3

How the West is Done: Simulating Western Pedagogy in a Curriculum for Asian International Students

Catherine Doherty and Parlo Singh

Introduction

This chapter builds from two premises: first that cultural processes under the conditions of accelerating globalization and 'new times', are no longer what they used to be; and second that the concept 'culture' cannot be used theoretically in the way that it used to be, that is, as an independent, inert, 'given' variable signified by a countable noun. Cultures are constituted through ongoing struggles. Thus, collective cultural identities are made and re-made relationally through contact with people socially and historically categorized as 'Other'. In this processual frame, an Australian university offering preparatory programs for international students can be understood to be engaged in cultural production, producing and enacting an account of 'how the West is done' pedagogically that positions the international student as outsider or Other. Thus, the Otherness of the international student is socially constructed in relation to the category of Western student. Moreover, the social and cultural difference of the Other, in this case the international student, is typically constructed in negative or deficit terms and as potentially risky to the Western traditions of the university. However, the continuing and growing presence of international students in the globalizing Western university suggests that such a claim to a pure, authentic tradition is nostalgic, a simulation seeking to recreate an imagined purity which is no longer there, if it were ever so.

Our main aim in this chapter is to explore how one Australian university imagines and enacts a 'pure', 'authentic' Western pedagogy in the contact zone of foundation programs designed specifically for Asian international students. We argue that teachers employed in foundation programs invoke a past that is increasingly illusory and elusive, and teach it to Asian international students, the very category of

P. Ninnes and M. Hellstén (eds.), Internationalizing Higher Education, 53-73.

student most likely to challenge and transform the Western academy by their increasing presence within the sector.

This chapter is presented in three sections. First, culture and cultural identities are theorized as processes of globalization, with pedagogy playing a more salient role in the constitution and maintenance of cultural scripts. Second, videotaped classroom activities in preparatory programs for international students at one Australian university are described to illustrate specific cultural scripts of 'how the West is done'. The section also deals with teachers' rationales for designing these particular cultural scripts or pedagogies for international students. Third, the chapter concludes by questioning the significance of simulations of notionally pure, authentic Western traditions in the Australian education export industry.

This chapter draws on a selection of data from a larger study funded by the Australian Research Council (Singh & Freebody 1997-2000). The larger study looked at questions of pedagogy, culture and knowledge in preparatory education programs offered by Australian providers to international students in on-shore and off-shore (Indonesia) campus settings. Such courses are typically referred to as 'Foundation', 'Bridging' and 'English for Academic Purposes (EAP)' programs. Teachers and students in university preparation programs offered in Indonesia and at an urban public university in Australia were interviewed, and a series of three to five class sessions for each of the nine teachers sampled in the on-shore programs was observed and videotaped. The interviews for these nine teachers included stimulated recall (Meade & McMeniman 1992, Keith 1988) pertaining to particular aspects of their observed practice. These questions probed the teacher's intentions, design and what they hoped the students would get from the selected activities.

The Changing Terrain of Australian Higher Education

Over the past fifty years, Australia has been a very successful exporter of higher education, in particular within its regional market of South East Asia. International education has been described as "Australia's seventh largest export earner" (Noonan 2003: 6) and a "5.2 billion (dollar) education export industry" (Illing 2003: 19). The top five source countries of full fee-paying international student enrolments are currently Singapore, Hong Kong, Malaysia, China and Indonesia (Noonan 2003: 6), with the vast majority being "ethnic Chinese" (Nesdale, Simkin, Sang, Burke & Frager 1995: 23; see also Maslen 2002: 2). International students may be enrolled at either on-shore campuses, off-shore campuses, and/or via on-line programs. The crucial point, however, is that international students now constitute a sizeable portion (21 per cent) of the total student enrolment of Australian universities (Department of Education, Science and Training 2003). Moreover, international student enrolments are typically clustered in certain disciplinary areas constituting 32.3 per cent of total enrolments in Information Technology fields of study, and 26.3 per cent in Management and Commerce fields (Department of Education, Science and Training 2003). At the same time, Asian international students are often at the centre of public controversies about the quality of higher education curricula (lowering of higher

education standards) and the perceived declining exchange or market value of Australian academic credentials in the global market place. Recently, a number of cases of alleged plagiarism involving Asian international students, as well as claims of so-called 'soft marking' for this cohort of students, have received extensive media coverage (see Contractor 2003, Illing 2003, McWilliam, Singh & Taylor 2002).

We suggest that the accelerating (real and virtual) flow of international students, knowledge and symbolic resources, as well as struggles and contestations over these movements, are characteristic of new globalized times (Waters 2001). In this chapter, we ask how this increasing Asian presence within the Western university is negotiated and handled by teachers employed in front-line programs, such as foundation and bridging programs, designed specifically to induct Asian international students into the Western university.

Australian Universities as Global Cultural Contact Zones

In this chapter and others (e.g. Doherty 2001), we suggest that the well-worn regional circuits followed by international students to study with Australian universities constitute a fifty-year history of increasing cultural entanglement (Ang 2001, Clifford 1997). This increasingly "symbiotic" (Dalrymple 2002: xlvii) relationship renders the Australian university, and more generally the Western academy, a dynamic, evolving and generative contact zone (Pratt 1992, Kenway & Bullen 2003) as opposed to some pristine, impervious cultural site that can retain and reproduce some essential pre-contact authenticity in its scripts. These contact zones can never be neutral places (Smith 2001: 378). Rather, contact zones are places that have been historically constituted as sites of transculturation, where colonizers and colonized, travelers and travelees interact, co-exist, and engage in "interlocking understandings and practices, often with radically asymmetrical relations of power" (Pratt 1992: 7). Moreover, contact zones are fluid and changing places, constructed and re-constructed anew as people with disparate historical trajectories meet and struggle over issues of representation (i.e. who has the right to speak on behalf of who, how, and with what consequences). Thus contact zones are sites of cultural struggle where the "making and remaking of identities" takes place (Clifford 1997: 7).

