

Respectful interactions: learning with international students in the English-speaking academy

Janette Ryan* and Rosemary Viete

Faculty of Education, Monash University, Clayton 3088, Australia

International students entering postgraduate courses in Australian universities encounter numerous challenges in their new environments. Many relate to the academic literacy and pedagogical practices in the English-speaking academic environment, which international students time and again have reported assume local linguistic and cultural knowledge and can result in feelings of disengagement and a sense that their own knowledge and experiences are undervalued. These practices are often associated with the notion of a native-speaker norm in the English-speaking academy, which exercises tacit power in pedagogy and assessment. Here, we identify the perceptions of international students with whom we have worked in our teaching and our research, which illustrate the impacts on their self-identity and self-esteem as they operate in unfamiliar linguistic and cultural environments. We identify essential principles for teaching and learning environments which students believe can help them to engage more actively in respectful conversations promoting learning for all. We focus on the personal impacts for international students of operating in new academic cultures, and seek ways of promoting dialogic, multivoiced learning spaces for all participants.

Keywords: international students; intercultural communication; internationalisation; identity formation; 'thirdspace pedagogy'

Australian universities are privileged to have students from a wide range of educational, social, cultural, and political contexts. With this diversity comes an enormous potential for the learning of all, and university policies around Australia claim to promote a global focus as integral to their teaching and research. Despite reported internationalisation of curricula, international students still experience the new environment as one where their discourse knowledge is seen as deficient and their learning is expected to conform to seemingly immutable and often implicit norms laid down by the local academy (Ryan 2005). Such norms are closely linked with the problematic notion of an idealised native-speaker's communication skills in English (Davies 2003), which in our experience are assumed in many academic teaching and assessing practices in Australian universities, and often conflated with competence in the disciplinary discourses.

Any discussion of the challenges facing international students needs to take account of the heterogeneity of the international student population. Since international students (like domestic students) come from diverse cultural, economic, social, and linguistic backgrounds, they cannot unproblematically be characterised

*Corresponding author. Email: janette.ryan@education.monash.edu.au

as having certain ‘qualities’. Making judgements about students’ abilities based on statements about whole systems of cultural practice (such as students from ‘Confucian-heritage cultures’) ignores the fact that there can be greater diversity within cultures than between them (Ryan and Louie 2007). In this article we draw on socio-cultural theories of learning and communicating to discuss pedagogical practices that international students in our postgraduate programmes have identified as problematic for their learning and as impacting on their sense of identity as competent learners/scholars. We discuss principles that our students believe are essential for them to engage in respectful conversations promoting learning in dialogic, multivoiced learning spaces.

Enacting the rhetoric of internationalisation

The rhetoric on internationalisation prevalent in Australian higher education contains many contradictions. While conceptualising international education as an enterprise of mutual learning across cultures, it discusses the pedagogy of this in terms of one-way flows of knowledge from teachers to students. The Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (AV-CC 2005) policy regarding education of international students mandates staff sensitivity and knowledge for appropriate teaching, but says nothing about valuing students’ knowledge. Thus, universities claim to value ‘international knowledge’, yet see their curriculum, research and staff to be the sources of this. There is an absence of mutuality of learning in such claims, and an apparent lack of respect and reciprocity. Western knowledge is legitimised as international in focus, yet there is no indication that the focus is developing through genuine intercultural dialogue.

Much research discussing international students in Australia has noted the paternalism of these discourses (Chalmers and Volet 1997; Kenway and Bullen 2003), which promote stereotyped misconceptions and essentialised notions of students from particular backgrounds (see, for example, Ballard and Clanchy 1997). A particular example is that international students are often seen as ‘deficient’ in academic skills such as critical thinking and as being unwilling to participate in class discussions. Such studies advocate a remedial approach through the ‘front loading’ of international students with academic literacy and language skills and confuse proficiency in English with students’ ability to think and know.

How can respectful equality and mutual learning be enacted, for lecturers, support providers, and for international students? How can we develop communities where members learn from each other? How can students build positive identities in their new learning spaces and how can teachers help them in doing so? These are important questions for responsive and respectful learning situations, ones that are not answered by emphasising research and staff as the founts of all wisdom and Western values and knowledge as superior and universal.

