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Abstract

This thesis presents the findings of a case study of international students who enrol in Australian secondary schools. Specifically, it focuses on the ways that staff in three schools and two international colleges position Eastern Asian international students through discourses of cultural difference. It draws together the Discourse Historical Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis with the work of Basil Bernstein and Pierre Bourdieu. The study finds that groups of students are positioned positively or negatively depending on their relationship to the dominant discourses of the Australian school. Australian students, while rarely mentioned, were positioned positively. By contrast, the Eastern Asian international students were positioned negatively in relation to the privileged discourses of Australian schooling. These discourses reflected the cultural capital that was valued in the schools. In particular, the cultural capital of active and willing engagement in competitive sports and being rough, rugged and an 'ocker' were privileged at the schools. International students from Papua New Guinea, and a few Eastern Asian students who behaved as ockers, were positioned positively because they realised cultural capital that was valued at the schools. By contrast, the students who were unable to be positioned through these discourses, because they did not realise cultural capital that was valued, were not viewed favourably. As a result, the data showed that there was a hierarchy of positions at the schools that were constructed in staff accounts. The analysis of data suggests that only some students are positioned favourably in Australian schools. The students who were already able to construct privileged Australian school discourses were positioned positively. The data suggest that the majority of the Eastern Asian students were represented through negative discourses because they did not realise cultural capital that was valued at the schools. Findings of this study may assist schools to identify international students who may experience their Australian school education negatively. The findings may also contribute to assisting staff to better engage with international students.
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Chapter One: Introduction
In Australia, the relationship between schools and international students appears to have shifted since the 1970s. Education for international students in the 1970s, and before, was offered as an aid. Offering education as aid predated the rise of what are now called ‘Asian tigers’, during what was popularly called the ‘White Australia’ era. By contrast to that time in Australia’s history, a large percentage of international students now pay for their own education rather than being offered an Australian education as an aid. The students who pay fees are known as full fee paying international students. Full fee paying international students can be found in all levels of education from preparatory school to postgraduate education.

This study is concerned with international students from the region of Eastern Asia who study abroad in mainstream Australian secondary schools. The research project began with an interest in the international market for school education. It follows from a Master of Education (Research) study into school choice. The Masters research project was concerned with why parents choose non-government schools rather than government schools, given the growth in the non-government school sector in the last part of the Twentieth Century. The present study began with a similar interest in why international students would choose an Australian education rather than an education in their home countries. However, when reading literature and considering the field, the interest of the dissertation changed from a focus on choice to a focus on the international students’ experiences of education. As Matthews (2002) has noted, the focus on the experiences of students who enroll in Australian international education, while in the institution, is under-researched. The researcher is greatly interested in the experiences of international students enrolled in Australia’s schools. This study adds to this research area. Its concern is with the experiences of one specific cohort of international students, those from Eastern Asia,
enrolled in an Australian secondary school. It examines whether their experience is like that of the majority of students in the Australian schools that they attend.

The study is concerned with full-fee paying international students' experiences in mainstream Australian secondary schools. These schools are not specialised language schools or institutions that only cater to international students. Rather, the institutions of interest to this study are the ‘school down the road’, the local state or independent Australian secondary school. International students are likely to be a minority in these schools because they principally offer education to domestic students by virtue of their being ‘mainstream’.

Background

At the heart of this study is an assumption that secondary school education is seen by staff and students as a tradeable commodity. This assumption is based on the market for education that appears to be evidenced by advertising campaigns, school and agency websites, as well as the on- and off-site agencies whose aim is to sell the educational programs offered at a particular school to international students. In Australia, the widespread view that education is a commodity that can be traded internationally is only about 40 years old. As noted above, approximately 60 years ago, education for international students was mainly seen as a form of foreign aid and was not considered a tradable commodity as it is today.

In 1950, the then Australian Minister for External Affairs, Percy Spender, pushed for the establishment of an aid arrangement with Southeast Asia in Australia’s interest. It was hoped that by offering international education as aid, Australia could mitigate the threats of communism that were a powerful motivating factor post-WWII (Oakman, 2009; 2010). The fear of communism was borne of
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Australia’s geographic place in Southeast Asia. Spender stated that, “no nation can escape its geography”, an “axiom which should be written deep in the minds of every Australian” (Oakman, 2010, p. 3). The plan was a bilateral scheme involving ministers from Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the UK, Ceylon, India and Pakistan. The scheme was dubbed the Colombo Plan because ministers met in Colombo, Ceylon, now known as Sri Lanka.

**Colombo Plan**

Coming at the height of the Cold War and during the White Australia Policy, the Colombo Plan was an attempt to engage with Asia as part of a reassessment of Australia’s geographical place as a small piece of *Europe* in the Asia-Pacific region (cf. Oakman, 2010). The plan still operates today and is one of the longest running bilateral arrangements. Its success in Australia results from its ability to marry “the humanitarian, internationalist and the Australian nationalist, fearful of the outside world” (Oakman, 2010, p. 3).

Between 1951 and 1964, nearly 5,500 international students attended Australia’s institutions, mainly institutions of higher education. This figure represented “4 to 6 per cent of the main student body…[between] 16 and 25 per cent of all overseas students were on Colombo Plan scholarships” (Oakman, 2009, p. 90). Thus, the Colombo Plan offered aid at a time when trade* was also being offered to international students. It has been argued (cf. Oakman, 2010) that it was, for many Australians, the first time that they had encountered Asian people. The students who were studying in Australia under the Colombo Plan were staying with host families in Australian family homes (cf. Oakman, 2009). It was, Oakman (2009) has argued, successful because these students were "male, from wealthy, middle-class families, already educated, and able to speak adequate English” (p. 95). These students were
achieving higher grades than their Australian counterparts and “developed a reputation as successful, industrious, and hard working” (Oakman, 2009, p. 95).

By the late 1960s, Australia’s focus within international education was changing. In 1972, a Parliamentary Committee reviewed the Colombo Plan. The result of this review was that the Prime Minister of the day, William McMahon, argued that emphasis should be placed on aid projects, specifically in education, so that the stability of the Asia-Pacific region could be ensured in Australia’s interest (Cleverly & Jones, 1976). The review was not isolated to Australia. In 1972, UNESCO published a report reviewing the link between international aid and international development (cf. Faure Commission, 1972).

By 1975, Australia had a new government in the wake of Gough Whitlam’s dismissal. Headed by Malcolm Fraser, the conservative government reduced the spending on aid for education in the region. Fraser’s government emphasised the role of the private sector in educational aid, the establishment of specialised loans to replace grants in aid to individual countries, and the establishment of private consulting firms to encourage Australian businesses to invest in overseas development (Cleverly & Jones, 1976). While the majority of the aid was seen in higher education, a proportion was offered to secondary school students. These secondary school students, who received aid to study in Australian schools, were principally located in the Papuan region (cf. Cleverly & Jones, 1976). The net effect of these policies was to encourage the development of an educated elite in the recipient counties (cf. Cleverly & Jones, 1976), as well as impeding the development of a successful educational infrastructure in those countries, creating a brain drain and emphasising Western assumptions about effective education (cf. Alexander & Rizvi, 1983; Matthews, 2002).
By 1982, two Commissions of Inquiry investigated Australia’s aid arrangements. The Commissions of Inquiry resulted in the establishment of the Jackson Committee. In 1985, the Jackson Committee’s findings were released. The findings advocated a move from education as aid to educational trade (Matthews, 2002). The then Minister for Trade, John Dawkins, argued that educational trade would be a panacea for Australia’s flagging export economy. He encouraged institutions, including schools, to vigorously pursue international student enrolments to compensate for federal and state funding shortfalls (Smart, Violet & Ang, 2000). One effect of the changes advocated by the Jackson Committee has been the increase in numbers of international full-fee paying secondary school students.

In more recent times, Australia’s government has turned its attention to trade and relations with Asia. Through the commissioning of a white paper in 2012, the current Prime Minister, Julia Gillard has encouraged Australia’s industry and institutions of education to see themselves as contributing to Australia’s place in an Asian century (cf. Gillard, 2011). The focus on Asia in the twentieth century is said to be due to the shift of economic and strategic weight to Asia that encompasses opportunities for engagement in the areas of “the economy, science and technology collaboration, clean energy, education, business-to-business and people-to-people links and culture” (Gillard, 2011, p. 7). The focus on the Asian century signals a renewed, albeit different, approach to the Colombo Plan’s focus on the development of links between Asia and Australia (cf. Megalogenis, 2012).

Markets, marketing and the marketisation of international education

The changes discussed above have encouraged institutions to view international students as a market for Australia’s education, particularly in the higher education
sector. The impact of the market for education has been the focus of much recent research (cf. Maringe & Carter, 2007; Ross, Heaney & Cooper, 2007) into international higher education. This literature describes international students as an economic benefit to institutions (cf. Maringe & Carter, 2007; Ross, Heaney & Cooper, 2007). The economic benefit is drawn from the buyer and seller relationship between international students and the institutions described in these studies. Thus, the view is that students are clients for the service of offshore education provided by Western institutions. As such, the international education market is said to be vitally important to institutions relying on the income derived from international student fees to overcome funding shortfalls (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Kreber & Mhina, 2007; Stromquist, 2007; de Wit, 2008; Gu, Schweisfurth & Day, 2009).

In the schooling sector, the market for education has been driven by changes to government funding that have seen schools defunded by governments, with the expectation that they source income privately (English, 2009). These changes have occurred alongside a move by governments on both sides of Australia’s political spectrum to shore up funding of non-government or private schools. However, the term ‘private schools’ is a misnomer because these schools are not private and draw monies from government. Since the 1970s, educational funding has been diverted from state government-run schools to private, non-government schools (cf. Morrow, Blackburn & Gill, 1998; English, 2005; 2009; Aitchison, 2006; Mueller, 2007). The political nature of the debate over the funding of non-government schools is contentious because Australia is the only country where tax monies are used to fund non-government schools (Morrow et al., 1998; English, 2005; 2009; Aitchison, 2006; Mueller, 2007). Thus, all schools in Australia are recipients of a decreasing pool of government monies (cf. English, 2005). In order to top up funding shortfalls, schools...
are reliant on an understanding of the market they serve and thus must determine how best to attract and maintain student numbers (English, 2009). These numbers are drawn from domestic and, increasingly, international groups of students. International and domestic students are thus seen as customers whose consumer behaviour affects the institutions’ bottom lines. In part, the understanding of the market is said to require marketing tools that can predict how and why consumers access one institution over another.

**Predicting how students will behave in the market**

Students’ consumer behaviours, particularly in Australia, Spain and the US, have been examined using marketing theories (cf. Cubillo, Sánchez & Cerviño, 2006; Wilkins & Huisman, 2011a; 2011b). Marketing theories, such as Theories of Planned Behaviour (Chen & Zimitat, 2006), are concerned with decision-making processes and have been used to predict consumer behaviours (Shanka et al., 2006; Altbach & Knight, 2007). Theories of Planned Behaviour are used to determine which students will be most attracted to an international study experience, in which countries and through which marketing efforts. Thus, research based on these types of theoretical models is used to attract specific students to specific programs.