A crucial tactic in these cultural struggles is the attempt by dominant groups to sanitize places of the historical legacy of unequal power relations. We argue that acts of purification or sanitization in contact zones, that is, attempts to construct pristine accounts of Western learning styles and pedagogy violently deny and repress the history of Western-Asian cultural entanglement (see Said 1995).

In this chapter we draw on video-taped lessons and stimulated recall interview data collected from nine teachers working on the onshore EAP and foundation programs at one Australian university, with a particular focus on the practice of two teachers. The size of the video-taped classes ranged from 12 to 26 students, with the vast majority of students from South East Asia (Hong Kong, Thailand, Taiwan, Malaysia, Singapore, East Timor, Indonesia). The age range of the students in these classes varied between 18 and 44, with all classes displaying a wide spread of ages.

Many students already had an undergraduate degree. In addition, all nine teachers who participated in the onshore component of the study had substantial teaching experience, ranging from seven to twenty-eight years across various education sectors. Five of the teachers had taught overseas, and seven of the teachers had postgraduate qualifications (see Singh & Doherty forthcoming).

The analysis of video-taped classes mapped the phases of different interactional practices (Lemke 1990), any shifts in thematic topics, and moments of interactive trouble in the pedagogy, such as student disruptions, challenges or failure to respond. The analysis of teacher interview data interrogated the categories of students constructed in their talk, and how these categories informed their operative models of Asian learner and Western teacher with which to regulate the choice of curricular content and pedagogic strategies. We focus on these two data sets because all the teachers talked about the Asian learner as passive, that is, not engaging in the desired forms of classroom talk or 'critical thinking', and therefore the need to explicitly teach or socialize students into these requisite skills.

The Impurity of Cultural Processes

There is growing recognition that 'cultures' have never been pure, stable and discrete - rather hybridity and change wrought through contact with Others is how cultural identity and cultural differences come into being, and then are sustained or reinvented over time (Friedman 1994, Trouillot 2002, Clifford 1988, 1997):

> The problem is not that cultures are suddenly changing: they have always been changing. Nor is it new that cultures are porous. Human groups have always been open, in various degrees, to new experiences, outside influences, borrowings, and impositions. The difference now is that the fiction of isolated cultures built by the nineteenth century on the assumptions of the Renaissance no longer fits the lived experiences ... (Trouillot 2002: 13).

The lived experience is different now because of the accelerating speed and quantities of global cultural exchange, and our growing consciousness of our place in the global order (Waters 2001). As Appadurai (1996: 10) has argued:

> The transformation of everyday subjectivities through electronic mediation and the work of the imagination is not only a cultural fact. It is deeply connected to politics, through the new ways in which individual attachments, interests, and aspirations increasingly crosscut those of the nation-state. The diasporic public spheres that such encounters create are no longer small, marginal, or exceptional. They are part of the cultural dynamic of urban life in most countries and continents, in which migration and mass mediation co-constitute a new sense of the global as modern and the modern as global.

In a globalized knowledge economy, Western higher education credentials are increasingly portrayed as the key or path to higher status, secure 'professional' employment. Thus *images* of the highly successful Western educated professional are relayed across the world via the web-pages of Western universities, other advertising media, including brochures, television advertisements, and personnel. Acquisition of Western higher education becomes the *imagined* gateway to upward social and economic mobility in an increasingly unequal global system. These *images* are appropriated in local contexts and used to launch individual and collective identities. Thus, for example, Perlez (2003) provides an account of 'study mothers' – women who travel from China to Singapore, take up menial work and live in cramped accommodation, in order to provide their children with what they *imagine* is the best education. Primary school education in Singapore is considered advantageous as instruction is in English, and English language competence enables Chinese children to apply for secondary school education programs in a Western country such as Australia or the United States. Thus, the *images* of Western education relayed across the globe, and the *imagined worlds* made accessible via Western education, provide a platform for *imagining* and launching individual and collective social actions such as the phenomena of 'study mothers' (see Appadurai 1996). The problem however, seems to be that many of the Chinese mothers who travel to Singapore, find it difficult to get jobs and struggle to make ends meet. Moreover, the children struggle to gain the necessary levels of English competency needed to apply for enrolment in Western secondary schools.

In this chapter, we are concerned with the pedagogic identities and practices imagined, constructed, and launched by Australian teachers for Asian international students. Moreover, we are concerned with analysing the struggles or politics over cultural identity enacted in the contact zones of Australian university foundation programs designed specifically for Asian international students.

Scripting How the West is Done

To report the observed classroom activities, we purposefully use the provocative term 'simulation' following Baudrillard (1988), to suggest that the versions of Western pedagogy constructed for international students are not simply a heuristic imitation or reflection of something that exists independently, but rather an act of masquerade that refers to a reality that is not in fact there. Baudrillard (1988: 167) defines simulation as:

> … no longer a question of imitation, nor of reduplication, nor even of parody. It is rather a question of substituting signs of the real for the real itself; that is, an operation to deter every real process by its operational double, a metastable, programmatic, perfect descriptive machine which provides all the signs of the real and short-circuits all its vicissitudes.

The illusory authority and purity of the pedagogic simulation create, we suggest, such an imagined, fictive and idealized script. Baudrillard (1988) deploys a metaphor of drama to describe the way in which social action creates or performs the 'scenodrama' of simulation. Similarly, we will describe the classroom staging of idealized Western pedagogic relations using the systematic metaphor of staging and scripting a theatrical production.