Conflating English-language proficiency with academic ability

English-language proficiency often influences the ways international students are assessed and afforded rights of participation. Many academics base their assessments of students on judgements about students’ use and control of language and these can be influenced by idealised views of language fluency and sophistication. Litowitz

(1993) argues that such judgements are more likely to be based on a 'fantasy' that learning is occurring when the learner is becoming like the lecturer, who may reward work they regard as having academic ability or value because it is similar to their own.

Lack of sophisticated language can result in international students' understandings and abilities being unrecognised (Errey 1994; Felix and Lawson 1994). The sophistication of a student's language may be equated with ability by a busy assessor but may not be a good indicator of what the student has learnt, particularly if cultural knowledge and experiences are rarely shared (Angelil-Carter 2000). Schmitt (2005) argues that the notion of 'nativespeakerdom' is problematic from a linguistic point of view as native speaker fluency is derived not from creative language use, but from the use of a shared set of memorised stock phrases that native speakers understand and tacitly agree are efficient and expected ways of expressing ideas. It is the use of non-conventional language that marks international students as non-native speakers and can marginalise them within their disciplinary community (Schmitt 2005) and ultimately disadvantage them in their assessment outcomes (Ryan 2005). Our contention is that teachers need to be open to what they can learn from their learners.

Creating new 'multivoiced' learning spaces

Many studies have focused on how students deal with academic tasks that seem to make new but often only tacit demands on writers unaccustomed to them. Kostogriz (2005, 202–3) advocates a critical pedagogy that actively promotes 'productive-transformative activities', rather than mere reproduction. He calls this a 'thirdspace pedagogy', which is 'able to take into account both the multiple and contested nature of literacy learning in multicultural classrooms and intercultural innovations in meaning- and identity-making' (203). 'Thirdspace' involves dynamic processes of growth and change, where we can learn from each other through the collision, discussion, and reflection of our myriad experiences. Relations of power permeate staff–student interactions, particularly in spaces enacted in the dominant discourses of the English-speaking Western academy. Thus, our sharing of this 'thirdspace' can only be generative and equitable if we engage in critical scrutiny of our own values and practices in academic 'conversation'. 'Thirdspace' pedagogy would help us understand the impact of our positioning as teachers and learners with different linguistic, cultural, disciplinary and experiential knowledge, and on our sense of ourselves in relation to others as writers, knowers, and professionals.

Vygotsky's (1962/1934) work firmly positioned learning as a profoundly social activity; it is relational and essentially dialogic. Yet, dialogic interactions are imbued with 'affective colorations' (Prior 2001, 59), which may influence the experience. Being able to engage in dialogic interactions in learning environments is essential for international students to become full members of the learning community, and indeed, to learn. Yet many international students report that, despite their desire to participate in these dialogues, they are not given adequate opportunity to do so (Ryan 2002). 'Thirdspace' learning environments require fundamental shifts in the ways that teaching and learning are mediated, including through dialogic interactions that are shared, respectful, and multivoiced.

Language and learning

While we have argued that learning occurs through engagement in target discourses, the spotlight is often placed only on international students' language proficiency at entry rather than on their continuing processes of learning. The required level of English-language proficiency has become the topic of fierce debate in Australia, with media claims that international students do not have adequate knowledge of English (Alexander 2007). Such views assume that it is the sole responsibility of the student to decipher and master the language of the learning environment. There is little recognition of the intense difficulties and frustrations for new language learners, even when they have a high-level command of everyday English. Although international students will have been screened by an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) exam and are assumed to have adequate language proficiency to participate in their new learning environments, due to the disjuncture between the test and the demands of disciplinary discourses within the university, these may in fact not be a good indicator of their ability to operate within the language of Anglophone academia (Schmitt 2005). Students may have notions of themselves as competent English-language speakers through previous English-language study, but this may not equip them well for the discipline-specific and often fast-paced language in lectures or tutorials, which is saturated with unfamiliar local knowledge, pronunciation and mores of dialogic exchange. Seemingly competent English-language speakers can find that they understand less than 10% of lectures and are unable to participate verbally in tutorials in any meaningful way. Difficulties arise not just from specific vocabulary but from the hidden language forms or 'codes', such as 'prompts' in essay questions (Errey 1994), 'turn taking' conventions in tutorials, or the traditional Western question-answer conventions between teachers and students (Watson 1999).

