them into this new situation, and it has huge impact. It goes back to a lot of those other questions, you know, about interacting and trying to get feedback from international students and how they interact with you because they see the teacher as a fount of knowledge. We’ve got the answers and, and we don’t actually want to be that, we (pause) wanting them to find their way through, and I think most of them do achieve that and they recognise, certainly at the end, they’ve recognised what a long way they’ve come and.. not all of them, but a lot of them acknowledge that, you know in their cards and stuff.

When Larissa was asked if she understood the part of criterion Q4 K4 that states, “Student learning strategies are tied to instructional models of their culture,” she said, “I am aware it, yes. So if it’s didactic then.. also they would tend to sort of feedback what we’ve taught them and that’s an expectation of that [home country, didactic] system. While here, as you know, our expectations are a bit different … It’s very different indeed.” Larissa’s response to the part of criterion Q4 K4 which suggests that “Procedures and standards for assessing student performance are culturally and nationally defined” was, “I think I would agree with that.” With regard to clinical assessments she offered, “There’s a whole list of competencies that students have to achieve to pass and they are definitely.. some of them particularly are culturally defined. It’s the way that you interact with a patient, how you discuss things, how you try and negotiate changes with patients.” Ruth’s response to this
criterion was, “Probably, I don’t know how they assess in Singapore, but I imagine it would be quite different. I know that’s one of the things that our international students really struggle with is the different assessments here … It’s really hard to do.” The researcher suggested that the idea of a 3,000-word essay might be challenging for some international students. Ruth provided the following response:

Yes, and probably a lot of the communication I have with the international students is around being clearer about assessment tasks. So often because we are trying to get some kind of application of knowledge rather than just a straight testing knowledge in our assessment tasks, they just have no idea where to start and really, what they always want to know is ‘Well what’s right?’ There isn’t a right. It’s a ‘be creative, be (pause) put your own interpretation on it, read this’. And they just, well, ‘What am I supposed to think?’ They have no idea. It’s lot of frustration for them there. Several of them have said to me they come from a background of where their assessment is just the exams or tests … and you learn the stuff and you pass. If you don’t learn, you don’t pass.

With regard to the part of criterion Q4 K4 which suggests that student learning strategies are tied to instructional modes of their culture, Ruth replied, “Yes, I think it is. And we try to move away from that in our international students study skills program (see criterion Q4 A3). At the beginning, we try and expose them to different ways of learning. The critical thinking and questioning is something that often takes them a long time to get. They don’t.. certain cultures don’t question things. They think it is rude.” This sounds similar to Ballard and Clanchy’s (1997) notion of conserving and extending attitudes towards knowledge that was presented in Chapter II in the section titled ‘Some non-Western approaches to teaching and learning’. Samantha’s view was that student learning strategies were tied to instructional models from their culture: “That’s the background they bring.. whatever the instructional models are that they’re familiar with. And I think for our
international students, part of the acculturation or cultural adjustment is adjusting to
the instructional models that we use.” For Samantha, a challenge for international
students when they first arrived was to contribute to discussions: “They will, by and
large, be really quiet. And if you ask them.. if you just throw question to the class,
you’d rarely get an international student putting their hand up or piping up a response
or a question or a critique or a comment. And they need lots of encouragement and
support to do that.” When asked whether she thought that procedures and standards
for assessing student performance were culturally and nationally defined, Samantha
gave the following response:

Probably. I mean, probably. Having not seen assessment procedures in other
countries, I would probably say that they might look a bit different. I mean
certainly, I think our assessment criteria.. that means what were asking
students to do, you know, critically analyse assumptions underpinning blah
blah blah, and critically reflect on, provide alternatives, may well be a bit
different to what they are used to. I think that it would be at one end.. the
challenging end of the continuum. And I think they’re nationally defined for
us, culturally defined because they’re underpinned by that quite commonly-
held theoretically framework about education encouraging critical thinking,
problem solving, etcetera.

Ursula said, “Yes, I’d agree with that” when presented with the suggestion
that student learning strategies were tied to the instructional models that international
students had experienced in their own culture. She reflected on the differences
between cultures in terms knowledge and education:

I’m certainly aware that, that our sort of, um, approach to knowledge and
packaging of knowledge is, is different to.. for many of them to what, to what
they came from. And, um, the notion that.. that they can be in a position to
create and interpret knowledge is something that, I guess, we, we strive to,
um, have our students work at, and, and, you know, that’s not necessarily
something that they would see as a desirable thing.
Further, Ursula offered, “I think we try to work with that reasonably specifically. And we try to give them.. we try to help them understand that … we do have these approaches to teaching and learning for a reason.” This is consistent with the information provided by Ursula in criterion Q4 K2. Ursula said she explained things in terms of “professional practice reasons, rather than educational theory reasons, because I think they’re a fair bit more relevant … So I wouldn’t talk to them about deep and surface meanings for example. But I’d talk to them about being able to understand the principles, then apply those principles and practice to a range of things.” Ursula was asked if she thought that international students were faced with great differences in terms of how they were assessed in Australia. She thought that whilst some of them may have experience with essays and exams, the biggest challenge was “the sorts of assessment where they have to actually interview a patient and have someone sit and listen to them do that, or some of the sorts of applied assessment, some of the high-level assessments, like their critical review, their annotated bibliography, some of their project work would be quite different.”

**Summary of lecturers’ responses to Knowledge criteria Q4 K1-K4**

Criterion Q4 K1: “The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles” (from Table 5.11). Dahlia and Ursula were the only lecturers with tertiary qualifications in education. Each had studied for a graduate certificate in tertiary teaching. The remaining four lecturers had undertaken the university’s teaching course through the Professional Development Department and the data for each showed that they found it very useful. In addition, the data showed that the course covered a number of key
concepts that were presented in Chapter II of this thesis in relation teaching and learning in higher education, such as different approaches to teaching and learning, myths about international students in the academic environment, and lifelong learning. The fact that all staff members in the department were encouraged and supported to undertake the training demonstrated the value that is placed on teaching and learning in the department. How is criterion Q4 K1 supported by the interview data? The lecturers have some basic knowledge of educational theory and different approaches to teaching and learning.

Criterion Q4 K2: “The lecturer should realize that professional identity is closely related to the hidden curriculum” (from Table 5.11). Initially, some lecturers were unsure what this criterion meant. When the concept was clarified, each related to the substance of the criterion. Bronwyn’s focus was on the implications of the hidden curriculum from an allied health practitioner’s perspective. The other lecturers related it to the higher education setting and its associated implicit agendas and expectations. Dahlia, Ursula, Ruth, and Samantha each conveyed that it was important that the department’s teaching and learning framework needed to be made as explicit and transparent as possible to students in the allied health program. How is criterion Q4 K2 supported by the interview data? One lecturer is familiar with the concept of the hidden curriculum. The remaining five lecturers could relate to the intent of the criterion once its substance was clarified. A number of lecturers believe that it is important to make the department’s teaching and learning framework as explicit and transparent as possible to students in the allied health program.
Criterion Q4 K3: “The lecturer must understand that the learning process is affected by a student’s own personal and social development, and pay sufficient attention to individual differences” (from Table 5.11). The lecturers’ responses to this criterion mainly focused on the students’ personal and social development with respect to their adjustment to the requirements of the Australian education setting. It was evident to the lecturers that each student’s social, educational, and cultural background impacted on the way they presented in, and responded to, the approach to teaching and learning taken by the allied health department. How is criterion Q4 K3 supported by the interview data? It is evident to the lecturers that the social, educational, and cultural backgrounds of their students impact on the way they present in, and respond to, the department’s teaching and framework.

Criterion Q4 K4: “The lecturer should know that students’ learning strategies are a result of instructional models, and that procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined” (from Table 5.11). Once again, this criterion was evident to the lecturers. Most reported that their concern was to support international students as they adapt to the teaching and learning framework in the department. Between them, the lecturers had the perception that many international students were not used to the sorts of academic tasks that the allied health programs demanded of them in Australia, for instance, discursive writing, particular forms of assessment, critical analysis and reflection, independent learning, the expectation of student dialogue in small group teaching, the style of referencing, the ‘teacher-as-guide’ rather than ‘teacher-as-authoritarian’, and preferred ways of interacting with patients. How is criterion Q4 K4 supported by
the interview data? It is evident to the lecturers that the learning strategies of the
international students are a result of the instructional models they have experienced
before studying in the allied health department. They also acknowledged that
procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent
culturally and nationally defined. This knowledge notwithstanding, the overarching
concern of the lecturers was to support all students to adapt to the requirements of
the teaching and learning framework in the department so they could meet the
learning objectives. In terms of Biggs’s (1996) 3P model, the department is very
responsive to the learning needs of its students.

Q4 Skills criteria

Table 5.12 lists the four criteria in the Skills category of ‘Qualification 4
(Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4 S1</th>
<th>The lecturer must know how to make his or her teaching methods and aims explicit to students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4 S2</td>
<td>The lecturer should discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 S3</td>
<td>The lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 S4</td>
<td>The lecturer must know how to involve students from different national traditions in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 S5</td>
<td>The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 32).
Qualification 4, Criterion S1 (Q4 S1)

“The lecturer must know how to make his or her teaching methods and aims explicit to students” (from Table 5.12). The interview data from Ruth and Ursula in the previous criterion made it clear that the department has strategies for making teaching methods and aims explicit to students. Larissa, too, agreed that this was the case. When Ruth was asked if she was confident that the department made its teaching methods and aims explicit to students, she replied, “Oh yes, I think we’ve got quite well set up systems for that.” The researcher then asked, “You as an individual as well?” to which Ruth replied, “Yes, it’s department driven though. Every topic has to write out their objectives and goals. And we match that with [the allied health professional association’s] competencies and it’s just something that is standardly done in our department.” The researcher suggested that this “Sounds fairly rigorous. And that helps the students, do you think?” Ruth responded, “I think it does, yes, and we go through them in the introductory lecture for each topic so there’s an opportunity to talk about them and state clearly what they are.” The researcher continued, “And they’d have a chance to have this in writing as well?” Ruth said, “Yes, in their topic booklet.” Samantha supported Ruth’s claims:

Yes, I mean they’re clearly documented.. teaching aims, learning outcomes, assessment criteria. And we make them explicit to the extent that we print them out for them. They are available on WebCT.23 We go through them in introductory sessions to the topic. And every time an assessment piece is given out we go through the assessment criteria in detail … I think that’s a very, very strong part of the culture here. I would feel really outside the mainstream if I didn’t do that. That’s how strong it is.

---

23 WebCT is a company that provides integrated web-based systems for higher education.
Qualification 4, Criterion S2 (Q4 S2)

“The lecturer should discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present” (from Table 5.12). This is very similar to the intent of criterion Q3 S3 which states that “The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account.” The interview data indicated that the lecturers did not formally operationalise criterion Q3 S3. It might be expected, therefore, that they would not discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present in the classroom. In response to criterion Q4 S2, Bronwyn said, “Not in the subjects I’ve taught. We don’t have a way of saying to the students, ‘We want you to sit around and talk about the cultural differences and the way your group is going to perform based on that’.” When the researcher asked if it is a reasonable expectation of the department, Bronwyn responded, “I have to be ambivalent about it because maybe it’s implicit, but not something that really needs spelling out.” Although Dahlia began by saying, “Oh, I think you have responsibility as a teacher to do that and I would see that as useful”, she followed this with “I guess I haven’t been in the circumstance where I’ve needed to do that.” After thinking about it more Dahlia suggested that formally following the intent of criterion Q4 S2 might be problematic:

I mean that’s particularly quite a tricky area to be talking and I guess do you want to bring it up before it happens or by bringing it up are you sort of suggesting it’s going to happen? It’s one of those I think difficult situations where, is it better to pre-empt it or is it better to wait and see if this thing and then address it?
Larissa’s view was that “It depends upon the context that we are talking about. Just thinking of the support tutorials, we could do that but I don’t think that it is entirely appropriate in that group.” Ruth said, “Well, no we don’t in a general sense, but I would if there was a problem within a group … But I wouldn’t specifically talk about cultural differences unless it came up as an issue.” Samantha offered the following stand-out comment on criterion Q4 S2:

No, I don’t. I never have and I guess, because we don’t want to draw attention to cultural difference as a point of conflict. Of potential conflict. Or as a way of needing to compensate or do things, especially. and I think (pause) if I thought for a moment why that might be, I think we take responsibility for cultural difference and we adjust our teaching and our behaviour and the way we conduct our business. But we expect that students come in. all students come in equally to learn … Do you know what I think? I think it problematises cultural difference. I think, I mean. I may be wrong but if I did that it problematises it, whereas I think if we accept it and treat it implicitly and unconsciously in classroom setting as a strength and just as a fact of life, and just get on with it.

Samantha’s comment that “all students come in equally to learn” is (again) a strong expression of Biggs’s (2003) Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’ where the focus is on helping students meet educational objectives rather that focusing on cultural or personality differences. Ursula’s response to criterion Q4 S2 was, “Not specifically.” She explained this from the point of view of some international students: “We as a group have had some experiences where the international students do not want to be singled out. They do not want to be treated differently or to have their differences highlighted or pointed out.” The responses to criterion Q4 S2 from Ruth, Samantha, and Ursula are consistent with their responses to criterion Q3 S3.
"The lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction" (from Table 5.12). The information gathered about the department thus far in this chapter indicates that the model of teaching and learning that is utilised is student-directed, or student-centred. Indeed, it is the contrast between teacher-directed and student-centred models of instruction that is evident in the interview data. Whilst the lecturers believe that many international students in the department come from teacher-directed educational environments, the focus of teaching and learning in the department is student-centred. The challenge for the international students is to adjust to the new approach and the challenge for the lecturers is to help them do this. Bronwyn said, “My belief is that they [international students] expect more didactic teaching than, than our [Australian] students.” In Dahlia’s view, international students were “used to a very didactic form of learning, so wanting it to be very clearly defined, sort of, what they need to know. So just wanting facts.. very fact-based rather than application.” She continued, “So, um, they’re not used to the.. oh, I’m not going to bring out the words.. you know, the right education words here … um, self-directed learning … The programs we have in this department.. that they are at the upper level of, sort of, moving students towards self-directed learning. So, I mean, we work very hard at that.”

Larissa, too, noted the difference between how a number of international students initially presented in the clinical setting and contrasted this against how things were expected to be done. She suggested that “[International] students need to
reflect and be critical. When they’re doing their clinical placements, some of the
students have, uh, great difficulty in picking out the important parts of medical notes.
So, the important bits that are relevant for their practice … [They] tend to just collect
all the information and can’t sift through it and identify the important parts.” Larissa
said that her teaching was “occasionally” more aligned with a teacher-directed model
of instruction “when needing to provide specific information, for example, during the
orientation to a topic.” In Ruth’s opinion, the teaching approach in the department
was “moving one step again away from.. from that didactic style of lecturing that we
do very, very little of, really.” Having said this, Ruth added that a certain amount of
“chalk and talk” did happen:

I mean, the reality of it is that there’s a certain amount of that that goes on,
because as background information to things, there is a certain amount of
knowledge that is just pretty boring and dull and you have to get across.
Even then, there are other ways of doing it. You can see if it’s just cut and
dried and it’s just factual information, you can just set it as reading, and then
work on different aspects of it or applications of that knowledge in class. So
some of that we do, some of what I do is just basic boring, giving information
really, but in general, the philosophy is very much a student-centred
approach, and that is partly why we work in groups so much.

Dahlia made a similar comment to the one above from Ruth. Although her
work was largely supervising postgraduate students, she had done some teaching in
the undergraduate program and said that there were times when she simply presented
the information to the students. This was balanced, however, by small group work
and discussion. The focus, stated Dahlia, was helping the students digest and apply
the information they were presented with. Ursula, too, whilst having been very
explicit to this point about the student-centred approach to teaching and learning that
was used in the department, also indicated that “Some didactic learning is fine. It’s
just that you don’t want your whole program to be made of di.. you know, if it’s fairly factual, straightforward.. Kreb’s Cycle.. there’s not a lot of point sitting around discussing your personal response to the Kreb’s Cycle, you know! The Kreb’s Cycle is [interviewee emphasis], and you’ve got to learn it.”

Samantha agreed that the student-centred teaching and learning model was a dominant feature of the department. She stated, “Yes, I think probably predominantly that would be our model and hence it’s about encouraging active learning, encouraging teamwork, communication, the building of partnerships between students in a very much.. and problem-based learning so that they construct their knowledge and they’re very active players in the learning process.” For Samantha, where the teacher-directed nature of her work was becoming more apparent was in her dealings with all students outside of class time. For example, she said one result of increased student numbers and an annual intake (as opposed to the department previously only having a biennial intake) was that lecturers found themselves with heavier workloads and, therefore, needed to have less of an open-door policy than was previously the case. Students were made aware of times that staff would be available for consultation and times when they would answer their emails:

All of that is about meeting our needs and being teacher-led, if you like. It’s what we [interviewee emphasis] need … in order to operate … Like [clinical] placements. You take what you get. If you don’t like it, you have the right to refuse but you may not get a placement. Whereas there was a time when we had the capacity to go running around setting things up for people just how they liked it … All of us are a bit more constrained, more focused, and it’s not all a bad thing … We’ve worked out what the priorities are, if you like. We can’t do everything.
Qualification 4, Criterion S4 (Q4 S4)

“The lecturer must know how to involve students from different national traditions in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings” (from Table 5.12). The extent to which lecturers utilised this skill is constrained by the extent to which the curriculum content is internationalised (see criterion Q1 S2). The results for criterion Q1 S2 showed that the content of the subjects was not heavily infused with examples from various cultural and educational settings. Nevertheless, Bronwyn, Ruth, Samantha, and Ursula did involve international students in class discussions by letting them ‘be experts’ about their own culture when appropriate. Larissa and Dahlia reported that the nature of their work with the students (clinical assessment and supervision respectively) did not lend itself to the activity suggested by criterion Q4 S4. Bronwyn encouraged international students “to give examples from their culture” when the dialogue in the classroom lent itself to such discussion. She believed this was a good way for international students to contribute to the discussion and build their confidence. Ruth took a similar approach:

Yes, to a certain extent, yes, and they can actually be really helpful in class … I think it is important. And I think it’s also one way in which we can encourage them to talk, because sometimes that is difficult for them, and rather than putting them on the spot, in a tutorial by answering a question that they might not be comfortable with, if you can engage them in something that you know that going to be comfortable with, then that is a good icebreaker.

When Samantha was asked if she let international students talk about their home culture experience to let them assume the role of an expert in the classroom she replied:
Yes, for sure, and I think that there are some topics that lend themselves more to that than others. And I teach much less in socio-cultural issues, but I think that is probably the best topic to really privilege cultural information and really bring that out… I see that as a fabulous place to… because it’s about socio-cultural… to actually really put it out there that we value… highly value cultural knowledge that our students bring.

Samantha was asked if this strategy was useful in getting international students to participate in class. She replied, “Without a doubt, because they are the experts in that situation and we are listening spellbound to what they have to say. So I think it’s extremely powerful as a means of communicating a respect and value of their culture.” Ursula, too, let students be the experts about their home culture in a bid to encourage their participation. She said “I’ll often ask them stuff around… try to pick things to ask them that I think that they’ll know. Like something about… how you’d do this in Hong Kong… I know that they’re pretty likely to have something to contribute.”

**Qualification 4, Criterion S5 (Q4 S5)**

“The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given)” (from Table 5.12). Given that there is no specific information about this criterion in Teekens’s (2000d) commentary which accompanies ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’, it is difficult to determine whether criterion Q4 S5 means assessment of student performance (for example, exams or assignments) or dialogue with the student (for example, classroom conversation) or both. Already it has been made
clear in this chapter that all students in the department have to meet the assessment requirements of their academic program in a manner that is clearly prescribed. It has also been shown that whilst the lecturers are generally open to different student behaviours in class (such as raising one’s hand to ask a question), they may not have enough culture-specific knowledge to know whether this is a cultural or personal characteristic. This is definitely likely to be the case if such culture-specific behaviour manifested itself in formal written assessment, for example, of the sort portrayed by Figures 2.6 and 2.7 in ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’ in Chapter II. These figures showed ‘cultural approaches’ to structured writing that would probably be misinterpreted by most Australian lecturers.

Bronwyn’s response to criterion Q4 S5 was, “I think probably not. But then I think we probably would make no apologies for not having the same academic culture, given that the students have chosen to come here.” She thought the assessment criteria were there for a specific reason: “I think it is a necessary requirement. It’s a communication skill that’s going to be worthwhile … So the assessment criteria should keep that fairly level for them.” When Dahlia was asked if she assessed student performance with a respect for different academic cultures given that people may not be used to what is expected in the Australian setting, she replied, “Well, I guess it would only be in terms of perhaps their use of language, so I would accept sort of minor grammatical errors, you know like, occasionally a single plural, you know, the a’s and the the’s missing … I mean the student still probably would not get a high distinction with those, which I wouldn’t perhaps accept from an
Australian student. I would see that as sloppy.” Dahlia referred to “standards of the degree” in that the international students were “taking an Australian degree so they have to meet the standards.” In terms of meeting such standards, Dahlia said, “I mean, I would help them get there, more than happy to give them feedback. Comprehensive feedback.”

Larissa’s comment on criterion Q4 S5 was, “That is a bit.. that is difficult. I’m thinking of the clinical placement again because I’m involved in that and involved in that assessment. Because one needs to meet certain competencies, that’s hard to do. We can to some extent take account of the particular student for some of the competencies. But others you can’t, because they do need to achieve those things … It is really hard.” Here, again, is the strong message that the all students must satisfy the assessment criteria. Whilst the assessment does not demand that international students reject their own culture in order to pass, certain behaviours, for example critical thinking, showing initiative, and communicating in the expected manner, more or less demand that things be done in a certain way. For Dahlia, for example, this meant correct spelling and, presumably, grammar. For Larissa, this meant that the clinical competencies had to be demonstrated. Success in these areas is heavily dependent on the international student’s language ability in terms of speaking and listening and their capacity to understand the contexts of the Australian (mostly Anglo-Celtic) social and health framework.

When Ruth was asked if she assessed student performance with a respect for different academic cultures, she replied, “It’s a hard one … I try not to, is my basic
position on it, I think, because of that thing of it being an Australian course and so therefore needing to have them well and truly reach the Australian standard that we are aiming for.” Although Ruth followed the policy of marking a piece of work “blind”, that is, without identifying the work with the particular student, she said, “Without a doubt you can pick whether you’ve got an international student in front of you or not, because of the language, etcetera, that they use.” Ruth said sometimes this meant she could identify students “who we know are really, really struggling, particularly [sponsored] students, not because they’re [sponsored], but often because they come from poorer backgrounds.” She continued, “It’s hard to not bring that prior knowledge into it. You know how hard they’re working, and I think subconsciously, what I do then is tend to look at the progress in their work rather than the actual.. what their work is. But having said that, the bottom line is we have got a standard, and it needs to meet that standard.” Again, Ruth referred to the non-negotiable aspects of assessment in the department:

There is a huge emphasis in our assessment process and application of knowledge and the core skills that we value like critical thinking and independent learners, and that sort of thing. A lot of our assessment would be geared right away from what international students are probably more used to.

When Samantha was asked if she assessed student performance with a respect for different academic cultures, she responded, “Possibly no, I think, if I understood that question correctly. Insofar as we assess students to our standards and that’s it, full stop. We don’t have a flexible way of assessing students that embraces their different learning traditions and different styles of instruction.” With regard to academic pieces of work, she thought that “there’s very little scope to be flexible and
interpret international perspectives.” Ursula concurred with Samantha’s thinking: “The short answer would be no, because for every piece of assessment we have standard assessment criteria developed for that piece of work which the students all have and have before the piece of work.” Ursula referred to a “grading grid that tells the students what a distinction for that criteria looks like, and we would use that for all students as a standard.” However, she did say, “We’re fairly flexible about deadlines, provided the students contact us. So we will pretty much give an extension to anybody who asks.” The observations from Samantha and Ursula on criterion Q4 S5 are consistent with the reports of the other lecturers.

Summary of lecturers’ responses to Skills criteria Q4 S1-S5

Criterion Q4 S1: “The lecturer must know how to make his or her teaching methods and aims explicit to students” (from Table 5.12). The interview data from Ruth and Ursula in criterion Q4 K4 provided evidence that the department undertook to make its teaching methods and aims explicit to students. Other lecturers also felt that this was a strong feature of the department’s approach to teaching and learning. Students were provided with documents that made topic objectives and goals evident. Ruth and Samantha commented that these were reiterated in introductory lectures and were also available on-line through WebCT. How is criterion Q4 S1 supported by the interview data? The lecturers’ responses demonstrate that all students are made aware of the teaching methods and aims related to the academic programs.
Criterion Q4 S2: “The lecturer should discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present” (from Table 5.12). It was noted that criterion Q4 S2 was similar to criterion Q3 S3 which asked lecturers to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take this into account. The interview data for that particular criterion showed that the lecturers chose not to do this in a formal sense. The lecturers’ responses to criterion Q4 S2 were thoroughly consistent with each other and the findings for criterion Q3 S3. They each commented that it was not a feature of their teaching approach to discuss with the students how the group intended to deal with cultural difference, preferring instead to deal with the reality of a culturally-mixed classroom without spelling out to the students that cultural difference was present. A number of lecturers said, however, that they would address issues of culture if it became a problem within the student group. How is criterion Q4 S2 supported by the interview data? There is a discrepancy between the requirement of the criterion and the interview data. The lecturers work with cultural difference in an informal manner in the classroom rather than make students aware of such differences.

Criterion Q4 S3: “The lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction” (from Table 5.12). It has been noted throughout this chapter that the model of teaching and learning that was utilised in the department was student-directed or student-centred. Teacher-directed, didactic teaching was not a big feature in the department’s academic programs. According to a number of lecturers,
however, there were some occasions when teacher-directed instruction was entirely appropriate, for example, when providing specific information (Larissa), providing background information (Ruth), simply presenting information to students (Dahlia), providing fairly factual, straightforward information, such as the Kreb’s Cycle (Ursula) and limiting both staff access times and student opportunities to negotiate clinical placement arrangements (Samantha). Overall, however, student-centred learning and small group teaching was the hallmark of the teaching and learning framework in the department. There is no evidence that the lecturers used a teacher-centred model of instruction to teach international students who might come from countries where such a model was assumed to be prevalent. How is criterion Q4 S3 supported by the interview data? The teaching and learning framework in the department is based on student-centred learning. Most lecturers, however, acknowledge that there are occasions when a teacher-directed focus is appropriate.