Two class activities observed in the on-shore preparatory programs in an Australian urban university have been selected as explicit exemplars of attempts firstly to invoke a notionally 'pure', authentic Western pedagogy, and secondly to explicitly socialize the students in this cultural script by simulating or enacting pedagogic roles. In addition, the rationale for these particular activities were discussed with the teachers in their interviews. Both class activities were designed to involve and immerse the Asian international students in a performance of Western student roles. The first example stages a class discussion, the second involves student oral presentations and the associated question time. Accomplishing or coaching in these two communicative orders constituted a common focus of the enacted curriculum observed across all nine class groups in the on-shore site. Our analysis of simulation/dissimulation asks:

- What model of Western tutorial is constructed in these lessons? What is the 'Other' of this model?
- How are 'international' students taught the skills and knowledge of Western tutorial?
- How is this mode of instruction different from that provided to 'Australian' students?

Activity A: Rehearsing a Group Discussion

In a weekly two hour class for a year long unit which uses Australian history content as a vehicle for 'study skills' instruction designed for international students, the second hour was devoted to watching a 25 minute video about Australia's changing immigration policies, and then to accomplishing a group discussion around these questions.

Teacher as director: Prior to taking a break after the first hour, the teacher suggested that students "Go off and have a break. Build up your energy so that you can be a bit more lively in your discussion than you are at the moment." In the ensuing class, students were provided with a set of questions that reflected the chronological order of ideas/themes in the video, and were encouraged to take notes as they watched the video. The instructions to the students highlighted the purpose of performing a group discussion, rather than the (secondary) purpose of engaging with the content of the video:

> **Teacher A:** We'll watch the video and remember we're looking for answers to those questions so that at the end of the video you'll be able to contribute to a

group discussion, and everybody will have to say something so if you want to sound intelligent, you'd better listen to the video.

Setting the stage: The 22 students initially sat at individual desks organized in rows across the room, facing the front in order to watch the video. At the end of the video recording, the video player was turned off and the teacher directed the physical reorganization of the furniture via a series of spoken directions and gestures, so that students were eventually seated in a circle facing each other, "so no-one has their back to anyone else". The teacher remained standing outside the circle, behind a student, thus excluding herself from the group.

Coaching the actors: Students were reminded, "when you're talking … you aren't talking to me... so you want eye contact with the class". She then continued to outline the discussion modus operandi with reference to how it would proceed, and how it should ideally proceed: "I'll interrupt you but hopefully you'll be able to keep the discussion going yourselves".

Allocating roles: She then passed around a bag containing numbers from which students were expected to select one at random. By her account, this activity was designed to make sure that the students contributed to the staged classroom discussion. In other words, this activity was designed to randomly distribute student contributions across the time and space of the lesson to generate the theatrical effect of a spontaneously generated discussion. This preparatory 'stage-setting' episode lasted three minutes.

The rehearsal: The teacher then invited "Number 1" to start, then continued, "I'll get you started. The question was: why did the Australian government want more migrants?" The designated student did not immediately respond, so the teacher prompted her with: "I think … I believe…" The student then offered a contribution. The teacher, from outside the circle, interjected after each student turn, moderating the discussion with comments such as, "Good. Number 3, anything to add?", and, "That's good. Number 4 can move on to Question 2." At this stage, the majority of students started to address their comments to the teacher, their eyes looking towards the teacher, and finishing with an upward inflection, thus seeking her confirmation. When this required the student seated directly in front of the teacher to turn her back on the student circle, the teacher reminded her to "turn around" to face the group again. Thus despite the considerable effort to reframe the communicative genre, the exchange fell back into the familiar initiation-response-evaluation chains of teacher-centred classroom discourse (Mehan 1979). Student contributions were usually a few sentences long, ranging from about three seconds to up to 30 seconds in length in a few cases. The teacher's contributions typically: (1) provided some evaluative feedback on the previous turn, (2) re-formulated the student's contribution, (3) developed the student's contribution to provide the desired instructional content focus, (4) restated the question, and then (5) called for the next turn. The teacher also alluded to previous students' comments, and invited the next speaker to respond to those ideas, thus modelling or scaffolding the process of cohesive backward referencing within the whole 'discussion' text.

Stage fright: Students often giggled or smiled in a self-conscious way before and after their turns. One student's contribution achieved a communal laugh when the teacher evaluated it as, "…good. It didn't actually answer the question, but it's interesting information. I mean, it's contributed."

Directorial feedback: When everyone had taken his or her allocated turn, the teacher started to close the activity, with an evaluation: "That's good. Everyone's said something." She was then interrupted by a student who offered another pertinent, unsolicited comment – the first spontaneous contribution as such. Following this, the teacher resumed her summary of the activity, indicating how the topic related to the next unit of work, and inviting students to self-evaluate their individual performances in the group discussion by referring to a self-evaluation guide in their textbook: "You might go through that criteria and think 'Did I do this? Did I do that?' You might be surprised." This book is a British publication (Cottrell 1999), and the relevant pages (pp. 98-99) outline a set of questions with which to evaluate one's own 'contributions' to seminars and group work, to invite other participants' evaluation of one's 'contribution', and to evaluate the group's 'overall working'.

Rehearsal closure: The class was then finally instructed to restore the desks and chairs back into the usual row layout.

This whole discussion 'scenario' lends itself to be understood as theatrical simulation, albeit a rehearsal, not the performance proper. The teacher acted as the director, coaching, prompting, stage-managing and giving feedback on the students' hesitant contribution and the comportment of their bodies, in order to fulfil a simple script of group discussion where talk is seen to be distributed randomly around the group, and 'everyone says something', while ideally looking each other in the eyes. The students displayed symptoms of stage fright before and after their performances. The spatial organization of furniture before and after provided clear cues of when the rehearsal started and when it finished. Though this might be what group discussion looks like and sounds like (*i.e.* randomized multivocality), this enactment was not the imagined 'real' tutorial genre in a number of ways. The students were acting through compulsion. They were expected to contribute something when their turn came up. They had little control over when they could contribute, what knowledge they could contribute, and how they would contribute to the tutorial. Rather, they were given explicit instructions of how to 'do tutorial talk', and thus were engaged in enacting this performance. Consequently, few of the students were actively occupied with the content of the Australian Studies lesson as such.