Theories of Planned Behaviour suggest that, in order to understand and predict behaviours, the underlying attitude of a consumer towards a particular service or product needs to be understood (Chen & Zimitat, 2006). The theory contends that students who consider studying abroad have a positive attitude to overseas study, coupled with positive responses to that attitude by family and friends (Chen & Zimitat, 2006). The Theory of Planned Behaviour has been used with other marketing analysis tools, such as analyses of students’ decision-making processes, which suggest that there is a criterion of choice among international students related to
institutional reputation, location and costs (cf. Shanka et al., 2006). Studies by Shanka et al. (2006) and Chen and Zimitat (2006) argued that these theories, used together, allowed students’ buying behaviours to be predicted and understood.

Predicting which students will be attracted to particular courses suggests that international students are consumers who use market factors to choose between educational destinations (cf. Chen & Zimitat, 2006; Wilkins & Huisman, 2011a; 2011b). For Shanka et al. (2006), it appeared that students developed criteria of choice to which they referred when making decisions about international study. Students’ criteria of choice, when combined with Theories of Planned Behaviour, could be used by institutions to explain their current market and make educated guesses about how to expand that market to greater numbers of international students (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Wilkins and Huisman (2011a; 2011b) have used push-pull analyses to examine choice. Their study was based in UK university hubs located in countries such as Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Singapore and Malaysia. A push-pull analysis is used in their work to examine and explain the choice of an institution. Its focus is on both the push factors, external to the student and the pull factors internally motivating the student to choose a particular institution (Wilkins & Huisman, 2011b). However, institutional push factors alone, while often used to describe student behaviour and choice, are insufficient as an explanation of international student choices. For example, pull factors, such as personal characteristics, economic, cultural and structural forces, are all said to influence students’ decisions far more than push factors alone (cf. Wilkins & Huisman, 2011a).

To this end, the international students of interest to this study who chose an education in an Australian school are perceived to have made rational choices about
which destination and institution to access, based on their individual criteria. Their choices can be analysed and predicted using marketing theories (cf. Chen & Zimitat, 2006). In addition, cultural factors predict the success of a campaign to attract students (cf. Cubilo et al., 2006; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Maringe & Carter, 2007). Consequently, institutions that are able to understand a target country’s culture and educational requirements are described as being the most successful at attracting international students (Shanka et al., 2006).

According to the studies above, international students are a group of discriminating consumers whose expectations of international education determine the institutions’ behaviours (Stromquist, 2007). Students report that they want to know the true quality of the course, an accurate comparison of the course with other providers and the employment opportunities for graduates when they return home before a decision about which country and which institution is made (Shah & Laino, 2006; Maringe & Carter, 2007). Shah and Liano (2006) and Maringe and Carter (2007) found that the students' experiences of international education drive the institutions' marketing agendas. Thus, international students enrolled in any institution have a financial relationship with their institutions.

**Financial incentives for institutions**

The attraction of enrolling international students for institutions comes from the fees that they pay (cf. Smith, 2003; Ross, Heaney and Cooper, 2007; Wæraas & Solbak, 2009). These students are said to provide financial benefits that overcome funding shortfalls. In one New Zealand study, successful schools were described as increasingly reliant on the income generated from their international clients to continue to function and to overcome funding shortfalls (Smith, 2003). However, not all schools were equally successful in attracting the international student numbers
required to make the market suitably lucrative (cf. Smith, 2003). Several factors including: (a) the size of the school (that is, its student and staff numbers); (b) the size of the marketing department; (c) the qualifications of employees and (d) the institution’s reputation affected an institution’s ability to recruit international students (Smith, 2003; Ross et al., 2007).

In the higher education sector, Wæraas and Solbakk (2009) attempted to examine the link between the institution’s branding and its ability to recruit international students. Their work examined the branding of higher education institutions in Norway and the impact branding had on students’ choice and satisfaction. Other studies have argued that, along with the institutions’ brand, the ‘brand’ of the host country overseas was also crucial to attracting international students (Shanka et al., 2006; Shah & Laino, 2006; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Wilkins & Huisworth, 2011a; 2011b). The institution’s brand is affected both by its reputation and the reputation of the country, which are competing with other institutions for international student enrolments (de Witt, 2008; Gu, Schweisfurth & Day, 2009). In one Australian study of schools attracting domestic students, the school’s brand was also found to contribute to its ability to attract students. Parents were drawn to the school’s brand, which was represented by symbols, such as the school uniform, extra-curricular activities and word-of-mouth recommendation from other parents (cf. English, 2005; Meadmore, 2004; Symes, 1998; Symes & Meadmore, 1999).

In a different take on the market for education, Becker and Round (2009) argued that any market for higher education or what they also argue is the marketization of higher education exists only in an untidy and poorly informed mind (p. 30). They argued that any analysis of the market for higher education needed to consider the myriad factors affecting the choice of one institution above the plethora
on offer. These factors included the similarity between institutions and the similarity between students’ desires. The findings of their study support others, such as Wang and Mott (2010), who argued that the differences between institutions made it difficult to compare them.

It would seem that, in the market for international education, institutions, such as the secondary schools of interest to this study, are seen as providers of a service to consumers. While this reality has always existed in the non-government school sector (cf. English, 2005), the notion that schools are providers of a service for a fee is a relatively new concept for state government schools (cf. Connell, 2002). Fifteen years ago, Morrow et al. (1998 in English, 2009) argued that government schools would increasingly adopt a private provider model. Similarly, Marginson (1998) argued that government schools would see themselves as producers of knowledge as a service to their consumers, and Connell (2002, p. 323-4) argued that “a private education for all” meaning that “no public education institutions” would exist would be the norm. All schools, both government and non-government, are increasingly competing for international students in a global market for education.

**Eastern Asian international students in Australia’s schools**

The majority of the students who come to Australia to complete a secondary education are from the region of Eastern Asia (cf. Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2008a). The origins of these students, their visas and the fees they pay to their schools are discussed below.

**Students' origins and destinations**

The international students who were enrolled in Australia’s schools in 2008, the year that data were collected for this study, were primarily drawn from the region of
Southeast Asia. According to one Australian Government report for Australian Education International (2008a), international students attending Australian schools were “sourced primarily from China (50%), Korea (11%), Vietnam (8%) and Hong Kong (6%)” (p.1). Korean students were most heavily represented in the primary and junior secondary sector (preparatory school to Year 10, or approximately ages five to 15). By contrast, Chinese students, with 47.4% of enrolments, constituted the biggest target market for senior secondary education, which was defined as Year 11 and 12 education (Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2008a). Year 11 and 12 students from Southeast Asia were aged 16-19. In addition, the majority of these students were male, with boys representing 53% of the total school market (Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2009a). Thus, the majority of students within the Eastern Asian student group were male students from Mainland China, studying in Years 11 and 12.

While the numbers of international students in Australia’s secondary schools were seen to be growing, particularly when data were collected for this study, they were still a minority student target market. The schooling sector, while a small segment of the overall student numbers, experienced a 6.6% growth in 2008 on the 2007 figures (Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2009a). The sector represented 5% of total international student numbers in 2008 (Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2009a). Within that 5%, the majority of students were enrolled in New South Wales (33% of enrolments), Victoria (29% of enrolments) and Queensland (18% of enrolments) (Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2008a). The most recent statistics on course of study found the majority of the students enrolled in secondary schools (91% of enrolments), with the remaining students enrolling in kindergarten or primary school.
courses (9% of enrolments) (Australian Government: Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2007). In 2008, 39% of enrolments were in government run state schools with the remaining 61% of school sector enrolments in independent schools (Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2009a). In all cases, students needed a visa to enter Australia for study.

**Students' visas**

The 571 international student visa is issued to all successful applicants to Australia's secondary schools. This visa requires that students have their risk level assessed, resulting in their being assigned a score, called an *assessment level*, based on their country of origin (Australian Government: Department of Immigration and Citizenship, ND). Assessment levels are said to determine the “risk posed by applicants from a particular country studying in a particular education sector” (Australian Government: Department of Immigration and Citizenship, ND, p. 4). As a result, an assessment level is determined for all students from the same country.

There are five assessment levels in Australia, with level one described as the lowest risk and level five being the highest risk (cf. Australian Government: Department of Immigration and Citizenship, ND). The Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) describes the groups given the highest assessment level as posing the highest risk of illegal immigration (Australian Government: Department of Immigration and Citizenship, ND, p. 7). The highest assessment level given to prospective international students in the school sector is level four. Mainland Chinese secondary school students attract a level four assessment. That is, the Mainland Chinese students interviewed for this study were assessed by DIAC as posing the greatest risk of illegal immigration of any international student accepted into a secondary school in Australia.
Level four assessment requires Mainland Chinese international students to provide greater evidence of their “good character” than that demanded of students from lower risk countries, such as Korea or Japan (Australian Government: Department of Immigration and Citizenship, ND; Australian Government: Study in Australia, 2010). A level four student is able to demonstrate their good character by several means, including proving compliance with previous visas, having enough money in the bank to sustain himself/herself and leaving the country before the visa expires (Australian Government; Study in Australia, 2010). In addition, level four students are unable to attend an Australian school until they have completed Year 10 studies in their home country (Australian Government: Department of Immigration and Citizenship, ND). This requirement to wait until the completion of Year 10 leads to a situation in which many students have to repeat Year 10 in Australia in order to meet both school and visa requirements. Thus, they have to pay for an ‘extra’ year of study, on top of paying for an ‘extra’ visa to cover their repeating Year 10.

Students from countries with a lower assessment level are described as presenting a lower immigration risk to Australia. One effect of this lower assessment level is that they are able to begin school much earlier, from kindergarten if desired. They are able also to bypass many of the conditions affecting students assessed as being level four, so that these students do not need as high an English proficiency score, are able to have less money in the bank and can apply for follow up visas in Australia.

In early 2011, changes were proposed to the visa requirements for certain courses. These changes reduced some of the assessment levels for China and Vietnam. In addition, these changes reduced the amount of money that students
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needed to have available. However, these changes did not affect the 571 visa and only affected higher education student visas.

**School fees**

In addition to paying for their visas, the students enrolled in Australia's schools as international students were required to pay fees to the schools. The school type determined the fees that the international students were charged. The fees generally covered tuition, preparatory course fees and government-imposed health and insurance costs. In many independent schools, the fees also included a building fund. The education departments in each state managed the state schools and set the fees charged by government-run state schools to international students. International students enrolled in the government-run state school sector in 2008 paid approximately $27,000 per annum. Conversely, independent schools were able to set the fees that they charged on a school-by-school basis. International students who enrolled in independent schools paid approximately $60,000 per annum in fees. The fees at both government and independent schools were for tuition only and did not include uniforms, extra-curricular activities, homestay/boarding, or transport.

As the study progressed, it became apparent that the context of international education, namely the attractiveness of international study, the relationships between home and host nation, the school type, the fees charged and so forth, impacted on educational experiences. Consequently, the research problem was refocused to a concern with how international students experienced education.