Simple acquisition of vocabulary does not ensure participation in pedagogical dialogue. Language research supports the idea of a language threshold for reading and writing below which students are unable to transfer successful reading and writing skills from their first language to the second language (Grabe 2003; Lin 2001). Lin (2001) found that once students cross a certain 'threshold' in terms of their mastery of English, conceptual, social, and cultural knowledge become crucial for comprehension and the ability to conform to the norms and conventions of reading and writing in a particular discipline area. Schmitt (2005) argues that although it seems logical to set language entry requirements above a certain threshold, this cannot be predetermined by a simple set of grammatical and lexical items. A language proficiency threshold will vary according to the complexity of the reading or writing task and complex academic tasks may, at least initially, cause cognitive overload for students who have met the language entry requirements of their university (Schmitt 2005).

Silent voices: language, learning, and identity

Being able to speak is not enough to ensure acceptance and belonging in a learning community, it also needs to encompass being listened to. 'We speak but they don't listen', said one international student (Ryan 2002). Another reported, 'I'm not respected. Not always...but sometimes I feel that they're ignoring me' (Viète and Peeler 2007, 182). Several international students in Ryan's (2002) study of

international students in Australian and British universities reported that despite their best efforts to participate in class (and often at the cost of possible humiliation and loss of 'face'), their lecturers often dismissed their contributions, not bothering to make the effort to understand their clumsy English or to risk taking the conversation into unfamiliar territory. Language is not only used for transactional episodes in teaching but is used as a 'vehicle for identifying, manipulating and changing power relations between people' (Corson 1998, 5). Power relationships influence who can speak and who becomes silenced and marginalised (hooks 1994). Thus, the suppression of 'voice' renders minority groups 'silent' and marginalised by their lack of access to privileged positions. This can lead to an intense loss of self-esteem and identity.

'Nativespeakerness' can take many forms, and even those with very sophisticated English-language skills can feel powerless in the new language environment of academia. This loss of self-esteem resulting from moving into a minority and marginalised group has been well documented in education. As bell hooks (1994) described how she felt the loss of community and belonging when she moved from a segregated school in America to a racially integrated one where black students were a minority group. Gee (2001) argues that such cultural and academic hegemony works to ascribe identities to individuals so that they become a different 'kind of person'. They move from being an 'insider' to an 'outsider' and attempt to take on modes of participation that are often alien to them (Ryan 2002). Chawla spoke of her acute experiences as an 'outsider' as feeling 'more brown than I am . . . I have felt browner since I stepped off the plane knowing that in this place my physical dissimilarities to those around me will be magnified to others and myself. I shed my own skin and become the "other" that I am expected to be' (Chawla and Rodriguez 2007, 699). Such 'internalised oppression' (Freire 1970) may cause students to deny their own identities in order to achieve, especially if the curriculum is Eurocentric (Ashcroft, Bigger, and Coates 1996).

Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) similarly emphasise that the 'artifacts we use to construct our worlds and mediate our relationships to these worlds' are created by others (171). Thus, when we cross geo-political, cultural, and community borders, we may face conflict, and find ourselves trying out new ways to mean. They suggest that this involves restructuring the self 'in line with the new set of conventions and social relationships sanctioned by the new community' (172). However, this view fails to see the generative possibilities of a more dynamic understanding of the nature of discursive participation. If we see an activity system as dynamic and responsive in the way Bakhtin (1981) does, then our notion of a homogenising process of discourse acquisition must change.

However, resistance to change is evident in many academic literacy practices in our universities. We talk of academic genres as if they were unchanging, of 'rules' of argument and evidence particular to certain disciplines, of how a thesis has to be organised, of what counts as critical analysis. It seems to most students that target skills are easier for 'native speakers' to acquire and that their own knowledge, linguistically mediated as it is in another language, is seen as being of lesser value. A fundamental question, therefore, for international students is how much they have to change their learning practices to suit the new academy, and for the academy, how much it needs to change its teaching and learning practices to suit the new cohorts of students and expand its own possibilities and knowledge. Yet despite the rhetoric

surrounding internationalisation, universities have been criticised for continuing to focus on 'changing individual minds rather than collective circumstances' (Archer 2007, 643). Archer (2007) argues that the deficit models that universities adopt tend to blame 'non-traditional' groups of students for their unequal patterns of participation. Sawir (2005) argues that '[B]y focusing merely on the language difficulties occurring after the student arrives in the English-speaking country, it is implied that the solution to those difficulties lies solely with the students concerned' (Sawir 2005, 570). She argues that universities need to take account of 'the whole learning biography' of international students to fully understand the nature of their learning difficulties, especially the impacts of their prior learning experiences.