Teacher A: A Stimulated Recall Rationale

In her interview account of this activity's design, Teacher A constructed an idealized version of how Western tutorial discussion should be conducted as student-to-student interaction, requiring little teacher intervention. The teacher was cast as a background arbitrator. In her account, this was epitomized in the distribution of eye contact – peer to peer and not with the teacher – and operationalized in the time-consuming re-arrangement of seating to achieve this eye contact. Thus she constructed the idealized

Western student as an active, independent and confident co-constructor of classroom interaction and knowledge, in opposition to her account of the international students' tendency to be passive and non-interactive.

Moreover, this simulated rendition of the Western tutorial was constructed as 'not natural', which by inference equates the internalized Western genre and its constituent roles as 'natural'. In her commentary, Teacher A indicated that the exercise was designed to "try [and] to force them (international students) to do things that they should be doing all the time in the tutorial situation". Such an authoritarian/coercive construction of power relations seems at odds with the idealized democratic distribution of power in the imagined/fictionalized model of tutorial discussion constructed within the simulation.

By her selection of this instructional focus (how to do Western tutorial discussion) and her allocation of considerable time in this and subsequent sessions, Teacher A was producing cultural difference, namely, cultural difference between the students' domestic and Western learning environments that pivots around the valorization of oral participation. In the following segment of interview data, she made explicit the moral order behind this code:

> **R**: I suppose I'm asking why do you pursue participation? What's your reasoning behind the idea that students should be participatory?
> **Teacher A**: Well, it's all based on our emphasis on critical and analytical thinking. If you don't participate then you're not contributing to whatever is developing and you're just relying on whatever the teacher is telling you. And they may be thinking about it as the teacher speaks but you don't know. So by having discussion you can have some sort of understanding about what they're thinking or how they're thinking…
> **R**: … you mean when they speak it's giving you information about how the teaching is going?
> **Teacher A**: Yes. How much they understand. And also because … otherwise they tend to lose concentration. I mean if I just talk, talk, talk for an hour they could go to sleep. I mean their eyes are open but they could still be asleep but I wouldn't know. So it's to keep them awake as well and keep them on target.

What are the students learning through this simulation of tutorial? Teacher A suggested that she provokes oral participation in order to encourage critical and analytical thinking. However, pedagogic strategies to elicit and develop critical and analytical thinking skills were not articulated. Rather, Teacher A went on to suggest that the pedagogic simulation of oral participation enhanced her control in classroom encounters. In other words, by encouraging students to talk, Teacher A could (1) gather information on what knowledge students had acquired and (2) ensure students stayed on task. The simulation of oral participation was thus explicitly tied to regulation of the international student. While regulation is a necessary feature of all classroom practices, by the higher education level students could be expected to be self-regulating and take responsibility for their own learning. As adult learners,

students are expected to critically engage with the knowledge articulated by other class members in tutorial sessions. By contrast, the preceding account of a simulated Western tutorial infantilises the international student. The international student is constituted as a child who readily loses concentration, and needs supervised practice in 'doing tutorial'.

Activity B: Performing Oral Presentation and Question Time

As a major assessment item in a preparatory course on business communication, students were required to give a 15 minute oral presentation that described the communicative genre used by certain work roles in business. Students in the audience were also assessed on their participation in a question time following each presentation. Each student was required to ask a certain number of questions over the series of presentations. The following account details the first part of an hour long class that was devoted to a series of these oral presentations, in particular the preparation for the session, the oral presentation, and the question time following this particular presentation.

Setting the stage: The room was set up with individual desks and chairs joined into three straight rows, facing a raised platform in front of a whiteboard. There was a screen positioned in one corner of the front, angled towards the audience. An overhead projector was positioned towards the screen side of the raised podium, next to a large desk. There was a video unit against the wall in the middle of the podium. The teacher set himself up at a desk on the side of the middle row of desks. He had various papers on the desk, in readiness to record his evaluations and comments on the presentations. The ten or so students present were seated throughout the rows of desks. The teacher moved to the podium, and the murmur of chat subsided. He moved the video unit on the podium into a corner, thus setting the stage.

Master of ceremonies: The teacher sat on the edge of the desk and opened the proceedings with: "Good morning. Welcome to the first of our presentations". The teacher then gave some advice about deep breathing to relax, and explained that he would be sitting in the audience. He asked if any of the presenters had any problems with the "physical equipment" props, and then moved offstage to mark the roll. He then moved back to stand in the centre of the podium to make "a general comment" about the moral code pertaining to late arrivals in such sessions: "Please do *not* enter the room when someone is speaking. It makes it very difficult … please wait outside. Sometimes, we can't help being late but we *can* help the person giving the talk by not interrupting." He pointed out the glass panel in the door, and suggested that students check what was happening before entering the room. This established a tightly insulated boundary around the space and the time devoted to these presentations, akin to closing the theatre doors just prior to a show starting.

Waiting for the call: The teacher returned to his seat in the body of the classroom, checked the class roll, established who would be the first presenter, then begged "just one moment" to prepare his assessment sheet. In the 17 seconds while he did this, the presenting student moved to the podium and waited, self consciously

adjusting his clothing and hair. This student had noticeably dressed up for the day's presentation, wearing a collared shirt (as opposed to his usual t-shirt), and had pulled his long fringe back into a ponytail arrangement, so it was not falling over his face.

Let the show begin: With a cue from the teacher when ready, the student then commenced his presentation about the various communicative genres employed by a marketing manager in his/her work role, with the opening, "Good morning, my friends". The presentation proper lasted about seven minutes. The student had prepared props in the way of overhead projector slides, with concept maps, definitions and summary notes. As he spoke, he frequently cast his eyes to the roof, with some facial gestures of effort, suggesting he was trying to remember a memorized script. Through his presentation, the student remained standing, moving across the stage between the overhead projector, the screen side of the podium and the desk.