**Research aims and questions**

This study is concerned with how international students who enroll in Australian schools experience the education they receive. It follows from the emphasis in
markets and marketing that the experiences of international students who enroll in Australia’s secondary schools should be grounded in an understanding of the student as consumer/institution as provider dyad. However, while the research described above has examined a market for international education from a marketing theory perspective, it has not been primarily concerned with the issues faced by international students in the secondary school sector. Further, this literature has not focused on international students’ experiences of education. Authors such as Matthews (2002) and Smith (2003) have argued that there is limited research into the experiences, choices and destinations of international students who access a school education. According to Matthews (2002) the literature gap has led to a situation in which “we know little about the experience, needs, future plans, and expectations of international secondary students” leaving “teachers and researchers … unclear [about] why students from different countries desire an overseas education and how this affects their response to schools” (Matthews, 2002, p. 373). This dissertation is located in this literature gap.

As a result, the focus of the study became one of examining the experiences of Eastern Asian international students in Australian secondary schools. The focus is on Eastern Asian students because they have been a traditional market for Australian education. The majority of the students who attended Australian institutions under the Colombo Plan were from the Eastern Asian region and, as was noted above, the majority of the current full fee paying students in all sectors are drawn from the region. In addition, the Eastern Asian region is targeted as part of the Asian Century white paper (cf. Gillard, 2012). Experience is understood as the encounters, occurrences and events to which students are exposed during their time in Australia. The experiences of interest are primarily those that occur in the school setting, such
as encounters with teachers, school staff and other students, and extra-curricular events, such as sporting teams. Further experiences that are of interest include those outside of school in the homestay family setting as these are likely to impact on the students’ experiences of their Australian school.

As the study’s interest is in a personal experience, it focuses on accounts of these students’ experiences of education from staff and from the international students themselves. The term ‘accounts’ is used to refer to the ways in which staff and students use oral descriptions of the encounters, events and occurrences that they experience. The dissertation is interested in accounts from students aged 15-19 from Mainland China, Vietnam, Korea, Japan, Malaysia and other countries (such as Papua New Guinea). It is also interested in accounts from staff involved in management, organisation, teaching, and recruitment and in providing assistance to Eastern Asian students. Specifically, staff accounts described their experiences of teaching, managing and interacting with international students and the students’ accounts described their experiences in schools and in homestay. The accounts of both groups, students and staff, add to knowledge about the experiences of Eastern Asian students through reporting stories and stating opinions about what happens to this group of students in Australian secondary schools.

Thus, the aim of this study is to examine accounts of Eastern Asian international students’ experiences of education in mainstream Australian secondary schools. In order to address the aim, the study set two research questions:

1. How do staff members in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for the experiences of their Eastern Asian international student cohort?
2. How do Eastern Asian international students enrolled in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for their experiences?

Definitions

There are several key terms introduced in these research questions and used by this dissertation to describe the students and the schools. Firstly, the term used to describe the students is Eastern Asian international students because this is the region from which they are primarily drawn. The numbers of participant students from China, Hong Kong, Korea, Japan, Malaysia, Indonesia and Vietnam suggest that the majority of students who access an education in Australian secondary schools are from the Eastern Asian region. This term is not used to suggest an essentialist view of culture but rather to signal the ‘home’ region from which the students travel to Australia and to which many are likely to return.

The second key term is mainstream Australian secondary schools. The schools approached were all mainstream in the sense that (a) they were primarily offering education to Australian domestic students, who comprised the majority student group, and (b) they were not a visa school. Visa schools are schools that enroll more than 20% of their students under the 571 visa scheme (cf. Queensland Government: Queensland Studies Authority, 2008). A visa school is a particular category of school that operates differently from other secondary schools. Visa schools have different assessment practices, different enrolment practices and are subject to different government regulations (cf. Queensland Government: Queensland Studies Authority, 2008).

In order to be considered a mainstream school for the purposes of this study, the schools needed to fulfill a number of criteria. Firstly, they needed to be managed
as other schools of their ‘type’. As such, each state school needed to be managed and organised as any other state school which means that it needed to be led by a district office, follow policies from the department of education and seek most of its students from a local catchment area. Similarly, the independent school and the Catholic school needed to be managed and organised as any other independent or Catholic school, again, it needed to seek most of its students from a domestic cohort and be managed and organised in a manner similar to other schools of its type. Thus, each target school needed to employ enrolment and assessment practices that would be seen in any other school of their type.

In terms of their being classed as secondary schools, the schools needed to enrol students in Years 10-12. The students’s ages ranged from 15 or 16 to 18 or 19. While some schools operate as P-12 institutions, offering student enrolments from preparatory school to Year 12, the students interviewed for this study were enrolled in the secondary school only and were aged between 15 and 19.

**Significance**

There are several reasons why this study is significant and why these research questions need to be answered. The dissertation is situated at a particular juncture in the history of Australian school education. At this time, the numbers of international secondary school students are growing, and in spite of recent downturns in student numbers, secondary school-aged student enrolments have remained relatively stable (Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2008a; Australian Government: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2008). The study investigates the experiences of international students, who are a growing minority group in Australia’s schools (Queensland Government: Queensland Studies Authority, 2008).
The enrolment of Eastern Asian international students into Australia’s mainstream secondary schools is not an isolated event. Rather, these students are enrolled in response to a number of contextual and institutional factors that make international school student enrolments both ‘thinkable’ and desirable for Australian secondary schools. However, while literature and policy documents exist that can account for the how of the enrolment of international students into Australian secondary schools, they cannot account for the experiences of the students.

The dissertation focuses on a gap in research related to the experiences of international students in Western secondary schools. The research study, located in this gap identified by Matthews (2002) and Smith (2003), will examine how international students who enrol in mainstream Australian secondary institutions experience their education. The research problem is concerned with the experiences of a group of students who are studying in a mainstream Australian school. In what follows, the dissertation explores this problem by examining two research questions.

The research questions were identified above as:

1. How do staff members in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for the experiences of their Eastern Asian international student cohort?
2. How do Eastern Asian international students enrolled in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for their experiences?

By focusing on experiences, this dissertation will endeavour to address the gap that has been identified in existing research. By addressing this gap, the current study is able to add to the literature that explores the ways that international students engage with Western education because it focuses on the experiences of a group of students in the context of mainstream, Australian secondary schools.

As Matthews (2002) states, there is a problem for “teachers and researchers” who “know little about the experiences … of international secondary students” (p.
Two experiences will be examined by this research study. The first is the experiences of culture. As will be seen in Chapter Two, culture is an important concept as it is used in studies (cf. Kashima & Loh, 2006; Yang, Noels & Samure, 2006; Jung, Hecht & Wadsworth, 2007; Swami, Arteche, Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2010) that examine whether international students are focused on the interaction between culture and adaptation to the Western institution and culture and learning in the Western institution. Previous studies (cf. Swami et al., 2010) have suggested that international students’ experiences of culture are different from domestic students in the UK, US, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. These studies generally describe the international and domestic students as having a different cultural background. In order to explore these experiences, the thesis will use the concept of cultural discourses. Cultural discourses will be used to examine how discourses of culture are used to divide things and people into groups (cf. Appadurai, 1990). These discourses construct group identities and naturalise differences so that, as Hall (1997) has argued, identities are marked and maintained and individuals can identify with whom they belong. These cultural discourses are fluid but are pervasive in the sense that they mark out categories that are used to divide and differentiate individuals.

In addition, the second experience that is explored in this dissertation is on belonging. The examination of belonging comes from the work on culture in the sense that it explores who international students who enrol in Australian schools are able to, in line with Hall’s (1992) work on hybridity, reconcile the multiple cultures in the Australian school setting. Thus, the focus will be on hybridity. Hybridity refers to the combination of ethnic, cultural and nationalistic discourses, through which international students are positioned. In order to experience belonging, these
students must demonstrate culturally appropriate behaviours, traits and attitudes that mark them as belonging. In this dissertation, Bourdieu’s (1993) concept of cultural capital is used to theorise the behaviours, traits and attitudes that are valued by the schools. In addition, the recognition and realisation rule (cf. Bernstein, 2000) are used to examine whether the students are able to recognise those behaviours, traits and attitudes that are valued by the schools and realise those behaviours in order to experience belonging.

**Overview of the Dissertation**

In what follows, this dissertation examines accounts of the experiences of Eastern Asian international students in Australian secondary schools. In order to begin to examine these experiences, this chapter has described the international education context in Australia as it affects international students and Australian schools. It has also examined the significance of this study, as well as the research questions.

Chapter Two reviews the research literature relevant to the dissertation’s research problem. Chapter Three presents the theoretical framework developed for this dissertation; its focus is on the theoretical concepts used to guide the analysis of data. Chapter Four describes the methodology employed to collect empirical data and details the case study sites and the data collection techniques utilised by this dissertation, with a focus on the use of interviews with staff and students. Chapter Five describes the analytic framework that translates the data collected using the methods outlined in Chapter Four into the theoretical language developed in Chapter Three. Thus, its focus is on the reading device (cf. Bernstein, 2000) that has been developed to allow for a theoretical redescription of the dissertation’s empirical data. Chapters Six and Seven provide an analysis of the accounts of staff and students in
the three Australian schools and two international colleges accessed as case study sites. Finally, Chapter Eight presents a concluding discussion. It focuses on the implications of this dissertation’s findings. Further, it discusses the contributions of the dissertation and suggests options for future research.
Chapter Two: 
Literature Review
This chapter contextualises the study's research questions in recent empirical research. The review examines recent research studies into international students and international education. As noted above, there is limited research on international students enrolled in mainstream secondary schools (cf. Matthews, 2002; Smith, 2003). Thus, this chapter is concerned with reviewing research related to the higher education and secondary school sectors that sets the context around international students and international education more broadly.

The review is arranged around the two key definitions related to the research questions, which were identified in Chapter One as Eastern Asian students and mainstream Australian secondary schools. In terms of this review, these two concepts have been broadened to include international students and institutions. This broadening of terminology is due to the limited research that has previously been conducted into schools. The chapter begins by reviewing literature that describes international students and is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the influence of culture, adaptation and learning on the experiences of Eastern Asian international students. The second section deals with the relationships between international students and the institutions and communities into which they are enrolled. It is concerned with the reasons why these students access an international education.

For the purposes of the review, owing to the limited research into secondary schools that offer international enrolments, the third section will review literature on institutions that offer international places more broadly. The fourth section reviews literature that emphasises the benefits that international students bring to an institution. Much of the literature in this section accounts for the students as a
curriculum resource; thus, their experiences prior to attending the institution are emphasised.

**Culture, adaptation and learning**

This section reviews literature that focuses on international students’ cultural, social and educational backgrounds. Most of the studies reviewed below used large-scale surveys or quantitative analysis of demographic data. The specific focus of these studies is the interaction between culture and adaptation, and culture and learning.

The research literature reviewed below generally describes international students as culturally different from domestic students, and as a result, having a different cultural background from the majority of students in the UK, US, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. The purpose of this review is to highlight research into the experiences of Eastern Asian international students as learners.