Criterion Q4 S4: “The lecturer must know how to involve students from different national traditions in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings” (from Table 5.12). The data gathered for criterion Q1 S2 have already demonstrated that the content of the allied health curriculum was not heavily infused with examples from other national, cultural, and educational settings. This did not stop lecturers like Ruth, Samantha, Ursula, and Bronwyn letting international students be the ‘experts’ about their own culture when appropriate. How is criterion Q4 S4 supported by the interview data? Whilst there is limited internationalised curriculum content in the allied health programs, the majority of lecturers in the department involve international students in the learning process by
letting them be the ‘expert’ about what happens in their home countries. The aim of this strategy is largely to get international students to contribute to the discussion and to help build their confidence.

Criterion Q4 S5: “The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given)” (from Table 5.12). Already in this chapter it has been demonstrated that lecturers are generally open to different student behaviours in class as long as this does not impact adversely on the learning outcomes that have been set for the allied health academic programs. The unequivocal message from the data was that students had to satisfy the assessment criteria and show that they had developed the professional competencies that were demanded by the Australian standard for the allied health profession. Whilst this did not mean that the international students had to abandon their cultural values in the process, they, like all students in the class, had to demonstrate, for example, that they could show initiative and be critical thinkers, independent learners, and were capable of high-level communication with peers, patients and clients, as well as professionals from other allied health and medical disciplines. How is criterion Q4 S5 supported by the interview data? The lecturers accommodate students’ culture- and personality-related behaviour in class. They are happy for students to ‘be themselves’. The overriding concern, however, is for the learning outcomes that have been set for the allied health academic programs to be met, regardless of students’ culture- and personality-related behaviour.
Table 5.13 lists the three criteria in the Attitude category of ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification 4 (Q4): Attitude Criteria A1-A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4 A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 A3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 32).

Qualification 4, Criterion A1 (Q4 A1)

“The lecturer should realize that his or her own status as an academic is strongly conditioned by national and cultural values and be willing to reflect on this” (from Table 5.13). When Bronwyn was asked if she reflected on this she replied, “Um, no not a lot.” The researcher responded, “Not really? What do you think that might mean?” to which Bronwyn replied, “To me it means where do I fit into maybe the university hierarchy? Where do I fit into Australian society? What’s my pay like? … But in terms of status, I don’t think at my age I’m particularly interested in status.” Bronwyn interpreted the word ‘status’ in the narrow sense of the word, that is, as determined by monetary value and position in the social hierarchy rather than a broader appreciation of the way that Australian culture and its values relate to the idea of a university lecturer and what holding this position might mean. Dahlia, whilst not relating her work to a salary level, initially took criterion Q4 A1 to indicate her status as a researcher and an academic within the allied health profession. When Dahlia was asked to describe the place of lecturers in Australian
culture, she responded, “A bit middle-of-the-road, I think. Oh, a reasonable status, I think, yes. As a professional, sort of middle-of-the-road, professional. I’m not sure who has good status these days, actually.” Despite some prompting, neither Bronwyn nor Dahlia made explicit reference to deeper considerations of what the position of lecturer might mean in terms of Australian culture.

Larissa’s comment on criterion Q4 A1 was, “I know broadly how they are seen. As very, very important people who.. whatever they say.. that’s it, really.” Larissa was referring to how many international students perceived Australian lecturers and the fact that the word of the lecturer, as a teacher and an expert, was accepted and beyond reproach. The researcher asked if Australian students would see it that way, too, to which Larissa responded, “Not with Australian students, no. I think with Australian students … they are seen as teachers who [they] can question. So you’re there to provide a learning environment, some information, but also a stimulus to further the learning.” The researcher suggested, “The facilitator?” and Larissa responded, “The facilitator.” The researcher then asked, “Would I be fair in saying that criterion Q4 A1 is something perhaps you haven’t actively dwelt upon?” to which Larissa replied, “Yes.. would be yes. I haven’t.”

Ruth was asked if she reflected on her own status as an academic in terms of what this meant in Australian culture. She said, “Yes I do reflect on that a bit” and commented that a recent exercise in applying for tenure at the university had been a catalyst for that. Ruth said that one thing that was important for her was the way she was perceived by the students “because I’ve got a basic [undergraduate] degree …
nothing more, and I’m training students with [for] a masters [degree], so they’re coming out with a better qualification than what I’ve got.” Although Ruth commented that she had a lot of experience as an allied health professional, she was pursuing further study because she would “actually like to be recognised … I would like to actually have ‘doctor’ in front of my name so that I don’t go down to a lecture as Mrs [Smith]. I go down as Dr [Smith].” Samantha, in a similar way to Bronwyn, initially interpreted the word ‘status’ in the narrow sense of social hierarchy. When asked if she reflected on her own status as an academic in terms of national cultural values, she replied, “Not really because I occupy the lowest status in academia (laughter) and so I mostly choose to make that irrelevant to my functioning.” Ursula initially interpreted criterion Q4 A1 in terms her own standing in the allied health field: “I’m seen to have a leadership role in academic [allied health discipline] in Australia. So I think I would be seen as one of the most experienced [allied health] educators in the country.”

*Qualification 4, Criterion A2 (Q4 A2)*

“The lecturer must have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour. (For example, in some countries students stand when asking a question)” (from Table 5.13). This is similar to criterion Q4 S5 which said, “The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given)” (from Table 5.12). Whilst it was shown that the lecturers did not operationalise that particular criterion for formal assessment, their responses to criterion Q4 A2 showed
that they were flexible towards different student behaviours in non-assessment tasks, for example, in the classroom setting. When Bronwyn was asked if she had a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour, she replied, “Ah, yes, I think I’d say yes.” This was based on her being “very cautious … cos I’m quite aware that you have to not offend students and you have to be careful. You have to treat them carefully as you would want to be treated.” The researcher gave the example of a quiet Australian or international student and asked Bronwyn if she thought she would have a flexible attitude towards that type of behaviour rather than perceiving it as a disadvantage. Bronwyn replied, “I don’t see that as a disadvantage. It’s a disadvantage if you want to hear what your students think and you encourage them to do that. It just means you have to go about it and create an atmosphere that’s as non-threatening for them as possible so that they can open up and talk.” Like the other lecturers, Bronwyn’s focus is on helping the students engage in tasks that relate to the learning objectives of their studies.

Dahlia was asked if she was flexible towards various styles of student behaviour. She said, “Yes, I think I am, because I’m accepting of.. I think it’s very important for people to be themselves.” This response is consistent with the interview data presented earlier that showed that Dahlia’s personal demeanour reflected this maxim. Dahlia suggested, “Everybody has a niche and everybody has a niche in their profession, and some people will be the quiet, hard workers and get on … Others will be out there sort of blowing their trumpet, so I think there’s a position for everybody and I wouldn’t want them all to be the same.” Dahlia reported that the department’s academic programs were not about changing people to the point that
they lost sight of who they were. This view is very much aligned with Cranton’s (2001) thinking that was outlined in Chapter III about the importance of being true to one’s Self.

Larissa’s response to the question of whether or not she had a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour was, “I think so.” The researcher said, “The opposite would be to be intolerant” to which Larissa responded, “That wouldn’t work.” The researcher then asked Larissa how she demonstrated this flexibility. She replied that when working with students individually or in small groups, “I would sort of respect the individual student and the way that they’re sort of interacting.” Larissa gave the example of how she managed different student behaviours in small group work. She said, “If one student is too extroverted, shall we say, is taking over the whole group, I will try and bring out other students … It’s trying to get that balance.” Larissa accepted that some students were extroverts: “So if you’re extroverted, that’s good… usually have lots to say, and that’s great. And also it could stimulate other people’s thoughts.” Larissa empathised with “the quiet people.” She said, “I tend to be quiet, so I tend to reflect on things.” The remainder of the conversation on this criterion with Larissa reinforced the idea that she was flexible with student behaviour and was reflective about her teaching practice:

Researcher: So it sounds like you are quite flexible with ... 
Larissa: I try to be flexible … Again, I think there’s other ways of dealing with that, and I’m constantly thinking about that.

Researcher: How are you constantly thinking about that?
Larissa: Well, it’s mainly from my experiences with the different groups. And different groups, as you know, operate in different ways, so I would reflect.. so once we had had a support tutorial and I can see how everyone’s
interacting, I then reflect upon, what do I need to do? If it’s not working well
or if it is working well.. that sort of thing for the next week.

Ruth, too, thought she had a flexible attitude towards various styles of student
behaviour. She said, “I like to think I’m open about that kind of thing because it does
vary such a lot.” She said that the teaching sessions in the department were “fairly
interactive and people can ask questions and clarify things in class either in a lecture
or in tute situations. But as we know, there are lot of international students who
aren’t comfortable doing that sort of thing.” However, Ruth also acknowledged,
“There’s a number who are.” Throughout this chapter it has been shown that Ruth
perceives herself as being aware of diversity within same-country/cultural groups.
Whilst Samantha reported that she was “very flexible to their [international
students’] cultural needs and their learning styles” she was inflexible with “behaviour
that is counterproductive to learning or disruptive of the class in any way or people
wanting special treatment because they are kind of spoiled and feel we owe them
special treatment.” When asked if she thought that international students fell into that
category, she replied as follows:

By and large not. I think, by and large, I find especially our Asian students
are very humble in their approach, rather than arrogant. Some of them are
overly anxious and make a lot of demands for every ‘i’ to be dotted and ‘t’ to
be crossed and for them to be informed over and over again to be given
instructions. And that can be a little bit wearing just because it is their
personal lack of confidence in themselves and their over-anxiety. And if they
relaxed a bit more and got on with things they may not need to make so many
demands of us. But that’s only a few.

Ursula, like Samantha, thought that she had a flexible attitude towards
various styles of student behaviour, but not towards disruptive or inappropriate
behaviour in classrooms. Of the latter, she said, “I’m less tolerant than I used to be
... but I think standards are important and I make no apologies for expecting big things of my staff and my students.” When asked why she might be less tolerant, Ursula replied, “I think I’m a bit tired and I think I’ve heard it all before ... I value my time and value the other students’ time.” On the supportive side of being flexible towards various styles of student behaviour, Ursula commented that she was “quite tolerant and recognise that different students have different personal styles and different levels of personality.” Of some students in the classroom, she said, “You can’t shut them up and other students you can never get them to talk and that’s just how we are as humans.” Ursula thought that she dealt with those sorts of differences “quite well in terms of trying to keep an eye on individual student learning but also in what’s happening in the class.” Again, Ursula’s focus is on all students, not only the international students.

Qualification 4, Criterion A3 (Q4 A3)

“The lecturer should take an interest in the cultural backgrounds of the foreign students in the group and support initiatives for extra-curricular cultural activities” (from Table 5.13). This criterion was examined in two stages. The first was to ask lecturers if they took an interest in the cultural backgrounds of the international students. The second was to document the sort of extra-curricular activities that the department provided to support their international students.

When Bronwyn was asked if she took an interest in the cultural backgrounds of the international students, she replied, “Yes, I think I do, but I’m not someone who wants to study the cultures in huge detail. I think I’m interested, well obviously in the
human aspect of it.” Bronwyn was interested in “where their belief structures have
come from and why they think what they do” but she was not “hugely motivated” to
learn about the Muslim or the Buddhist religions. Further she did not think that
learning about these religions would necessarily inform her about the characteristics
of her international students. Moreover, her interest was “in the modern context for
them as they sit in the families in this global world and their perceptions of us and,
you know, what life’s going to be like for them back in their own culture.” Dahlia
said she was interested in the cultural backgrounds of the international students and
expressed this interest using the example of asking students about festivals in their
home countries: “Well, when opportunities arise ask things, you know, I guess
Christmas, Easter, their festivities.. say ‘Okay well, what are your festivals? What do
you do? How do you celebrate your festivals? What are important things for you?
What do you do when you have.. you know.. celebrate the birthday, special food,
etcetera?’” Dahlia said she had “a strong interest in that.”

In response to the first part of criterion Q4 A3, Larissa said, “Yes, it is always
really interesting just finding out their background, where they live, the foods they
eat, how.. what it’s like back home, what they’re going to do when they go back
home.” Larissa said that her background of having spent her youth living overseas
had stimulated her interest in this area. When Ruth was asked if she took an interest
in the cultural backgrounds of the international students, she said, “It’s always
interesting. I always love occasions when we might get together and they bring food
from their own country or something.” She commented about “a really lovely
student, a couple of years ago, who came from a very traditional Chinese-Malay
background.” Although the student was engaged to be married, she told Ruth, “I’m not ready to go back to being a traditional Chinese wife.” Ruth said to the researcher “It’s that kind of stuff that you don’t get much insight into really in a classroom, but it’s only when you get to know them a little bit better that you sort of realise some of that.”

The researcher suggested to Samantha that she had expressed an interest in the cultural backgrounds of international students over the course of the multiple interviews. She replied, “Yes. I mean I do insofar as I’m interested in our students as people and human beings from whatever culture they come from. And I’ve said, as a new, first generation migrant myself, I am particularly interested in the experience of international students around cultural adjustment.” When Ursula was asked if she had an interest in the cultural background of the international students, she responded, “Yes. I mean I’m a traveller. And certainly having spent time in Singapore, in particular, I think has been really helpful.”

The second part of criterion Q4 A3 states, “The lecturer should support initiatives for extra-curricular cultural activities.” Whilst the intent of this part of the criterion is suggestive of social events, it was clear from the interview data that the department did not provide such activities. Samantha explained that whilst it would be ideal to offer social activities “particularly because of the absolute wealth of cultural experience that we have in front of us … at the end of the day we do not have skerrick of energy for it.” Ruth said, “It is a bit of a shame” that informal social events were not part of the department’s offerings, because “I think that they and us
get quite a lot out of those informal sessions, because that’s when you get to chat about other things. And that’s when you get the little snippets of information that come out that you didn’t know before.”

Bronwyn, too, said, “It would be nice, ideally, to allow our students to immerse us in some of their... you know, bring a... have a food day or something like... but it just seems like another extra bit of work for everyone.” Already in this chapter, it has become evident that the lecturers in the department are particularly busy in meeting the demands associated with the academic work of the allied health programs. Time is perceived as a precious resource. For the moment, it is enough to recognise the import of Samantha’s comment that “we are fairly resource poor in terms of we have a small staff complement” has for the department’s activities extending to organising social and cultural events for the student body. It is also worth mentioning that resources exist in the broader university community for social and cultural events for international students. Samantha said that lecturers in the department made international students aware of these resources. In addition, Ruth commented that the Australian and international students in the department had formed an [allied health discipline] club, “which does offer some social activities.”

Whilst the department did not provide social and cultural activities, it did provide structured assistance to international students to help them make the adjustments to the department’s teaching and learning framework. Dahlia referred to such initiatives as “the special issues, you know, that we have to put in place in addition... to enable the international students to achieve as well.” Ursula, the longest
serving staff member, was well-placed to comment on the nature of these extra-
curricular activities. She referred to mentoring systems, extra support tutorials, and the department’s own orientation for international students as special initiatives to support international students. Ursula said, “We have toyed with mentoring. Um, we’ve done more that toy with it. We’ve tried.. we tried two systems and neither of them have worked particularly well and, um, it’s something that we need to get back to.” The first mentoring system Ursula referred to was allocating four or five international students to individual staff members. Not only did increasing international student numbers make this problematic, but other challenges soon became apparent, as explained by Ursula:

We ran into trouble with that because the line between support person and gate-keeper became difficult. So, you’d be having coffee with the student one week and the next week you’d be telling them that they failed a piece of work. And, I.. you know, I think particularly for students from Asian countries where those.. the lines of sort of friendships and rules and, and family connections are not as clear as they might be in Australia that, that proved difficult that the students.. you know, exactly.. It was difficult for us to be a mentor and [interviewee emphasis] a gate-keeper.

The second mentoring system involved practising allied health professionals outside of the university becoming mentors for international students. Ursula said this “worked reasonably well for the students that engaged and the [allied health professionals] that engaged but the students.. many of the students found they didn’t have time.” Further, the department had difficulty recruiting allied health professionals who were “outside the pool of those actively involved in assessing” the students. Ursula said, “The next thing we’ll try and do is to try and have some sort of more peer-based mentoring system. Um, so I think, I think it’s something that’s
really important but I’m not sure the best way to go about it. We try to cover things and, and both of them were fairly resource-intensive as well.”

The department also offered beginning international students a two-week orientation program that, according to Ruth, had been developed “to try and integrate them a little bit more.” She said that the name of the activity had been changed to the “International Students Study Skills Program” rather than calling it an orientation. Ruth elaborated that this was “because they think it is optional, you know, having a tour of things, when really it’s a lot of sessions about different teaching and learning strategies and methods and different study techniques, and it kind of gets them used to that before they hit the term, the semester.” Ursula said that the department ran the orientation “for the first two weeks before uni starts.” Her assessment of the department’s orientation is related in full because it provides a good overview of the event, its rationales, and its outcomes:

I mean one of the big things that we’ve just started … is the … two-week orientation program which we say is compulsory but we … don’t charge for. And there’s lots of levels to that. One is that we just want them to be here early so they’ve got some time to acclimatise … and settle down before they appear in the classroom so, and, and, you know, so that they’ve, they’ve got a bit of time to find a flat and, and some of that stuff is over before they actually hit the classroom. We try to explore some of the issues around teaching and learning like plagiarism, like, um, we, we give them some, some opportunities to actually practice some of the skills they’re going to need around reading and critiquing articles in, in, a first semester topic so we actually give them almost like one of the tutes from the first semester topic so that when they get into the real classroom they’ve actually done some of it. Um, we try to, um, you know, that its got some food stuff so it’s really, we have a, we have a, an Aussie lunch, so it’s really about food, it’s about time, it’s about teaching and learning. It’s about giving them an opportunity to start developing relationships in an environment where they feel more equal than when they hit the classroom with, with, you know, the more socially-confident Australian students. We’ve only done it once but, but that was something we all noticed that they seemed to be much more confident when they got to the big class because they’d already formed some relationships.
Clearly, the orientation is a significant and very positive demonstration of the department’s commitment to assisting its international students to adapt to their new social and educational surroundings. As well as the (currently inactive) mentoring programs and the orientation, the third extra-curricular activity the department had for its international students was its support tutorials. Although they were available both to Australian and international students, Ursula reported that the initiative grew out of recognition of a group of “at-risk students” in 2003 for whom “an extra two hour tutorial in each of the topics” was provided which “focused again on assessment.” She said, “There were a couple of Australian students in that but they were mainly international students.” Ursula also mentioned that the department provided additional academic tutorials for second year students. Samantha, too, referred to the support tutorials: “We do structure in extra tutorials for students who are, before assessment time, if we think they are likely not to pass or where it becomes quite clear that students are struggling.” Ruth’s comment on the support tutorials was interesting. She said that rather than the support tutorials being offered to all students, they were offered only to students who the lecturers perceived as being at risk of failing. The reason for this, Ruth said, was that “whatever you offer to international students they all go to. And yeah, that just defeats the purpose cos you.. it’s like running another classroom time.”

Apart from the mentoring, orientation, and support tutorials, Ruth also mentioned that the department “informally encouraged” international students to form study groups “to help with particularly the volume of reading.” In the topics that she taught, there were several background articles that students had to read
before tutorial sessions. Ruth said, “Now if English isn’t your first language then that reading will literally take them twice as long often. Sometimes for some of the students it will take them three or four times as long.” Dahlia also said that “just managing the amount of reading” was one of the biggest issues that international students faced. In the study group, each student took responsibility for an article and summarised it thoroughly. When the group met, the student swapped their summaries and discussed their thoughts with other students. In relation to study groups, Ruth said, “That’s not something that we organise though but it’s something that we encourage.” She said that Samantha had interviewed and videotaped “a group of students who formed a study group and used it quite effectively” and then showed it to the students at the department’s orientation. Ruth said that the presentation illustrated “the benefits of working in a group together.. because we do have a student-centred approach to learning.”

It is clear that the underlying rationale for the implementation of all the extra-curricular activities mentioned above is to maximise the success of the international students’ adjustment to life and study in Australia. Equally, it can be said that they seek to minimise the possibility of students failing. In terms of having such support mechanisms, Dahlia’s view was that “the general feeling is that it’s important to do it, um, but it’s actually rewarding to do it and it’s worth doing it.” She said that the activities addressed “the major areas these students are lacking” and that it was better than waiting for them to fail before taking action: “Well, it’s no good, you know, finding out they lack them when they’re trying to complete assignments.”
Summary of lecturers’ responses to Attitude criteria Q4 A1-A3

Criteria Q4 A1: “The lecturer should realize that his or her own status as an academic is strongly conditioned by national and cultural values and be willing to reflect on this” (from Table 5.13). This criterion is similar to criterion Q1 A3 which asked lecturers to “reflect on the cultural context of his or her role as a teacher” (from Table 5.4). For that particular criterion, the data showed that the lecturers had a sound grasp on the cultural context of their role as teachers, particularly in terms of their place in the student-centred model of teaching that was used in the department. The data for criterion Q4 A1 showed that a number of the lecturers interpreted ‘status’ in a fairly narrow sense (as in achievement) rather than having a broader appreciation of the way that Australian culture and its values related to the idea of a university lecturer and what holding this position might mean. This is despite the researcher prompting the lecturers to consider the likely extent of the criterion’s meaning. It may well be that whilst the lecturers have an appreciation of the cultural context of their role as lecturers (criterion Q1 A3) qua teachers, they might not have extensively reflected on the way that the academic role is situated in Australian culture. How is criterion Q4 A1 supported by the interview data? *The lecturers might not have reflected at length about the way that their academic role is situated in Australian culture. As suggested in criterion Q1 A3, however, the presence of international students in their classes has made them reflect on the likely differences in the roles of teachers across cultures.*

Criterion Q4 A2: “The lecturer must have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour. (For example, in some countries students stand when
asking a question)” (from Table 5.13). This criterion shares some similarities with criterion Q4 S5 which states, “The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given)” (from Table 5.12). Whilst it was shown that the lecturers would not operationalise that particular criterion for formal assessment, their responses to criterion Q4 A2 show that they are flexible towards different student behaviours in the classroom setting. Bronwyn, in a similar way to Ursula in relation to criterion Q3 S2, said that this was fine as long as it did not inhibit the students’ learning processes. The stand-out comment from Dahlia was “It’s very important for people to be themselves.” How is criterion Q4 A2 supported by the interview data? The lecturers have a flexible attitude towards students’ culture- and personality-related behaviour.

Criterion Q4 A3: “The lecturer should take an interest in the cultural backgrounds of the foreign students in the group and support initiatives for extracurricular cultural activities” (from Table 5.13). All lecturers expressed a genuine interest in the cultural backgrounds of their students. Regarding the second part of the criterion, the department provided a number of initiatives and activities that were directed at helping international students adjust to the expectations of Australian academe and the teaching and learning approach valued in the allied health department. These were directed more towards academic than social ends and included the ‘International Student Study Skills Program’ (two-week orientation), the
(currently inactive) mentoring programs, the extra support tutorials, and the informally-encouraged, student-led study groups.

In particular, the fact that the department had developed its own two-week ‘International Student Study Skills Program’ at no extra cost to the students is testimony to its supportive outlook. The department recognises the value of introductory sessions to assist international students form friendships and relationships before the start of the semester and to gain an understanding of the demands and expectations of the teaching and learning environment into which they would shortly be immersed. This is a resource-intensive activity at a very busy time of the year. How is criterion Q4 A3 supported by the interview data? All lecturers expressed a genuine interest in the cultural backgrounds of their students. Further, although the department offered no extra-curricular functions of a purely social nature, several initiatives have been developed that support the learning (and, to an extent, social) needs of international students.

Conclusion to Chapter V

The presentation and discussion of data from each of the six research participants has generated a case study of the broad approach to teaching and learning in the allied health department in relation to its international students. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, each second-level summary of the data for each criterion will contribute to answering Associated Question 2 of the Key Research Questions which seeks to establish how the Profile is supported by actual teaching practice. To this end, these summaries are presented below as conclusions.
of the research outcomes for each qualification. Although the research findings support the majority of the Profile’s claims, there were discrepancies between six of the Profile’s criteria and the teaching practice in the allied health department. One criterion concerned the use of internationalised curriculum content and the remaining five concerned theoretical and practical aspects of culture in the educative process. More will be said about the discrepancies in the following chapter when Associated Question 2 of the Key Research Questions is revisited.

Qualification 1 (Q1): General

There was one discrepancy in this qualification between the Profile’s claims and the teaching practice in the allied health department. Whilst criterion Q1 S2 required lecturers to “be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used” (from Table 5.3), internationalised curriculum content was not a strong feature of the department’s academic programs. There was concord between the remainder of the criteria in this qualification and the teaching practice in the allied health department. Whilst two lecturers accounted for over half of the cumulative tertiary teaching experience in the department, all lecturers had extensive practitioner experience in a client-centred, allied health profession and reported that they had a thorough knowledge of the subjects they taught (criterion Q1 K1). To varying degrees, all but one of the lecturers had reflected on the cultural context of their role as lecturers qua teachers (criterion Q1 A3).
All lecturers agreed that they were generally open, flexible, and interested in teaching students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds (criterion Q1 A1). The lecturers acknowledged that the well-established canon of knowledge in their field may differ substantially from other academic traditions (criterion Q1 K2) but they said that their knowledge about these differences was not comprehensive. The lecturers were aware that the previous educational experience of some international students may lead to their teaching role being seen in a different light (criterion Q1 A2). All but one of the lecturers described specific strategies they used to support international students in the academic setting (criterion Q1 S1). The teaching strategies were used to help international students adapt or adjust to the department’s teaching and learning framework. Only one lecturer pointed out that such strategies had universal application to all students.

**Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction**

There was one discrepancy in this qualification between the Profile’s claims and the teaching practice in the allied health department. Although the lecturers were aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message (the first part of criterion Q2 S2), there was no evidence to suggest that they altered their ‘natural’ body language in response to the presence of people from different cultural settings (the second part of criterion Q2 S2). There was concord between the remainder of the criteria in this qualification and the teaching practice in the allied health department. All research participants were well-educated, native English speakers and were very experienced practitioners in an allied health field that was characterised by a significant emphasis on communication skills. To this end,
although the fundamental English language-related criteria (Q2 K1, Q2 K2, and Q2 K3) were not examined, it is expected that all lecturers would satisfy their requirements. The lecturers had confidence in both their use of voice control in their teaching activities (criterion Q2 S1) and in their ability to say things in different ways and rephrase sentences that were not understood by students (criterion Q2 S3). All lecturers used audio-visual aids in their group teaching (criterion Q2 S4). Whilst they were aware that differences in student performance may be due to different levels of language proficiency, the lecturers accepted that there could be a number of reasons why students were quiet in class (criterion Q2 A4). Further, this was acceptable as long as it did not impede their learning. The lecturers exhibited some flexibility about the use of English in written and spoken assessment and non-assessment tasks (criterion Q2 A5) but it was clear that the assessment criteria were strictly non-negotiable. All lecturers reported that they used some humour in their teaching and a number of them said they avoided humour that might be offensive in a culturally-diverse classroom setting (criterion Q2 A3).

Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences

There were two discrepancies in this qualification between the Profile’s claims and the teaching practice in the allied health department. First, none of the lecturers were able to analyse cultural differences using a theoretical framework (criterion Q3 S1). Second, the lecturers did not make students aware of the cultural differences within the group with a view to helping them take such differences into account (criterion Q3 S3).
There was concord between the remainder of the criteria in this qualification and the teaching practice in the allied health department. To varying degrees and from different perspectives, the lecturers stated they were aware of their own culture and understood that this strongly shaped their own views (criterion Q3 A1). The lecturers reported that they had a basic knowledge of some of the cultures of their international students (criterion Q3 K4). Each lecturer accepted that there were differences between various cultural groups (criterion Q3 K1). All lecturers acknowledged that culture was learned and was very difficult to unlearn (criterion Q3 K3). Five of the six lecturers said that although they tended to think in stereotypes about international students, they did this less when more about particular individuals became known (criterion Q3 A2). Although the lecturers expressed a desire to able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, they considered that this relied on the degree to which they knew the students’ cultures and the personal traits of individual students (criterion Q3 S2). All lecturers acknowledged that formal education was an important feature of a national culture (criterion Q3 K2).

Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching & learning styles

There were two discrepancies in this qualification between the Profile’s claims and the teaching practice in the allied health department. First, the lecturers did not discuss with the students how the group would deal with the cultural differences that were present (criterion Q4 S2). Second, whilst the lecturers were respectful of the cultural differences in the student group, they did not follow the lead of criterion Q3 A3 which states, “The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments
for cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of other group members” (from Table 5.10).

There was concord between the remainder of the criteria in this qualification and the teaching practice in the allied health department. The lecturers had some basic knowledge of educational theory and different approaches to teaching and learning (criterion Q4 K1). It was evident to the lecturers that the backgrounds of their international students impacted on the way that they responded to the teaching and learning framework in the allied health department (criterion Q4 K3). Similarly, it was also evident to the lecturers that the previous instructional models experienced by international students determined their learning strategies (the first part of criterion Q4 K4). Further, they acknowledged that procedures and standards for assessing student performance were to a large extent culturally and nationally defined (the second part of criterion Q4 K4). Although the department’s teaching and learning framework was based on student-centred learning and small group teaching, some lecturers acknowledged that there were occasions when a teacher-directed focus was appropriate (criterion Q4 S3). The department had clear processes for making all students aware of the teaching methods and aims associated with their academic programs (criterion Q4 S1). Related to this, all lecturers could identify with the 'hidden curriculum’ (criterion Q4 K2) once its meaning was clarified, and a number of them believed that it was important to make things explicit and transparent to all students in the allied health department. All lecturers reported that
they had a flexible attitude towards culture- and personality-related student behaviour (criterion Q4 A2).

Further, the lecturers accommodated students’ culture- and personality-related behaviour in class (criterion Q4 S5). They were happy for students to ‘be themselves’. All lecturers expressed a genuine interest in the cultural backgrounds of their students (the first part of criterion Q4 A3) and although the department offered no extra-curricular social functions, it did provide some significant initiatives to support the learning needs of international students (the second part of criterion Q4 A3). Finally, the majority of lecturers let the international students be the ‘experts’ about information specific to their home countries (criterion Q4 S4).

The examination of the Profile against the teaching practice in the allied health department has resulted in an extremely rich description of the personal and professional outlooks of the six lecturers themselves. Whilst this investigation did not set out to build profiles of individual lecturers or to make comment on whether or not the teaching practice of each was indeed an example of leading practice in teaching international students, the cumulative research results inevitably portray substantial profiles of both the individuals and the department. However, rather than comment on the lecturers as individuals, it is fitting to conclude this chapter by noting the main characteristics of teaching in the department:

- The research data demonstrate that teaching in the department is focused on helping all students achieve their learning objectives, regardless of their
Chapter V - Examining the Profile’s pillar of practice

cultural, language, or educational background. International students are
supported to adapt or adjust to the requirements of the teaching and learning
framework in the department. The student-centred teaching approach is
directed at assisting all students to achieve rich learning outcomes and the
development of critical and analytical skills in relation to the allied health
discipline. In this sense, the teaching practice of individual lecturers in the
department might be described as showing characteristics of Level 2
‘teaching as accommodating’ and perhaps even approaching Level 3
‘teaching as educating’.

- Whilst the lecturers do not appear to have an extensively-developed
  intercultural dimension with regard to the criteria in the Knowledge and
  Skills categories, the research data demonstrate that with regard to the
  affective dimension (Attitude), all students are accepted for who they are
  (their culture and their personality) and where they are (their station in life).
  To this end, all lecturers appear to some extent to be open to, accepting and
  appreciative of, and comfortable with cultural difference. In the section in
  Chapter II titled ‘Summary of Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing
  with cultural differences’ it was suggested that this might be as important as
  being well-acquainted with culture-specific knowledge. Further, it could form
  the foundation of a personal and professional cosmopolitan outlook.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THE INVESTIGATION: HOW THE PROFILE IS SUPPORTED BY THEORY & PRACTICE

Introduction to Chapter VI

This chapter presents the conclusions that have been drawn from the investigation into how the Profile is supported by theory and practice. It does this by addressing the three key research questions that were listed in Chapter I. Following this, the limitations and delimitations that were presented in Chapter I are revisited to place the conclusions in perspective. The application of the validity criteria that were outlined in Chapter IV is then reviewed in relation to this particular investigation. To conclude, suggestions are made for further research.

Answering the key research questions

In Chapter I, it was stated that the key research questions were of two types. First, there was the overarching question that represented the main outcome that was sought from the overall investigation. Second, there were the associated questions which together informed the overarching question. These questions will be revisited in this chapter, starting with the associated questions that examined the Profile’s pillars of theory and practice. The answers to the associated questions will then inform the discussion of the overarching question.
Associated Question 1: The Profile’s theoretical pillar

How are the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students supported by the various bodies of literature upon which it draws?

The critical review of the Profile in relation to the various bodies of literature in Chapter II and Chapter III enabled 14 discrete outcomes to be identified for Associated Question 1. These are reiterated below, along with a brief conclusion for each one. Further, a précis of the major themes evident in these outcomes will be presented in the section titled ‘Overarching Question: The Profile’s theoretical & practice pillars’, under the headings of ‘The Profile & globalisation theory’, ‘The Profile & internationalisation theory’, ‘The Profile & cultural theory’, and ‘The Profile & theory on teaching in higher education’.

1. Although significant cultural, language, and educational diversity is evident in the international classroom in Western Europe, in practice the educational setting reflects the Western tradition of higher education. Rather than being characterised by multi-reference grid curricula, the emphasis is on student-centred learning, independent study, critical thinking, interactive debate, and small group teaching. International students need to adapt or adjust to the education-related requirements of the host institution.

The information gathered about teaching and learning approaches in international education, or internationaal onderwijs (IO), at RSM Erasmus
University is consistent with NUFFIC’s description of IO in The Netherlands in general. This suggests that what the Profile calls for and what is presently happening in terms of approaches to teaching and learning in IO are two different things. It appears that international students in the IO stream share a similar experience to international students who study in Australia, in the sense that they have to adapt or adjust to the approach to teaching and learning that is characteristic of the host country and institution. The fact that the relatively recent and growing phenomenon of IO in parts of Western Europe constitutes a separate higher education stream may result in its being perceived by certain institutions as an opportunity to pursue new avenues in approaches to teaching and learning such as those which appeal to multi-reference grid curricula. Presently, however, any such claims appear to be normative rather than descriptive.

2. The teaching and learning literature supports the Profile’s general claims in relation to the verbal and non-verbal communication skills that are required for successful teaching in the international classroom, that is, lecturers need to have good interpersonal and intercultural communication skills. What is not supported, however, is the idea that lecturers should change their personal and cultural behaviour because of the presence of students from other cultures (which is implied to a degree in the Profile).

---

24 This outcome, whilst derived from the literature on teaching practice in IO in The Netherlands, also informs Associated Question 2 of the Key Research Questions. That is, the Profile’s pillar of practice.
The teaching and learning literature makes a distinction between lecturers’ knowledge of discipline content and their ability to broadly communicate such knowledge to students. As well as being experts in their field, lecturers also need to have suitable interpersonal and intercultural communication skills. The Profile is well-supported by the related literature in this regard. What is not supported, however, is the idea that lecturers should abandon their ‘normal’ behaviour because of the presence of international students. Whilst they are encouraged to be sensitive to the needs of international students, the suggestion of modifying, for example, their body language or avoiding spontaneous humour is unsupported. Borrowing from the research associated with the practice pillar of this investigation, one lecturer commented that with regard to body language in the classroom, she had to be herself and respect cultural difference. The two positions are compatible and desirable and reflect authenticity in teaching as well as a rooted, or grounded, form of cosmopolitanism. Lecturers and international students should be free to be themselves in an education environment that is appreciative of cultural difference and sensitive to the educational needs of all students.

3. The Profile neglects to focus on language-related issues and challenges for students who are learning in a non-native language. To this end, the teaching and learning literature suggests that the Profile significantly underestimates the implications this is likely to have both for students and lecturers. A revised Profile should address this oversight.
The teaching and learning literature clearly holds that language is an issue for EAL students who study in an academic setting in which English is the medium of instruction. Even although they may have studied English for many years, they are likely to be initially confused by local accents and colloquialisms, as well as by the host country’s cultural package as it relates to the use of language in social and educational settings. Further, EAL students are unlikely to ever approach the language competency of native speakers of English and this will be reflected in their academic work, for example, in reading and writing tasks. Whilst the Profile’s focus on issues concerning lecturers teaching in a non-native language is understandable, it also needs to recognise the likelihood of significant student-related language challenges in the international classroom and how this will impact on both the EAL students and the lecturers. The teaching and learning literature offers support to lecturers by way of teaching strategies and initiatives to assist EAL students adapt or adjust to the academic language requirements of the higher education setting. These are universal teaching strategies that will also assist native English-speaking students.

4. The Profile and the culture-related literature indicate that whilst knowledge of culture-specific information might be useful to lecturers as a guiding framework to help explain and understand student behaviour, this is best complemented by lecturers being aware of their own culture and its assumptions, and being able to appreciate and be comfortable with cultural difference.
Whilst culture-specific information is useful to lecturers, there are at least two limitations to keep in mind. First, lecturers cannot be expected to know everything about the different cultures that are present in the international classroom. Second, culture-specific information should only be used as a guide to inform lecturers of the likely backgrounds of their international students. It cannot be used with any certainty to predict or explain actual student behaviour. The Profile supports this position (see Point 5 below). The Profile also requires lecturers to reflect on their own culture and its assumptions. This culture-general engagement is supported by the culture-related literature as a critical activity to assist in understanding the cultural Other. The attitudes of openness, acceptance, and understanding that are encouraged by the Profile are reflective of personal characteristics that are highlighted in the culture-related literature as being desirable, indeed necessary, features of the personal and professional outlooks of authentic and cosmopolitan lecturers in the Twenty-First century. This is a particular strength of the Profile.

5. The culture-related literature supports the Profile in cautioning against judging student behaviour in terms of expectations associated with cultural theories. The use of stereotypes is discouraged by this body of literature. Instead, where possible, lecturers should get to know students on an individual basis.

Whilst essentialist cultural theories will most likely be utilised by busy lecturers who are interested in understanding something of other cultures, individual traits cannot be predicted from national cultural norms. The use of stereotypes is not
supported either by the Profile or by the culture-related literature. Getting to know students as individuals is a key to understanding both their personality and also their cultural background. How practical this is in many higher education settings is, however, open to question. Again, borrowing from the research associated with the practice pillar of this investigation, one lecturer commented that getting to know students as individuals became more difficult as their numbers increased. In this case, academic staff who teach smaller classes out of the larger group might well be the ones who actually get to know individual students. For example, small group teaching is a feature of higher education in Australia (where it is called a tutorial class) and in The Netherlands as well.

6. The teaching and learning literature strongly supports the Profile’s claim that lecturers should base their teaching on educational theory. This body of literature clearly supports the idea that staff who teach as part of their academic work need to ground their approach to teaching and learning in educational theory. This represents a renewed focus on the core business of university teaching. It challenges the notion that being an expert in a particular discipline guarantees desirable teaching and learning outcomes. Instead, lecturers need to ground their pedagogical approach in the sorts of teaching and learning theories that were presented in ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’ in Chapter II, for example, student approaches to learning (SAL theory), student-centred learning, the Presage-Process-
Product (3P) model of teaching and learning, and Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching.

7. The teaching and learning literature does not support the radical use of multi-reference grid curricula for teaching international students. If the Profile is a normative claim for this sort of curricula, then it is a radical model of education. There is an obvious discrepancy between the international classroom in practice and any such normative claim (see Point 1 above, as well as the research findings from Associated Question 2).

In the discussion of Point 1 in this section, it was suggested that the recent phenomenon of IO in parts of Western Europe may have been interpreted by the creators of the Profile as opening the door to a brave new world of higher education which offers novel possibilities for approaches to teaching and learning. It has been shown, however, that despite the significant cultural, language, and educational diversity in the international classroom, the teaching and learning frameworks in countries like The Netherlands and Australia are still firmly grounded in the Western academic tradition. Further, international students in these countries have to adapt or adjust to the requirements of this educational tradition. The radical use of multi-reference grid curricula is discounted outright in the literature. It is impractical and undesirable to teach international students in the ways they have been taught prior to entering the international classroom. The focus, then, shifts to the question of how to best assist international students to adapt or adjust to the requirements of the academic tradition that informs local educational practice. This is not to say that in
the meantime local educational practice should not pursue its own transformative possibilities in the face of contemporary global flows; for instance, encouraging the development of cosmopolitan attitudes in staff and students.

8. The minor use of multi-reference grid curricula of the sort outlined by Biggs’s (2003) Level 2 ‘teaching as accommodating’ locates the Profile in a deficit model of education. A revised Profile could stress that student-related teaching strategies and support structures should be utilised to help international students adapt or adjust to the expectations and requirements of the host country’s tertiary academic setting, rather than being an ongoing commitment to teaching them in the cultural or educational contexts of their home countries. This locates the sense of deficit with both the international students and the local students as they make the transition to a new teaching and learning environment. It does not suggest that the education systems from which the students come are inherently deficient or weak. Nor does it suggest that the students are incapable of making the transition to meeting the requirements of the new academic setting.

In Chapter II it was shown that the teaching and learning literature suggests that lecturers should use support initiatives and teaching strategies to help international students adapt or adjust to the academic requirements and expectations of their host institution. As it turns out, the teaching strategies that are promoted in this body of literature are universal. Their use could benefit all students. This is suggestive of something like a ‘half-step’ between Biggs’s (2003) Level 2 ‘teaching
as accommodating’ and Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’, for the focus is on what the lecturers do in response to what the students are doing. The idea of deficit in this case does not apply to the lecturer not having a big enough repertoire of teaching skills vis-à-vis being able to accommodate international students long-term in the ways that they have been taught in their home countries. Rather, the deficit belongs to international students in the same way that it applies to local students who are making the transition to tertiary education. This sense of deficit is not necessarily negative. It is simply a statement of fact, for it cannot be expected that students who have not studied at an Australian tertiary institution will arrive with the knowledge and skills necessary to satisfy the demands of the new teaching and learning environment (for example, see footnote 8 on page 86). The whole premise of education is based on a developmental or constructive approach. If this view is taken, then the growing body of literature concerned with initiatives and teaching strategies to assist international students remains relevant and should continue to inform the design of curriculum process and context.

9. The discussion of Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching has resulted in the identification of the likely value of the Profile to lecturers at each level. At Level 1, the Profile encourages lecturers to recognise culture in the classroom by, for example, pointing out that stereotypes are not useful ways of interpreting student behaviour. At Level 2, the Profile helps lecturers respond to cultural difference in the classroom by, for example, promoting the use of teaching strategies that are perceived to specifically help international students adapt or adjust to the academic requirements of their studies. At
Level 3, the Profile encourages lecturers to pursue a cosmopolitan outlook to the point where cultural difference is no longer a focus in the universal educative process.

The consideration of the Profile in relation to Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching has resulted in a broader interpretation of the Profile’s usefulness. However, this is only in the case of a revised Profile which has moved away from any radical use of multi-reference grid curricula. The revised Profile’s value at each level of teaching is in the way it presents culture in the classroom. As noted in Chapter II, the concept of culture is undoubtedly the foundation feature of the Profile. This is still the case even in relation to Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching. For lecturers at Level 1 teaching, the Profile has the capacity to orientate their views on culture in such a way that international students are not stereotyped as, for example, rote learners who are shy and unable to work with progressive Western teaching techniques. This orientation leads the lecturer to pursue a form of Level 2 teaching to work with cultural difference in the classroom by assisting international students to adjust to the requirements of the host institution’s teaching and learning framework. Although this ameliorates the negative view of culture in Level 1 teaching, there is still a dichotomy in terms of the lecturer seeing ‘those students’ as international students and ‘those students’ as local students.

As lecturers move toward Level 3 teaching, the Profile has the capacity to encourage them to embark on the ‘journey within’ and the ‘journey without’ in such a way that their view of students in the classroom becomes one of cultural
appreciation in general. Simultaneously, they begin to recognise the universality of
the learning process. At this point, Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching and the
Profile’s focus on culture come together and complement each other. In fact, each
without the other is insufficient. Further, Biggs’s (2003) Level 3 teaching and the
Profile ultimately arrive at the same point but via different routes. Biggs (2003)
focuses on the universality of the educative process. The Profile seeks to have
lecturers be amongst the cosmopolitans of the Twenty-First century by being
comfortable with cultural difference to the point where difference is not an issue.
Suddenly, Biggs’s (2003) claim that culture is largely irrelevant in teaching
international students makes sense, rather than being somewhat controversial.

10. The creators of the Profile have most likely overestimated the impact of
contemporary global flows and have assumed, therefore, that higher
education must change to reflect the hyperglobalist worldview. This fails to
recognise the strong regulatory role that nation-states still exert and the
continuing influence they have over social institutions such as education.
Similarly, it also fails to recognise the strong role that culture plays in a
country’s education system in terms of the value ascribed to certain
approaches to teaching and learning.

The extent to which the Profile is based on the international classroom being or
becoming an expression of the hyperglobalist worldview is also the extent to which it
overestimates the impact of contemporary global flows. Whilst global forces are

25 The progression between stages is never likely to be as neat as that portrayed here.
precipitating changes to the sovereignty of nation-states, the continuing strong role of the latter in regulating much human activity cannot be underestimated. As a result, it is premature for the Profile to be based on a worldview that suggests that national borders have lost their meaning and that increasing student mobility requires the adoption of a radical form of multi-reference grid curricula. The Profile needs to be revised to reflect the transformationalist worldview, that is, a position which maintains that whilst higher education is being shaped by both global and national forces, the reality is that it is neither one extreme nor the other and that the trajectory of global flows is not yet explicit. In the case of higher education, whilst national approaches to teaching and learning are still dominant, the current global economic, political, and cultural flows do mean that universities cannot work purely towards nationally-directed ends. Accordingly, they become exposed to situations that have the potential to result in their own transformative possibilities. The Profile, in focusing primarily on increasing cultural, language, and educational diversity within what has traditionally been a national education system for local students has a great deal to offer in this sense. A revised Profile, in particular, can encourage lecturers to engage with the concept of culture in the classroom in a meaningful way in relation to the three levels of teaching identified by Biggs (2003).

11. The Profile is an important contribution to the internationalisation literature at the within-institution level. Further, it is a unique offering to the literature in this area by virtue of its ultimately advocating a whole-of-person approach to internationalisation practices in higher education at the level of the individual lecturer.
Much of the literature on the internationalisation of higher education is focused on the university at the organisational level. The work of Jane Knight and Hans de Wit, in particular, has been embraced by a number of stakeholders in higher education in Australia and overseas. Whilst such work has made an important contribution to the understanding of the internationalisation of higher education, it does not adequately inform within-institution activities, for example, at the level of what internationalisation means for university teaching. Whilst there is an emerging body of literature on within-institution internationalisation activities, particularly in Australia, most of this is directed towards the experiences of international students. As noted in Chapter I, not much has focused on lecturers and their part in the internationalisation process. This is where the Profile is of significant value. Further, it is made more significant by the way that it highlights the affective element of the work of lecturers (see Point 14 below). By doing so, the Profile recognises that if lecturers are to be amongst the ‘new internationalists’ (cosmopolitans) of the Twenty-First century, they have to have more than just knowledge and skills related to teaching and culture. Such cognitive processes have to be supported by a mindset of attitudes that is aligned to the demands of work and life in an increasingly fluid local, national, regional, and global milieu.

12. The literature on transformative education theory and Cranton’s (2001) views on authenticity in teaching in higher education supports the Profile’s claims.

The inward journey that the Profile encourages is well-supported both by transformative education theory and Cranton’s (2001) views on authenticity in
teaching in higher education. In the absence of any particular educational theory acting as a foundation for the Profile, transformative learning theory is more than suitable. Its central concern is for people to be better able to interpret their surroundings by becoming critically aware of their own expectations and assumptions, as well as those of the society in which they live. The link to the Profile is clear. The Profile encourages lecturers to reflect on their role as teachers, this role in the broader social environment, the hidden curriculum, their own culture, and the cultures of others. Cranton’s (2001) work is useful in this regard because it encourages lecturers to be true (authentic, genuine) to themselves both as lecturers and as people or citizens. An individual’s path to authenticity and genuineness is through critical reflection and critical self-reflection on the basic assumptions of their own culture and worldview. This can facilitate a transformative process which can result in greater self-awareness and self-acceptance. Individuals who are self-aware and self-accepting should be better able to comprehend, accept, appreciate, and work with cultural difference. This is a key requirement of the Profile.

13. The literature on cosmopolitanism generally supports the Profile’s claims, although rooted, or grounded, cosmopolitanism is more appropriate than the universal cosmopolitanism that the Profile seems to promote. The Profile should ultimately be viewed as an expression of the cosmopolitan lecturer in higher education. Such a disposition is not only supported by the literature on the type of lecturer that is best-suited to working in contemporary higher education, but also the type of citizen that is best-suited to life in the Twenty-First century.
Chapter VI - Conclusions drawn from the investigation

The inward and outward journey that the Profile encourages is well-supported by the literature on cosmopolitanism. As it stands, however, the Profile can be accused of being a call for the abandonment of local and national affiliations in favour of a new and borderless form of education and being that reflects the hyperglobalist worldview. Such a universalistic form of globalisation is not supported in the literature on cosmopolitanism. What is supported is a grounded, or rooted, form of cosmopolitanism based on the transformationalist worldview. A revised Profile needs to be aligned to this latter view because it enables lecturers to work with the local and the national whilst also being able to relate to the regional and the global. In the section titled ‘Cosmopolitanism and education’ in Chapter III it was shown that the education-related literature makes a strong case for the peoples of all nations to develop cosmopolitan outlooks in the face of intensive and extensive global flows which were increasing in velocity and impact. To a large extent, education is charged with the responsibility of helping to develop such attitudes. Whilst most references to cosmopolitanism and education focus on inculcating cosmopolitan attitudes into students, the precursor of this is having the teachers of the students operating from a cosmopolitan base in the first place. To this end, a revised Profile would virtually stand alone in the literature as a model that encourages lecturers to embark on the inward and outward journey that underwrites the development of cosmopolitan attitudes. To focus only on knowledge and skills for work and life in the new millennium is insufficient. The Profile has significant value and potential in this regard.
14. The Profile’s Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude categories can be transposed onto Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives. The Knowledge and Skills categories are identified with the cognitive domain, whilst the Attitude category is identified with the affective domain. The Attitude category is a particular strength of the Profile because it draws attention to values that underwrite an individual’s internationalised personal and professional outlook such as being accepting, understanding, aware, flexible, interested, open-minded, reflective, respectful, supportive, tolerant, and appreciative of cultural difference. Such values are highlighted in the globalisation and education literature as being necessary for work and life in the Twenty-First century.

In representing the cognitive and affective dimensions of educational objectives, the three categories of Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude give the Profile its balance and a distinctive form. The Knowledge and Skills categories are not only useful to the activity of teaching, but are also critical components in culture-related areas which are variously known in the literature as ‘intercultural competence’, ‘multicultural training’, and ‘cross-cultural training and education’. The Attitude category has been singled out as one of the Profile’s particular strengths given that the affective dimension is little-mentioned in teaching in higher education. Its value lies in the way in which it highlights the importance of developing an internalised, self-referentially consistent value system that forms the foundation of an individual’s worldview. The types of attitudes that the Profile encourages lecturers to embrace are acceptance, awareness, flexibility, interest, understanding, open-mindedness,
reflection, respect, tolerance, and appreciation of cultural difference. Such values underwrite the sort of cosmopolitan outlook that is called for in the contemporary literature related to globalisation and education.

*Associated Question 2: The Profile’s practice pillar*

How are the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students supported by teaching practice in a university department that is peer recognised as an example of leading practice in teaching international students?