Audience participation: The student closed his presentation with the request, "If you have any questions please ask me". There was a 16 second hiatus, presumably while the teacher was completing his written comments on the assessment sheet. Finally, the teacher spoke from his seated position in the audience:

> I have a question, and whenever we ask a question, as part of the genre of the question period we always say our name first, so my name is … , and I have a question …

The question pertained to the student's interpretation of an important concept. Not satisfied with the student's first reply, the teacher then asked a more pointed question challenging the student's definition of advertising as a genre. The student conceded an error. A chain of questions with two students and answers followed. There was another marked silence of 10 seconds. No other students took the opportunity to ask questions.

End of the act and interval: The teacher then offered his thanks, and the class applauded the presenter, who moved back to resume his seat in the rows of desks. The teacher then asked for "a couple of moments" before the next presenter.

This class session essentially constituted a theatrical performance, with its stage setting, attention to costume, props, restricted entrance, ritual of applause, and the interval between presentations. Unlike the other data episode (Teacher A) on group discussion, this was not a rehearsal, but the actual performance. At the same time, however, the performance was a simulated version of a tutorial presentation that students might be expected to perform in their future, 'real' university courses. In the preceding data extract, the student had obviously rehearsed and memorized his script in detail. The teacher moved between being the stage-manager establishing the running order, the master of ceremonies announcing the proceedings as they unfurled, and the critic evaluating and documenting the quality of performance. The audience members had their role to play in performing question time.

In terms of the knowledge produced and transmitted in this activity, the meticulously detailed assessment instrument used to evaluate these presentations allocated 25 per cent of the score to the presentation content – half of this being a

judgement of its 'quantity', and the other half a judgement of its 'quality'. The other 75 per cent of the score allocations addressed issues of manner, delivery, presentation, with penalties applied to poor time management. This imbalanced allocation of assessment criteria between the putative instructional discourse task (what the presentation was to be about) and the regulative discourse task (how to do Western oral presentation) demonstrates the effort to impart codified forms of knowledge about implicit Western pedagogic models in these curricula.

Teacher B: A Stimulated Recall Rationale

In his interview, the teacher explained the rationale behind the design and assessment of this oral presentation task. He justified the task in terms of its relevance to future work (in business) and study demands. As he explained the goals of the task, in terms of accomplishing nonverbal as well as verbal criteria, he referred to the student performance described above which he assessed as poor. The teacher outlined his belief that the speaker's bodily presentation is as much the performance as the content of the talk. He then mitigated his account of the assessment criteria with reference to the students' cultural differences and the supportive, bridging nature of the course. He called it a "test the water" type of situation. He thus drew a distinction between the criteria he had instructed the students in as applying to the mainstream university, and the softened, more accommodating assessment practices of this preparatory course.

By the teacher's account, these international students "will be expected to know" certain procedural and genre expectations, which extend to control and comportment of the body in oral presentations. For this teacher, these culturally specific rules included how one's hair should be styled when giving an oral presentation. "I think … a lot of these [items] for us might be commonsense but I think their culture is specific", and he recounted making this explicit in his lead up to this task. This provided a rationale for instructional content pertaining to general grooming (criteria for styling hair) and deportment during oral presentations. So, for this teacher, the rules were present and enforced, but they were implicit 'common-sense' in the mainstream. The role of these bridging courses was to make the implicit explicit, that is, to codify and make transferable the tacit knowledge of socialization processes: "introducing them to things which they will be expected to know…just the whole box and dice of how to succeed as a student at this university". He outlined the curriculum leading up to the assessment of the oral presentation task as focussed on aspects of non-verbal communication and suggested that "in a different context what I'd be looking for there would be how much material was presented which is a function of the time". He was thus emptying the assessed curriculum of the instructional content (the 'what'), to focus on the regulative discourse (the 'how') of bodily and linguistic comportment, as evidenced by the assessment instrument.

In the interview, the teacher articulated his notion of what he could and could not expect of the international students, and used the metaphor of a bridge between presumably two mutually exclusive educational worlds. He referred to a hypothetical, unachievable, unrealistic "wish list" in which students reproduce the ideal desired

Western performance: "And I think we have to be careful because we have a "wish list" here that these students would do exactly what we want which is unrealistic. It's not realistic in life or at university but you do…" He characterized these courses devoted to the preparation of international students as a "secure environment" and "a special kind of unit", which constructs an unreality in terms of assessment practices, and a dilemma for the teachers*:* "you can't blame someone for something they don't know".

In his reflection on the design of the ritualized question time, he explained that it served a number of heuristic purposes. The involvement of the audience members demonstrated their understanding of the proceedings and secondly, fulfilled Western notions of active, argumentative participation, and exposed the international students to this expectation/practice. The ideal social order constructed here was of active, dialogic relationships between students, and teachers: "so I try to suggest to them that this involvement, the give and the take, the turn taking is part of what we do". In his version of the West, which he distinguished from other cultures, knowledge is tested and contested, even aggressively, in these relationships. So the question following a presentation was a contribution to the robustness of the academic enterprise: "Whereas, here, we go for the chink in the armour and we say, 'Well, now wait a minute, mate. What about that time? Why didn't it work then?'... and that's argumentative, the pros and cons". In his rationale, he valorized the quality of being active, his "active listener" being one that participated by asking questions. This invoked an implicit contrast with the passive, inscrutable Asian archetype. By his account, the action of asking a question also played a role in Western education of displaying understanding for assessment and classroom control: "because part of the whole thing is allowing someone to understand what you're thinking about. You could be sitting there and really concentrating but you could also be sitting there and be somewhere else".