In what follows, two themes evident in the literature on cultural adaptation and learning are discussed. These themes suggest that, because international students are culturally different, they face specific problems as a result of their enrolment in Western education. The problems they face affect their experiences of education. Two problems have been identified: (1) adaptation, referred to as ‘cultural fit’; and (2) culturally-determined learning styles. While other problems may be evident, these two problems are most prominent in the literature and will be discussed here. It is noted that much of the earlier literature has been reviewed in recent doctoral dissertations (cf. Exley, 2005; Dooley, 2005; Doherty, 2006; O'Regan, 2007). It is useful to begin by discussing the literature reviewed in these recent doctorates.

In her dissertation, Doherty (2006) argued that a great deal of literature existed which constructed international students in the tertiary sector as a force displacing
domestic Australian students, dumbing down curricula and eroding standards. She reviewed work from Ballard and Clanchy (cf. 1984, 1988, 1991, 1997), who attempted to instruct teachers how to teach international students. Their work focused on the differences between Western and Eastern learning styles, and made claims that the attributes associated with Eastern Asian learners were detrimental to the learning and adaptation of international students. Doherty (2006) challenged these assertions as being problematic and simplistic. Similarly, Exley (2005) argued that there is a need to challenge the assumptions about the passive, rote learning Asian student evident in the literature. To illustrate the prevalence of these assumptions, she cited literature that argued that Asian students were different from Western students in terms of learning style. Most of the problems identified in this corpus were attributed to the assumption that international students had a different socialisation (cf. Reid, 1987; Ballard, 1989; Evans & Tregenza, 2001; 2002a; 2002b). This focus on socialisation was concerned with the cultural background of the students and its impact on their behaviours, tastes, preferences and learning styles.

O’Regan (2007) also problematised these studies, arguing that the legacy of research emphasising cultural difference is that differences between students has been foregrounded but not questioned. Citing the work of Volet (1999), she argued that studies of international students ‘set up’ tacit assumptions of the learning processes and values of two different and competing cultures. These assumptions are especially evident in Knight’s work (cf. 1997; 2004). She argues that these studies reinforce the deficit thinking based in Eurocentric models of education. The Eurocentric view pervades the recent research reviewed below and remains prevalent in the literature.
Cultural fit

Many studies were concerned with how students adapted their cultural backgrounds to the culture demanded of them in international study. Studies by Kashima and Loh (2006), Yang, Noels and Samure (2006), Jung, Hecht and Wadsworth (2007) and Swami, Arteche, Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham (2010) have examined the students' experiences adapting to the culture of the institution. Yang et al. (2006) termed the adaptation cultural fit, which they defined as the congruence between the students’ culture and the Western academic culture of the institution (Yang et al., 2006). Thus, the term ‘cultural fit’ defined the students' adaptation. Those students whose home cultures most closely resembled the institution’s culture were said to have the most successful cultural fit (Sawir, Marginson, Deumert, Nyland & Ramia, 2008; Swami et al., 2010). As a result, these studies have found that those students who had access to Western models in their home countries were more likely to experience a successful cultural fit. Factors such as access to friends from the home country, greater language proficiency and lower perceived discrimination, were found to positively influence the students’ cultural fit (cf. Swami, et al., 2010).

Yang et al. (2006) and Gloria, Castellanos, Park and Kim (2008) used large-scale quantitative surveys. Data that examined students' problems with cultural fit were collected through survey instruments targeting large groups of international students in the tertiary sector (cf. Rosenthal, Russell & Thomson, 2007; Gloria et al., 2008; Sulkowski & Deakin, 2009). One limitation of a reliance on survey instruments is that they reduce the complexities of a problem to a simple number (cf. Denzin, 2009). As a result, these studies’ findings are general and focus on the cultural mismatch that students are perceived to have when they first entered the institution. The early experiences of the institution are said to be significant because at this time
the students’ prior cultural learning and preparation poses the most acute problems for their education (cf. Yang et al., 2006; Gloria, et al., 2008).

Two main issues with the students’ culture were identified in these studies. The first issue was with the students’ home or primary culture. Studies, such as Yang et al. (2006) and Swami et al. (2010), focused on the Eastern Asian international students' experiences of cultural fit. In one study, Swami et al. (2010) collected questionnaire responses from 249 Malaysian students studying in Britain. They and others (cf. Rosenthal, et al., 2007; Sulkowski & Deakin, 2009) argued that the students who struggled with cultural fit exhibited behaviours, personality traits and cognitive abilities that were incompatible with the institutions in which they were enrolled. Specific examples included the students not seeking help or assistance with class and assessment work (Gloria et al., 2008), not understanding what was required of them (cf. Biggs, 2003), plagiarising and displaying inappropriate obsequiousness with their teachers (cf. Durkin, 2008), or experiencing heightened levels of stress and anxiety (Rosenthal et al., 2007; Sulkowski & Deakin, 2009). Social networks were advocated as a means of assisting or alleviating students' levels of stress (Poyrazli, Thukral & Duru, 2010).

Poyrazli et al. (2010) used a large-scale quantitative survey and found that cultural fit was most greatly enhanced by the students’ social connections and support. International students were described as having problems in establishing solid social networks in their host country. The advantage of positive social networks included successful adaptation and adjustment to international education (Bartram, 2007; Rosenthal et al., 2007; Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping, & Todman, 2008; Leask, 2009). Further, the students who established strong social networks were found to
experience fewer incidents of depression, social isolation and loneliness (Kashima & Loh, 2006; Yang et al., 2006; Jung et al., 2007; Sawir et al., 2008).

Sawir et al. (2008) undertook a survey of 200 students studying onshore in nine Australian universities. They found that students who established solid social networks were less likely to suffer from entrenched loneliness and social alienation. They argued that, if the students did not address their feelings of loneliness by establishing social networks in their new country, their academic achievement would decrease. Moreover, a decrease in educational achievement was often accompanied by attrition.

Moving away from large-scale quantitative survey instruments, Rosenthal et al. (2007) conducted interviews with a large cohort of international students studying in one Australian university. They found that the factors that most influenced cultural fit were the students' connectedness with other students, both domestic and international, in the city in which they were living. They found that social mixing between Asian students and Australian students heightened international students' sense of connection. However, their findings suggest that Asian students were less likely to mix with Australian students than with students from their own home countries. Rosenthal et al. (2007) stated that those students who had connections with people who knew them personally, and with whom they could talk about personal issues, were best able to adapt to their new environment.

In their study, Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping and Todman (2008) performed a review of literature, with a particular emphasis on Chinese international students in UK universities. They found that students who (a) spent informal time with peers, (b) were interacting with host nationals, and (c) had made friends in the new institutional environment were less likely to experience academic problems and social difficulties.
They argued that students who had severely limited interactions with host nationals were an extreme case of student sojourners. These students experienced the “greatest differences in cultural expectations” and thus suffered greater problems with adaptation and cultural fit (Zhou et al., 2008, p. 73).

Consequently, students who were unable to establish strong relationships with individuals in the host country were described as having problems with cultural fit. These problems were said to have hindered the students’ adaptation and adjustment to international education. Problems with adaptation and adjustment, due to limited socialisation, were found to heighten social stress. In one study, Leask (2009) argued that the institution had a role in reducing social stress by promoting interactions between home and host students. She argued for specialised programs to assist with international students’ cultural fit (cf. Leask, 2009).

Leask’s (2009) study collected data from small-scale, informal interviews and anecdotal accounts from staff and students. She asked staff and students to recount their experiences with the formal curriculum, as well as informal curricular experiences, in Australian institutions, as these experiences affected cultural fit. Leask (2009) and others (cf. Ye, 2006a; 2006b; Green, 2007; Zhang & Brunton, 2007) found that the informal curriculum of out-of-class activities organised by institutions was significant to student adaptation. Out-of-class activities were usually restricted to establishing *buddy arrangements* (cf. Ye, 2006a; 2006b; Green, 2007; Leask, 2009) and working with the *homestay* host family (Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004; Zhang & Brunton, 2007). Buddy arrangements was a term used to refer to institutionally-arranged relationships of support between international and domestic students which were said to improve the students’ adaptation because they had a model of how to behave in the institution (Ye, 2006a; 2006b; Green, 2007).
In addition to buddy arrangements, there was an emphasis on institutions assisting the development of relationships with host families in the *homestay* setting (Zhang & Brunton, 2007; Kinginger, 2008). Homestay was described as a tool to assist international students to adapt to the cultural demands of their new environment (cf. Tanaka, 2007). In one example, Tanaka (2007) conducted interviews with a cohort of 29 Japanese students on a study-abroad program. The homestay was perceived by students to be a tool that would assist them with learning the language and culture of the host country. However, their experiences of homestay were quite different: Instead of an immersion in culture and language, the participant students described limited opportunities to use English, which prevented them from adapting to the host nation’s language and culture.

Similarly, in a study of students from the US studying in several countries, Kinginger (2008) found that, for many students, the expectation of homestay was that living with a host family would allow students to explore a second language in a safe and supportive environment through immersion into the culture of the host country. Focusing on students’ qualitative accounts, also collected in interviews, she found that some of her participants experienced problems, including feeling uncomfortable in the homestay and, when English speaking homestay guests arrived, a failure to immerse themselves in the host language. Further, in a study of the literature on second language socialisation, Wang (2011) found that there was conflicting evidence around the homestay advantages. Citing one study (Allan, Dristas & Mills, 2007), Wang (2011) argued that the students who engaged with the host family in the homestay setting were better able to identify with the host culture. However, failure to use the host language was a consistent problem.
Homestay was considered to be a particularly significant social interaction in the secondary school sector. For example, Richardson and Hurworth (2007) used qualitative interviews and focus groups to collect data from staff at ten secondary schools. They argued that communication with the host family assisted secondary school age international students in Australia to adapt their culture and fit in at their schools. Students of all ages, but especially younger students, were found to gain emotional support and supervision that positively influenced their experience of international education (Richardson & Hurworth, 2007). Consequently, the establishment of positive social interactions with members of their homestay families was found to assist students to adapt to the culture of the host country and its institutions (Zhang & Brunton, 2007; Popadiuk, 2009; 2010; Collins, 2010).

In three recent studies, Popadiuk (2009; 2010) and Collins (2010) argued that the homestay family was the significant factor in international secondary school students’ adaptation. Popadiuk (2009) interviewed international students studying in Canadian secondary schools. She advocated for school counsellors to openly discuss the issues faced by international secondary school students in their homestay host families. Through an analysis of narratives constructed in qualitative interviews, she concluded that open discussion about homestay should be encouraged, so that counsellors could intervene early when problems first arose. Early intervention was generally understood to involve providing information about support mechanisms and helping international students to build trusting relationships with their host families.