The conclusions that were drawn in Chapter V from the research in the allied health department inform Associated Question 2. 26 In Chapter V it was shown that although the research findings support the majority of the Profile’s claims, there were six discrepancies between the Profile’s criteria and the teaching practice in the allied health department. The following two sections respectively highlight areas of discrepancy and concord in terms of the Profile’s claims and the teaching practice in the allied health department.

*Discrepancies between the Profile & teaching practice*

There were six discrepancies between the Profile’s claims and the teaching practice in the allied health department:

---

26 These conclusions are also supported by the information that was presented in Point 1 from Associated Question 1.
1. “The lecturer must be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used” (criterion Q1 S2 from Table 5.3).

Given that internationalised curriculum content does not feature strongly in the department’s educational offerings, this criterion is not supported by the interview data. Whilst this is mainly due to the focus of the allied health department on producing practitioners who can work in the Australian health setting, it was also noted that related content from the home countries of many of the international students was either inaccessible or not developed to the point where it would be useful in the academic programs. As mentioned in Chapter V, the national focus of the allied health department is at odds with Teekens’s (2000d) claim that national borders were disappearing and education had to be reoriented to meet global demands. Whilst some internationalised curriculum content might be evident in some disciplines, for example, commerce and economics, it may be more challenging to imbue it into disciplines that are oriented to meet the requirements of national regulatory frameworks.

2. Criterion Q2 S2: “The lecturer must be aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, but not use it in an extreme manner, such as making exaggerated movements to support spoken language” (from Table 5.6).
Most lecturers were aware of the role of body language in their teaching. Three of them provided examples of body language in the international classroom when they indicated that international students might not like eye contact from the lecturer. Overall, however, the data indicated that the lecturers’ engagement with body language in their day-to-day teaching activities was in the context of what might be considered as the normal sort of body language that is associated with teaching in the Australian tertiary setting. None of the lecturers said that they changed their body language in the presence of international students. Ursula’s stand-out comment about having to be culturally sensitive yet remain authentic to herself was particularly noteworthy for it demonstrates sensitivity to cultural difference whilst operating from a grounded sense of Self.

3. “The lecturer must be able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework” (criterion Q3 S1 from Table 5.9).

Whilst none of the lecturers could do this, they had developed a basic knowledge of some of the cultures of their international students (criterion Q3 K4) from personal travel and overseas work, reading, watching television, and talking with their international students. Further, and perhaps even more importantly, the interview data for all lecturers demonstrated that they respected the cultural differences that were present in the international classroom. They accepted people for who they were. Although the concept of culture is a keystone in the Profile’s foundation, it can be suggested that whilst criterion Q3 S1 appears to be a reasonable expectation in an education environment characterised by increasing cultural,
language, and educational diversity, it may actually be less important than it initially seems. This suggestion is supported by the findings reported in Chapter II where it was observed that cultural theory should be used with caution when predicting or interpreting the behaviour of international students. Note that any watering down or removal of criterion Q3 S1 would not mean that the concept of culture becomes divorced from the Profile. It merely removes the requirement that lecturers have to engage with cultural theory as part of their teaching work.

4. “The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account” (criterion Q3 S3 from Table 5.9).

The lecturers did not counsel students about how cultural diversity ought to be taken into account in the classroom. Instead, they worked with cultural difference in an informal manner. Indeed, some lecturers reported that some international students stressed that they did not want to be treated any differently because of their cultural background. In any event, the overriding concern of the lecturers was that all students work towards meeting their educational objectives. As suggested in the previous point, the lecturers were happy for the students to be themselves, both culturally and also in terms of their personality, as long as this did not present an impediment to progress in their studies.
5. “The lecturer should discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present” (criterion Q4 S2 from Table 5.12).

Similar to the situation described in Point 4 above, the lecturers preferred to work with culture in an informal manner in the classroom rather than making students aware of such differences. Although the international students comprised 50 per cent of total student enrolments in the allied health department, the lecturers did not point out the cultural differences in the classroom and counsel students about appropriate ways of working with such difference as they set about their learning. Again, the overriding concern of the lecturers was to help all students achieve their learning objectives.

6. “The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments for cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of other group members” (criterion Q3 A3 from Table 5.10).

Whilst the lecturers respected cultural difference in the classroom (the second part of the first sentence of criterion Q3 A3) their primary focus was to help international students adapt or adjust to the department’s teaching and learning framework rather than making adjustments for cultural difference in the classroom (the first part of the first sentence of criterion Q3 A3). A clear message from the interview data was that the assessment criteria were non-negotiable for all students.
Another clear message from the interview data was that, as mentioned in Point 4, the lecturers were happy for the students to be themselves, from the point of view of both their culture and their personality. The lecturers’ focus on educational outcomes did not require students to abandon their distinctive culture- and personality-related behaviour. In a similar way, the interview data demonstrated that the lecturers did not think it was appropriate to abandon their own distinctive culture- and personality-related behaviour when teaching international students.

Summary of the discrepancies between the Profile & teaching practice

Five of the six discrepancies are concerned with working with cultural difference in the classroom. It is evident that although the lecturers recognise and respect cultural difference, it is not pivotal in terms of directing the teaching and learning framework in the allied health department. Culture in the classroom in this instance of teaching practice is, therefore, dealt with in a more informal way than that suggested by the Profile. Culture occupies an important place in the department in terms of lecturers appreciating and being sensitive to cultural difference. This is why there is concord between the views of the lecturers in relation to many of the Profile’s claims. The major focus in the department is, however, to help all students meet the educational objectives of the academic programs. Whilst in the Biggsian sense this is indicative of Level 3 teaching, given that the lecturers utilise specific support initiatives and teaching strategies to help international students adapt or adjust to the department’s teaching and learning framework, it is reflective of the half step between Level 2 and Level 3 teaching that was suggested in the penultimate section in Chapter II.
Concord between the Profile & teaching practice

Apart from the six discrepancies that have been discussed above, there were many areas of concord between the Profile’s claims and the teaching practice in the allied health department. These are revisited below for each of the four qualifications.

Qualification 1 (Q1): General

Whilst there was never a focus on determining whether or not the research participants were ‘good’ academics, the following points were noted in relation to their overall experience and whether or not they had a thorough knowledge of the subjects they taught (criterion Q1 K1). Two staff members constituted the core of tertiary teaching experience in the department. Although the remaining four lecturers were reasonably new to university teaching, their mature age, extensive practitioner experience, and the supportive, client-centred nature of the allied health profession may well offset the Profile’s requirement for ample teaching experience. All lecturers reported that they had a thorough knowledge of the subjects they taught. To greater and lesser extents, all lecturers except one had reflected on the cultural context of their role as lecturers qua teachers (criterion Q1 A3). All lecturers agreed they were generally open, flexible, and interested in teaching learners from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds (criterion Q1 A1).

Although all lecturers acknowledged that they were aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in their field may differ substantially from that of other academic traditions (criterion Q1 K2), they also said that their knowledge about
these different approaches was not comprehensive. Most lecturers interpreted such difference through their experiences with teaching international students. The lecturers were aware that some international students may see their teaching role in a different light based on their experience in educational settings in their home countries (criterion Q1 A2). Rather than seeing this as an age and gender issue (as canvassed in the Profile), the lecturers reflected on differences in student expectations in relation to the role of teachers. All but one of the lecturers described specific strategies they used to support international students in the academic setting (criterion Q1 S1). Although the use of such strategies has universal application to all students, only one lecturer made this connection.

*Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction*

Given that all research participants were well-educated, native English speakers and were very experienced practitioners in an allied health field that was characterised by a heavy emphasis on communication skills, the fundamental English language-related criteria (Q2 K1, Q2 K2, and Q2 K3) were not examined. It is expected that all lecturers would satisfy the requirements of these criteria. With regard to the criteria that were examined, the lecturers were confident in their voice control in their teaching activities (criterion Q2 S1) and reported that they were able to say things in different ways and rephrase sentences that students did not understand (criterion Q2 S3). All lecturers used audio-visual aids in their group teaching (criterion Q2 S4). Whilst they were aware that differences in student performance may be due to different levels of language proficiency, they did not
simply ascribe a student’s attitude to their use of language (criterion Q2 A4). The lecturers accepted that there could be a number of reasons why students were quiet in class and this was fine as long as it did not impede their learning. Whilst assessment criteria were non-negotiable, the lecturers exhibited some flexibility about the use of English in written and spoken assessment and non-assessment tasks (criterion Q2 A5). All lecturers reported that they used some humour in their teaching and some were mindful of avoiding humour that might be offensive in a culturally-diverse setting (criterion Q2 A3).

Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences

The lecturers believed they were aware of their own culture and understood that this strongly shaped their own views (criterion Q3 A1). They reflected on this, however, to varying degrees and from different perspectives. The lecturers reported that they had a basic knowledge of the cultures of their international students (criterion Q3 K4). This had largely been gleaned from personal travel and overseas work, reading, watching television, and talking with their international students. Each lecturer accepted that there were differences between various cultural groups (criterion Q3 K1). All lecturers acknowledged that culture was learned and was very difficult to unlearn (criterion Q3 K3). Whilst most lecturers said they tended to think in stereotypes, such views were replaced by concrete views on particular individuals once more about those individuals became known (criterion Q3 A2). Similarly, for criterion Q3 S2, although the lecturers expressed a desire to able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, this was dependent on the degree to which they knew both the students’ cultures as well as the personal traits of individual
students. Although the lecturers acknowledged that formal education was an important feature of a national culture, there was a widespread belief that many people from other cultures placed greater value on education than many Australians (criterion Q3 K2). All lecturers expressed an appreciation of the social and academic difficulties faced by many of the international students and respected the efforts they made in their studies.

Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching & learning styles

The lecturers had some basic knowledge of educational theory and different approaches to teaching and learning (criterion Q4 K1). This was the result of either having qualifications in the discipline of education or having completed the teaching course through the university’s Professional Development Department. It was evident to the lecturers that the social, educational, and cultural backgrounds of their international students impacted on the way that they presented in, and responded to, the teaching and learning framework in the allied health department (criterion Q4 K3). It was also evident to the lecturers that the learning strategies of their international students were the result of the instructional models they had experienced before studying in the allied health department (the first part of criterion Q4 K4).

Further, they acknowledged that procedures and standards for assessing student performance were to a large extent culturally and nationally defined (the second part of criterion Q4 K4). The overarching concern of the lecturers, however,
was to support all students to adapt or adjust to the requirements of the teaching and learning framework in the department so they could meet their learning objectives. Although this framework was based on student-centred learning and small group teaching, some lecturers acknowledged that there were occasions when a teacher-directed focus was appropriate (criterion Q4 S3). A feature of the department was that it made all students aware of the teaching methods and aims related to the academic programs (criterion Q4 S1). Associated with this, all lecturers could relate to the hidden curriculum once its meaning was clarified (criterion Q4 K2). In this regard, a number of lecturers believed that it was important to make the department’s teaching and learning framework as explicit and transparent as possible to all students in the allied health program. The department had mechanisms in place to ensure that this was done.

All lecturers expressed a genuine interest in the cultural backgrounds of their students (the first part of criterion Q4 A3). They reported that they had a flexible attitude towards culture- and personality-related student behaviour (criterion Q4 A2). In this regard, the lecturers accommodated students’ culture- and personality-related behaviour in class (criterion Q4 S5). They were happy for students to be themselves. The overriding concern, however, was that the learning outcomes that had been set for the allied health studies had to be met, regardless of students’ culture- and personality-related behaviour. Further, although the department offered no extra-curricular functions of a purely social nature, some significant initiatives supported the learning needs of international students (the second part of criterion Q4 A3). One of these was the resource-intensive, department-based International Students Study
Skills Program (orientation) that introduced international student to the department, the allied health discipline, university services, and the approaches to teaching and learning that the students would encounter in their studies. Another initiative was the support tutorials which provided extra assistance to Australian and international students who were deemed to be at risk.

Whilst there was limited internationalised curriculum content in the allied health subjects, the majority of lecturers in the department involved international students in the learning process by letting them be the experts about what happened in their home countries (criterion Q4 S4). The aim of this strategy was largely to get international students to contribute to the discussion and to help build their confidence. Whilst the lecturers had an appreciation of the cultural context of their teaching role (criterion Q1 A3) _qua_ teachers (as partners in learning, and facilitators and managers of learning), the interview data suggested that they might not have extensively reflected on the way that the academic role is conditioned by their national and cultural values (criterion Q4 A1).

**Summary of the areas of concord between the Profile & teaching practice**

Whilst the interview data demonstrates that cultural difference does not drive the teaching practice in the department, there is evidence that the lecturers appreciate and respect their international students in terms of their culture and what they bring into the classroom as individuals. They understand that their students’ culture, social background, language(s), previous education, and personality all impact significantly on their studies. This is despite the lecturers not demonstrating a deep engagement
with culture-specific knowledge and not using cultural theory to help predict or explain the social and academic behaviour of their international students. It is evident that this appreciation and respect for cultural difference, when combined with a clearly-defined and supportive educational focus in the department, satisfies nearly all of the Profile’s criteria.

**Overarching Question: The Profile’s theoretical & practice pillars**

How are the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students supported by theory and practice?

The conclusions outlined above for Associated Question 1 and Associated Question 2 inform the Overarching Question. Whilst there is no need to reiterate at length what has already been described for the associated questions, the main outcomes of the investigation can now be consolidated. Although five separate outcomes are presented below, there is considerable overlap between each of them. Further, the arguments that support the outcomes are consistent with each other. Essentially, the following discussion suggests that the Profile’s credibility will be enhanced if it is realigned to reflect a foundational shift from a confused hyperglobalist worldview to the tranformationalist worldview.

**The Profile & globalisation theory**

The first outcome is in relation to the Profile and globalisation theory. The globalisation literature does not support the hyperglobalist position. The extent to which the Profile is a normative claim for education to embrace the radical use of
multi-reference grid curricula should be interpreted as a weakness. The argument put forward in this investigation is that the Profile should instead be aligned to the transformationalist worldview which is responsive to the national and supranational forces that are shaping higher education. The transformationalist worldview can accommodate international students being supported to adapt or adjust to the local teaching and learning framework without diminishing their unique cultural and personality-based Selves in the process.

The transformationalist worldview can also accommodate local teaching staff developing a cosmopolitan outlook that respects and appreciates cultural difference in the face of greater cultural, language, and educational diversity in the classroom. There is nothing inherently negative about international students engaging with host country curricula to achieve rich learning outcomes as long as the curricula are constructively aligned (internally consistent and valid) and the classroom environment is respectful and appreciative of the uniqueness of each individual, both teachers and students, in the educative process. The creators of the Profile have taken the changes in the student demographic as a signal that the ‘global’ is in and the ‘local’ is out. More precisely, and somewhat confusingly, the host local is out whilst the locals of the international students are all in. This confusion can be resolved by realigning the Profile to the transformationalist worldview which supports international students to adapt or adjust to the local teaching and learning framework whilst simultaneously encouraging all participants in the international classroom to develop a grounded, or rooted, cosmopolitan outlook. The teaching practice examined in this investigation also supports this claim.
The Profile & internationalisation theory

The second outcome is in relation to the Profile and internationalisation theory. It was suggested in Chapter I that the Profile is a recent, one-of-a-kind addition to the literature on the internationalisation of higher education. Its interest, however, lies in an area that has not been the focus of much of the contemporary internationalisation literature. Rather than focusing on internationalisation at the level of the organisation, the Profile’s interest lies in internationalisation at the within-institution level and specifically at the level of the individual lecturer. The Profile virtually stands alone as a model of education that addresses both teaching practice and culture. Further, the fact that its fundamental premises are well-supported by transformative learning theory and cosmopolitanism theory is a heartening sign that the Profile, particularly if revised to reflect the transformationalist worldview, has the potential to help lecturers and other stakeholders in higher education reflect on the implications of the changing social and educational milieu for teaching practice. The call for individuals to engage with the inward journey of Self-discovery that is promoted by transformative learning theory and Patricia Cranton’s work, plus the outward journey of the discovery of Others through cosmopolitanism is unmistakably clear in the bodies of literature concerning globalisation, culture, and, in general, education.

The fact that the manifestations of this call are hardly evident in the contemporary literature on the internationalisation of higher education indicates that the issues dealt with by the Profile places it at the cutting edge of developments in this area. Where the Profile currently falls down in this regard, however, is in the
degree to which it encourages universal cosmopolitanism instead of a rooted, or grounded, form of cosmopolitanism. The idea of throwing out the local in a bid to engage with the global is not supported by the contemporary literature on cosmopolitanism. The transformationalist worldview, however, can accommodate a rooted, or grounded, cosmopolitan outlook.

*The Profile & cultural theory*

The third outcome is in relation to the Profile and cultural theory. Whilst it is timely that the Profile introduces the concept of culture into the dialogue on directions for education in the Twenty-First century, cultural theory itself suggests that its role in the educative process may not be as pivotal as the Profile makes it out to be. For example, the ability to “analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework” (criterion Q3 S1 from Table 1.1) has only cautionary support from cultural theory itself, where it is suggested that national cultural norms should be used with discretion when predicting or interpreting the behaviour of individuals. (To its credit, the Profile cautions against this as well.) Further, as has already been shown, there is little support for the adoption of multi-reference grid curricula in response to the presence of the cultural Other in the classroom.

If the cultural Other is not writ large in the educative process, then the real value of cultural theory to the workings of the international classroom might be in the way that culture-specific and culture-general knowledge can be used to develop cosmopolitan outlooks amongst its participants. In this regard, cultural theory can usefully underwrite the journey within (culture-general knowledge) that is related to
transformative learning theory, and the journey without (culture-specific knowledge) that is related to developing a sense of cosmopolitanism. Although the idea of the cultural Other in the classroom adds richness to the broad educative process, it does not assume a pivotal role in determining the teaching and learning framework. The teaching practice examined in this investigation supports this claim. A revised Profile can accommodate the re-positioning of the concept of culture without diminishing the value of the Profile.

*The Profile & theory on teaching in higher education*

The fourth outcome is in relation to the Profile and theory on teaching in higher education. The Profile’s claim that lecturers should base their teaching practice on educational theory has resounding support in the literature on teaching in higher education. In this sense, the Profile has a very strong foundation. Perhaps the most interesting outcome, however, is in the way that the Profile engages with Biggs’s (2003) three levels of teaching. The Profile’s ideal might well be several staged ideals on the way from Level 1 ‘teaching as assimilation’ through to Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’. At Level 1 teaching, culture in the classroom is invisible to the lecturer. The Profile’s value at this level is in the way that it encourages the lecturer to recognise the cultural Other as being more dynamic than merely representing groups of problem students. At Level 2 teaching, culture in the classroom is now visible to the lecturer. The Profile’s value at this level is in the way it encourages the lecturer to work constructively with the cultural Other by using specific support initiatives and teaching strategies that are promoted to help international students in particular. If the use of such initiatives and strategies is to
help the international students adapt or adjust to the local teaching and learning framework, rather than trying to teach them in their home-country ways, then the lecturer’s teaching practice might well be in between Level 2 and Level 3 teaching. As lecturers move towards Level 3 teaching, the value of the Profile is to challenge them to make culture in the classroom invisible again, although not in the way in which it is invisible for Level 1 teaching. It is an enlightened invisibility that sees the lecturer being respectful and appreciative of cultural difference but recognising that it is counter-productive to focus on this in the pure (and perhaps narrow) educative process. Instead, the lecturer works from the principle of the educative process being universal. In the Biggsian sense, ethnicity is beside the point.

The Profile & actual teaching practice

The fifth outcome is in relation to the Profile and actual teaching practice. In the discussion of Associated Question 2 it was suggested that the examination of the Profile against actual teaching practice in the allied health department demonstrates strong support for the Profile’s current recommendation that culture has a central place in the educative process. What is interesting, however, is that it only takes five culture-related discrepancies between teaching practice and the Profile’s claims to actually de-centre the cultural Other to a lesser, although arguably still important, place in the (broader) educative process. Whilst the international classroom is characterised by cultural, language, and educational diversity, this is not what drives the educative process. Rather, it is driven by the host culture. The fact that this is the case in the allied health department, while so many of the Profile’s claims are still upheld by teaching practice in that department, demonstrates that the lecturers
respect and appreciate cultural difference and also that the Profile can survive without the concept of the Other culture as its prime mover. It also suggests that quite a few of the Profile’s criteria, whilst flagging a lecturer’s understanding of the impact of cultural, language, and educational diversity in the classroom, actually skirt the educative process proper. Instead, they function to stimulate the lecturer to reflect on such diversity to better understand how their international students might present in the classroom.

Compare, for example, some of the Knowledge criteria in ‘Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences’ with some of the culture-related Skills criteria that represent discrepancies between teaching practice in the allied health department and the Profile’s claims. In terms of actual teaching practice, the latter is the more significant. A lecturer may acknowledge that culture can be defined in different ways (criterion Q3 K1), and that that culture is learned and is very difficult to unlearn (criterion Q3 K3), and that formal education is one of the most important features of a national culture (criterion Q3 K2). However, as the research data have shown, it is possible to be cognisant of these Knowledge criteria and yet simultaneously subscribe to teaching practice that, for example, does not make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account (the obverse of criterion Q3 S3), and does not discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present (the obverse of criterion Q4 S2). Whilst being sympathetic to the challenges that international students face in relation to having to adapt or adjust to the teaching and learning framework in the allied health department, the lecturers can deal with
culture informally in the classroom without this contradicting their acknowledgement of the aforementioned Knowledge criteria. The investigation of the teaching practice in the allied health department clearly demonstrates this.

The Overarching Question revisited

It was stated in Chapter I that whilst the Profile is a pragmatic response to teaching in the international classroom, theory and practice are two of its fundamental pillars which have yet to be examined. This investigation has examined both pillars and has provided an evidence base from which to critically engage with the Profile’s claims in relation to teaching international students. This has resulted in a recommendation to revise the Profile’s qualifications that particularly relate to teaching international students to reflect the transformationalist worldview. Whilst the Profile has emerged from practice for practice as a heuristic device for stakeholders in higher education to reflect on the implications of increasing cultural, language, and educational diversity for university teaching, its credibility will be enhanced by its being revised to reflect actual teaching practice as well as the various bodies of literature that have been reviewed in this investigation. The Profile has significant potential to help lecturers at various levels of teaching understand how they can work positively with cultural, language, and educational diversity to enhance teaching and learning in the international classroom.
Revisiting the delimitations & limitations of this investigation

In Chapter I, a number of delimitations and limitations that apply to the investigation were outlined. This section briefly revisits each one to place the conclusions of the Key Research Questions into perspective.

The investigation’s delimitations

The Profile’s pillar of practice has been investigated by examining its claims against the experiences and opinions of academic staff in one teaching department at one university. It is prudent, therefore, to approach the conclusions drawn from this part of the investigation with a degree of caution. For example, the findings in relation to Associated Question 2 have contributed to the suggestion that the Profile should be revised to reflect the transformationalist worldview. Whilst this has been suggested with some confidence, it needs to be remembered that the case study on the allied health department is only a single case. Whilst the higher education-related literature suggests that similar findings might be drawn from other departments in the Australian (and perhaps Western) tertiary setting, this cannot be stated unequivocally from the research findings of this investigation into the Profile’s pillar of practice.

It also needs to be kept in mind that the investigation into the Profile’s pillar of practice has only taken into account the experiences and opinions of academic staff. Whilst the triangulation framework that was incorporated into the research design was satisfactory, the use of international students, for example, as a source of triangulation of data would have provided an interesting perspective to the investigation. Another investigation with greater scope could pursue this.
The third delimitation was that the overall investigation only examined those qualifications in the Profile that most strongly related to teaching international students. Whilst ‘Qualification 5 (Q5): Using media and technology’ has something to do with teaching international students, it was nevertheless omitted from the investigation in preference to examining only those qualifications that dealt particularly with the fundamental issues of teaching and learning in the international classroom. Whilst this gave the investigation a scholarly and economical focus, it is recognised that another investigation with greater scope could incorporate other qualifications of the Profile into its research design.

The investigation’s limitations

The delimitations listed above apply to the research design of this particular investigation. The conclusions drawn from the overall investigation also need to be considered in relation to some fundamental limitations that universally apply to educational research. First, from both philosophical and practical viewpoints, no investigation can ever reveal the true nature of reality. Whilst this investigation has incorporated academic rigour and a schedule of validity techniques and criteria into its design, it is recognised that the research data are only partial accounts of reality. For example, the data from the interviews with lecturers in the allied health department is insufficient to establish the very essence of each academic staff member as a lecturer and teacher, or to even convey everything that their essence imparts to their teaching practice. The best outcome of any research will only ever be a close approximation of what is happening in the real world. The second limitation is related to the first one. This investigation is only one way of interpreting an event.
It is *an* interpretation rather than the *correct* interpretation. This is despite measures having been taken to maximise the likelihood that the conclusions of the investigation are as close as possible to describing the real world.

**Addressing the validity measures of this investigation**

Given the limitations of the investigation described above, it is also important to revisit the validity measures that were discussed in Chapter IV. This section recounts the measures taken to ensure that the conclusions presented in this chapter can be accepted with a high degree of confidence. The model of validity criteria for qualitative research produced by Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001) was adopted by this investigation to enhance its rigour, credibility, and quality. The model consists of a range of techniques to diminish threats to validity, and a number of primary and secondary criteria to ensure a high standard of scholarly engagement with qualitative research ideals.