We ourselves are acutely aware of the deeply personal transformative possibilities of international study through our own experiences as international students and teachers, as well as through our own professional and research work with many hundreds of international students over many years. But we are also aware of the intense impact such experiences can have on one's sense of identity. From being previously competent, articulate, and sophisticated students we suffered the tribulations of struggling with such minor things as bus timetables and more significant difficulties such as responding to lecturers in class in rudimentary ways that belied our true capabilities. Our minds yearned for self-expression, for the sense of 'connectedness' that Cadman and Hai (2001) discuss as being central to positive learning.

Unsilenced voices: principles for respectful interactions

International students in the postgraduate programmes in our institution often bring a great deal of experience in their professions. They come with extensive skills in communication in both English and other languages. Many are academics in their own settings and hope to further their careers through study. Others have just completed undergraduate studies, or are entering the education profession for the first time. Some wish to stay in Australia and others aspire to positions overseas. In our experience and by our students' own accounts, all want to learn about more than just the content of their course; they want to grow and be valued. Yet these positive experiences are heavily mediated by the discourses in the new settings, and the roles students play in interaction with peers, teachers, and texts are shaped in part by pedagogical practices.

Students in our faculty have researched their own and their peers' experiences. A number of these studies identify issues of communication that students find problematic in their new learning spaces (e.g. Marlina 2007; Tian 2004; Youn 2003) and matters of identity in relation to study (Phan 2004; Takeda 2005). All of these studies discuss experience through socio-cultural lenses, and many take account of complex relations of power. Students need to feel confident to learn in their new educational setting. Yet students can feel constrained by ways of communicating and learning that seem opaque and fixed because they are permeated with norms never made explicit, knowledge they do not share, or the language of others. Thus aspects of academic communication take on a mystical status; they seem to 'belong' to a certain group of 'native speakers' and to remain 'out' there, unchanging and tantalisingly out of reach. It is not relevant that the discourses of academia are 'no-one's mother tongue' (Bourdieu and Passeron 1994, 8) when these

students feel that academic language belongs to native speakers. As Davies (2003) argues, native-speaker language is a chimera for those who believe it is a goal.

What do students perceive to constrain and facilitate their communication and learning in their Australian academic environments? The students referred to above and others interviewed by us (e.g. Ryan 2000, 2005; Viete and Peeler 2007), have identified several important principles for successful learning: feelings of belonging; being valued as a person with knowledge; and being able to communicate effectively, creatively, and with confidence. Here, we provide illustrative examples of these from our students, and in their own voices.

Feelings of belonging

Students have reported feeling excluded, ignored, isolated, marginalised, or simply distanced. One student commented that when groups formed in classes, she ended up in 'the multicultural group' while 'the local students, they tend to come together'. She saw this as being an 'obvious' separation, and attributed it to local students' interests and 'English background as well'. Her classmate experienced this spontaneous separation of local and migrant and international students as 'a big gap between us', which made interacting difficult. A third student felt somewhat indignant, because 'sometimes ... the Australians [in class] have not the patience to hear us, to stay and listen, to put some attention, while we must do this for them' while they engaged in discussions he saw as digressions, going 'in every direction'. A student who had taught in her country of origin had 'the feeling in [her] classroom that no-one cares about your opinion'.

Classrooms and other learning settings can easily create feelings of exclusion. If the world that lecturers evoke to clarify the points they make belongs to the 'natives', newcomers feel that their experiences are not valued. Nevertheless, a simple act of positive feedback from her teacher about the value of her opinion and experience helped one student to feel included: 'I sort of found a spot, found a place in the classroom, like I could stay in the classroom' (Viete and Peeler 2007, 181). Similarly, for another student who said he was the only non-local student in his class, being engaged in conversation with a local student fostered a sense of belonging. He expressed this sadly unusual experience thus: 'One of my colleagues – he is Australian – but he is the only one, not all the group [who] speaks with me. Yesterday we spent about half an hour talking about general topics'. For all these students (local and international), such interactions built a new space for learning.