However, providing information to students and early intervention may not always be enough to help students overcome their problems. In a later study, Popadiuk (2010) found that large numbers of the participant students experienced
problems that could not be overcome through information and early intervention alone. Problems related to: (a) a feeling of financial exploitation; (b) a feeling of being scared or lonely in homestay; (c) dark and dirty environments in other people’s houses; (d) a feeling of being betrayed when the homestay did not follow through with what they had offered the student; and (e) being unsure how to change the living arrangements when homestay did not work out. She advocated, in much the same terms as in her previous study (cf. Popadiuk, 2009), that school counsellors had a major role to play in preparing international students for their adaptation to the homestay and, when this was effectively managed, to overcome issues with adjustment and isolation. Many of the issues identified in the Popadiuk (2009; 2010) studies will be raised in the data analysis chapters. Good Collins (2010) analysed qualitative interview accounts of the homestay-student relationship in New Zealand. Citing the work of Schmidt-Rinehart and Knight (2004), he argued that international students learned the gestures, approaches, language and skills of adaptation through their homestay. Collins (2010) found that students who lived with a host family who provided a safe and supportive environment were better able to adapt to the demands of the institution. Adaptation would be facilitated by students’ learning to feel comfortable and confident interacting in an English speaking, Western environment.

The failure to manage social relationships and homestay was problematic. In many cases, students felt that their homestay families, their lecturers and the other students were discriminating against them. *Discrimination* was defined as “receiving mistreatment, and feeling socially isolated” because of differences “based on race or color” (Poyrazli et al., 2010, p. 26). The effect of discrimination was that it made adaptation to the Western learning environment difficult (cf. Tavakoli, Lumley, Hijazi,
For example, Hanassab (2006) conducted a questionnaire with a large sample of students at UCLA, and found that, while there were more discriminatory incidents off-campus, all international students had experienced some form of discrimination from UCLA staff, students and faculty. The discrimination meant that “an extraordinary learning opportunity … is often neglected” (Hanassab, 2006, p. 170). Similarly, Meegan and Kashima (2010) used a large sample questionnaire to examine the experiences of Asian international students in an Australian university. They found that there was a relationship between expectations of discrimination and the experience of discrimination. As such, those students who reported that they had been discriminated against had expected some levels of discrimination. Put simply, this study suggests that the students were expecting discrimination and, thus, they experienced it. The effect of discrimination was low self-esteem. The researchers argued that those students who felt they had experienced the greatest discrimination were more likely to have associated themselves with the host group. Issues of discrimination will be taken up in the data analytic chapters, where students’ reports on the racism they experienced is examined.

The findings of Hanassab (2006) reflect the work of Poyrazli and Lopez (2007), who also found that lower self-esteem, depression and homesickness were directly related to perceptions of discrimination and a lack of interaction with peers from the host country. Poyrazli and Lopez (2007) argued that the effects of discrimination on their large sample survey group in one US university were that students “segregated themselves from White students” (p. 267). For Swami et al. (2010), the key was proficiency in English. They conducted a survey with 249 Malaysian students.
studying various courses onshore in several British universities. They found that those students who spoke English fluently had more contact with British students, were less likely to perceive high levels of cultural difference and were better adapted to life in their host country.

These studies have argued that there is a link between the students’ culture and their experiences of education. Those students whose cultural backgrounds were described as similar to the culture of the enrolling institution were most effective at fitting into the institution. By contrast, those students who had a different cultural background struggled to fit into the institution. While buddy arrangements and homestay were used to assist students in making the adjustment, these were found to be ineffective in many cases.

In what follows, literature that focuses on the influence of culture on the learning styles of different groups of students is reviewed. The next section is principally concerned with Eastern Asian international students, who, it is argued, struggled to adapt their learning style, mediated by their culture, to the academic environment in higher education institutions in the UK, US, Australia, Canada and New Zealand.

**Culture and learning styles**

Mitsis and Foley (2009) described international students as having a learning style that was directly related to their cultural background. Their study, and others (cf. Nilsson, Butler, Shouse & Joshi, 2008; Mitsis & Foley, 2009), suggested that Eastern Asian students' learning styles were determined by their cultural background and were thus different from the learning styles demanded in Western education. It was the role of the lecturer and support staff to understand the students’ cultural learning styles and to make allowances for those differences (Mitsis & Foley, 2009). In two
recent studies, Nilsson et al. (2008) and Mitsis and Foley (2009) analysed the classroom behaviours, classroom interactions, teaching style preferences and achievement motivations of international students. Both studies argued that international students’ cultural differences had affected their ability to adjust to the demands of their host institutions. In these studies, the international students’ learning style was observed in their behaviours in the classroom, as well as in the students’ reports of their learning style preferences and their achievement motivation.

Eastern Asian students were said to have specific preferences in assessment and monitoring (cf. Sulkowski & Deakin, 2009). For example, peer assessment was found to be difficult for Eastern Asian international students, such as those from Vietnam, because it led to the judgement of, and disagreements with, their peers.

Studies conducted by Nilsson et al. (2008), Sulkowski and Deakin (2009), Pham and Gillies (2010) and Liu, Liu, Lee and Magjka (2010) used Hofstede’s (1994) five measurable cultural dimension factors in an attempt to define the cultural differences between Eastern Asian students and Western pedagogy. In brief, the five factors are: Power distance, which refers to the acceptance of unequal power relations; individualism versus collectivism and the degree of group integration; uncertainty avoidance, or the tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty; long-term orientation; and restraint, or the ability to delay gratification (cf. Hofstede, 1984). Sulkowski and Deakin (2009) argued that “the benefit derived from the application of Hofstede’s dimensions in classifying cultural difference is in acquiring knowledge and understanding of the relevant implications for a diverse range of learners” (Sulkowski & Deakin, 2009, p. 162). As a result, the international students in their study were said to have different learning needs and to require different teaching styles based on their adherence to an Asian cultural dimension. It is noted that the Asian cultural
dimension was used to define all students who were identified as Asian students, thus constructing a singular Asian student learning style.

Liu et al. (2010) argued that Hofstede’s (1986) dimensions of culture approach allowed for the measurement of cultural difference. While acknowledging the essentialist nature of Hofstede’s work (cf. Goodfellow & Hewling, 2005), a concept that will be discussed in Chapter Three, they stated that the dimensions of culture model “has proven to be a valid framework for analyzing cultural differences in teaching and learning” (Liu et al., 2010, p. 178). Citing the work of Wang (2007), whom, they argued, proved the validity of Hofstede’s framework, Liu et al. (2010) found that by using culturally sensitive materials, scaffolding instructions and expectations, and varying activities, international students would be able to transition into international education more effectively.

Liu et al. (2010) found that understanding Eastern Asian international students’ learning styles would allow staff to identify ways in which the primary culture affected learning and achievement in the Western institution. In their study of Eastern Asian students enrolled in an online MBA course in one US university, large-scale one-on-one interviews and focus groups were used to examine the students’ experiences of cultural differences. They found that Eastern Asian students were passive learners in online contexts. Liu et al. (2010) argued that this passivity stemmed from their Confucian culture.

The Liu et al. (2010) study found that the students’ cultures affected their achievement and learning in international education. For example, achievement was affected because they were seen to be too passive to seek clarification and help when required (cf. Liu et al., 2010). The Liu et al. (2010) study argued that the “degree to which students hold high Confucian, collectivism, and high uncertainty
avoidance culturally anchored values” affected their “reflective and theoretical learning” (Mitsis & Foley, 2009, p. 250). Liu et al. (2010) and Mitsis and Foley (2009) described Eastern Asian students as having a passive learning style associated with their Confucian culture. Their views of Eastern Asian students’ Confucian cultural background were informed by Hofstede’s (1984) work.

Pham and Gilles (2010) used Hofstede’s (1984) cultural theories to argue why Confucian students avoided open conflicts in class. They argued that conflict was counter-intuitive to their culture, which emphasised providing negative feedback indirectly and never face-to-face. The result was that the culture of the students in their study negatively impacted on their achievement in Western education because they avoided conflict in class discussions. The finding that students avoided conflict due to their cultural background supported earlier studies undertaken by Andrade (2006) and Currie (2007), who found that academic and professional staff, as well as domestic students, described Confucian students as passive, teacher-centred learners. The Confucian students' learning styles were said to be incompatible with the learning and teaching styles valued in institutions in the US in particular (Andrade, 2006; Currie, 2007). Park (2000), whose work was cited by Pham and Gilles (2010), argued that the Eastern Asian students preferred a passive pedagogy, namely to unquestioningly respect authority, to hold a strong commitment to family and traditions, and to have a strong social hierarchy and a patriarchal world-view. This view of the Eastern Asian student is contrasted with that of the Western student. Park (2000) and Burnapp (2006) argued that, unlike Eastern Asian students, Western students in the US were able to manage the active pedagogy valued in Western institutions. For these researchers, active pedagogy was characterised by a questioning of sources and the use of argumentation and essays. Active pedagogy
was considered problematic for students who avoided uncertainty, because they were unable to rely on their teacher to give them information. In addition, active pedagogy required students and teachers to interact in a meaningful and equal exchange, which was considered problematic for students who were socialised into a distant relationship with those who held power, presumably the teachers.

These studies have argued that the students’ culture has negatively impacted on their experiences of Western education and their achievements. Those students whose cultural backgrounds were described as Asian were described as having problems adapting to the institution because of factors including a perception that they were passive and teacher centred, avoided uncertainty and conflict and were unable to engage with the institutions’ active pedagogy.

In contrast to the five measurable cultural dimension factors, Mitsis and Foley (2009) used Hofstede’s (cf. 1980) cluster approach. This approach places different countries into cultural clusters, based on their heritage rather than their geographic region. This approach is used to explain the impact of Confucian culture on learning. Mitsis and Foley (2009) used data from a large questionnaire cohort to argue that Hofstede’s (1980) cluster approach overcame some of the criticisms of his dimensions of culture approach used in the Liu et al. (2010) study. Acknowledging the Goodfellow and Hewling (2005) criticisms of Hofstede’s (1980) work, they argued that “country culture clusters identified that even if countries reside in the same geographic location or region it does not automatically result in similar cultural beliefs or values” (Mitsis & Foley, 2009, p. 241). As a result, geographic regions, such as Southeast Asia, will have multiple clusters. Understanding the multiple cultural characteristics within a region, they argued, overcame the criticisms of Hofstede’s (1980) work as essentialising cultures with geographic regions.
In one study, Sukowski and Deakin (2009) built on Hofstede's (1980) work to propose that the differences between Asian- and what they termed Western pedagogy fitted into one of four categories. These categories were: (1) language; (2) teaching and learning preferences; (3) assessment preferences; and (4) interactions with staff and peers. Thus, students' problems with international education were related to problems in one or more of the four categories. In order to assist students to adapt their culture to the Western pedagogy described by Sukowski and Deakin (2009), changes to induction programs, such as English for Academic Preparation (EAP) courses, were advocated (Burnapp, 2006; Kim, 2006; Peelo & Luxon, 2007; Counsell, 2011). The EAP was seen as a strategy to overcome the students' educational problems. For example, Burnapp (2006) stated that students needed to learn to adapt their approaches to learning, while the EAP needed to focus on change rather than deficits. He and others (cf. Carroll & Ryan, 2005) argued that the EAP defined the students' educational deficits as originating in the cultural baggage they brought with them to the institution. However, this view is problematised because it implies that only the students carry cultural baggage “and not … the teachers” (Carroll & Ryan, 2005, p. 23).