The knowledge constructed within Teacher B's classroom lesson was an enactment of a set of principles, procedures or rules for selecting, combining, and realizing two separate discourses: a discourse of instruction and a discourse of moral regulation (Bernstein 2000). The latter discourse, namely regulative discourse, generates the arbitrary internal ordering of classroom knowledge. In other words, what is taught and how it is taught in terms of foundation/preparatory curricula are arbitrary constructions, generated by theories of instruction – "a model of the learner and of the teacher and of the relation" between teacher/learner (Bernstein 1996: 49). In the lesson discussed above, Teacher B prioritized a theory of instruction based on communicative genres, and a theory of the Asian international student as culturally different from the Australian university student. Moreover, the cultural difference of the Asian learner was constructed in terms of fashion codes (unaware of hair and dress codes for oral presentations) and learning codes (unfamiliar with the rules for oral presentations). Thus strong symbolic boundaries were constructed around the categories Australian and international student, and Asian and Western pedagogic practices. According to Teacher B, it was his pedagogic responsibility to create simulations of Western oral presentations in order to induct Asian international

students into the ways of being and enacting Western/Australian student roles as a bridge/pathway into mainstream university courses.

Why Simulate a Pure, Authentic Tradition?

In previous work (Doherty & Singh 2002), we critiqued the simulations of Western pedagogy constructed in foundation/bridging programs, as well as the versions of academic knowledge made available to students in these programs. In that work, we theorized simulation as the 'concealment of the non-existence of something' (Kraidy 2002: 200). We suggested that simulacrums of Western pedagogy were displays of copies with no original. The Western pedagogy constructed in these international education programs, we argued, was a simulation of an imaginary or idealized pedagogy rather than actually enacted pedagogic practices. However, processes of simulation work in conjunction with processes of dissimulation. To dissimulate means to 'feign not to have what one has while to simulate is to feign to have what one has not (Baudrillard cited in Kraidy 2002: 200). Thus, to suggest that "chalk and talk" and "closed questioning" teaching strategies are no longer practised in the West is to engage in processes of dissimulation. Such processes of dissimulation deny that such traditional, as well as progressive and critical, pedagogic strategies continue to be deployed and enacted side-by-side in Australian educational systems (see Kubota 2001 regarding mixed practices in US settings).

In this chapter, we wish to go one step further and suggest that the pedagogic simulations serve also to produce and assert essentialized cultural differences, thus affirming a purity in 'how the West is done' despite the significant demographic changes taking place. In this way, Western identity is consolidated during a period of rapid cultural flux and instability, a period in which the 'Asian Other' is increasingly acquiring Western commodities, mimicking, indigenizing and hybridizing Western practices. It is through these processes of simulation and dissimulation that Western universities attempt to re-make and project legitimized institutional identities (see Castells 1997). In other words, fictionalized differences between Western and 'Other' pedagogues, or between Western and 'Other' education systems, are imagined, launched, and enacted as stabilizing devices or mechanisms during periods of intense cultural instability, fluidity, and complexification.

The crucial point we want to make here is that during these 'new times' of globalized modernity, a period marked by heightened flux, fluidity, contradiction, paradox, and anomalies, university teachers are likely to be positioned simultaneously and ambiguously by a complex inter-play and exchange between re-centring and de-centring discourses (see Kress, Jewitt & Tsatsarelis 2000, Tyler 1999). Indeed, these apparently oppositional discourses serve a complementary function. On the one hand, de-centring discourses need to orient the subject towards change and complexification (see Tyler 1999). For example, strategies are devised at the level of the state (policy positions, funding guidelines, regulatory mechanisms) and the institution (mission statements, organizational structures, teaching units) to orient university teachers to

meet the changes wrought by increases in student numbers, diversity in the student body, reductions in public spending, and the exponential growth of knowledge internal and external to the university sector. On the other hand, re-centring discourses need to orient the subject towards stability. For example, retrospective discourses about the scholarly tradition of universities, the ideal scholar, and the professional ethic of care between academic-teacher and student-learner are evoked to ensure that external market-orientations are complemented by introspection. Tyler (1999: 282) goes on to argue that:

> In conditions of high turbulence, the tensions between these two opposing tendencies (complexification and stabilisation) will become quite intense and the overall state of the system of exchange quite 'unstable'. Under the extreme conditions of moral ambiguity, and the proliferating technical and legal innovations which accompany the excesses of consumerism, the contradictions at the heart of the functional model of regulation take on an unexpected centrality and importance.

In this context, re-centring retrospective discourses that project notions of pure, nostalgic, Western pedagogic and scholarly traditions serve as a counter-balance to de-centring prospective discourses aimed at internationalizing the Western university as it is increasingly populated by Asian international students. The work of the imagination, as collective fiction and invention, comes to play an increasingly important role in the construction of a politics of identity in these new times (see Appadurai 1996, Castells 1997, Clifford 1988). The "quotidian work" of imagination (Appadurai 1996: 5) can produce both an affirming essentialism from within the group and a repressive essentialism from without (Werbner 1997), to forge and articulate an identity in relation to, while distinct from, the imagined 'Other'. McCarthy and Dimitriades (2000: 193) draw on Nietzsche's concept of resentment to explain how a collective identity under stress:

> consolidates ... by a complete disavowal of the merits and existence of his social other. A sense of self, thus, is only possible through an annihilation or emptying out of the other, whether discursively or materially.

This strategy protects the self by imaginatively belittling the other. In other words, Western pedagogic identity is constituted through such "annihilation or emptying out" of the Asian other (Nietzsche, summarized in McCarthy & Dimitriades 2000: 193).