**Techniques for demonstrating validity**

All four types of technique suggested by Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001) were utilised in this investigation to enhance the validity of its claims. These are listed in Table 6.1. The specific techniques that were used are evident in the right-hand column. A complete description of the activities associated with these specific validity-enhancing techniques is provided in Appendix Q.
### Table 6.1 The validity-enhancing techniques used in this investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of technique</th>
<th>Technique used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design consideration</td>
<td>Developing a self-conscious research design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sampling decisions (for instance, sampling adequacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employing triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data generating</td>
<td>Articulating data collecting decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrating prolonged engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing verbatim transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td>Articulating data analysis decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using computer programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing a literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflexive journaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing an interim report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bracketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Providing an audit trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing evidence that support interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging the researcher perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing thick descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary & secondary validity criteria**

In Chapter IV it was stated that the use of the validity model from Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001) not only guided the design and implementation of the overall investigation but also provided a method for judging the quality of the investigation as a whole. The numerous techniques listed in the previous section are structural mechanisms that have been used to enhance the validity of this investigation. The primary and secondary criteria of the validity model listed in this section are conceptually different because they relate to standards or ideals of qualitative research. Whilst it will ultimately be left to readers to decide the extent to which this investigation satisfies the criteria, a brief comment on each one is provided in the remainder of this section.
The primary criteria relate to all forms of qualitative enquiry. The *credibility criterion* asks if the research reflects “the experience of participants or the context in a believable way” (from Table 4.4). The examination of the Profile’s theoretical pillar constructed a conceptual framework which comprised of several bodies of literature that the Profile either implicitly or explicitly draws upon to support its claims. The context of the conceptual framework was framed by the logical relations that were made between the various theoretical perspectives. At all times the researcher sought to be guided by the best available theoretical evidence to construct a sound, believable argument to support the conceptual framework. The examination of the Profile’s pillar of practice also sought to portray the research participants’ experiences in a believable way. Care was taken to create a comfortable and congenial interview environment and to explain the interview questions clearly so that the lecturers could direct their opinions and experiences to the essence of each of the Profile’s criteria. In addition, the within-lecturer and between-lecturer triangulation framework helped establish the consistency of the lecturers’ claims over the series of in-depth interviews.

The *authenticity criterion* seeks to establish whether the “representation of the emic perspective exhibit[s] awareness to the subtle differences in the voices of all participants” (from Table 4.4). As mentioned in the conclusion of Chapter V, whilst the research interests do not focus on individuals *per se*, it was inevitable that rich descriptions of each lecturer would be generated as part of determining how the teaching practice in the allied health department supported the Profile’s pillar of
practice. The emic perspective was clearly present as the dialogue over the multiple in-depth interviews constructed a unique representation of each lecturer.

The *criticality criterion* asks whether the “research process demonstrate[s] evidence of critical appraisal” (from Table 4.4). This has been achieved in two ways. First, the conceptual framework that was constructed in Chapter II and Chapter III engaged in a critical appraisal not only of the Profile, but also of the various bodies of literature that inform the Profile’s claims. In the case of theory associated with teaching and learning in higher education, it was argued that the sense of deficit in Biggs’s (2003) Level 2 ‘teaching as accommodating’ was better interpreted as a student deficit associated with making the transition to tertiary studies, rather than a lecturer deficit. In terms of cultural theory, it was concluded that essentialist theories may be of less value to lecturers than that suggested by the Profile. With regard to globalisation theory, it was argued that the transformationalist worldview is more suitable than either the hyperglobalist or the sceptical positions. With reference to internationalisation and higher education, a case was made that the work of Jane Knight was limited in terms of its capacity to inform internationalisation activities at the within-institution level. In terms of theory associated with cosmopolitanism, it was argued that universal moral cosmopolitanism was misguided and that rooted, or grounded, cosmopolitanism was the most appropriate view. Chapters II and III should also be viewed as a comprehensive and critical engagement with the Profile’s qualifications under examination. One of the key functions of these two chapters was to critically examine what has, to this point, not been investigated to any extent.
Chapter VI - Conclusions drawn from the investigation

The second way in which the research process has demonstrated evidence of critical appraisal is in the part of the investigation that examined the Profile’s pillar of practice. The development of the research framework and the generation and analysis of the interview and questionnaire data was characterised by reflection and reflexive practice at every step of the research process. In this sense, the critical appraisal is of the researcher’s own performance as a researcher and a research instrument in the field. With regard to the research data, whilst the interview transcripts spoke for themselves, the researcher was critically engaged in the systematic reduction of large amounts of data to represent the essence of a particular lecturer’s response to each of the Profile’s criteria. Further, the researcher was critically engaged with the research data when drawing the various conclusions from the interview and questionnaire data.

The integrity criterion is concerned with whether or not the research reflects “recursive and repetitive checks of validity as well as a humble presentation of findings” (from Table 4.4). Again, Appendix Q provides a thorough account of the validity checks that were built into the research framework. With reference to the presentation of findings in Chapter II, Chapter III, Chapter V, and this concluding chapter, whilst the researcher has offered the various conclusions with confidence, this should not be mistaken for arrogance. It is based on a belief that the conclusions are well-supported by a rigorous research framework. Whilst this investigation has advocated a revision to the Profile, this is based on the researcher’s belief that it has significant value to various stakeholders in higher education, especially lecturers, in
terms of encouraging the development of good teaching practice and cosmopolitan outlooks.

The secondary validity criteria of the model developed by Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001) provide further benchmarks for determining the quality of qualitative research. Again, the reader will ultimately decide the extent to which this investigation satisfies the six secondary criteria. In terms of *explicitness*, the researcher is confident that “methodological decisions [and] interpretations have been addressed” (from Table 4.4) in an appropriate manner. With regard to having dealt with the issue of “investigator biases” (from Table 4.4), perhaps the best way to approach this is by saying that when the researcher first came across the Profile, it seemed to hold *all* the answers to teaching and learning in the international classroom. A biased research approach, then, might be to wholeheartedly support the Profile as it presently stands. What emerged from the research process, however, was the conclusion that the Profile would need to be revised in light of contemporary theory and actual teaching practice (although the latter should be observed with some caution seeing only one case study on teaching practice was undertaken). It is also important to acknowledge that biases of many sorts permeate the lives of all individuals on a daily basis. Researchers are not immune to this. All they can do is to maximise their awareness of any biases with a view to minimising their impact on the research outcomes.

With regard to *vividness*, the researcher is confident that “thick and faithful descriptions been portrayed with artfulness and clarity” (from Table 4.4). The
creativity criterion calls for the incorporation of “imaginative ways of organising, presenting, and analysing data” (from Table 4.4) into the research design. To a great extent, the use of the Profile as a template for the investigation determined the organisation, presentation, and analysis of data. The researcher hopes that readers of this thesis will find the information accessible, well set out, and engaging. In terms of thoroughness, the researcher is satisfied that the findings of the investigation “convincingly address the questions posed through completeness and saturation” (from Table 4.4).

The final secondary criteria concern congruence and sensitivity. The former criterion seeks an answer to the question of whether or not the research process and findings are congruent and if all the themes fit together (from Table 4.4). The process and outcomes of the investigation clearly satisfy this part of the criterion. There are logical connections between all the chapters in the thesis as well as a synergy arising from their interaction with each other. Again, using the Profile as a template for the investigation has had something to do with this. The congruence criterion also asks if the findings fit into a context outside the study situation (from Table 4.4). Whilst it has been suggested that the conclusions drawn from the Profile’s pillar of practice should be interpreted with a degree of caution, the content of the part of the investigation that examined the Profile’s theoretical pillar more than compensates for this, for it launches the investigation outside of the study situation and onto the global stage.
The sensitivity criterion seeks to establish if the investigation has “been implemented in ways that are sensitive to the nature of human, cultural, and social contexts” (from Table 4.4). The section in Chapter IV titled ‘Ethical issues’ outlined measures that were taken to ensure sensitivity when working with the research participants. The anonymity and confidentiality measures built into the research design are examples of this. Another example is the researcher remaining reflexive throughout the investigation about his role as a data-generating instrument in the field.

Suggestions for further research

This investigation concludes with some suggestions for further research.

In the section titled ‘Significance of the investigation’ in Chapter I it was noted that there has been a lack of investigation into the experiences of Australian lecturers who work with increasing numbers of students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. More research needs to be undertaken in this area in general. It would seem that there are abundant opportunities for interested researchers to pursue meaningful research activities and contribute to this body of literature.

In Chapter II it was suggested that the sense of deficit belonging to the teacher in Level 2 ‘teaching as accommodating’ as portrayed by Biggs (2003) seems an odd proposition. Instead, it was suggested that the deficit belonged to students who were making the transition to the tertiary setting and that lecturers who assisted
them to adapt or adjust in this regard might be somewhere between Level 2 and Level 3 teaching. Some focused theoretical and practical research in this area would be appropriate.

In Chapter III it was observed that there is a gap in the literature in the area of the internationalisation of higher education and cosmopolitanism. Some theoretical research to further explore this area would be useful. It is likely that such research could contribute to the development of a consolidated body of theory in terms of the internationalisation of higher education. This theory would bring together internationalisation processes along the depth dimension of the reach of internationalisation that was outlined in Figure 3.2 in Chapter III. At present, the main body of theory, whilst organisational in its focus, bottoms out at the institutional level and does not inform the within-institution level to any great extent. If internationalisation theory were to be consolidated in the way that is being suggested here, it would represent an extremely significant development in this body of literature.

More work also needs to be undertaken on the Profile itself. Whilst this investigation has examined the qualifications of the Profile that particularly relate to teaching international students, the Profile as a whole is still unexamined (apart from the work that is evident in Appendix B). This would appear to be a well-defined research project, whether or not the whole Profile is examined or just the qualifications that have been omitted from examination in this thesis. Further, this investigation has suggested that a revision of the Profile would be appropriate to
enhance its usefulness. Further research needs to be undertaken to determine the specific details of the revision, for example, which of the qualifications, categories, and criteria should remain as they are at present, and what information should be changed, added, or deleted.

Given that this investigation appears to be the first time that the Profile has been examined in any depth, it would be appropriate for more research to be undertaken on its pillar of practice in particular. This investigation has drawn some tentative conclusions in relation to the Profile’s pillar of practice. As mentioned, only one department was investigated. There is an opportunity, therefore, to investigate other instances of actual teaching practice to determine how they support the Profile’s claims. This would help inform the detail of a revision of the Profile.
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APPENDIX A

ALL QUALIFICATIONS & CRITERIA OF THE ‘PROFILE OF THE IDEAL LECTURER FOR THE INTERNATIONAL CLASSROOM’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification 1 (Q1): General</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1 K1:</strong> The lecturer must be a good academic, with ample teaching experience and a thorough knowledge of the subject</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q1 S1:</strong> The lecturer must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs</td>
<td><strong>Q1 A1:</strong> The lecturer must be open, flexible and interested in the teaching and learning customary [sic] in other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1 K2:</strong> The lecturer should be aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in his or her field may differ substantially in other academic traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q1 S2:</strong> The lecturer must be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used</td>
<td><strong>Q1 A2:</strong> The lecturer should be aware that some students ascribe him or her [sic] a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or she has been used to within his or her own tradition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2 K1:</strong> The lecturer must have a very good oral and written command of the language of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q2 S1:</strong> The lecturer must be able to use the language of instruction in such a way that the natural flow of speech is not impeded by unnatural use of the voice, such as speaking very loudly</td>
<td><strong>Q2 A1:</strong> The lecturer must be aware of the fact that he or she is not using his or her native tongue and reflect on this fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2 K2:</strong> The lecturer must be capable of writing general texts, scientific reports and articles in the language of instruction and, where required, policy papers</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q2 S2:</strong> The lecturer must be aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, but not use it in an extreme manner, such as making exaggerated movements to support spoken language</td>
<td><strong>Q2 A2:</strong> The lecturer should be aware that body language and other non-verbal aspects of communication have a great impact on the way he or she is understood (or misunderstood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2 K3:</strong> The lecturer must know the terms in the language of instruction that are used for teaching the subject in question, and be familiar with the jargon in his or her field</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Q2 S3:</strong> The lecturer must be able to say things in different ways, rephrasing sentences that are not understood</td>
<td><strong>Q2 A3:</strong> The lecturer must be aware of the role of humour in communication, but also that humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined spheres of personal identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualification 2 (Q2) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S4: The lecturer should use audio-visual aids in support of spoken texts</td>
<td>Q2 A4: The lecturer must be aware that different levels of language proficiency within the group may account for differences in performance, but should not simply ascribe attitude to language (a ‘silent’ person may be shy, not interested, incompetent, bored, full of respect for the teacher or one of a whole range of explanations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S5: The lecturer must never use two languages at the same time, for example to explain something quickly to some of the students</td>
<td>Q2 A5: The lecturer should be open to suggestions as regards [sic] the use of language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K1: The lecturer should know that culture can be defined in different ways</td>
<td>Q3 S1: The lecturer must be able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework</td>
<td>Q3 A1: The lecturer should be aware of his or her own culture and understand that this strongly colours his or her own views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K2: The lecturer should know that formal education is one of the most important features of a national culture</td>
<td>Q3 S2: The lecturer should be able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, for example knowing whether a student is only shy or feels that it is not appropriate to ask a question</td>
<td>Q3 A2: The lecturer must try to avoid thinking in stereotypes, and to behave and express opinions without resorting to such generalizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K3: The lecturer should know that culture is learned, and is very difficult to un-learn [sic]</td>
<td>Q3 S3: The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account</td>
<td>Q3 A3: The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments for cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of other group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K4: The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of the culture(s) of the students in the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K1: The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles</td>
<td>Q4 S1: The lecturer must know how to make his or her teaching methods and aims explicit to students</td>
<td>Q4 A1: The lecturer should realize that his or her own status as an academic is strongly conditioned by national and cultural values and be willing to reflect on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K2: The lecturer should realize that professional identity is closely related to the hidden curriculum</td>
<td>Q4 S2: The lecturer should discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present</td>
<td>Q4 A2: The lecturer must have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour. (For example, in some countries students stand when asking a question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K3: The lecturer must understand that the learning process is affected by a student’s own personal and social development, and pay sufficient attention to individual differences</td>
<td>Q4 S3: The lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction</td>
<td>Q4 A3: The lecturer should take an interest in the cultural backgrounds of the foreign students in the group and support initiatives for extra-curricular cultural activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K4: The lecturer should know that students’ learning strategies are a result of instructional models, and that procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined</td>
<td>Q4 S4: The lecturer must know how to involve students from different national traditions in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 S5: The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualification 5 (Q5): Using media and technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 K1: The lecturer must be capable of using media properly in order to support his or her presentation</td>
<td>Q5 S1: The lecturer should know how to prepare students for the use of ICT learning and be able to explain its use, purpose and limitations</td>
<td>Q5 A1: The lecturer must realize that most students will have better ICT skills than he or she does</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualification 5 (Q5) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 K2: The lecturer must be able to include the use of ICT in such a way that it enhances other forms of teaching and learning</td>
<td>Q5 S2: The lecturer should be able to communicate with students by email to facilitate the learning process</td>
<td>Q5 A2: The lecturer should realize that the use of media and technologies has a culturally defined meaning and implicit message that can enhance communication, but may hamper contacts for some students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 K3: The lecturer should be able to support students in web-based learning processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualification 6 (Q6): Specific requirements connected with the academic discipline and diploma recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 K1: The lecturer should be aware of a subject’s status in other traditions. (For example, in Spain physiotherapy is a university degree programme, whereas in the Netherlands this course falls under higher professional education)</td>
<td>Q6 S1: The lecturer must be capable of teaching the subject in an international context, and of discussing concepts and theories from the point of view not only of his or her own tradition but also that of other traditions</td>
<td>Q6 A1: The lecturer should have an open mind when it comes to other approaches to the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 K2: The lecturer should be familiar with the different theoretical approaches to the subject that are possible within different traditions</td>
<td>Q6 S2: The lecturer should be capable of consulting with international counterparts and jointly developing a learning agreement through which students can qualify for international credit transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 K3: The lecturer should know the international context of his or her subject and how the subject has developed in other countries, and be familiar with the international literature in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualification 7 (Q7): Knowledge of foreign education systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7 K1: The lecturer should have a basic knowledge of the main features of education systems in other countries, in particular the countries from which students in the international classroom come</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Qualification 8 (Q8): Knowledge of the international labour market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8 K1: The lecturer should be aware of the important international differences on the labour market as regards qualifications, professional recognition, and possible periods of probation for the specific profession or job for which the students are preparing themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 K2: The lecturer should know the general features of the profession in other countries (for example, the role of the chemist in the pharmacy or drugstore).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Qualification 9 (Q9): Personal qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9 S1: The lecturer must be able to work efficiently within the limits of the programmes involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 S2: The lecturer must be able to cope with the stress caused by the nature of the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 S3: The lecturer should be able to place the internationalization of education in its proper perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

REVIEW OF THE PROFILE’S QUALIFICATIONS THAT ARE OMITTED FROM EXAMINATION

The following qualifications of the Profile that were omitted from the investigation are reviewed in this appendix. This is done so that the Profile can be understood in its entirety:

Qualification 5 (Q5): Using media and technology;
Qualification 6 (Q6): Specific requirements connected with the academic discipline and diploma recognition;
Qualification 7 (Q7): Knowledge of foreign education systems;
Qualification 8 (Q8): Knowledge of the international labour market;
Qualification 9 (Q9): Personal qualities.

Qualification 5 (Q5): Using media & technology

Table B.1 lists the criteria for this qualification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B.1 Criteria of Qualification 5 (Q5): Using media &amp; technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 K1 The lecturer must be capable of using media properly in order to support his or her presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 K2 The lecturer must be able to include the use of ICT in such a way that it enhances other forms of teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 K3 The lecturer should be able to support students in web-based learning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 S1 The lecturer should know how to prepare students for the use of ICT learning and be able to explain its use, purpose and limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 S2 The lecturer should be able to communicate with students by email to facilitate the learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 A1 The lecturer must realize that most students will have better ICT skills than he or she does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 A2 The lecturer should realize that the use of media and technologies has a culturally defined meaning and implicit message that can enhance communication, but may hamper contacts for some students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This qualification requires lecturers to be skilled in the use of media and technology to enhance student learning. It also asks them to be aware of cultural issues that might arise with regard to the use of media and technology. The following sections deal with the main themes of this qualification.

The use of media & technology in higher education

Teekens (2000d) stated that the use of media and technology was increasingly displacing old school teaching methods like chalk-and-talk in tertiary education in many countries. As a result, lecturers need to have the knowledge and skills to integrate media and technology into their teaching practice (p. 32). This observation is supported by the literature on teaching in higher education. For example, Ketteridge, Marshall, Fry, and Trigwell (2002) believed that “electronic intervention [was] probably the most single important contemporary development in teaching” (p. 177). Race (2001) suggested that computer-based learning resources were widely available and played a valuable part in teaching (p. 214). Wong (1997) urged lecturers to use the available technological tools to help students learn (p. 269). Trevitt (1997) promoted the use of “educational technologies” (p. 293) to supplement course content. Olds (1997) endorsed the use of multi-media technologies in delivering computer-based lectures and tutorials (pp. 402-403). Davis (1993) said that computers and multimedia enable staff to make their teaching “more efficient, effective, powerful, and flexible” (p. 334). Cannon and Newble (2000) reported that computer-aided teaching has positive effects on student learning (p. 7). Manicas (2000) thought that “computer-mediated technologies” (p. 34) increase access to
education in a cost-effective manner, and reflect the demands for new types of skills and knowledge.

Whilst directing lecturers to use Information Communications Technologies (ICTs) in their teaching, Teekens (2000d) maintained that the personal relationship between the lecturer and the students is important to nurture in the face of modern technologies. Teekens (2000d) made it clear that ICTs should support teaching and learning rather than becoming the main focus of activity in the international classroom (p. 33). Cannon and Newble (2000) also stressed that technology was useful as an adjunct to facilitate learning, but not as an end in itself (p. xvii). Cranton (2001), too, felt that a “living teacher” (p. 14) remained crucial to student learning, despite the availability of computers. This was put into context by Schwen (1998):

If good teaching must be responsive to the context of the relevant academic discipline and the peculiar difficulties of the subject, it must also be responsive to the technologies through which it operates. We are, after all, living in the midst of the so-called Information Age [but] we should treat the Internet, as we should treat all technological innovations that have pedagogical applications, as another part of the context that helps to shape the character and possibilities of teaching and learning, not as either bête noire or a panacea. (Schwen, 1998, pp. 78-79)

It is also important to note Morgan’s (1997) point that technology should actually contribute to student learning rather than just being used for the sake of being innovative. Morgan (1997) reported that although his students enjoyed his initial foray into multi-media presentations, they did not think it had as big an impact on their learning as the lecturer had anticipated. Employing a battery of media to demonstrate every point in the lecture was not necessarily productive (p. 265).
That lecturers should have a good command of ICT knowledge and skills is more or less an expectation these days. Of perhaps more interest in this qualification are the criteria in the Attitude category which consider the relationship between culture and technology as well as the likelihood that lecturers need to be open to students having better ICT skills than themselves. With regard to the relationship between culture and technology, Teekens (2000d) said that differences between countries in terms of what was appropriate or inappropriate regarding the use of media in teaching meant that lecturers should explain the place of media in the international classroom to students prior to its use. The example provided was the use of video presentations during lectures. Teekens (2000d) suggested that in one country such a practice in an academic setting might be frowned upon because it was the lecturer’s role to impart knowledge rather than present it in a video recording. In another country, however, students might expect the lecturer to use teaching aids such as video presentations (p. 32). In any case, Davis (1993) provided good advice to lecturers using films or videos in class by urging them to prepare their students for the viewing by explaining why they were showing the program and what they expected students to learn from it (p. 331).

With regard to ICT skill levels, Teekens’s (2000d) observation that students might have superior computer-related knowledge and skills than their lecturers is the obverse of what is generally encountered in the literature, where the focus is mostly on student deficit in this area. This is, understandably, especially so in the literature from the early to mid-1990s. Loy and Amrapala (1991) stated that “in many societies
from which our students come, the level of technology is well below that of Australia” (p. 53). Mezger (1992) noted that some international students may not be familiar with computers (p. 33). By the late 1990s, however, whilst still acknowledging that some students would have little experience with using technology, there was an emerging recognition that not all students fell into this category (De Fazio, 1999, p. 165). This is reflected in findings from research conducted by Matthews (2003) where some international students in Australia from Singapore, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong reported that information technology facilities in Australian institutions were “less advanced than those they had in their home countries where schools and universities had the latest equipment” (p. 258). Matthews (2003) also found that other students from the same countries, however, reported that the facilities in Australia were superior to what they had experienced in their home countries (p. 258). Whether or not it is actually the case that most students will have better ICT skills than lecturers (criterion Q5 A1 in Table B.1), lecturers are encouraged to be open to this possibility without feeling threatened by it.

**Student use of technology**

Whilst this qualification is largely concerned with the use of technology and media from the lecturer’s point of view, Teekens’s (2000d) accompanying commentary also recognised the way in which ICTs allow students to “discuss topics from the courses they are taking with others around the world” (p. 33). In Teekens’s (2000d) view, such flexible, web-based learning would create a completely new international classroom in which learning would “no longer be subject to
geographical boundaries [and would represent] a true intercultural experience” (p. 33). As noted in the section titled ‘Some non-Western approaches to teaching and learning’ in Chapter II, Hudson and Morris (2003) suggested that ICTs also cater for cultural diversity in the classroom by being able accommodate different approaches to learning, for example, rote learning. Clearly, Biggs (1996) and Watkins (1996, 1998a) would take exception to this suggestion from two points of view. First, Asian students do not, on the whole, rote learn in the sense of engaging in mindless repetition to meet learning objectives. Second, the distinction between rote learning and more analytical methods infers, intentionally or otherwise, that Asian approaches to teaching and learning are inferior to Western approaches.

**Location of this qualification’s criteria**

The three criteria listed in Table B.1 in the Knowledge category are not correctly expressed as knowledge statements. They are more suited to the Skills category because they are how to statements. Further, the two criteria in the Attitude category in Table B.1 are best located in the Knowledge category because they are expressed as such.

Qualification 6 (Q6): Specific requirements connected with the academic discipline & diploma recognition

Table B.2 lists the criteria for this qualification. This qualification asks lecturers to be aware of the nature of their discipline from the point of view of other traditions. It urges them to teach from an international perspective. The following sections deal with the main themes of this qualification.
### Table B.2 Criteria of Qualification 6 (Q6): Specific requirements connected with the academic discipline & diploma recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 K1 The lecturer should be aware of a subject’s status in other traditions. (For example, in Spain physiotherapy is a university degree programme, whereas in the Netherlands this course falls under higher professional education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 K2 The lecturer should be familiar with the different theoretical approaches to the subject that are possible within different traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 K3 The lecturer should know the international context of his or her subject and how the subject has developed in other countries, and be familiar with the international literature in the field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 S1 The lecturer must be capable of teaching the subject in an international context, and of discussing concepts and theories from the point of view not only of his or her own tradition but also that of other traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 S2 The lecturer should be capable of consulting with international counterparts and jointly developing a learning agreement through which students can qualify for international credit transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 A1 The lecturer should have an open mind when it comes to other approaches to the subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, pp. 35-36).

### Comments on this qualification

This qualification appears to be a mixture of the sentiments of Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences, Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles, and Qualification 7 (Q7): Knowledge of foreign education systems, but with specific focus on the particular academic discipline to which the lecturer belongs (for example, commerce, science, arts, or education).

It is suggested that lecturers should have a substantial knowledge of their discipline as it exists in other countries, from the point of view of how their particular diploma or degree sits in relation to those in other countries, and with regard to the sorts of theoretical approaches that inform other academic traditions. An example might be a lecturer in medicine in The Netherlands being familiar with
the structure of medical training in the countries from which their international students are sourced, such as England, China, Indonesia, Japan, and Germany. Further, the lecturer will also have some familiarity with the different theoretical approaches that underwrite medical practice in those countries. A contrasting example is the theoretical approach that informs medical training in The Netherlands versus that which underwrites medical training in China for traditional Chinese medicine. Whilst such knowledge might well be useful, the extent to which it becomes a feature of the local (for example, Dutch) curricula (as suggested by criterion Q6 S1 in Table B.2) is debatable. It most likely underestimates the strong national focus that still drives the majority of academic programs in most countries and the way that Western knowledge holds a privileged place over other epistemic approaches.

Further, part of criterion Q6 K3 in Table B.2 suggests that the international literature in the field is a resource that could help lecturers become familiar with different theoretical approaches to their discipline. Whilst this may be so, it should be remembered that the international literature is likely to be biased towards Western conceptions of ontology and epistemology (Appadurai, 1997) and, in the main, be presented in English only. As Dator (2000) pointed out, Western culture has dominated most educational systems (including many non-Western ones) for the past two centuries (p. 75). In Nandy’s (2000) view, Western-style universities have “trivialized or helped marginalize” (p. 117) other traditions of knowledge.
Location of this qualification

 Whilst the focus on the academic discipline is useful, any revision of the Profile might consider relocating the criteria in this qualification to any one of the three qualifications listed above to avoid duplication and to streamline the Profile.