Counsell (2011) extended this work to argue that generic EAPs were less likely than discipline-specific courses to be able to prepare students for study in the Australian university. Following five international students, Counsell (2011) conducted a questionnaire and semi-structured interview with the participants, and argued that the focus on educational deficits in the Eastern Asian international cohort merely reproduced stereotypes. While many problems were still evident, including using Academic English, the study supported the findings of Carroll and Ryan (2005),
who argued that a ‘difference as deficit’ approach is too simplistic to explain and address international students’ issues in Western education.

The difference as deficit approach described Eastern Asian students as ‘different’ and their deficits in academic performance as resulting from their cultural learning preferences (cf. Burnapp, 2006; Peelo & Luxon, 2007). Thus, Confucian heritage students were said to need to be explicitly taught specific skills in order to overcome their deficits that impacted negatively on their experiences of Western education (Counsell, 2011). These skills included reflective learning (Burnapp, 2006), essay writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Min, 2006; Bretag, 2007; Green, 2007; Counsell, 2011), and proper referencing to avoid plagiarism (Duff, Rogers & Harris, 2006; Nguyen, 2010; Martin, Rao & Sloan, 2011), as well as remedial instruction related to their discipline of study (Peelo & Luxon, 2007; Lee, 2010; Counsell, 2011). Explicit instruction in specific academic skills, Counsell (2011) argued, would assist students in adapting their learning style to institutional demands and thus reduce their educational deficits.

Two main problems have been identified with cultural learning style research. Firstly, there is the problem of whether institutions are responsible for ensuring that Confucian heritage international students, to whom they have offered a place, are properly prepared for the ‘rigours’ and ‘demands’ of learning (cf. Park, 2000; Kennedy, 2002; Carroll & Ryan, 2005; Counsell, 2010). Researchers who have identified this problem advocate for specialised introductory programs that help students adapt their Confucian cultural background to the demands of the institution. For example, Valiente (2008) argued that students needed to learn how to adjust their behaviours to the requirements of the Western institution through their preparation programs. These programs were found to be a means through which so-
called Confucian students could learn the skills and attributes of successful Western learners.

Secondly, studies that were critical of the cultural learning style approach questioned whether the descriptions of international students’ learning styles were accurate (cf. Sayers & Franklin, 2008; Goodfellow & Lamy, 2008). Consequently, Hofstede’s dimensions of culture and cluster approaches were problematised because they were found to assume that learning traits were shared by groups of students based on geographic or cultural region (cf. Goodfellow & Lamy, 2008). Thus, all students from Southeast Asia were assumed to share Confucian cultural characteristics, and as a result, to have the same cultural learning style. Assuming that all international students had the same Confucian culture naturalised international students’ learning problems because it ascribed attributes to all students from the same geographic region (Poyrazli & Lopez, 2007; Goodfellow & Lamy, 2008). In addition, as will be discussed extensively in Chapter Three, studies (cf. Kettle, 2005; 2010) have argued that the emphasis on cultural learning styles may affect students’ agency in the institution because they are proactive and strategically engage with the content and their experiences in more nuanced ways. Other studies (cf. Manathunga, 2009), which will also be discussed in the following chapter, have problematised learning style literature for failing to consider alternatives to the focus on learning style.

In summary, the focus on learning styles, especially those associated with a Confucian heritage, viewed international students as different and as experiencing specific problems in the institution because of their cultural background (cf. Lee, 2010; Martin et al., 2011). Students’ learning style preferences were linked with aspects of their culture that were considered inappropriate for institutions in the UK,
the USA, Canada and Australia. While the focus on the learning styles of international students was problematised in several studies cited above, it appeared that the major focus was on the problems faced by students from a Confucian heritage background – Eastern Asian students in higher education.

The research reviewed above assumes that the students' problems with adaptation and learning stem from their Confucian cultural heritage. As such, it is argued that all Confucian heritage students have a similar learning style and are inculcated into the same cultural background, thus requiring the same specialised introductory program (cf. Sayers & Franklin, 2008). In their study of international students from Asia studying in New Zealand, Sayers and Franklin (2008) argued that the situation was more complex, in spite of the persistence of the international student stereotype of “silent, passive, non-participatory and surface learners” (p. 80). They argued that self-reflection on the part of the lecturer, and the challenging of their cultural assumptions, were two ways that specialised introductory programs could be improved and the stereotypes of cultural learning eliminated.

This review provides a foundation for understanding how the research literature has used cultural and social backgrounds to describe the international students who enroll in Western education. Further, it suggests that culture may contribute to the ways that staff account for the experiences of Eastern Asian international students in Australian schooling. As a result, in Chapter Three, culture will be used as one of the theoretical concepts that this study adopts to analyse data. The next section of this chapter reviews literature that describes international students' motivations for seeking an international education.
Motivations for seeking international study

This section will review literature that suggests that there are several motivations for international students who access an education in Western institutions. One such motivation is the possibility of migration, a concept that will be taken up in Chapter Seven, which analyses students' responses. For example, several studies (cf. Hawthorne, 2005; 2010; Jones, 2006; Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007) have noted that students choose to access international education in a particular country because they plan to migrate there at the completion of their course. In one example, an Australian study found that up to 75% of students from India stayed on in Australia indefinitely after they had successfully completed their higher education course requirements (Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007). Further, in US-based studies, interviews with staff have established a perception that permanent residence in the host country was the main reason why international students chose to study in a particular location and on a particular course (Hazen & Alberts, 2005; 2006).

Recent studies in Australia have argued that migration might be a positive outcome of the international student cohort. To illustrate, Jackling and Keneley (2009), Hawthorne (2010) and Hawthorne and Hamilton (2011) argued that the international student population was a ready source of skilled workers. For example, in response to the decline in fertility in Australia, as well as the ageing population, international students could be used as a trained migrant pool to meet Australia’s skills needs (Hawthorne & Hamilton, 2011). As a result, encouraging international students to study courses that are undersubscribed by Australian students was suggested as a means to address the skills shortages that exist in medicine (Hawthorne, 2010; Hawthorne & Hamilton, 2011) and other professions, such as accountancy (Jackling & Keneley, 2009). The use of educational migration to fill skills
shortages has led to a situation in which visas exist to encourage international students to study particular courses with the promise of migration.

Still other studies, such as that by Chaloff and Lemaître (2009), examined migration statistics to argue that encouraging international students to stay in the host country at the completion of their degrees was one way of reducing skills and labour shortages in all OECD countries. Chiswick and Miller (2009) argued that encouraging migration among skilled international students could mitigate against the “less-than-perfect international transferability of human capital” (p. 162). Thus, in much the same terms as Charloff and Lemaître (2009), Hawthorne and Hamilton (2011) and Hawthorne (2010), Chiswick and Miller (2009) stated that international education could be used to promote a migration agenda that suited the national interest of the host country. The migration agenda was linked with the national interest because it ensured the country’s productivity by mitigating against skills shortages in specific industries.

However, studies focusing on the students’ perspective have not found that the intention to migrate to the host country was motivating the students. For example, in a series of studies by Hazen and Alberts (2005; 2006), focus groups with international students studying in the US to determine their migration intentions post-study found that the students did not cite migration as their main goal. Rather, it was argued that the students’ interest in international education stemmed from a perceived benefit to their future careers and employment prospects in the home, not host, country (Hazen & Alberts, 2005; 2006).

Several studies (cf. Stafford, 2004; Huang & Yeoh, 2005; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Waters, 2007) support the view that the benefits of international education are most felt by the students on their return to their home countries. These studies argue
that international students seek an international education for two principal reasons. The first reason that they seek out an international education is in order to improve their English, and the second reason is as an investment in their futures (cf. Salisbury, et al., 2009). Investment in the future involves accessing opportunities to improve career and life prospects upon return to the home country (Salisbury, et al., 2009). The notion of investment will be taken up in the next chapter.

In several studies, English competence gained through international study in schools in Australia, Canada and the USA was described as a form of cultural capital (Stafford, 2004; Waters, 2006; 2007; Salisbury et al., 2009; Hayden, 2011). Using the work of Bourdieu (1984), these studies defined cultural capital as the social assets that an individual possesses that predispose that individual to achieve in education. Generally, these studies have used a qualitative case study approach, including, individual and focus group interviews with international students to identify the cultural knowledge, skills and educational credentials (Stafford, 2004; Waters, 2006; 2007; Salisbury et al., 2009; Hayden, 2011). Thus, English competence was described as a form of cultural capital, in line with Bourdieu (1984), that improved the standing of the international student. For example, Waters (2007) proposed that high school students from Hong Kong who were educated in Canada were able to position themselves as part of an exclusive overseas-educated student habitus through international study. Her study defined habitus, using the work of Bourdieu (1984), as "the formative relationship between individuals and their socio-cultural surroundings" (Waters, 2007, p. 478). For Waters (2008), this overseas-educated habitus means that students who were educated in Canada learned particular dispositions and habits from their experience that reinforced their sense of entitlement and advantage.
The overseas-educated student habitus was developed through the acquisition of cultural capital, such as English language proficiency and an international perspective demonstrated through the overseas qualification (cf. Waters, 2006; 2007). Waters (2006) defined cultural capital as valued knowledge acquired over a long timeframe, which ensures social advantage. She argued that the value of the qualification depended “upon their membership of an exclusive network of ‘overseas’ students and graduates, facilitating their transition into the labour market” (Waters, 2006, p. 185). The smooth transition of these students into the labour market has been found to further reproduce social inequalities, as these students were able to access a highly elite education that led to greater prestige. The greater prestige signalled an elite experience of education.

In one recent study of international students enrolled in secondary schools, Hayden (2011) argued that these students were the “materially relatively privileged … transnational elite” (p. 215-216). She traced the history of schools offering places to international students to expatriate schools of the 1920s. Citing the work of Bryceson and Vuorela (2008), she argued that these schools originally offered expatriate communities “the symbolic capital of education and language” that would “enable them to move freely, offering relatively easier access to border crossing and citizenship” (p. 8). However, the expatriate school has been supplanted by mainstream schools offering education to international students. Citing the work of Waters (2006), Hayden (2011) argued that these schools offered social status to those who could afford it because students would acquire what was termed a Western education. As a result, Hayden (2011) argued that the international school sector was part of a multi-billion dollar global industry linked to other international trade in commodities. Quoting the work of MacDonald (2006), she stated that
international schools are “a natural stepchild of international business and provide a vital piece of international business infrastructure” (p. 218).

In her analysis of the history of these schools, Hayden (2011) argued that the purchase of an education at a school in a foreign country represented the desires of affluent families for a “form of education as a prestigious commodity perceived to be superior to the ... education that would be experienced in local schools” (p. 218). She argued that international students’ parents were unlikely to be globally mobile, rather they were aspirational for their children. The family's aspiration was for the child to access an elite higher education in a Western, English-speaking country, which was more readily accessed if the student had studied in a secondary school in the same country. As a result, she found that parents were accessing these schools as a form of institutionalised cultural capital that ensured social reproduction. Institutionalised cultural capital is the cultural capital associated with institutional success. These students were different from those who accessed an international education under the Colombo Plan (see discussion in Chapter One).