In the context of the internationalized Australian university, Bullen and Kenway (2003) demonstrate this containment by belittling, when they illustrate how university staff choose to construct 'imagined' third world women rather than deal with real, more complex, female postgraduate students from South East Asia. The script for the imagined women, they suggest, is drawn from generic culturalist assumptions that, in conjunction with the orientalist 'learning style' literature informing practices,

diminish both the capacities and the needs of these students, resulting in "the infantilization of international students in general, and of international women students in particular" (Bullen & Kenway 2003: 43). A similar discourse was evident in the interview data above, where Teacher A justified oral participation on the grounds of keeping the international students awake, and Teacher B's insistence on aspects of grooming in the curriculum. In contrast, Rizvi (2000) identified a "global imagination" in the discourse of international students studying in Australian universities, who "are able to imagine the nation and its links to the outside world in radically new ways" (Rizvi 2000: 223). Similarly, Kenway and Bullen (2003), in their parallel study of the international postgraduate women's self-representations, demonstrate a heterogeneity in the students' own expressions of tactical and contingent identities. Our own teacher interview data collected in the offshore, Indonesian based component of the study reported in this chapter, suggested that students were keen to acquire a "global focus" via the acquisition of Western knowledge. Australian teachers working off-shore in Indonesia suggested that for many of the students in their classes, the "global focus", or focus on "globalization" meant acquisition of "English language and information technology literacy". Moreover, acquisition of knowledge to attain this "global focus" started early. Like the Chinese 'study mothers' reported earlier in this chapter, Indonesian 'study parents' often sent their children at an early age to other Asian countries such as Singapore or Malaysia for study purposes, and also ensured that their children had experience with the Australian secondary schooling system. Moreover, a few of the Indonesian 'study parents' owned property in Australia, and consequently were frequent visitors to the country (see Singh 2003).

This contrast between how teachers working in an Australian university (on-shore campus) imagine Asian international students as culture-bound, and how the international students and Australian teachers working offshore imagine themselves and engage in transcultural practices, could not be starker. Another contrast is in how international students' educational outcomes are represented. Rizvi (2000: 223) suggests that international students are strategic and opportunistic, "chasing economic, social, educational and cultural opportunities", but do not consume Western education indiscriminately (see also Luke 2001). International students' mobility suggests more the purposive nomadic strategy of exploiting opportunities then moving on. Kraidy (2002: 205) suggests that the construction of hybrid cultural identities through such nomadic sampling processes is no simple add-on process, but a re-inscription, "an assertion of differences coupled with an enactment of identity, as a process which is simultaneously assimilationist and subversive, restrictive and liberating". This contrasts with the reliance on the discourse of cultural 'learning styles' that Bullen and Kenway (2003) reported amongst their sample of Australian university staff, and is further demonstrated in the essentializing accounts of the teachers profiled in this chapter. This discourse, evident in the empirical discussion above, works to polarize and exaggerate the way in which the Western learning style is constructed as a critical tradition and the Oriental as non-critical, implying the "behindness" and "outsideness" built into the modernization thesis (Pratt 2002: 29).

Education curricula are not disinterested conduits of such cultural scripts, but rather are active in the constitution and promotion of certain facts/fictions over others. The curriculum is an arena of competing alternatives wherein the more powerful will advantage their interests (Bernstein 1971). Thus curricula can work to legitimate certain social orders and relative advantages by mediating and resourcing the collective imaginary (London 2002).

This study looked at how the selling power of the Western academy shapes the curricula of preparatory programs for international students to privilege nostalgic versions of 'how the West is done' pedagogically. Such versions shore up the eroding facade of a notionally 'pure' Western tradition and deny the international student any constitutive "insideness" (Pratt 2002: 29). We are aware of the multiple, contradictory and competing discourses circulating within any one university: de-centring discourses that project notions of culturally inclusive curricula, an international university and so forth, as well as re-centring discourses that launch imagined nostalgic discourses of pure Western scholarly traditions and practices. In this chapter, we have been concerned with the workings of re-centring, retrospective discourses that imagine essentialized differences between the Western student and Asian 'Other'. By interrogating the curriculum enacted in the preparatory programs offered to international students we have demonstrated how retrospective discourses within a Western university work to resist any "negotiation of difference" (McConaghy cited in Bullen & Kenway 2003: 47). Rather, these retrospective discourses work to create/reassert a cultural script of an authentic, pure and essential pedagogical tradition, in active denial and suppression of any emerging hybridity, despite the escalating entanglement with 'Other' students.

We suggest that teachers employed in foundation education programs need to hear the complex, fluid, and changing voices of their students, and design education programs that meet the needs of this clientele. To continue to construct reified notions of the cultural 'Other' based on out-dated theories of fixed, static, cultural learning styles, is simply bad educational practice. Researching and designing innovative educational practices however, requires time, space and financial resources. All three conditions are often not available to preparatory studies teachers employed in the Australian university sector. Most of the teachers participating in the research study documented in this chapter were employed on a casual basis, and usually only paid for contact time, delivering pre-packaged curricular materials. These employment conditions must change if teachers are to meet the shifting educational needs of the large cohort of international students now attending Australian universities.

Following Boyer (cited in Zubrick, Reid & Rossiter 2000: 7) we argue that scholarship or scholarly activity should be part of every aspect of university work (including the work of preparatory studies teachers) and should be characterized by four features, namely that it: (1) emerges from enquiry and builds explicitly on existing knowledge; (2) is creative and progressive; (3) is generative and productive; and (4) its outcomes are public. Good teaching qualifies as scholarship or scholarly activity when:

1. teachers' lessons properly emerge from enquiry and build upon existing knowledge;
2. teachers' engagement with their subjects and their students is creative and progressive;
3. teachers' efforts are productive of learning and strategies for learning;
4. the results of techers' efforts are open to public evaluation; and
5. teachers' convey academic and disciplinary values and ways of thinking (Zubrick et al. 2000: 7).

The work of preparatory studies teachers is front-line, not peripheral, work in the new global knowledge economy and should be treated as serious, scholarly work. With the rigorous reflection, self-examination and scrutiny of practice such a charter entails, it will become increasingly untenable to unproblematically reproduce nostalgic versions of how the West is done.

Acknowledgements

Funding for the study reported in this chapter was provided by the Australian Research Council. This is a significantly revised version of the paper included in the 30th Annual Conference Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Comparative and International Education Society (Ninnes & Tamatea 2002).

References

Ang, I. 2001. *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living between Asia and the West*. London: Routledge.

Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baudrillard, J. 1988. "Simulacra and Simulations." In *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*, edited by M. Poster. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bernstein, B. 1971. "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge." In *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, edited by M. Young. London: Collier MacMillan.