Contrary to what many academics believe, international students do want to participate in class and mix with local students (Ryan and Hellmundt 2003). Lecturers need to create the contexts where they feel safe and able to contribute. For example, students characterise study groups as places where the teacher 'cares' about the students and 'a good place we can share, not only our study, like also share the panic'. They reported feeling comfortable contributing in these environments and a stronger sense of acceptance and belonging.

Respect for one's knowledge

Many of our students report feeling afraid that others might regard them as less intelligent than other students because they remain silent in class, or cannot express

their ideas as fully as they could in their first language. In the experience of one student, ‘in the tutorial, you need to hide; you can’t say your problem – you maybe look idiotic, or uninformed, stupid or something’. Many feel that their voices are silenced in classes because they aren’t given time to formulate their responses in English, or aren’t invited to comment on the topic in their own contexts. They also see this as marking them as unable to think. Students emphasise the need for time to discuss their ideas. This implies more time from staff (whether online, face-to-face or in extra support classes) and more structured interactions among students including fairer turn taking. They raise the need for carefully structured group formation and interaction (De Vita 2005) that focuses on establishing sound group working processes, not solely on group assignment outcomes.

Creative, effective, and confident participation

Schmitt (2005) discusses the need for students to be creative in language usage. Our students have expressed their frustrations as their words are prevented from ‘flying’ (Viète and Phan 2007) by what they view as the pedestrian practices of thesis writing, or by the prohibition against stories and emotive or passionate language. While some of these prohibitions are changing, perhaps partially because of such students’ own insistence on preserving elements that help them to feel their voice in their writing is their own (see Viète and Phan 2007), many still prevail.

One example of this tension is the multiple sets of values and practices associated with the use of other people’s ideas and words. On the one hand students are not encouraged to let their own voices ‘fly’; they must be muted, and embedded in the voices of other theorists. On the other hand they must develop their own distinctive but ‘appropriate’ voice and argument. They are rewarded for sounding professional, as long as their appropriation of this professional language cannot be detected as echoing others’ words. Even for local students, the negotiation of this difficult terrain can be a ‘minefield’, but for international students, it can be treacherous. Those highly competent in the language will be able to take on this polyphony, while those with less expertise will be seen as appropriating rather than participating in the community of scholars.

Students occupying new spaces of learning may experience an initial loss of confidence. This is a common theme among those entering a new discipline, but it is particularly so for students operating in a second language and a new culture. One student in an earlier study by Viète and Peeler (2007) speaks of the burden of not knowing what locals know and the consequent loss of her former confidence:

My culture, my background, everything is different from them, so I have, not risk, but I have too many things, too many MORE things, that I have to think about than other students. I think I lost so much confidence of mine. I’m thinking I have so many. I’m talented, I want to think like that, but whenever I go to tutorials, I feel like I can’t do anything, so I’m not respected. (Viète and Peeler 2007, 181)

Students with whom we have talked are deeply concerned about their English use, yet when they find that much of others’ attention to their talking and writing is focused on what they are not doing or have not yet learnt, they feel this does not respect or appreciate the achievements and progress they have made. They want the focus to be on their growth as language learners. During their studies they feel they have

acquired competence in a broad range of demanding written genres previously entirely unfamiliar, and have learned to communicate more effectively in English. Some are able to celebrate this learning with their teachers and peers as a great personal achievement. Sadly some are led to believe that their 'language' is merely deficient by an academy that requires the use of language (English) on its own terms only, and that sees 'errors' of use as tantamount to deficiency of thought. Such students may come to subscribe to the views of others and insist that they do not know English well, despite all evidence to the contrary.

If teachers and learners can discuss the role of languages and cultures in our understanding and learning, and explore what it is like for people to have to negotiate these as they cross borders (native speakers and non-native speakers alike, however we define these groups), we might gain a healthier respect for each other's achievements and a better understanding of how to make meaning together.