In a similar study conducted in Australia, Stafford (2004) argued that international students in Australian schools were described as buying into international education as a form of embodied and institutional cultural capital that ensured social reproduction. He defined social reproduction as the ways that international education facilitated the reproduction of the social structure, ensuring that the children of elite parents would be able to access elite education. Social reproduction was found to have occurred through the takeup of valuable embodied cultural capital, for which the value lay in the exclusivity of the credentials. Thus, in similar ways to the habitus acquired through international study described by Waters (2006; 2007), the cultural capital of an overseas qualification was found to be of
benefit to those students who had accessed international education because it ensured they were able to be successful in careers in their home countries (cf. Waters, 2007). In these studies, Bourdieu’s (1984) work on social reproduction was used to explain why parents went to great lengths to ensure that their children accessed the right academic credentials to secure professional jobs and careers (Waters, 2007). Not only were international students acquiring cultural capital, but they were also purportedly acquiring other forms of capital such as social capital. For example, Mehra and Bishop (2007) described international students as being able to develop new and mutually beneficial relationships from their enrolment in international study. They used the term ‘social capital’ to refer to a branch of human capital that develops links between culturally diverse peoples in times of globalisation and global connection. Mehra and Bishop (2007) argued that the need to develop social capital “related to [the interactions] of people with others in groups or communities” (p. 32). Consequently, the students who accessed an international education were positioned within aspirations for new cultural and social knowledge and skills that would benefit them in their careers (Stafford, 2004; Waters, 2006; 2007; Mehra & Bishop, 2007).

However, other studies have reported that the capital gained through international study may be used as compensation for failing in the home country (Waters, 2006; Brooks & Waters, 2009a; 2009b). In these cases, international education becomes a second chance draw for prospective students. In one example, Waters (2006) described international education as an escape for students who were unable to cope in the highly competitive and stratified local, or home country, educational system, particularly at school level. Thus, an international education
offered the students of the Waters (2006) study a chance to avoid failure in the Hong Kong school system, through access to Canadian education.

Similarly, a series of studies by Brooks and Waters (2009a; 2009b) used small-scale qualitative interviews with international students to argue that British students accessed an international tertiary education to secure a *second chance* at success. Their studies suggest that students in Britain accessed study in international institutions outside the UK, so as to avoid “‘failure’ (or potential failure) ‘at home’” (Brooks & Waters, 2009a, p. 199). For the students of Brooks and Waters’ (2009a; 2009b) studies, choosing an American or European university was predicated on a failure to secure acceptance into the top universities in Britain, particularly Oxford and Cambridge. Access to overseas study offered these students a second chance at success through “gaining access to highly elite higher education” (Brooks & Waters, 2009b, p. 1094). Thus, it appears that for both tertiary and secondary school students, an overseas education offers some students a second chance at the academic, and to some extent social, recognition they both anticipate and require from education (cf. Waters, 2006; Brooks and Waters, 2009a; 2009b).

In summary, the benefits afforded to international students were generally seen on their return to their home countries. In some cases, the perception was that students sought overseas study for migration. However, the majority of studies argued for different benefits that were seen in the home, not the host, country. The benefits were varied. In several studies, it was English competence and improved future job and career prospects (cf. Stafford, 2004). However, other research suggested that the major benefit was a ‘second chance’ at success. Access to a second chance at success will be taken up in the data analysis chapters of this
dissertation. The next section focuses on the institutional context and discusses the benefits for the institution.

**Internationalisation of education**

This section reviews the literature that argues that international students encourage the introduction of an international perspective into institutions. It positions the research questions guiding this study within literature that argues that institutions are able to demonstrate an international perspective through the enrolment of Eastern Asian international students.

International students were said to introduce a cross-cultural appreciation or an international focus to the institution (cf. Gu, Schweisfurth & Day, 2009). In addition, studies by Haigh (2002; 2009), Guest, Livett and Stone (2006), Schulz, Lee, Cantwell, McClellen and Woodard (2007) and Gu et al. (2009) suggested that international students contributed to the curriculum, pedagogy and experiences of domestic students. Studies by Leask (2006) and Altbach and Knight (2007) have argued that international students provided a ‘lesson’ in cultural politics, globalisation and international perspectives.

Haigh (2009) used observation of classroom practice in the UK to argue that the enrolment of international students challenged institutions to develop courses and curricular offerings that “embed and validate … cultures other than the Western and present them to local learners without making them seem exhibits in a museum” (p. 271). His focus was on the cross-cultural appreciation that was developed through international students studying both onshore and in hubs. Hubs are regions in which international institutions establish small faculties in order to facilitate ease of enrolment for students. One example is the establishment of UK university hubs in
Dubai, Bahrain and Kuala Lumpur. It was argued that international student enrolments would result in a better future that would be seen in its promotion of “justice, security, equality, human rights, and economic sustainability” (Stromquist, 2007, pp. 81-82).

The view that international students provided a lesson in intercultural competence and cultural politics was often described in terms of interactions between domestic and international students. Intercultural competence was defined as bridging global and domestic cultural diversity by focusing on patterns of interaction in a cultural context (Deardorff, 2006; Bennett & Salonen, 2007). It was said to be achieved through formal and informal interactions between groups of students (cf. Hammond, 2008; Banks, 2008; Gu et al., 2009; Leask, 2009).

Intercultural competence was described as a benefit for both the international and domestic students. Firstly, international students were said to benefit by interacting with teaching staff and domestic students (Bennett & Salonen, 2007). Secondly, intercultural competence was said to benefit domestic students who, it was argued, learned to communicate effectively and appropriately with students of different cultures while studying (Deardorff, 2006; Schulz et al., 2007). The enrolment of international students was also said to contribute to the development of cross-cultural appreciation in all graduates (cf. Deardorff, 2006; Schulz et al., 2007).

However, a series of studies have been critical of the ways that international students were, in many cases, positioned as the primary means through which an international perspective was introduced into the institution (Heppner, 2006; Wei, Heppner, Mallen, Ku, Liao & Wu, 2007; Ninomiya, Knight & Watanabe, 2009). Studies by Schulz et al. (2007), Gu et al. (2009) and van der Wende, (2009) argued that the enrolment of international students did not provide an international
perspective. Haigh (2002), Moore (2005), Schulz et al. (2007), Gu et al. (2009) and van der Wende, (2009) have all argued that international students were not forming relationships with domestic students, thus the international perspective was not being introduced effectively into the institution. As such, because there was a lack of real contact between groups of international and domestic students, there was also a lack of interaction through which true cross-cultural appreciation could occur (Sovic, 2008; Gu et al., 2009; Brown, 2009).

Brown (2009) undertook a year-long ethnographic study of a group of international students enrolled in the UK. She found that, in many cases, institutions had failed to address friendship patterns between domestic and international students and between groups of multinational students, and had failed to provide adequate opportunities for diverse interaction. Brown (2009) defined multinational students, in line with Hofstede (2001), as groups of students, both domestic and international, from a variety of different countries and regions. The study found that these institutions would not be able to claim the cross-cultural appreciation benefits that were said to have developed in other literature because of a lack of interaction among students.

Brown’s study, and others (cf. Hellstén & Reid, 2009; Haigh, 2009; Dogra, Reitmanova & Carter-Pokras, 2010), argued that centralised programs were required to encourage successful intercultural interactions between domestic and international students. Thus, this research supported the findings of studies, reviewed above, that argued that, in order to assist international students to transition into the institution, diverse interactions between international and domestic students should be encouraged.
The research reviewed above described students as a cross-cultural or intercultural awareness resource for the Western institution. International students were seen as one of the principal means through which internationalisation was enacted. By contrast, other studies have criticized the positioning of international students as a resource of internationalizing education. They argue that educational institutions need to design curriculum and pedagogy to encourage communication between domestic and international students.

Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter suggests several pertinent concepts that will be explored in the remainder of this dissertation. These concepts are culture, cultural capital, and adaptation. Firstly, there is an emphasis on culture in the review. Culture is said to affect several aspects of the institutional experiences of Eastern Asian international students. These experiences include the adjustment and cultural fit, the learning style of, and the benefits that are accrued by these students.

Secondly, the literature reviewed above suggests other concepts that will be significant in an analysis of the experiences of Eastern Asian students in Australian schools. In particular, the studies by Waters (2006; 2007) and Brooks and Waters (2009a; 2009), suggest that, beyond the cultural capital of English language competence and a global perspective, students access international education as a second chance at success. The notion that a Western education at a secondary school in Australia may represent a second chance at success will be explored in the present study.
Concepts of culture and cultural capital are connected to notions of cultural identity because they suggest that students’ cultural backgrounds affect their experiences of education. Although the concept of a specific Confucian culture or the influence of Asian students’ cultural background is contested, the literature suggests that culture is significant in accounting for ways that international students experience education in countries like Australia. For example, the emphasis on culture and its affects on learning, adaptation and migration suggest that students' experiences of education in their host countries are tied up with their cultural identities. The studies reviewed in this chapter focus on the importance of culture in defining the students, identifying who they are as learners (cf. Liu et al., 2010), as migrants (cf. Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007) and as a lesson in cross-cultural appreciation (cf. Gu et al., 2009) through an examination of their cultural background.

The literature describing students as a cross-cultural resource suggests that a notion of belonging would be significant to any study endeavouring to examine students’ experiences of international education. For example, the study by Poyrazli and Lopez (2007) found that international students were segregating themselves from the discrimination they said they were subjected to from what they termed white students. The segregation and discrimination suggested that these students did not feel that they belonged in the institution because they were isolated from the domestic students. Rather, they defined themselves as belonging to an Eastern Asian student group. The finding suggested that the educational experience of belonging experienced by Eastern Asian international students may be affected by segregation and cultural difference.
The literature that describes students’ adaptation and cultural fit suggested that there are problems with belonging. While the geographically segmented and stereotyped use of culture will be contested in the following chapter, the studies reviewed above describe culture and cultural difference as impacting negatively on students’ adaptation and transition into Western institutions. For example, studies describe students as struggling to immerse themselves in the host culture (cf. Tanaka, 2010) and as feeling socially isolated (cf. Meegan & Kashima, 2010), lonely (cf. Sawir et al., 2008) and homesick (cf. Popadiuk, 2009; 2010). Feelings of social isolation, loneliness and homesickness suggest that the students of this study may experience problems with fitting in and belonging in their schools. This suggestion that students may experience problems is not to imply that they need to take sole responsibility for adjusting to fit in, rather this should be a shared responsibility taken on by the host country, institution, teachers, students, and home-stay parents.

The emphasis on culture in the literature has suggested that the concepts of cultural capital and belonging are significant to studies of international students’ experiences of education. As a result, the experiences that this study will explore in accounts by staff and students will focus on experiences of culture and belonging. The research questions guiding the remainder of the dissertation have been rewritten. The questions are:

1. How do staff members in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for the experiences of culture and belonging among their Eastern Asian international student cohort?
2. How do Eastern Asian international students enrolled in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for their experiences of culture and belonging?