Qualification 7 (Q7): Knowledge of foreign education systems

Table B.3 lists the single criterion in this qualification. This qualification asks lecturers to be aware of the characteristics of the education systems in the home countries of their international students. The following sections deal with the main themes of this qualification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7 K1 The lecturer should have a basic knowledge of the main features of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems in other countries, in particular the countries from which students in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international classroom come</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Tabulated from text in Teekens (2000d, p. 36).*

Understanding different education systems

Teekens (2000d) suggested that a lecturer’s understanding of their international students would be heightened if they were familiar with the characteristics of the education systems of the students’ countries. As an example, she outlined a general difference between education in France and The Netherlands. French secondary students, according to Teekens (2000d), worked particularly hard but had a comparatively “relaxed schedule” (p. 36) at university. In The Netherlands, however, the opposite was said to be the case. For Teekens (2000d), a lecturer would benefit not only from knowing such general information, but also from a deeper
understanding of the structure of, for example, education in France in terms of the number of years of compulsory schooling, any streaming that occurred, and the nature of assessment (p. 36). de Bruin (2000) also provided some justification for this:

Lecturers in an international classroom stand before students who have come from a variety of education systems. The lecturers should have at least some awareness of these systems and at the same time should understand the background of their own system and how it differs from others. It is therefore useful to outline … how each system is rooted in a historical context and based on particular assumptions, and to point out how this explains differences and similarities that currently exist between systems. (de Bruin, 2000, p. 57)

An example of a resource for understanding different education systems

An example of a useful resource for lecturers on education systems in other countries is the Country Education Profiles (CEPs) which are produced by Australian Education International (AEI) through the National Office of Overseas Skills Recognition (NOOSR). The CEPs describe the education systems of over 100 countries in detail. As an example, Table B.4 provides an idea of the detail available in the publication on Singapore’s education system. The CEPs are a one-stop shop for understanding the main features of education systems in other countries. Of course, another sound reason for a lecturer to be knowledgeable about education systems in other countries is to facilitate credit transfer arrangements. Although not every lecturer in the Australian tertiary sector would be involved in such work, most departments would determine the specifics of credit transfer for their academic programs, as well as assessing the suitability of postgraduate applicants. This is despite the bulk of admissions in Australian institutions most likely being handled by
centralised administrative departments. The CEP for Singapore also contains a detailed flowchart of that country’s education system (see Figure B.1).

**Table B.4 Topics covered by the Country Education Profile for Singapore**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Singapore</td>
<td>Geography, demography, and history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The education system</td>
<td>History and current characteristics (for example, medium of instruction, structure, administration and finance, private education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School education</td>
<td>Structure and characteristics of primary, secondary, and pre-university education, as well as ‘other’ (foreign curriculum) schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and vocational education</td>
<td>Structure and characteristics of institutions and qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>Structure and characteristics of teacher education in Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Structure and characteristics of institutions and qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading systems</td>
<td>An outline of the percentage and letter grades used in senior secondary schools and polytechnics, plus notes on the grading systems used at institutes and universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative standing of tertiary institutions</td>
<td>Commentary on the funding of education, level of resources, competition for places, and general standard of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Commentary on the emphasis placed on the use of examinations, the high level of English, and the fact that post-secondary qualifications tend to reflect the needs of industry and commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment guidelines</td>
<td>Suggestions for determining how a qualification from Singapore fits into the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Comment on the structure & location of this qualification*

Although criteria for Skills and Attitude that would correspond to the single criterion listed in the Knowledge category in this qualification can be imagined, they are absent from the Profile. In addition, whilst the single criterion certainly has a place in the Profile, it (and therefore, this qualification) could easily be subsumed into ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’
Figure B.1  Outline of Singapore’s education system
(Source. NOOSR, 1996, p. 36)
for expediency, especially given that Teekens’s (2000d) commentary that accompanies ‘Qualification 7 (Q7): Knowledge of foreign education systems’ is more suited to understanding differences in student attitude and performance than, for example, facilitating credit transfer arrangements. This criterion also compliments other criteria which presently exist in ‘Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles’. See, for example, criterion Q4 K1 and criterion Q4 K4 in Table 2.8 in Chapter II.

Qualification 8 (Q8): Knowledge of the international labour market

Table B.5 displays the two criteria for this qualification. This qualification asks lecturers to be aware of the characteristics of the international labour market and how their profession is situated in other countries. The following section deals with the main themes of this qualification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8 K1 The lecturer should be aware of the important international differences on [sic] the labour market as regards qualifications, professional recognition, and possible periods of probation for the specific profession or job for which the students are preparing themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 K2 The lecturer should know the general features of the profession in other countries (for example, the role of the chemist in the pharmacy or drugstore)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


University education & the international labour market

The call for lecturers to have an awareness of the international labour market is something that is new in the literature, particularly in terms of the ends to which it is directed in the Profile. To this point in time, in Australia at least, an understanding
of foreign labour markets has largely been the responsibility of international students themselves, in the sense of its being a *caveat emptor* regarding future employment. For instance, the Singaporean Ministry of Education advised students to find out before commencing their studies whether particular overseas degrees are acceptable for work in Singapore (Singapore Government, 2005, Tip 2, ¶ 4 & 5). The Singapore Professional Engineers Board, for example, recognises engineering degrees in particular fields from only some Australian universities which offer engineering specialisations (Singapore Government, 2005b, The Schedule). What is interesting about Teekens’s (2000d) commentary which accompanies this qualification is the suggestion that lecturers may need to alter curricula in the international classroom to satisfy the needs of particular students in relation to the professional requirements of overseas labour markets. This radical multi-reference grid curricula approach exemplifies the hyperglobalist thinking behind the international classroom.

It is not difficult to understand why the close relationship between curricula and career preparation is seen to have implications for teaching in the international classroom (Teekens, 2000d, p. 37). According to O’Sullivan (1999), “almost all educational institutions are geared towards teaching the skills necessary for dealing with the needs of the consumer-industrial phase of this … period” (p. 47). In support of this claim, Teekens (2000d) observed that “increasingly, qualifications in higher education are linked to the workplace and the development of competencies” (p. 37). Dunkerley and Wai (2001) also stated that currently there was a worldwide trend in higher education for curricula in many disciplines to be directly influenced by employer and work-based needs (p. 3). This change in focus is contextualised by
university education moving from an elitist model to one of mass higher education in the last few decades of the twentieth century. One of the outcomes of the new model, according to Dunkerley and Wai (2001), was the displacement of academic skills in favour of what O’Sullivan (1999) described as more practical skills to meet the needs of business and industry (p. 45). In the case of Australia, for example, De Fazio (1999) said that whilst Australian universities conventionally were academically-oriented and TAFE institutes were by tradition vocationally-oriented, the distinction was no longer so clear cut due to universities introducing “new courses and course plans” (p. 1).

The workplace which meets the needs of what O’Sullivan (1999) described as the “global competitive marketplace” (p. 45) is no longer thought of in terms of local or national boundaries. Instead, the internationalisation of the labour market implies a global perspective (Divis, 2000, p. 80). Universities are keenly aware of the importance of making their qualifications relevant to the global marketplace, hence, for example, the statements that Australian qualifications “are respected internationally when seeking employment” (Australian Government, 2005a, Are Australian qualifications recognised in my home country?) and that they help international students “launch their careers around the world” (Australian Government, 2005b, Universities, ¶ 2). For whatever reasons international students choose to study overseas, the majority ultimately intend to use their university education for employment purposes. As noted in Chapter I, close to one in every four tertiary students in Australian higher education is an international student. Many will look for work in their home country or the global marketplace after completion of
their academic program(s). Further, some Australian students are likely to seek work overseas. To this end, lecturers can no longer consider the local or national as the extent of the realm of portability for the degrees awarded from academic programs that they teach. As noted by Beare and Slaughter (1995), “educational qualifications have, in short, have become an international currency” (p. 30). It makes sense, then, for lecturers to have an understanding of how the academic or professional study program taught by their department fits into the bigger picture of the global marketplace. How they might obtain this knowledge is not made explicit in the Profile but, upon first inspection, the two criteria as they are presented in Table B.5 do seem pertinent for lecturers, given the developing international labour market. What is less known is how this qualification would be manifested in practice in the way that is intended for the international classroom in parts of Western Europe, that is, having curricula support the specific requirements of vocations in other countries. At the very least, it implies a considerable allocation of resources and expertise.

Qualification 9 (Q9): Personal qualities

Table B.6 lists the three criteria of this qualification. The first eight of the Profile’s qualifications describe the ideal lecturer as a person with a positive disposition who is both understanding and accepting of cultural difference and has a comprehensive knowledge and skill set to meet the teaching and learning demands of the international classroom. The ninth qualification of ‘Personal qualities’ is a reflection of the demanding nature of the previous eight qualifications as well as the work associated with the international classroom. This qualification is perhaps the most awkward to represent in the Australian education setting. This is because the
three Skills criteria that comprise the qualification pertain directly to the way the international classroom operates in parts of Western Europe, that is, as a stream of education separate from the national stream, where lecturers generally teach across both streams. The intent of this qualification, therefore, is about managing workloads across the two streams. Despite the fact that there is no equivalent system in Australian higher education, this qualification does canvass some important issues for Australian lecturers who teach international students and would ideally be explored by further research. The following sections deal with the main themes of this qualification.

Table B.6 Criteria of Qualification 9 (Q9): Personal qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9 S1</td>
<td>The lecturer must be able to work efficiently within the limits of the programmes involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 S2</td>
<td>The lecturer must be able to cope with the stress caused by the nature of the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 S3</td>
<td>The lecturer should be able to place the internationalization of education in its proper perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Workload issues

Upon first inspection criterion Q9 S1 as it is stated in Table B.6 could well apply to the Australian context, for it would be a basic expectation that lecturers would work efficiently within whatever limits existed for their academic programs. It lacks relevance to the Australian context, however, due to the particular way that it applies to the lecturer’s role in the international classroom in parts of Western Europe. As previously noted, Peters (2000) described the international classroom as one of two parallel streams of education within individual institutions (p. 91), that is, there were international classrooms (English speaking) and there were national
classrooms (for example, Dutch speaking). Peters (2000) also stated that “international programmes do not, as a rule, require the entire attention of a full-time lecturer” (p. 98). This, when considered along with Teekens’s (2000d) observation that “sometimes lecturers devote too much time to their international work” (p. 38), indicates the likelihood that lecturers divide their time between international and national classroom duties and responsibilities. Whilst this dual role would present a significant challenge, given that there is no such separation in Australian universities, criterion Q9 S1 is less relevant to Australian lecturers. What remains relevant, however, is the impact of international students on lecturers in terms of workload.

Teekens (2000d) believed that the sort of work required by the international classroom would occasionally be stressful (p. 37). To this end, criterion Q9 S2 in Table B.6 addressed the need for lecturers to be able to cope with stress caused by the nature of the work. Although this criterion is listed as a skill, it is presented as a general statement rather than a specific skill or strategy. That ‘the lecturer must be able to cope with the stress caused by the nature of the work’ is a desirable state of affairs. What skills might enable this to be achieved is not made explicit in the Profile. At least it recognises the likely stresses associated with work in the international classroom. In general, there is some recognition that a lecturer’s work can be stressful. For example, Ramsden (2003) noted that university teachers were working harder than ever before due to the tertiary setting becoming more businesslike and accountable (p. 1). Race (2001), too, said that heavier workloads seem to have become a way of life for most lecturers and that this was unlikely to change. Race (2001) also suggested that stress was often the result of a greater
workload, plus diversification in the student body. In particular, the latter meant that lecturers had to respond to “an ever-widening range of requirements and expectations” (Race, 2001, p. 223). Race (2001) believed that lecturers had to achieve a balance between the competing activities of teaching, research and administration and that it was important for them to manage their workload and stress (p. 222). Martin (1999) also noted that the massification of higher education not only meant more students, but a greater diversity in their backgrounds and previous educational experiences (p. 8). This, along with universities conforming to business-like practices to enhance efficiency, meant that Australian academics were working harder and had little time to address the needs of diverse groups of students (p. 1). Tierney and McInnes (2001) reported that Australian academics were taking on increasing workloads in a climate in which universities had to make up for decreasing amounts of public funding:

A drastic reduction in government funding has necessitated calls for dramatic changes in Australian tertiary education. There has been a concomitant scramble to recover funds, primarily from capturing full-fee tuition from Asian students. However, in surveys and interviews of academic staff over the last year we have found great concern about the future. Faculty have experienced an almost psychic exhaustion with the increase in workloads while they try to serve new revenue-generating populations, improve the quality of the institution, and maintain a viable research capacity. (Tierney & McInnes, 2001, ¶ 2)

Placing internationalisation in perspective

Criterion Q9 S3 in Table B.6 is particularly interesting. Its intent most probably resonates with that of criterion Q9 S1, that is, lecturers who share their time between the international and national classrooms should be able to place internationalisation in its proper perspective, as they move from one environment to
the other. Despite the fact that this raises the question of the role of internationalisation in local language classrooms in parts of Western Europe, the criterion as it is presented is remarkably poignant for the Australian context. Whilst internationalisation is a buzzword that is liberally bandied around in the tertiary environment in Australia, it would be very interesting to know what it means to individual lecturers as they go about their daily work. Kelly (2000) observed that although many faculties in Australian universities were being urged to internationalise their curriculum, “this is rarely a welcome message, because most academics have been given few opportunities to understand the context or terminology and less support to put these into practice” (p. 162).
APPENDIX C

OVERVIEW OF HOFSTEDE’S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS & RELATED CRITICISMS

An overview of each cultural dimension is presented below. Following this, a summary of the common criticisms of Hofstede’s work, along with his response to each criticism, is presented.

The five cultural dimensions

*Power Distance (PDI) dimension*

Hofstede (2001) defined Power Distance as “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally” (p. 98). It is concerned with hierarchical relationships around inequality as manifested in, for example, physical and mental characteristics, social status and prestige, wealth, and laws, rights and rules. Hofstede (2001) claimed that the Power Distance Index (PDI) is a measure of the value that a society places on levels of interdependence *between* people versus dependence *on* people. Following are examples of societal norms that are associated with low and high PDI societies. In a low PDI society, all people have equal rights and are interdependent. Subordinates and superiors are from the same stock and the powerful try to appear less powerful than they are. The elderly are neither respected nor feared. The system is to blame for problems. Austria’s score of 11 was the lowest PDI. Australia’s PDI of 36 positioned it towards the lower end of the PDI (Hofstede, 2001, p. 87). In contrast, most people in a high PDI society will be dependent on an independent, powerful, and privileged few. Subordinates and superiors view each
other as very different types of people and those in power appear as powerful as possible. Older people are respected and feared. The underdog is to blame for problems (Hofstede, 2001, p. 98). The country with the highest PDI was Malaysia with 104. The PDIs for Hong Kong, Indonesia, and Singapore were 68, 78, and 74 respectively (towards the higher end of the PDI) (Hofstede, 2001, p. 87). China’s PDI was 80 (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 43). Together, students from Malaysia, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Singapore, and China form a significant portion of the international student population in Australia. The PDI difference between Australia and these source countries, therefore, might indicate something to lecturers in terms of likely differences in behaviour and expectations towards, for example, education.

**Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) dimension**

Hofstede (2001) characterised this dimension as “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations” (p. 161). Whilst the future is inherently uncertain for all people around the world, different societies cope with unstructured situations in different ways. For example, low Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) societies are more comfortable with ambiguity, chaos, novelty, and convenience. Such societies are open to change and new ideas and have a greater tolerance for diversity. They respond to difference with curiosity. Each day is taken as it comes and life is characterised by a sense of ease, lower stress and less anxiety. On the other hand, high UAI societies manage uncertainty by having rules that reflect clarity, structure, and purity. These societies are conservative and have a fear of foreignness. They perceive difference to be dangerous. Each day poses a threat of some kind which must be overcome and there is a higher level of
stress, anxiety and neuroticism (Hofstede, 2001, pp. 160-161). Singapore’s score of 8 was the lowest UAI. Greece had the highest score with 112. Australia scored 51, whilst Indonesia, Malaysia, and Hong Kong scored 48, 36, and 29 respectively (Hofstede, 2001, p. 151). China’s UAI was 30 (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 169).

*Individualism versus Collectivism (IDV) dimension*

Hofstede (2001) suggested that although humans are social beings, different societies show different degrees of gregariousness and this is reflected in societal norms, social institutions, and people’s “mental programming” (pp. 209-210). Hofstede (2001) provided a definition of individualism and collectivism:

> Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are loose: Everyone is expected to look after him/herself and her/his immediate family only. Collectivism stands for a society in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people’s lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. (Hofstede, 2001, p. 225)

This dimension focuses on the degree to which a society reinforces individual or collective achievement and how this is reflected in interpersonal relationships. The following are some examples of societal norms that are associated with both poles. A society with a low Individualism Index (IDV) is one in which the collectivity orientation leads to ‘we’ consciousness that places an emphasis on belonging. Identity is derived from a person’s place in the social system. There is emotional dependence on institutions and organisations and shame is a strong social norm. Value standards differ for in-groups and out-groups. Loyalty to one’s family guarantees protection. Low IDV societies are described as being traditional in their
outlook. Conversely, high IDV societies exhibit an ‘I’ consciousness where the emphasis is on individual initiative and achievement. Identity is perceived in terms of the individual. There is emotional independence from institutions and organisations and guilt is a strong social norm, both in terms of avoidance and as a response to transgressions. Value standards are universal. Individuals are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate family. High IDV societies are classified as modern or postmodern (Hofstede, 2001, p. 227). Australia’s IDV score of 90 was second only to the US with 91. Hong Kong had an IDV score of 25, Indonesia scored 14, Malaysia scored 26, and Singapore scored 20 (Hofstede, 2001, p. 215). China’s IDV was 20 (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 79). Guatamala had the lowest IDV score with 6 (Hofstede, 2001, p. 215). Once again, there are large differences between the Australian IDV score and those of the Asian countries.

**Masculinity versus Femininity (MAS) dimension**

Hofstede (2001) used the Masculinity Index (MAS) to indicate how a particular national culture coped with the duality of the sexes, in terms of emotional and social roles of males and females. He said these were relatively arbitrary choices that were mediated by cultural norms and traditions (p. 280) which imbued gender-related values and behaviours into individuals from an early age (p. 300). Hofstede (2001) defined Masculinity and Femininity as opposing two poles:

- **Masculinity** stands for a society in which social gender roles are clearly distinct: Men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success; women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life.
- **Femininity** stands for a society in which social gender roles overlap: Both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life. (Hofstede, 2001, p. 297)
The following societal norms reflect the two poles. Low MAS societies have a relationship orientation. ‘Small and slow’ are beautiful. The stress is on who you are and quality of life and people are important. People work in order to live. Modesty is a virtue both for men and women and the values of both hardly differ. Females are treated equally to males in all aspects. There is sympathy for the weak. Conversely, in high MAS societies, an ego orientation is the norm. ‘Big and fast’ are beautiful. The stress is on what you do and people live in order to work. Money and material things are desirable. Men are expected to be (and women may be) assertive and ambitious. Values of men and women are very different. There is a great degree of gender differentiation. High MAS societies have sympathy for the strong (Hofstede, 2001, pp. 298-299). Sweden’s MAS score of 5 was the lowest. Japan had the highest MAS score with 95. Australia scored 61, whilst Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore scored 57, 46, 50, and 48 respectively (Hofstede, 2001, p. 286). China scored 66 (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 120).

*Long-versus Short-Term Orientation (LTO) dimension*

This fifth dimension of national cultures was developed in the mid-1980s in response to Bond’s Chinese Value Survey (CVS) that was derived from values put forward by Chinese scholars. Hofstede (2001) described this independent (and non-Western) dimension as follows:

Long Term Orientation stands for the fostering of virtues oriented towards future rewards, in particular, perseverance and thrift. Its opposite pole, Short Term Orientation, stands for the fostering of virtues related to the past and present, in particular, respect for tradition, preservation of ‘face’ and fulfilling social obligations. (Hofstede, 2001, p. 359)
Upon first inspection, both poles do not seem as antithetical to each other as do the opposing poles of the other four dimensions. Hofstede (2001) suggested that it would not be surprising that Western readers would find the values in this dimension puzzling, because they reflect the practical ethics-based teachings of Kong Ze (Confucius) (p. 351). Altogether, 23 countries appeared on the original Long-Term Orientation Index (LTO). In the meantime, another 16 countries have been added. In terms of people’s responses to the questionnaire that tested this dimension, Western countries scored on the low side of the LTO, whilst Eastern countries scored highly (Hofstede, 2001, p. 351).

Examples of norms from a low LTO, or a short-term oriented, society are an expectation of immediate gratification of needs, sacrosanct traditions, short-term values like social consumption, spending, the bottom line, analytic thinking (derived from the pursuit of Western Truth), and fuzzy problem-solving. These contrast against examples of norms from a high LTO society such as an acceptance of deferred gratification, adaptable traditions, long-term values such as frugality and perseverance, saving and investing, creating a strong market position, synthetic thinking (derived from the pursuit of Eastern Virtue), and structured problem-solving (Hofstede, 2001, p. 367). The country with the highest LTO score was China with 118. Pakistan had the lowest with 23. Australia’s LTO score was 31, whilst Hong Kong scored 96, and Singapore scored 48 (Hofstede, 2001, p. 356).
Common criticisms of Hofstede’s work

Hofstede (2001) outlined five common criticisms of his work and responded to each one (see Table C.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Hofstede’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys are not a suitable way of measuring cultural differences</td>
<td>They should not be the only way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nations are not the best units for studying cultures</td>
<td>True, but they are usually the only kinds of units available for comparison, and they are better than nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A study of the subsidiaries of one company cannot provide information about entire national cultures</td>
<td>What were measured were differences between national cultures. Any set of functionally equivalent samples from national populations can supply information about such differences … The extensive validation … show[s] that the country scores obtained correlated highly with all other kinds of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IBM data are old and therefore obsolete</td>
<td>The dimensions found are assumed to have centuries-old roots; only data that remained stable across two subsequent surveys were maintained, and they have since been validated against all kinds of external measurements; and recent replications show no loss of validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or five dimensions are not enough</td>
<td>Additional dimensions should be both conceptually and statistically independent from the five dimensions already defined and should be validated by significant correlations with conceptually related external measures; candidates are welcome to apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Tabulated from text in Hofstede (2001, p. 73).*
APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE ON CULTURE SHOCK

For many people, culture shock or acculturative stress is part of the process of adjusting to life in a new environment. Berry and Sam (1997) suggested that this condition is symptomatic of conflict that is generated by the inability of a person’s repertoire of existing social skills and coping mechanisms to suit the characteristics and demands of the new environment (p. 298). Familiar signs and symbols of social interaction such as customs, gestures, facial expressions, and words no longer convey the same sorts of messages as they did in a person’s home country and disorientation is often the result (Mezger, 1992, p. 165). Hofstede (2001) outlined the four phases associated with acculturation (see Figure D.1). Some writers refer to the acculturation curve as the \(U\) or \(W\) curve (for example, see Mezger, 1992, pp. 168-169; Weaver, 1998, p. 187; Hart, 2002).

In Hofstede’s (2001) view, Phase 1, or the honeymoon period, generally reflected the excitement of travel and novelty of living in a new place. Phase 2 was the period of conflict where there was a mismatch between the individual’s repertoire of social and coping skills and the demands of the new culture. Berry and Sam (1997) said that for most people, this presented only moderate difficulties (p. 298). Hofstede (2001) indicated that for some, however, the physical and social symptoms were severe and sometimes led to suicide (p. 426). In Phase 3, the individual was increasingly confident and able to function successfully in the new environment. According to Hofstede (2001), they would have adopted some local practices and
become integrated into a new social network (p. 426). Hofstede (2001) described three different states in Phase 4 (see a, b, and c in Figure D.1). In the case of 4a, the individual felt alienated and discriminated against (compared to life in their home country), despite having been in the foreign environment for some time. In 4b, life was “just as good as before” (p. 426) the move. For Hofstede (2001), this was a state of “bicultural” (p. 426) adaptation. In 4c, the individual had abandoned much of their cultural heritage and had “gone native – he or she has become more Roman than the Romans” (Hofstede, 2001, p. 426). Of interest, whilst Hofstede (2001) took this to be a positive response, Pedersen (1988) saw “going native” (p. 58) as a defensive strategy to deal with culture shock.

*Figure D.1* The acculturation curve
(Source. Hofstede, 2001, p. 426)
Culture shock or acculturative stress has long been known to be part of the experience of most international students. Authors whose findings supported this view include Abbott (1997), Ballard and Clanchy (1997), Chapdelaine and Alexitch (2004), Cullingford and Gunn (2005), Dawson and Conti-Bekkers (2002), Doyle, Helms, and Westrup (2004), Heyward (2002), Huchatz (1997), Kenyon and Amrapala (1991), and Ramburuth (2001). Ballard and Clanchy (1997) noted that the adjustments that most international students have to make to their new surroundings will lead them to experience varying degrees of culture shock and homesickness. They suggested that this was a “predictable problem” (p. 4), particularly for international students from a “close-knit family tradition” (p. 4). De Fazio (1999) said that even students from the UK and the USA were prone to experiencing culture shock in Australia (p. 24).