In summary, we suggest that not only policy, but also curriculum, assessment, the educational community, and teaching and learning practices should all reflect the following principles:

1. That diversity be valued. This requires a less normative and more positive valuing of different ways of knowing and communicating knowledge. It also requires that having diverse linguistic resources be recognised and valued.
2. That interactions be respectful. This requires explicit attention to providing equitable opportunities for knowledge and ideas to be explored by teachers and students, and not only on the terms of the host community. It requires all communicators, not just a few – to actively search for meaning in what others say and write. It also requires support for communicators and regulation of non-inclusive behaviour.
3. That there be a focus on growth. This prohibits the deficit view, and takes pains to acknowledge achievement.

Through students' voices and our own accounts of their experiences of negotiating learning in new linguistic and cultural terrains, we hope to have shown how important it is to be guided by such principles in our curriculum and pedagogical practices. Moreover, with the globalisation of education, Australian universities are not the only institutions where students are obliged to operate in what is for them an additional language and a new discursive environment. Many other Western universities may find the challenges and principles relevant to their own efforts at making learning a responsive, reciprocal process where we learn from each other.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we offer a poem we wrote (which appears in Maley and Mukundan 2007), which draws upon the many poignant and moving expressions students have used to describe their 'bumpy' journey with English and learning in a new country, as well as our own experiences of operating in languages and cultures other than our first. We hope that it illustrates the intensely personal impact on the sense of self when entering and trying to appropriate a foreign language and discourse. For us, such feelings of vulnerability and powerlessness are fresh in our minds, but are enormously beneficial to us in our current work in reminding us of what it is like for

those with whom we work. These reminders help us to see the importance of recognising and nurturing not only our own agency as teachers, but that of our students so that they can feel creative, competent, and respected as learners, thinkers, and people.

On studying in English

Once I felt I shared my mind with others
 Now I sob behind closed doors,
 Desperation
 Muted in the fall of water.
 How to understand, be understood
 In mind and soul?
 My tongue lies frozen
 Between
 The slipperiness of words
 And the passion to be heard,
 To be more than a child
 In an adult game.
 One day I feel
 Part
 Of the conversation,
 Another, like oil on water
 A puddle of otherness.
 Some days I grasp the words
 And we dance

(Rosemary Viète and Janette Ryan, in Maley and Mukundan 2007, 66)

Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge Pearson Malaysia for their permission to use this poem in this article.