Bernstein, B. 1996. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique.* London & Washington D.C.: Taylor & Francis.

Bernstein, B. 2000. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. revised ed. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bullen, E., & J. Kenway. 2003. "Real or Imagined Women? Staff Representations of International Women Postgraduate Students." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 24(1): 36-50.

Castells, M. 1997. *The Power of Identity*, *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Clifford, J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and*

Art. Cambridge, MA, & London: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Contractor, A. 2003. "Failing Grade for Uni's Overseas Courses." *The Sydney Morning Herald,* August 6.

Cottrell, S. 1999. *The Study Skills Handbook.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST). 2003. *Students 2002: Selected Higher Education Statistics.* Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Dalrymple, W. 2002. *White Mughals: Love and Betrayal in Eighteenth-Century India*. London: Flamingo.

Doherty, C. 2001. "Internationalisation under Construction: Curricula and Pedagogy for International Students." In *Designing Educational Research: Theories, Methods and Practices*, edited by P. Singh & E. McWilliam. Flaxton, Qld.: Post Pressed.

Doherty, C., & P. Singh. 2002. "Simulating Western Pedagogy: A Case Study of Educational Programs for International Students." Paper presented at Internationalizing Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Critical Reflections, Critical Times. 30th Annual Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Comparative and International Education Society, University of New England, Armidale, Australia, 6-8 December.

Friedman, J. 1994. *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage.

Illing, D. 2003. "Compromised by Copying Allegations" *The Australian,* August 8.

Keith, M. 1988. "Stimulated Recall and Teachers' Thought Processes: A Critical Review of the Methodology and an Alternative Perspective." Paper presented at the 17th Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Louisville, KY, November 9-11.

Kenway, J., & E. Bullen. 2003. "Self-representations of International Women Postgraduate Students in the Global University 'Contact Zone'." *Gender and Education* 15 (1): 5-20.

Kraidy, M. 2002. "The Global, the Local, and the Hybrid: A Native Ethnography of Glocalization." In *Ethnographic Research. A Reader*, edited by S. Taylor. London: Sage Publications and The Open University Press.

Kress, G., Jewitt, C. & Tsatsarelis, C. 2000. "Knowledge, Identity, Pedagogy. Pedagogic Discourse and the Representational Environments of Education in Late Modernity. " *Linguistics and Education,* 11(1): 7-30.

Kubota, R. 2001. "Discursive Construction of the Images of U.S. Classrooms." *TESOL Quarterly* 35(1): 9-38.

Lemke, J. 1990. *Talking Science: Language, Learning and Values.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

London, N. 2002. "Curriculum and Pedagogy in the Development of Colonial Imagination: A Case Study." *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* 10(1): 95-122.

Luke, C. 2001. *Globalization and Women in Academia. North/West. South/East*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Maslen, G. 2002. "Asia Remains Our Largest Student Pool." *Campus Review,* September 11-17.

McCarthy, C., & Dimitriades, G. 2000. "Globalizing Pedagogies: Power, Resentment, and the Re-narration of Difference." In *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*, edited by N. Burbules & C. Torres. London: Routledge.

McWilliam, E., Singh, P. & Taylor, P. 2002. "Doctoral Education, Danger and Risk Management." *Higher Education Research & Development* 21(2): 119-130.

Meade, P., & McMeniman, M. 1992. "Stimulated Recall – An Effective Methodology for Examining Successful Teaching in Science." *Australian Educational Researcher* 19 (3): 1-18.

Mehan, H. 1979. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nesdale, D., Simkin, K., Sang, D., Burke, B. & Frager, S. 1995. *International Students and Immigration*. Canberra: AGPS.

Ninnes, P. & Tamatea, L. eds. 2002. *Internationalizing Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Critical Reflections, Critical Times.* Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Comparative and International Education Society (6-8 December). Armidale, NSW: School of Education and ANZCIES.

Noonan, G. 2003. "Overseas Student Numbers Surge 15%." *The Sydney Morning Herald,* July 2.

Perlez, J. 2003. "For Chinese Mothers With a Dream, Hard Knocks." *The New York Times,* September 23.

Pratt, M. L. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge.

Pratt, M. L. 2002. "Modernity and Periphery: Toward a Global and Relational Analysis." In *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization*, edited by E. Mudimbe-Boyi. New York: State University of New York Press.

Rizvi, F. 2000. "International Education and the Production of Global Imagination." In *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*, edited by N. Burbules & C. Torres. London: Routledge.

Said, E. W. 1995. *Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin.

Singh, P. & Freebody, P. 1997-2000. Australian Research Council funded project: *English Literacy in Off-shore Scientific and Technical Programs: A Case Study of Exporting Australian Education to Indonesia.*

Singh, P. 2003. "Offshore Australian Higher Education: A Case Study of Pedagogic Work in Indonesia." In *Disrupting Preconceptions: Postcolonialism and Education*, edited by A. Hickling-Hudson, J. Matthews & A. Woods. Flaxton, QLD: PostPressed.

Smith, Z. 2001. *White Teeth.* New York: Vintage International.

Trouillot, M-R. 2002. "The Perspective of the World: Globalization Then and Now." In *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization*, edited by E. Mudimbe-Boyi. New York: State University of New York Press.

Tyler, W. 1999. "Pedagogic Identities and Educational Reform in the 1990s: The Cultural Dynamics of National Curricula." In *Pedagogy and the Shaping of Consciousness*, edited by F. Christie. London and New York: Continuum.

Waters, M. 2001. *Globalization*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Werbner, P. 1997. "Essentialising Essentialism, Essentialising Silence: Ambivalence and Multiplicity in the Constructions of Racism and Ethnicity." In *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*, edited by P. Werbner & T. Modood. London: Zed Books.

Zubrick, A., I. Reid, & P. Rossiter. 2001. *Strengthening the Nexus Between Teaching and Research* (Evaluations and Investigations Programme Higher Education Division). Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.