Mezger (1992) stated that the first few months for international students in the new host country was most likely to be characterised by stress, anxiety, and a temporary reduction in the ability to cope (p. 165). Kenyon and Amrapala (1991) reported that culture shock manifested itself in a variety of short- to medium-term symptoms ranging from physical illness and insomnia to lack of responsiveness in teaching situations and general lack of participation in teaching activities (pp. 6-14). Mezger (1992) stated that students suffering from culture shock could present as confused, disorientated, overwhelmed, nervous, excessively tired, apathetic, depressed, and unwilling to participate. They could also be over reactive, lacking in concentration, frustrated, and wanting to drop out and leave the country (p. 166). Abbott (1997) said this reduced capacity to function lasted hours, days, or months,
depending upon the individual (p. 106). Mezger (1992) provided lecturers with a number of strategies to support and assist students suffering from culture shock:

- Encouragement of friendship networks with local students. For example, through student associations and student social events.
- Provision of peer pairing programs.
- Host family and community link programs.
- Class activities which encourage mixing between local and international students. For example, structured class introductions at beginning of the year and group tasks in class.
- Class projects outside class time.
- Staff/student social activities.
- Creation of a friendly atmosphere.
- Clarification of students’ expectations.
- Clarification of Australian culture and cultural differences.
- Referral to counselling services. (Mezger, 1992, p. 167)

Schröder (2000) noted that new environmental, social, and educational conditions contributed to culture shock for international students. With regard to the new educational conditions, international students had to get used to the subject matter, different teaching methods and approaches, and (for many) a non-native language in an academic setting (p. 50). Indeed, it is clear that there are two aspects to culture shock for international students. One is the result of having to adjust to life in a new country and culture. The other is due to adjustments that are needed to adapt to the new academic subculture. This was referred to by Mezger (1992) as having three components: (1) institution shock: a reaction to difference at the broad level of the institution; (2) learning shock: a reaction to differences in learning and teaching approaches, the nature and function of assessment, and the roles of teachers and students; and (3) language shock: a reaction to the specific academic requirements of reading, writing, speaking, and listening (pp. 171-191). Ballard and Clanchy (1997) also reported that international students were likely to experience learning shock
after sitting through their first few lectures and tutorials, because of unfamiliar patterns of behaviour in the teaching and learning environment (p. 28).

Given that culture shock or acculturative stress will be experienced by most international students (Huchatz, 1997, p. 155; Mezger, 1992, p. 165), any revision of the Profile should incorporate it as a criterion.
APPENDIX E

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO HEAD OF THE ALLIED HEALTH DEPARTMENT

[Name and contact details of Head of Allied Health teaching department suppressed]

1 July 2003

Dear [name suppressed],

I hold the position of Associate Professor in the School of Education at Flinders University.

This letter is to formally introduce Mr Gavin Sanderson who is a doctoral student in the School of Education at Flinders University. He is undertaking research leading to the production of a thesis on the impact of culture and difference on the internationalisation of curriculum processes in Australian universities. In brief, the research is a strength-based assessment of the ways in which lecturers are responding to operational and educational challenges and opportunities associated with teaching growing numbers of international students from diverse language and cultural backgrounds. Its prime objective is to understand the mechanisms by which lecturers are internationalising their work practices to facilitate effective learning across cultures.

I am aware that Gavin has been in contact with you informally about the research project and that you have given permission for him to gather data by means of questionnaire and interviews from lecturing staff associated with the Bachelor of [degree name suppressed] and the Master of [degree name suppressed] programs.

The main points to emphasise at this stage are:

- This research project has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee. The Secretary of this Committee can be contacted on 8201-5466 (tel), 8201-2035 (fax), or by e-mail at <Lesley.Wyndram@flinders.edu.au>. For greater detail of the research project’s parameters, please refer to the copy of the ‘Application for Approval of Social or Behavioural Research Involving Human Subjects’ (see Attachment 1 of this correspondence).

In anticipation that you will formally give permission to proceed, the following dot points address the practicalities of the research project:

- Can you please nominate a contact person in your Department (for example, an Administrative Officer) who Gavin can liaise with on an on-going basis to help manage the administrative requirements of the project?
• Your assistance is sought to arrange for a list of contact details to be produced for all full- and part-time teaching staff, associated with the Bachelor of [degree name suppressed] and Master of [degree name suppressed] programs. This list will enable the distribution of the questionnaire and associated documents. Indeed, it would be appreciated if the Administrative Officer would distribute the questionnaire to the academic staff. Gavin can be invoiced, if this incurs a cost.

• Can you please produce a short letter on your letterhead which iterates your support for the project and encourages all those contacted to participate? Gavin will make copies as needed and include them with the materials which will be posted to the academic staff. Would you mind including this letter in the posting of your written permission which allows Gavin to recruit lecturers in your department? I will pass it to him.

• It is envisaged that the questionnaire will be distributed by mail at the end of August 2003. The questionnaires will be returned to the School of Education office by means of a stamped, addressed envelope which will be provided in the initial posting.

• By means of the questionnaire, staff will be invited to indicate if they will volunteer for interviews (beginning late in semester II, 2003) to elaborate on the research themes. Interviewees will be contacted in second semester to organise meetings in a neutral and private venue at [university location details suppressed]. Gavin will liaise with the Administrative Officer to locate such a room. At the initial meeting, Gavin will produce his student card, which carries a photograph, as proof of identity. Each interview will be taped on audio cassette to assist in the recording and management of data. The names or identities of participants will not be revealed in any transcripts. Should it be necessary to make the recording available to administrative assistants for transcription, such persons will be advised of the requirement that names or identities are not to be revealed and that the confidentiality of the material is respected and maintained. Further, each interviewee will have the opportunity to read the transcripts of their interviews. Before the material is used as data, interviewees have the opportunity to confirm if they are satisfied that it is a true record of what they reported and that they are happy (or otherwise) to release the data for inclusion in the thesis.

• Throughout the questionnaire and interview process, participants are entirely free to discontinue their participation at any time or to decline to answer particular questions.

• Anonymity and confidentiality assurances for participants are guaranteed. The research framework suppresses the identities of individuals in your Department who participate in the research, and treats their comments and opinions as confidential.

• To maintain confidentiality and anonymity, the Bachelor of [degree name suppressed] and the Master of [degree name suppressed] will not be named as such in the publication of the thesis (or associated papers). Instead, they will
be referred to as “undergraduate and postgraduate coursework allied health programs.” This is done to protect your staff. For similar reasons, the name of your university will be suppressed throughout the thesis.

- Note that Gavin has included your details in a ‘debriefing information’ sheet as a contact person for staff involved in the research, should they have any concerns or negative experiences they want to relate to you as a participant in the research process (see Attachment 2 of this correspondence).

[Name suppressed], thank you in anticipation for your co-operation and assistance. If you have any questions relating to this correspondence or the project in general, please feel free to direct them to either myself or Gavin. Pending a favourable written response from you, Gavin will be in touch to initiate the research proceedings.

Yours sincerely,

Bob Teasdale

Attachment 1
[Specific detail of the ‘Application for Approval of Social or Behavioural Research Involving Human Subjects’ – not provided in this appendix for reasons of anonymity and confidentiality].

Attachment 2
Sample of the debriefing information form that was distributed to all academic staff in the allied health teaching department:

Debriefing avenues available to participants

Participation in any research carries with it the possibility of some unforeseen risks to all parties, however unlikely it might initially seem. Whilst the researcher has worked hard to satisfy the ethical dimensions of the research, the following advice and information is presented so that you can deal with any negative experiences.

For confidential comments about the research questions and themes, or any direct contact that you have with the researcher, contact the researcher’s supervisors and/or the Head of the [name of department suppressed]:

Flinders University
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Robert Teasdale
tel: 8201 2330, fax: 8201 3184, email: robert.teasdale@flinders.edu.au

Co-supervisor: Dr Shirley Yates
tel: 8201 3360, fax: 8201 3184, email: shirley.yates@flinders.edu.au
Head of [allied health] department
[Name suppressed]
tel: [suppressed], fax: [suppressed], email: [suppressed]

For any confidential, professional counselling you may require as a result of your participation in this research project:

[Name of university suppressed]
Counselling Services [pseudonym] for staff
[Address suppressed]
[Telephone suppressed]
APPENDIX F

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO ACADEMIC STAFF IN THE ALLIED HEALTH DEPARTMENT

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Sir/Madam,

This letter is to introduce Mr Gavin Sanderson who is a doctoral student in the School of Education at Flinders University. He is undertaking research leading to a thesis on the internationalisation of curriculum processes in Australian higher education. The research is concerned with the ways in which lecturers are responding to educational challenges and opportunities associated with teaching international students from diverse language and cultural backgrounds.

Gavin is inviting you to complete the accompanying questionnaire, which should take between 15-30 minutes. The stamped, addressed envelope can be used to post the completed questionnaire to the School of Education office. Further, Gavin would like to interview you about certain aspects of the research topic. He would be most grateful if you would volunteer for between four and six 60 minute interviews which will begin towards the end of Semester 2 of 2003, in an office on your campus. Although this is a significant commitment, the interviews may well be spaced over 12 months. If you are willing to be interviewed, please provide your consent and contact details on the second page of the questionnaire, titled “Interview Information Sheet / Consent Form for Interview.”

Any information you provide will be treated in the strictest confidence. No participant will be individually identifiable in the resulting thesis, or in any reports or other publications relating to the thesis. In addition, you are entirely free to decline to answer particular questions or discontinue your participation at any time. Any enquiries concerning this project should be directed to me at the contact details which are listed at the top of this letter. This research project has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee. The Secretary of the Committee can be contacted on 8201-5466 (tel), 8201-2035 (fax), or by e-mail at Lesley.Wyndram@flinders.edu.au. In addition, the project complies with the requirements of the Human Research Ethics Committee at Flinders University.

Thank you for your attention and assistance. I now invite you to turn your attention to the accompanying questionnaire.

Yours sincerely,

G R Teasdale
Director, Flinders University Institute of International Education
APPENDIX G

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM HEAD OF THE ALLIED HEALTH DEPARTMENT

[Contact details for the allied health department and the university have been suppressed]

01 July 2003

Academic staff
[Name of department suppressed]
[Name of university suppressed]

Dear All,

With this letter you will find information about an important research project being undertaken by Mr Gavin Sanderson. This project seeks to explore and understand the experiences of academic staff in relation to the internationalisation of teaching in higher education in Australia. The [name of department suppressed] is strongly committed to supporting effective learning for students from diverse language and cultural backgrounds. I believe that this project will provide important information that will help us reflect on and strengthen our teaching practice in this area. You will be asked to complete a short questionnaire and then, if you wish, to volunteer for a series of interviews.

This project has my full support and I would encourage you to participate. I have seen a detailed ethics proposal for the project which has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee. You can be confident that your responses will be anonymous. All reported information from the interviews will also be anonymous and treated in the strictest confidence. In addition, [name of university] and [name of department] will not be identified in the thesis or related papers. As you all know, I place very high value on evidence-based practice and the research that underpins such practice. It is very important that we support research not just in [name of discipline] but in other disciplines as well. As current or future researchers I also believe we have an obligation to be participants when given the opportunity. Please give your support to this important project.

Best wishes

(Signature)

[Name suppressed]
Head
[Name of university and department suppressed]
APPENDIX H

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear academic staff member,

Thank you for taking the time to fill in the attached questionnaire. It should take 15 minutes to complete. Your comments will be treated confidentially and your anonymity is guaranteed.

INSTRUCTIONS

• There are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire items are seeking some personal details and experiences.

• Please write clearly wherever a written response is required.

• When you choose a response that requires a selection, please ensure that you tick is placed wholly within the particular box. In the following two examples, for instance, if you are female and you have between five and nine contact hours per week during semester, the ticks would be placed as such:

A. What is your gender? (please tick)  Female ✓  Male □

J. How many student contact hours do you have per week during semester? (For example, in lectures, workshops, tutorials, out-of-class meetings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>≤ 4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>≥ 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• An important part of the research project is based on interview data. I would like to invite you to participate in four to six confidential, one-on-one interviews of approximately one hour duration for each. I appreciate that you have a busy schedule but if you are willing to assist, please ensure that you provide your informed consent and include your contact details on the page following the questionnaire.

• Please use the reply-paid envelope to post the completed questionnaire to me at the School of Education at Flinders University. It would be greatly appreciated if you can return the questionnaire by the beginning of August 2003.

Yours sincerely,

Gavin Sanderson
Research Higher Degree Student
Your non-identifiable biographical information. Note that \( \leq \) less than or equal to, and \( \geq \) greater than or equal to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. What is your gender? (please tick)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. What age range are you in? (please tick)</td>
<td>( \leq 25) yrs</td>
<td>26-35 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. What is your nationality? (please tick)</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Other(s) (please list): ______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Type of employment (please tick)</td>
<td>Contract (part or full-time)</td>
<td>Tenured (part or full-time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Academic classification (please tick)</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Associate Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Do you speak at least one language other than English? (please tick)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what language(s)? ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. What is the highest tertiary qualification you have either completed, or is in progress? (please tick)</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Do you have any formal tertiary qualifications in education (completed, or in progress)? (please tick)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what qualification(s)? _______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each question below, please tick the Value or Value Range to its right which best indicates your experience.

| I. How many student contact hours do you have per week during semester? (For example, in lectures, workshops, tutorials, out-of-class meetings) | \( \leq 4 \) | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | \( \geq 20 \) |
| J. As a full-time equivalent, how many years have you been teaching at the tertiary level? | \( \leq 1 \) | 2-5 | 6-9 | 10-19 | \( \geq 20 \) |
| K. Number of hours that you work per week during semester (at your university and at home) | \( \leq 9 \) | 10-19 | 20-39 | 40-49 | \( \geq 50 \) |
| L. The percentage of international students in your lectures, tutorials, workshops or seminars | \( \leq 9\% \) | 10-19\% | 20-29\% | 30-39\% | \( \geq 40\% \) |
| M. Home country of most of your international students (1 = largest group, 2 = second largest group, 3 = third largest group) | 1/ _____________________ | 2/ _____________________ | 3/ _____________________ |
| N. Are you willing to participate in a series of confidential interviews to explore your experiences in relation to teaching international students? (please tick) | Yes | No |

*If Yes, please fill in the consent and contact details on the following page*
Interview Information Sheet / Consent Form for Interview

Interview information
The interviews will follow up on general themes associated with your experiences in teaching international students. Interviewees will be contacted to organise a meeting in a private venue at the university. Each interview will take approximately 60 minutes. At the initial meeting, the researcher (Gavin Sanderson) will produce his student card, which carries a photograph, as proof of identity. The interviews will be a mix of structured and semi-structured questions. Each interview will be taped on audio cassette to assist in the recording and management of data. The names or identities of participants will not be revealed in any transcripts. Should it be necessary to make the recording available to secretarial assistants for transcription, they will be advised of the requirement that names or identities are not to be revealed and that the confidentiality of the material is to be respected and maintained. Interviewees will receive a written transcript of each interview. Before the material is used as data, they will have the opportunity to indicate their satisfaction that (1) it is a true record of what they reported, and (2) they are happy to release it for inclusion in the thesis and associated publications.

Please provide your details in the following fields to indicate your consent to be involved in the interviews:

I, ......................................................, being over the age of 18 years hereby consent to participate as requested in the interviews for the research project on the internationalisation of teaching in higher education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family name:</th>
<th>Given name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Telephone: | (business hours) | (mobile) |

Most frequently used email address:

1. I have read the information provided.
2. Details of procedures and any risks have been explained to my satisfaction.
3. I agree to my information and participation being recorded on cassette tape.
4. I am aware that I should retain the enclosed copy of this page for future reference.
5. I understand that:
   - I may not directly benefit from taking part in this research.
   - I am free to withdraw from the project at any time and am free to decline to answer particular questions.
   - While the information gained in this study will be published as explained, I will not be identified, and individual information will remain confidential.

Participant’s signature……………………………………  Date…………………...

I certify that, by means of the information contained on this page, I have explained the nature of the interviews to the volunteer and consider that she/he understands what is involved and freely consents to participation.

Researcher’s signature:  

Date: 01 July 2003
APPENDIX I

EMAIL TO STAFF IN THE ALLIED HEALTH DEPARTMENT TO ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION IN THE RESEARCH

To: [Name of designated liaison officer in the department]
From: Gavin Sanderson (gavin.sanderson@flinders.edu.au)
Date: 08 July 2003
Subject: Research participants

Hello [Name of designated liaison officer],

It was nice to meet you recently to discuss how you might be able to assist me with my research. Would you mind distributing the following email message on my behalf to all staff in the department?

Dear academic staff member,

My name is Gavin Sanderson and I am a research higher degree student in the School of Education at Flinders University. By now you should have received the introductory information about my research project. Sincere thanks to those who have returned the completed questionnaire already and have expressed an interest in taking part in the interviews. If you have not completed the questionnaire yet, I would like to encourage you to do so as soon as possible. Your confidential response will make a valuable contribution to the research being carried out on the internationalisation of teaching in higher education.

If you have not received (or have misplaced) the questionnaire, can you please let either myself or [name of designated liaison officer suppressed] know and we will arrange to send you one immediately.

Many thanks.

Gavin
## APPENDIX J

LOG OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULES WITH LECTURERS IN THE ALLIED HEALTH DEPARTMENT & RELATED INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Interview sequence</th>
<th>Interview date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Transcribed by</th>
<th>Transcription sent for member check</th>
<th>Permission to use transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thu 13 Nov 03, Noon</td>
<td>Bronwyn's office</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 09 Jan 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wed 12 Nov 03, 1pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 09 Jan 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tue 04 Oct 03, 4pm</td>
<td>Ursula's office</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 09 Jan 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tue 02 Dec 03, 10am</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 09 Jan 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fri 19 Dec 03, 10am</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 09 Jan 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thu 15 Jan 04, 10am</td>
<td>Samantha's office</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 06 Feb 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mon 02 Feb 04, 1pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Tue 16 Mar 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wed 04 Feb 04, Noon</td>
<td>Dahlia's office</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Tue 16 Mar 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wed 04 Feb 04, 2pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Tue 16 Mar 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thu 05 Feb 04, 11am</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Tue 16 Mar 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thu 05 Feb 04, 1pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Tue 16 Mar 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fri 06 Feb 04, Noon</td>
<td>Samantha's office</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Tue 16 Mar 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wed 07 Apr 04, Noon</td>
<td>Bronwyn's office</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Thu 06 May 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fri 26 Mar 04, 2pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 09 Apr 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wed 24 Mar 04, Noon</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 09 Apr 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wed 07 Apr 04, Noon</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Thu 06 May 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tue 06 Apr 04, 1pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Thu 06 May 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thu 11 Mar 04, 1pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fri 09 Apr 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tue 15 Jul 04, 1pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Tue 03 Aug 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wed 30 Jun 04, 1pm</td>
<td>Dahlia's office</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Thu 05 Aug 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tue 15 Jul 04, 11am</td>
<td>Ursula's office</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Tue 03 Aug 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wed 14 Jul 04, Noon</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Tue 03 Aug 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tue 08 Jul 04, Noon</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Fri 30 Jul 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fri 16 Jul 04, 11am</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Thu 05 Aug 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wed 03 Nov 04, Noon</td>
<td>Bronwyn's office</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Thu 16 Dec 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wed 08 Dec 04, Noon</td>
<td>Dahlia's office</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Thu 06 Jan 05</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fri 22 Oct 04, 1pm</td>
<td>Dahlia's office</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Mon 13 Dec 04</td>
<td>YES *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tue 02 Dec 04, 2pm</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Fri 17 Dec 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wed 03 Nov 04, Noon</td>
<td>Seminar Room</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Thu 16 Dec 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thu 18 Nov 04, 1pm</td>
<td>Samantha's office</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Thu 16 Dec 04</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mon 10 Jan 05, Noon</td>
<td>Bronwyn's office</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Fri 28 Jan 05</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thu 13 Jan 05, Noon</td>
<td>Ursula's office</td>
<td>Pam Webb</td>
<td>Thu 27 Jan 05</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1. * = some confidential information omitted at the request of the interviewee.

Total number of interviews: 32
APPENDIX K

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONAL TRANSCRIBER

Verbatim Transcript Conventions
The verbatim transcripts require the following format:

- Two full stops after a word indicate an unfinished word or sentence which is quickly supplanted by a further statement. For example, “Cos I don’t.. I’m not involved”

- Emphasised words or phrases are noted. For example, if the word ‘know’ is emphasised in “I know why we put so much emphasis on it for our students”, then the sentence will appear as “I know [speaker’s emphasis] why we put so much emphasis on it for our students”

- Non-verbal characteristics of interviews like laughing and pauses of greater than one second are presented as (laugh) and (pause) in the transcript.

- If a word or words cannot be discerned from the audio recording of the interview, then this will be indicated by either (indiscernible word) where there is no idea of what the statement is, or (indiscernible word, possibly did not do) to indicate words possibly used.

- Include utterances such as “ah”, “um”, “hmm”, and “er.”

Ethical Considerations
All research participants have been advised that the following anonymity and confidentiality measures will be taken with regard to their participation in the research investigation:

- The university and its departments will be de-identified;
- The name of their department will be de-identified;
- Pseudonyms will be used in place of all real names;
- Their interview material will remain confidential; and
- If professional transcription services are used, the transcriber will have to agree to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality measures outlined above.

As a provider of professional transcription services, you are obliged to comply with and respect the anonymity and confidentiality measures that are built into this research investigation. Please provide your signature below to indicate your agreement with these conditions.

Signatory 1:  

___________________________

Miss Pam Webb

Date: ____________

NOTE: Signatory 1 signed in the presence of Signatory 2
APPENDIX L

DEMONSTRATION OF MEMBER CHECKING PROCESS

Consent to use information from the Interview Transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym allocated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES REGARDING THE INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT AND ANONYMITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY MEASURES:

1/ The interview transcript

- The interviews have been transcribed verbatim. At times, verbatim transcripts can read awkwardly. Please do not worry about the sentence structure or the grammar as they appear in the transcript. Unfinished sentences are denoted by two full stops and a space before the start of the next utterance.

- The researcher has indicated where words cannot be clearly heard on the audio tape. These are marked with ‘indiscernible word’. Most times this is accompanied by a suggestion of what the word probably is, based on either the sound of the word or the context in which it used, or both.

2/ Anonymity and confidentiality measures

- The name and location of the university being researched will be suppressed in the thesis and associated publications. Any description of the university and its departments will be made as general as possible.

- The name of the department being researched will be suppressed. The department will be identified as one that teaches undergraduate and postgraduate allied health academic programs.

- No individual will be identified by their real name in the thesis and associated publications. A pseudonym will be used for any comments from the interviews that will appear in the thesis and associated publications.

- If professional transcription services are used, the transcriber will have to agree to respect the anonymity and confidentiality measures outlined above.

- Before returning the transcript to the researcher, you are encouraged to read it and to use a highlight pen to select words or phrases that you do not want to appear in the thesis and associated publications. These will be omitted.
Appendix L (cont.).

Declaration and consent

I, the participant whose signature appears below, have read the transcript of my participation in the interview and believe that it is a true indication of the conversation that transpired. Further, I give my permission to release the non-highlighted information in the transcripts for use as data for the research project and associated publications.

Participant’s signature……………………………………….Date…………………………

I, the researcher whose signature appears below, agree to omit any highlighted sections of the transcripts from the research project and associated publications.