References

- Alexander, H. 2007. Unis open to students who fail English tests. *Sydney Morning Herald*, January 29.
- Angelil-Carter, S. 2000. *Stolen language*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Archer, L. 2007. Diversity, equality and higher education: A critical reflection on the abuses of equity discourse within widening participation. *Teaching in Higher Education* 12, no. 5–6: 635–53.
- Ashcroft, K., S. Bigger, and D. Coates. 1996. *Researching into equal opportunities in colleges and universities*. London: Kogan Page.
- Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee. 2005. *Provision of education to international students. Code of practice and guidelines for Australian universities*. Canberra, Australia: AVCC.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. Discourse in the novel. In *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*, ed. M.M. Bakhtin and M. Holquist, 259–434. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ballard, B., and J. Clanchy. 1997. *Teaching students from overseas: A brief guide for lecturers and students*. Melbourne, Australia: Longman Cheshire.
- Bourdieu, P., and J.-C. Passeron. 1994. Introduction: Language and the relationship to language in the teaching situation. In *Academic discourse*, ed. P. Bourdieu, J.-C. Passeron, and M. de Saint Martin, 1–34. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- Cadman, K., and T.H. Hai. 2001. 'Only connect': Transcultural supervision as the 'Rainbow Bridge'. In *Postgraduate research supervision. Transforming (R)Elationsm*, ed. A. Bartlett and G. Mercer, 215–32. New York: Peter Lang.
- Chalmers, D., and S. Volet. 1997. Common misconceptions about students from South-East Asia studying in Australia. *Higher Education Research and Development* 16, no. 1: 87–98.
- Chalwa, D., and A. Rodriguez. 2007. New imaginings of difference: On teaching, writing and culturing. *Teaching in Higher Education* 12, no. 5–6: 697–708.
- Corson, D. 1998. *Changing education for diversity*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Davies, A. 2003. *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- De Vita, G. 2005. Fostering intercultural learning through multicultural group work. In *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all*, ed. J. Carroll and J. Ryan, 75–83. London: Routledge.
- Errey, L. 1994. Cultural diversity: Or who's who in the university? In *Diversity challenge: How to support the learning of an increasingly diverse student body*, ed. C. Rust and J. Pye, 6–12. Oxford: Oxford Brookes University.
- Felix, U., and M. Lawson. 1994. Evaluation of an integrated bridging course on academic writing for overseas postgraduate students. *Higher Education Research and Development* 13, no. 10: 59–69.
- Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Ringwood, UK: Penguin.
- Gee, J. 2001. Identity as an analysis lens for research in education. In *Review of research in education*, ed. W. Secada, 99–125. Washington: American Educational Research Association.
- Grabe, W. 2003. Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*, ed. B. Kroll, 242–62. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ha, P.L. 2004. Daughter-in-law of a hundred families: Forming national professional identities in the teaching of global English. PhD diss., Monash University.
- hooks, b. 1994. *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Kenway, J., and E. Bullen. 2003. Self-representations of international women postgraduate students in the global university 'contact zone'. *Gender and Education* 15, no. 1: 5–20.
- Kostogriz, A. 2005. Dialogical imagination of (inter)cultural spaces: Rethinking the semiotic ecology of second language and literacy learning. In *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives*, ed. J.K. Hall, G. Vitanova, and L. Marchenkova, 189–210. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lin, Z. 2001. Discovering EFL learners' perception of prior knowledge and its roles in reading comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading* 25, no. 2: 172–90.
- Litowitz, B. 1993. Deconstruction in the zone of proximal development. In *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development*, ed. G. Foreman, N. Minick, and A. Addison Stone, 184–96. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maley, A., and J. Mukundan, eds. 2007. *Poems for young Asian readers*. Vol. 7. Malaysia: Pearson Longman.
- Marlina, R. 2007. International students' experiences of participation in university tutorials. Masters thesis, Monash University.
- Pavlenko, A., and J.P. Lantolf. 2000. Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, ed. J.P. Lantolf, 155–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prior, P.A. 2001. Voices in text, mind, and society: Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, no. 1–2: 55–81.
- Ryan, J. 2000. *A guide to teaching international students*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.
- Ryan, J. 2002. University education for all? Teaching and learning practices for diverse groups of students. Doctoral thesis, University of Ballarat.
- Ryan, J. 2005. Improving teaching and learning practices for international students: Implications for curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. In *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all*, ed. J. Carroll and J. Ryan, 92–100. London: Routledge.

- Ryan, J., and K. Louie. 2007. False dichotomy?: 'Western' and 'Eastern' concepts of scholarship and learning. *Educational Philosophy and Learning* 39, no. 4: 404–17.
- Ryan, J., and S. Hellmundt. 2003. Excellence through diversity: Internationalisation of curriculum and pedagogy. Refereed paper presented at the 17th IDP Australian International Education Conference, October 21–24, in Melbourne, Australia.
- Sawir, E. 2005. Language difficulties of international students in Australia: The effects of prior learning experience. *International Education Journal* 6, no. 5: 567–80.
- Schmitt, D. 2005. Writing in the international classroom. In *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all*, ed. J. Carroll and J. Ryan, 63–74. London: Routledge.
- Takeda, Y. 2005. Negotiating identity: Language and identity issues for Japanese international students in Australia. Masters thesis, Monash University.
- Tian, Q. 2004. The development of spoken English proficiency for international TESOL postgraduate students. Masters thesis, Monash University.
- Viète, R., and E. Peeler. 2007. Respectful encounters: Valuing each other in teacher professional learning contexts. In *Dimensions of professional learning: Professionalism, practice and identity*, ed. A. Berry, A. Clemans, and A. Kostogriz, 178–90. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Viète, R., and L.H. Phan. 2007. The growth of voice: Expanding possibilities for representing self in research writing. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique* 6, no. 2: 39–57.
- Vygotsky, L. 1962/1934. *Thought and language* (Translated into English). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Watson, D. 1999. 'Loss of face' in Australian classrooms. *Teaching in Higher Education* 4, no. 3: 355–62.
- Youn, J. 2003. Young adult Korean EFL learners using communication strategies in Australian classrooms. Masters thesis, Monash University.

Copyright of Teaching in Higher Education is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.