Researcher’s signature…………………………………………Date…………………………

PLEASE USE THE ACCOMPANYING ENVELOPE TO RETURN THIS PAGE AND THE TRANSCRIPT TO THE RESEARCHER

Enquiries can be directed to the researcher at gavin.sanderson@flinders.edu.au (tel: 8201 5223)
APPENDIX M

THE PROFILE’S Q1-Q4 CRITERIA LISTED AS INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification 1 (Q1): General</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 K1: The lecturer must be a</td>
<td>Q1 S1: The lecturer must be able to present the curriculum in a context that allows students from different backgrounds to fulfil their learning needs</td>
<td>Q1 A1: The lecturer must be open, flexible and interested in the teaching and learning customary [sic] in other cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good academic, with ample teaching experience and a thorough knowledge of the subject</td>
<td>Initial questions: Would you describe yourself as having ample teaching experience in the university setting? Do you have a thorough knowledge of the subjects you teach?</td>
<td>Initial question: Are you open, flexible and interested in teaching international students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 K2: The lecturer should be aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in his or her field may differ substantially in other academic traditions</td>
<td>Q1 S2: The lecturer must be able to treat the subject matter of his or her discipline in such a way that examples from various cultural and educational settings are used</td>
<td>Q1 A2: The lecturer should be aware that some students ascribe him or her [sic] a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or she has been used to within his or her own tradition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial questions: Are you aware that the well-established canon of knowledge in your field may differ substantially in other academic traditions? Do you recognise that there are others ‘ways’ of thinking and knowing?</td>
<td>Initial question: Does the curriculum content of the allied health subjects you teach include examples from various cultural and educational settings?</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you think that international students have different expectations of your role as a lecturer and as an individual based on their previous experience?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 A3: The lecturer should reflect on the cultural context of his or her role as a lecturer</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you reflect on the cultural context of your role as a lecturer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Qualification 2 (Q2): Issues related to using a non-native language of instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2 K1:</strong> The lecturer must have a very good oral and written command of the language of instruction</td>
<td><strong>Q2 S1:</strong> The lecturer must be able to use the language of instruction in such a way that the natural flow of speech is not impeded by unnatural use of the voice, such as speaking very loudly</td>
<td><strong>Q2 A1:</strong> The lecturer must be aware of the fact that he or she is not using his or her native tongue and reflect on this fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: Not applicable. This criterion was not tested</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you have good voice control and projection when you give a lecture or a tutorial?</td>
<td>Initial question: Not applicable. This criterion was not tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2 K2:</strong> The lecturer must be capable of writing general texts, scientific reports and articles in the language of instruction and, where required, policy papers</td>
<td><strong>Q2 S2:</strong> The lecturer must be aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, but not use it in an extreme manner, such as making exaggerated movements to support spoken language</td>
<td><strong>Q2 A2:</strong> The lecturer should be aware that body language and other non-verbal aspects of communication have a great impact on the way he or she is understood (or misunderstood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: Not applicable. This criterion was not tested</td>
<td>Initial question: Are you aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message?</td>
<td>Initial question: Not applicable. This criterion was not tested because its content was examined by criterion Q2 S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2 K3:</strong> The lecturer must know the terms in the language of instruction that are used for teaching the subject in question, and be familiar with the jargon in his or her field</td>
<td><strong>Q2 S3:</strong> The lecturer must be able to say things in different ways, rephrasing sentences that are not understood</td>
<td><strong>Q2 A3:</strong> The lecturer must be aware of the role of humour in communication, but also that humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined spheres of personal identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: Not applicable. This criterion was not tested</td>
<td>Initial questions: Are you able to say things in different ways? Do you rephrase sentences that are not understood?</td>
<td>Initial questions: Are you aware of the role of humour in communication? What do you make of the statement that &quot;Humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined spheres of personal identity&quot;?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualification 2 (Q2) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S4: The lecturer should use audio-visual aids in support of spoken texts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2 A4: The lecturer must be aware that different levels of language proficiency within the group may account for differences in performance, but should not simply ascribe attitude to language (a 'silent' person may be shy, not interested, incompetent, bored, full of respect for the teacher or one of a whole range of explanations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial questions: Do you use audio-visual aids in support of spoken texts? What sort of audio-visual aids do you use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial questions: Are you aware that different levels of language proficiency within the group may account for differences in performance? What would you make of a student who is quiet in class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 S5: The lecturer must never use two languages at the same time, for example to explain something quickly to some of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2 A5: The lecturer should be open to suggestions as regards [sic] the use of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: Not applicable. This criterion was not tested</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial questions: Are you open to suggestions with regards to the use of language of your international students? What expectations do you have of international students with regard to written and spoken English for formal assessment tasks and non-assessment tasks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualification 3 (Q3): Factors related to dealing with cultural differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K1: The lecturer should know that culture can be defined in different ways</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 A1: The lecturer should be aware of his or her own culture and understand that this strongly colours his or her own views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: Do you think that culture can be defined in different ways? That is, 'culture' in the sense of the different values and worldviews that people have in different countries and places</td>
<td>Initial questions: Are you able to analyse cultural differences on the basis of a theoretical framework? Have you, for example, heard of Geert Hofstede's theory of cultural dimensions?</td>
<td>Initial questions: Are you aware that your own culture strongly colours your own views? How might this be so?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualification 3 (Q3) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K2: The lecturer should know that formal education is one of the most important features of a national culture</td>
<td>Q3 S2: The lecturer should be able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, for example knowing whether a student is only shy or feels that it is not appropriate to ask a question</td>
<td>Q3 A2: The lecturer must try to avoid thinking in stereotypes, and to behave and express opinions without resorting to such generalizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial questions: Are you aware that your own culture strongly colours your own views? How might this be so?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K3: The lecturer should know that culture is learned, and is very difficult to un-learn [sic]</td>
<td>Q3 S3: The lecturer must be able to make students aware of the cultural differences within the group and help them to take them into account</td>
<td>Q3 A3: The lecturer should try to made [sic] adjustments for cultural differences within the groups, while at the same time respecting these differences. They include the differences between his or her own culture and those of other group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial questions: Are you aware that a person’s culture is learned and is very difficult to unlearn? How do you think that this statement applies to your international students?</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you make students aware of the cultural differences within your classes and help them to take them into account?</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you make adjustments for cultural differences within your classes, while at the same time respecting these differences? This includes the differences between your own culture and those of other group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 K4: The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of the culture(s) of the students in the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: What level of knowledge do you have of the cultures of the students in your classes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualification 4 (Q4): Specific requirements regarding teaching and learning styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K1: The lecturer must have some basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles</td>
<td>Q4 S1: The lecturer must know how to make his or her teaching methods and aims explicit to students</td>
<td>Q4 A1: The lecturer should realize that his or her own status as an academic is strongly conditioned by national and cultural values and be willing to reflect on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: Do you have a basic knowledge of educational theory and different teaching and learning styles?</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you make your teaching methods and aims explicit to your students?</td>
<td>Initial questions: In what ways is your status as an academic strongly conditioned by national and cultural values? Do you reflect on things like this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K2: The lecturer should realize that professional identity is closely related to the hidden curriculum</td>
<td>Q4 S2: The lecturer should discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present</td>
<td>Q4 A2: The lecturer must have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour. (For example, in some countries students stand when asking a question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: Do you realize that professional identity is closely related to the hidden curriculum? (Wait, initially, to see whether the lecturer understands this idea. If not, explain what it means).</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you discuss with your students how the class will deal with the cultural differences that are present?</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour? (For example, in some countries students stand when asking a question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K3: The lecturer must understand that the learning process is affected by a student’s own personal and social development, and pay sufficient attention to individual differences</td>
<td>Q4 S3: The lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction</td>
<td>Q4 A3: The lecturer should take an interest in the cultural backgrounds of the foreign students in the group and support initiatives for extra-curricular cultural activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial questions: What do you make of the statement that “A student’s learning process is affected by their personal and social development”? Do you pay attention to individual differences in this regard?</td>
<td>Initial question: Does your approach to teaching include both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction?</td>
<td>Initial questions: Do you take an interest in the cultural backgrounds of your international students? Do you support initiatives for extra-curricular cultural activities? Do you support initiatives for other sorts of extra-curricular activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K4: The lecturer should know that students’ learning strategies are a result of instructional models, and that procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined</td>
<td>Q4 S4: The lecturer must know how to involve students from different national traditions in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you involve international students in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Initial question: What do you make of the following statement? ”Students’ learning strategies are a result of instructional models that are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined” and ”The procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K2: The lecturer should realize that professional identity is closely related to the hidden curriculum</td>
<td>Q4 S2: The lecturer should discuss with the students how the group intends to deal with the cultural differences that are present</td>
<td>Q4 A2: The lecturer must have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour. (For example, in some countries students stand when asking a question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial question: Do you realize that professional identity is closely related to the hidden curriculum? (Wait, initially, to see whether the lecturer understands this idea. If not, explain what it means).</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you discuss with your students how the class will deal with the cultural differences that are present?</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you have a flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour? (For example, in some countries students stand when asking a question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K3: The lecturer must understand that the learning process is affected by a student’s own personal and social development, and pay sufficient attention to individual differences</td>
<td>Q4 S3: The lecturer should have a comprehensive approach to instruction which includes both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction</td>
<td>Q4 A3: The lecturer should take an interest in the cultural backgrounds of the foreign students in the group and support initiatives for extra-curricular cultural activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial questions: What do you make of the statement that “A student’s learning process is affected by their personal and social development”? Do you pay attention to individual differences in this regard?</td>
<td>Initial question: Does your approach to teaching include both teacher-directed and student-directed models of instruction?</td>
<td>Initial questions: Do you take an interest in the cultural backgrounds of your international students? Do you support initiatives for extra-curricular cultural activities? Do you support initiatives for other sorts of extra-curricular activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 K4: The lecturer should know that students’ learning strategies are a result of instructional models, and that procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined</td>
<td>Q4 S4: The lecturer must know how to involve students from different national traditions in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you involve international students in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualification 4 (Q4) (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4 S5: The lecturer should assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures. (For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. The lecturer must learn to expect a long introduction before the correct answer is given)</td>
<td>Initial question: Do you assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures? For example, in some traditions it is very impolite to answer a question directly. You might, then, expect some international students to give a long introduction before the substance of the question is addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

SAMPLE INTERVIEW FORMAT & QUESTIONS FOR ACADEMIC STAFF IN THE ALLIED HEALTH DEPARTMENT

PRE-INTERVIEW INFORMATION READ TO THE INTERVIEWEE

Thanks for participating. The interview will take approximately one hour and will be taped for transcription purposes. Your identity will not be revealed and your comments will remain confidential. When not being used for transcription purposes, this cassette tape will be stored in a lockable filing cabinet in my office. After the investigation is completed, it will be stored in a lockable filing cabinet in my primary supervisor’s office. The interview transcript will be stored on my computer during the data analysis and writing-up of the thesis. After this, it will be transferred to a data CD and stored (along with any printed copies of the transcripts) in a lockable filing cabinet in my primary supervisor’s office. Before any information from this interview is used as data for the thesis and associated publications, you will have the opportunity to (1) review the transcript to assess whether it is a true reflection of our conversation today, and (2) let me know if you’re happy to release the information to be used as data in the investigation. Do you mind if I email the transcript to you? With regard to today’s interview format, whilst there are a number of prepared questions, we can follow themes that emerge throughout the interview. The initial questions concern your teaching experience in general and teaching international students in particular. There are no correct or incorrect answers. Feel free to express your opinions and your thoughts and for questions, or parts of questions, to be repeated. Feel free to ask for any clarification. At any stage during the interview, you have the right to refuse to answer certain questions or to discontinue your participation. Would you mind diverting any incoming telephone calls for the duration of the interview?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (Interview 1)

1. Briefly, what are the best things that you like about teaching at university?
2. What are the things that are most challenging about teaching at university?
3. Can you describe the main characteristics of your international students’ as learners?
4. What would be the biggest issues that you are aware of for your international students?
5. Would you say that your international students generally learn in a different way than Australian students? If so, in what ways do they do this?
6. How do your international students differ from the Australian students in terms of the academic challenges they face?
7. How would you describe your personal experience in teaching international students?
8. How do you think your international students would describe the lecturers in this department?
9. In what ways do you think your teaching skills elicit positive learning outcomes for your international students?
10. Can you let me know four or five particular teaching strategies that you use to help your international students adjust to the requirements of their academic programs?
11. Where did you learn these strategies?
12. Have you changed in any way through teaching international students?
13. What initiatives does this teaching department employ to address the needs of its international students?
14. Where do you think the impetus comes from for your Department to do these things? Is it from the teaching unit itself or broader university education policy?
APPENDIX O

SAMPLE OF EMAIL MESSAGE SEEKING THE LECTURER’S PERMISSION TO USE EMAIL TO GENERATE DATA

To: bronwyn.x@universityx.edu.au [real email address suppressed]
From: gavin.sanderson@flinders.edu.au
Subject: Interview information
Cc:
Bcc:
Attached:

Hi Bronwyn [pseudonym],

Thanks for taking part in the series of interviews. Over the next few months I will be doing further analysis of the interview transcripts. It is more likely than not that I will need to seek more information from you to either add to what has been already provided or to clarify what you have reported. Are you happy to use email to do this? Although this might see us corresponding a few times, I don’t think it will become onerous.

If you feel comfortable using this medium for the purposes specified above, the information you provide will be treated in exactly the same way as the information that was collected in the interviews. That is, the confidentiality of your statements and your anonymity is assured.

For obvious reasons, the only difference in the data-gathering process is that I will not be sending you a transcript of your email message to check that it is a true record of what you said. You should be mindful, therefore, to only include information in the email messages that you are happy for me to use as data for the investigation.

Let me know what you think.

Cheers.

Gavin
All interview transcripts were imported into NVivo in Rich Text Format (RTF). Figure P.1 is a screen capture which depicts part of one such interview transcript. The location of the criterion and its location in the Profile are shown in red text. The researcher’s dialogue is shown in blue text. The dialogue of the respondent is shown in black text. Coding stripes can be seen in the column to the right of the interview transcript. The dialogue associated with each individual criterion was block-coded according to the location of the criterion in the Profile. This allowed the researcher to collate the responses of all lecturers for each individual criterion as a distinct node (see the following two pages for examples). The coding stripe titled Stand-out comment indicates that a certain part of Ursula’s dialogue was determined to be a significant comment and was coded as such.

Figure P.2 is a screen capture which illustrates some nodes that were created to assist in the analysis of the interview data. Each criterion from the Profile was created as a node. The content of each node was all the interview data across the multiple transcripts of the six research participants that were coded by virtue of belonging to a particular criterion. For instance, in the top right-hand frame, ‘Q1, A1 General’ is highlighted. In the bottom right-hand frame, the properties of the node show (i) how many documents (interview transcripts) contained data related to this criterion, and (ii) the actual statement of the criterion.
Figure P.1 NVivo screen capture 1

Figure P.3 is a screen capture which is an example of a node which has collated all interview data for criterion Q4 S1. The node lays out the entire Q4 S1 interview data in separate blocks that represent the dialogue of each respondent. The left-hand frame shows some dialogue from Ruth and Samantha. In the case of Samantha, “Document ‘Samantha 2’” indicates that the dialogue comes from her second interview. The coding stripes in the right-hand frame show that the interview dialogue was coded as belonging to criterion Q4 S1 in ‘Qualification 4: Teaching and Learning’. 
Figure P.2 NVivo screen capture 2

Figure P.4 is a screen capture of a memo that the researcher added to the transcript of an interview in response to something that the research participant said. Such memos were flags for the researcher to think about what was said or as something to explore in subsequent interviews. This was a useful aid to assist in the data analysis.
Figure P.3 NVivo screen capture 3
Appendixes

DOCUMENT TEXT REPORT

Document: Dahlia 1

Created: 5/12/2003 - 4:01:51 PM

Description:
Dahlia interview number one.

Document Text:

Q1: General, A2

The lecturer should be aware that some students ascribe him or her a different role as a teacher and as an individual than the one he or she has been used to within his or her own tradition.

1: I'll make some statements, and if you can just comment on them as we go and we'll follow them and see where we end up. The first statement is, do you understand why a teacher's role may be perceived differently by some students? So I guess from an international or cultural point of view, you might have students in your classroom who are looking at you as a lecturer or a teacher, but the concept they've got of who they're looking at and what they stand for and what they are may be slightly different, is that something that, um... Have you thought about that?

2: DAHLIA: Not to a lot of depth, I guess what I would think about is what the student might expect from me rather than how they might perceive me. I'd definitely say that's not something that I've really thought about, how they might perceive me. Cos I guess they get what they get from me, you know I don't change how I present myself depending on who I might be talking to, I might change what I say and phrase it differently. Does that make sense?

3: MEMO TO THE RESEARCHER: In the ensuing interviews with Dahlia, be mindful of her suggestion of not having reflected on how international students might perceive her. How might this be expressed for these criteria in the Profile which seem to draw on the reflective activity of lecturers in relation to their international students?
APPENDIX Q

TECHNIQUES FOR DEMONSTRATING VALIDITY IN THIS INVESTIGATION

To enhance the validity of this investigation, a number of strategies from all four types of techniques suggested by Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001) were utilised. The specific techniques are outlined below under the four categories of techniques.

1) Design consideration techniques

   Developing a self-conscious research design: The research design in this investigation consisted of two parts. One examined the Profile’s theoretical pillar and the other examined the Profile’s pillar of practice. The researcher was conscious about structuring each part to best address their respective Associated Question so that the conclusions drawn for each could inform the Overarching Question. A great deal of planning and ongoing reflection characterised the emergent shape of both parts of this investigation in terms of the logical relations that determined the structure of each, as well as the connections that made each part complement the other.

   Sampling decisions (for instance, sampling adequacy): The justification for the sampling decisions made in this investigation was presented in the section titled ‘Sample of the case study & gaining access’ in Chapter IV.
Employing triangulation: The within- and between-lecturer triangulation framework utilised in this investigation was described in the section titled ‘Using interviews as the primary source of data’ in Chapter IV.

Giving voice: This was done in three ways. One was allowing the research participants to express themselves freely in interviews and encouraging them to engage openly with the questions that were asked. The researcher was always mindful that the interview was not a place for the interviewer to dominate the discussion or sway the opinions of the research participants. The second way was the construction of rich profiles of each lecturer in the department. Whilst the research interests did not focus on the profiles of individuals per se, rich and descriptive profiles were nevertheless an unavoidable by-product of the research process. A rich picture of each lecturer was generated through their words as they reflected on and responded to the Profile’s criteria. The third way that voice was given was by giving voice to the investigation itself in terms of ascertaining the credibility of the substrate ideas that informed the development of the broad investigation by presenting them at conferences and in published papers throughout the duration of the doctoral candidature. This is discussed further in the Author Note on page 564.

2) Data generating techniques

Articulating data collecting decisions: Decisions relating to the collection of data were articulated at length in the sections titled ‘Sources of evidence: questionnaire & interviews’, ‘Using interviews as the primary source of data’, and ‘The use of multiple in-depth interviews’ in Chapter IV.
Member checking: All verbatim interview transcripts were returned to the respective research participants for member checks (see Appendix L).

Expert checking: The research instruments were subjected to a schedule of pre-testing and pilot-testing (see the section titled ‘Pre-testing & pilot-testing the questionnaire & interview instruments’ in Chapter IV).

Demonstrating prolonged engagement: This applies to both parts of the investigation. With regard to the investigation of the Profile’s theoretical pillar, the critical literature review and development of the associated conceptual framework was carried out over four and a half years of full-time study. The conceptual framework was a reflexive work-in-progress for the entire period. With regard to the investigation of the Profile’s pillar of practice, the data generation occurred between November 2003 and January 2005. See Appendix J for a log of interview schedules and related information.

Providing verbatim transcription: All interviews were transcribed verbatim either by the researcher or by the person who provided professional transcription services.

3) Analytic techniques

Articulating data analysis decisions: The data analysis decisions were articulated in the section titled ‘Establishing meaning from the interview data using a phenomenographic approach’ in Chapter IV. Some data analysis decisions were also
evident in Chapter V in the presentation and discussion of the research results, for example, in the section titled ‘Introduction to Chapter V’, where two levels of treatment or refinement of data were outlined.

Using computer programs: As mentioned in Chapter IV, the analysis of interview data was enhanced by the use of qualitative data analysis software called NVivo. Examples of how NVivo software was used in the investigation were presented in Appendix P.

Performing a literature review: Chapter II and Chapter III represent a focused and comprehensive review of several bodies of literature that the Profile implicitly and explicitly draws upon. Chapter IV represents a focused literature review on the research methodology and methods used to examine the Profile’s pillar of practice.

Memoing: Memos were used extensively by the researcher to keep track of developments and to prompt reflexive practice in relation to the data analysis. An example of memoing is presented in Figure P.4 in Appendix P.

Reflexive journaling: An example of the sort of reflexive journaling undertaken in this investigation is provided in Appendix R.

Writing an interim report: Formal annual reviews of progress were required by Flinders University. These reports obliged the researcher, in association with the
supervisory team, to document the progress made in each 12-month period against the overall study plan. The annual reviews of progress were a useful mechanism to encourage reflection and planning.

Bracketing: In qualitative research, this term refers to endeavouring to disconnect from, or put aside, preconceived ideas and instead focus on the essence of the phenomena of interest themselves in a bid to understand them better. Reflection and reflexive practice contributed to bracketing during the research process. In addition, remaining open to what emerged from the literature review and the lecturers’ questionnaire and interview data assisted in this regard.

4) Presentation techniques

Providing an audit trail: As previously mentioned, this investigation has been well-supported by a structured audit trail which recorded its development, progress, and administration. In doing so, the audit trail assisted in managing the overall research process. Evidence of the audit trail can be found by looking at Appendix E through to Appendix P, as well as Appendix R and Appendix S.

Providing evidence that support interpretations: A great deal of evidence was systematically gathered for the examination of the theory and practice pillars of the Profile. The evidence has been read and re-read to ensure that the conclusions that have been drawn from the investigation are as credible as possible.
Acknowledging the researcher perspective: The researcher perspective has been acknowledged in this investigation in three distinct ways. First, it was acknowledged in Chapter I in the section titled ‘Research interests of this investigation’ when it was suggested that the investigation was pursued to add to the body of knowledge on that part of the internationalisation of higher education which concerned the internationalisation of the academic Self. Second, in the section in Chapter I titled ‘The location of the investigation’ the researcher declared that this research thesis reflects and willingly embraces some defining characteristics of the Profile itself, for instance, humanistic education and transformative learning theory. Third, in Chapter IV the researcher perspective was acknowledged through the qualitative research approach being nominated as the methodology that would be used to generate and analyse research data. This commits the researcher to viewing the social world as a constructed phenomenon that is derived from the interactions of culture, language, and social context. Social reality is shaped through the interactions that people have with each other.

Providing thick descriptions: Both parts of the investigation exhibit thick descriptions. With regard to the examination of the Profile’s theoretical pillar, the bodies of literature that have been reviewed have resulted in the development of a rich and thick conceptual framework. With regard to the examination of the Profile’s pillar of practice, the interview data was characterised by rich and thick descriptions of the lecturers’ experiences and opinions in relation to teaching and learning in general, and teaching international students in particular.
APPENDIX R

EVIDENCE OF JOURNALING

Memo 12 March 2003
This memo is a personal record which outlines some developments in relation to the thesis.

Refining focus
The research interests are undergoing more of a refinement in focus than a change of direction. Some background is provided below before an update of the focus of the thesis is noted.

Background to the research project
When this research project began, it was driven by the fundamental question “How do academic staff respond to the curriculum process and context needs of a growing number of students from divergent language and cultural backgrounds?” The research interest was the ‘internationalisation of the academic self’, especially with regard to teaching international students. Whilst the focus was on teaching, it wished to examine this in the broadest sense, that is, not just in terms of what happened in the lectures and tutorials, but a more holistic view of academic support. This extended to the ways in which academic staff perceived international students. It included out-of-class interactions, as well as the influences of departmental and university initiatives that helped or directed academic staff in their teaching of international students. In essence, there was an interest in determining the orientation of academic staff towards international students and the factors that made this so. The initial key research questions were:

1. What were the experiences of academic staff with international students in the academic setting?
2. How did academic staff perceive international students as learners?
3. How did academic staff meet the learning needs of international students?
4. What sorts of things influenced or informed staff in the dealings they had with international students with regard to 1, 2 & 3?

The interest in the research was driven by the fact that whilst more investigations are being carried out around Australia on the international student experience as an aspect of internationalisation, there has been little focus on what internationalisation means for the role of academic staff.

Immediately after starting my studies in late February 2002, Dr Bob Teasdale, my primary supervisor, encouraged me to build a conceptual framework that dealt with ‘big picture’ issues. Given I was interested in Australian academic staff and their dealings with onshore international students, the ‘big picture’ extended to interactions between people from different cultures, particularly in terms of current globalisation and internationalisation processes. It included an historical treatment of ideas associated with prejudice, bias and bigotry and how academic staff in an Anglo-based culture might deal with these issues in their teaching of international
students as ‘the Cultural Other’. With regard to the actual research, Bob suggested that I should look for examples of best practice in teaching international students to make a ‘positive’ contribution to the literature. Following this guidance, the title of the research proposal that I presented in November 2002 was:

*The Impact of Globalisation on Contemporary Higher Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: A Case Study of Best Practice in the Internationalisation of the ’Academic Self’ in Australian Higher Education.*

Besides Bob’s encouragement to look at ‘big picture’ issues, I have also been motivated by the example that Malcolm Slade had set with regard to the incorporation of the ‘bigger picture’ in his thesis titled *Listening to the boys.* Consequently, the literature review I undertook throughout 2002 and the first few months of 2003 was largely focused on globalisation, internationalisation and culture, particularly in relation to the impact that these phenomena had on tertiary education. The complexity of the issues and the plethora of information relating to globalisation and culture (and to a lesser extent, internationalisation) made it challenging to develop a conceptual framework that could bridge the gap to the actual research that I was about to undertake to satisfy the sorts of research questions listed above. In retrospect, the scope of the conceptual framework and its ‘distance’ from the research questions was problematic.

*A catalyst for a change of focus for the conceptual framework*

In December 2002 Dr Hans de Wit, a specialist from Holland in the field of internationalisation in higher education, was in Australia as a visiting scholar. I attended a seminar he presented in Canberra where he made reference to a Dutch author called Teekens who had put forward a profile of the ‘ideal lecturer for the international classroom’. This interested me greatly and I placed an order for the book with the Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC). Although the book had sold out, I eventually obtained a copy from the author in March 2003. After reading Teekens’s work, it was clear that the sorts of concepts she dealt with resonated strongly with my interests in the ‘internationalisation of the academic self’. This has influenced me to abandon the ‘big picture’ conceptual framework in favour of something more immediately relevant and appropriate to the research that is being carried out. Perhaps elements of the ‘big picture’ will still be able to be incorporated into the emerging research design, but this will be determined by how the thesis reorients itself to address Teekens’s work.
APPENDIX S
EVIDENCE OF COMPUTER USE FOR MAINTAINING AN AUDIT TRAIL OF RESEARCH-RELATED RECORDS & ACTIVITIES

Figure S.1 Computer use in relation to the audit trail

The screen capture above depicts the contents of folders that held materials in relation to the development and management of records the investigation.
AUTHOR NOTE

Throughout the candidature of my doctoral studies, I made a point to present my work at conferences. This is one way in which the investigation was given voice during its development. The peer-reviewed publications arising from these conference presentations are listed at the end of this section. Writing, presenting, and publishing papers enabled me to test the credibility of many of the ideas in this thesis. Subjecting my work to the scrutiny of my peers gave me confidence that my thinking was academically sound and scholarly in its approach. The feedback provided from the peer-reviewers also enhanced the academic rigour of the overall investigation.

It was important to have the ideas that form the substrate of this investigation both peer-reviewed and also in circulation in the public domain, for whilst the larger investigation is perhaps more structured or guided (by using the Profile as a template) than many qualitative investigations, it nevertheless was subject to the same moments of frustration, uncertainty, and indetermination that Huberman and Miles (2002) suggested are characteristic of qualitative research in general:

When you actually come to grips with collecting and analyzing real-life data, things seldom work out that way [clearly and effortlessly]. Research-in-use is almost always more intractable, disjointed, and perverse that research-in-theory (Huberman & Miles, 2002, p. 394).

The words of Huberman and Miles (2002) heralded somewhat of an epiphany for me. They let me know that I was probably not the only doctoral candidate
ruminating over whether or not the research design was satisfactory, or lamenting that I had neglected to follow a certain tack in an interview that, upon making the transcript, was so obvious and critical. Despite my best planning and efforts, and sound guidance from my supervisors and critical readers, there were certainly times when the vagaries of the ‘real world’ threatened to wrestle all the good work that had been done to the ground and hold it ‘down for the count’. Again, the words of Huberman and Miles (2002) provided encouragement:

We believe that methodological quagmires, mazes, and dead ends are not necessarily the products of researcher incapacity; rather, they stem from qualitative data themselves. Like the phenomena they mirror, these data are usually complex and ambiguous and sometimes downright contradictory …. You don’t need prolonged socialization or arcane technologies. The core requisites for qualitative analysis seem to be a little creativity, systematic doggedness, some good conceptual sensibilities, and cognitive flexibility – the capacity to rapidly undo your way of construing or transforming the data and try another, more promising tack. (Those, and a little help from your friends…) (Huberman & Miles, 2002, pp. 394-395)

These words were good companions for the entire period of the candidature and I wholeheartedly recommend them to other researchers setting out on a similar path.

The following refereed publications (all arising from conference presentations) were made between 2002 and 2004:


---

27 This should not be taken to mean that the larger investigation was undertaken at Flinders University. The allied health department had nothing to do with this particular paper.