In what follows, the concepts of culture and belonging are examined theoretically. The assumptions about cultural difference that characterise many of the findings of studies reviewed in this chapter are contested. In addition, the review conducted in the following chapter establishes the theoretical language that will be used to analyse the data. It is noted that the literature reviewed above was predominantly based on research deploying large-scale surveys and quantitative data sets. There are limitations with these methods, particularly for a study that is interested in analysing the accounts of experiences of education. The study’s interest in accounts has led to a qualitative approach, in line with the studies by Waters (2006; 2007), Brooks and Waters (2009a; 2009b). The experiences of small groups of students and staff are explored in this study to capture the specific experiences of culture and belonging among a small number of international students in schools in Australia. The qualitative data collection techniques used by this study will be discussed in Chapter Four.
Chapter Three:
Theoretical Framework
The previous chapter outlined the ways in which empirical literature was focused on assumptions about Eastern Asian students' culture. In that chapter, studies that described the deficits or problems associated with international students in Western education were reviewed. It was noted that the studies reviewed in that chapter shared several assumptions about Asian students culture that was used to account for these deficits and problems. This chapter begins by reviewing literature that takes a different theoretical view of culture. Specifically, the chapter reviews literature that takes a non-essentialist interpretation of culture. In the previous chapter, many of the studies were relying on essentialist interpretations of culture were evident. This has some problems because it can fail to consider how factors, other than culture, impact on students' experiences. Similarly, it may impose a cultural explanation of students behaviours rather than considering other learning and educational issues. Finally, it tends towards a fixed and unchanging notion of a culture than can be described for all students who share a geographic location.

This chapter discusses studies that take a non-essentialist view of culture. Drawing attention to studies that critique the essentialist view of international students' culture, as discussed above, permits the development of a language that will be used to theorise cultural identity and belonging in this dissertation. In what follows, the chapter will review literature that problematises the essentialist view of culture, and then outline the theoretical framework for this study. Firstly, studies that problematise the Confucian student discourse are reviewed. Two main themes are evident in these studies, namely the link between essentialist views of culture and agency, and the multiple discourses of Asian students' identities. Secondly, the chapter discusses the theoretical language that the study will use to analyse
experiences of culture. Thirdly, the chapter will outline the theoretical language that the study will use to analyse experiences of belonging.

**Problematising a Confucian student discourse**

This section highlights studies that critique the literature reviewed in the previous chapter. Its purpose is to examine the ways in which culture is used to account for Eastern Asian students' behaviours and experiences of education. Discourses, such as the *Asian learner*, construct “knowledge, identities and social relations as products of power relations” that determine the identities available to individuals, groups and institutions (Clark & Gieve, 2006, p. 54). As a result, “the production and circulation of discourses (such as that of ‘the Chinese learner’) … offer individual learners a restrictive social identity as a homogenous representation of national culture” (Clark & Gieve, 2006, p. 56).

In order to consider how discourses of culture would restrict an individual's experiences in education, it is useful to define how this dissertation is using the term *discourse*. Following on from Fairclough (cf. 1992), discourse is used to refer to language use as a form of social practice. For Fairclough (cf. 1992), discourses were social. They were constructed in order to establish relationships between people. For example, teachers may use discourses that construct Eastern Asian students as a group that fails to mix well with other groups of students in the school, such as domestic students. The dominance of these discourses may affect the ways that the students experience their education in the Australian school. As such, discourses have a social element. The definition of discourse provided above involves language because dominant discourses are embedded in language. To illustrate how language and discourse work together, Fairclough gives examples of how politicians give
speeches about social policy that reinforce the dominant, middle-class view of social policy. For example, it might be that married, heterosexual motherhood is dominant because other types of families are perceived as needing to be brought into line with this view of family. This example needs further explanation that refers to political speeches about social policy.

The social element of discourses means that they are language practices that embed and reproduce social and political power. Thus, following from the example above, language practices privilege certain family models. These language practices are instituted into policies that reward families who follow the dominant discourse of family. Through these policies and practices, the dominant social order is reinforced, which in turn reproduces the social and political power. Fairclough (2001) defined language as having power when used by powerful people. For him, language had power because it was socially produced and was internalised by people. As a result, language contained embedded discourses that constructed restrictive identities and social positions.

He proposed that individuals selectively inculcated the discourses available to them to construct their identity (Fairclough, 2001; 2003; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). The concept of inculcation suggests that the uptake of discourses is a slow process. Fairclough (cf. 2001) argued that discourses were initially constructed through imaginings, whereby individuals imagined what the discourse would mean to them. During the imaginings phase, there was a distance between the discourse and the individual. An individual would 'play' with the discourse, trying it on until they reached the phase that Fairclough termed inculcation. During the inculcation phase, individuals learned to own a practice and to see themselves through the discourses associated with that practice. To illustrate this point, it is useful to draw on the work of
Kettle (2010). She found that the teachers’ explicit instruction allowed students to inculcate the valued academic discourse practices associated with success in Western education. Fairclough’s theory suggests that, for the students of interest to this research study, the ownership of discourses would occur when they and others used privileged discourses of culture and belonging to account for their Australian study experience.

It is important to note that privileged discourses link with ideological power. Using the work of Fairclough (1995), Thomas (2005) argued that “ideologies work to establish and sustain relations of power and domination through hegemonic struggles over versions of reality” (p. 64). Thus, ideologies privilege some groups over others, and it is these groups that construct the preferred discourse. Through the preferred discourse, “versions of the world are presented as the natural, common sense representation of the way things are” (Thomas, 2005, p. 64). These versions of the world are “constructed by hegemonic discourses” (Thomas, 2005, p. 64) and establish the authoritative and ‘true’ discourse (Thomas, 2003). Through preferred discourses, key groups and actors are differently positioned; however, alternative discourses can be found “in the ambiguities that [characterise] … the preferred discourse” (Thomas, 2004, p. 242). Such alternative discourses define the situation differently and contest preferred discourses (cf. Thomas, 2003; 2004).

In terms of the accounts of Eastern Asian students’ experiences of culture and belonging, a discourse approach to culture will be used. The literature reviewed in the previous chapter, while problematic, suggests that the dominant discourse constructed about Eastern Asian students is a cultural discourse that positions these students as the cultural other. As a result, culture has become a central feature of the research questions, and thus, the study will examine how accounts construct Eastern
Asian international students’ experiences of culture in the Australian school. The approach taken by this dissertation is to examine how discourses of culture are used to position students in institutions. Thus, students are positioned in relation to the dominant discourses of the school.

The concept of position warrants definition. Fairclough (2003) argued that discourses constitute the subject positions that individuals inhabit. Subject positions refer to the means by which discourses construct an individual's place in the social order, particularly in relation to dominant discourses. In this way, the discourse of Confucian student may position Eastern Asian students as the cultural other whose learning and behaviours are passive, one-dimensional and unable to adapt to the Western institution. At the same time, however, subject positions are not one-sided. Individuals choose the discourses within which they position themselves. For example, Fairclough (2003) argued that “discourses are positioned representations (including reflexive self-representations of social practices)” which give rise to different representations (Fairclough, 2003, p. 23). As such, the students of interest to this study may choose to position themselves within the dominant, Confucian student, discourse.

However, studies have problematised this concept of position. Price (1999), for example, argued that the concept of position was dichotomous and unable to be reconciled with itself. He problematised the concept by arguing that it was contradictory. He stated that if discourses coerced subjects into certain positions and social practices, and if individuals were able to manipulate these positions, “where do awareness and the possibility of interests independent of discourse come from?” (Price, 1999, p. 581). He cited the work of Widdowson (1995), who suggested that language is used on two levels, the social semiotic level and the social action level.
For Widdowson (1995), the term language was confused, so that social action and social semiotic were conflated as the same thing. He argued that, at the semiotic level, social relationships were enacted and coded. It is at this level that positions were defined and identities constrained. However, at the social action level, agents were more free to choose the discourses through which they were positioned. At the level of social action, individuals were able to choose from the variety of discourses that were available to them. For Widdowson (1995) positions were always constrained by social structures.

This view of discourse is challenged by Price (1999) who argues that Widdowson (1995) has constructed a dichotomy between subject and discourse. He argues that positions may be more fruitfully understood if they are examined as a practice. The discourse position as practice theory suggests that subjects are free to perform within various discourses, so that the discourses through which they are positioned are flexible and changeable. From this perspective, it could be argued that research literature that attributes educational issues to cultural identity and difference could be limited because they create the dichotomy between subject and discourse. In terms of this dissertation, the concept of subject position suggests that students may choose to position themselves in the Confucian student discourse when it suits them but they may also seek to construct their identities through different discourses.

In what follows, two themes that emerge in the Confucian student discourse literature are the focus of attention. The first theme is concerned with agency. The main logic of the argument here is that research that poses an essentialist notion of the Confucian student identity denies students agency in terms of negotiating identity in specific educational contexts. The second theme is concerned with multiple discourses of identity. In this section, a review is undertaken of work that
problematises the Confucian student discourse because it suggests that all Asian students are considered to have the same learning style, behave in a similar manner and need the same specialised, remedial instruction to bring them into line with the culture of the Western institution. The problem of learning, in both categories of literature, is placed squarely on the ‘Asian’ students. These students are expected to adapt, change, modify and reposition themselves in line with the ‘norm’ of Western education.

**Agency**

Numerous studies have problematised the narrow description of Asian students as Confucian learners (cf. Ninnes, 1999; Maxwell, McConaghy & Ninnes, 2004; Leder & Forgasz, 2004; Kettle, 2005; 2010; Ditton, 2007; Klerides, 2009). These studies have warned of the potential impact on student agency when when teachers/educators describe students using singular, cultural representations of Asian learners. For example, Ninnes' (1999) research focused on the ways that staff members in institutions labeled Eastern Asian international students as Asian learners. He was concerned with the impact these labels had on students’ performance and engagement with learning in Australian institutions. He argued that, by positioning Asian students’ as culturally different, these students were (a) assigned ‘special needs’ and (b) had their adaptation to Western education hindered.

Ninnes argued that Asian international students who were successful in international education selectively appropriated the dominant discourses of the Western institution and adopted them into their learning practices. He used qualitative interviews with Indian students studying in an MBA program in Australia to argue that power and privilege were produced and reproduced through institutional discourses. These discourses encouraged certain types of identities and valued
certain types of knowledge. Ninnes (1999) advocated further research to examine how international students used various discourses, including Western academic discourses and cultural discourses, to (a) exercise agency over their study and (b) adapt their learning preferences to meet the challenges of Australian academic environments. The focus of Ninnes’ (1999) study was on students’ learning behaviours and, as such, it was not concerned with the students’ experiences of culture and belonging. However, its usefulness to this dissertation is in its examination of students’ awareness of the discourses used by staff to construct their learning practices in the Western institution.

Ninnes’ (1999) work has been cited by studies that examine the impact of dominant, Western, institutional discourses on the agency exercised by international students (cf. Maxwell, et al., 2004; Leder & Forgasz, 2004; Kettle, 2005; 2010; Ditton, 2007; Klerides, 2009; Leong, 2010). For example, Kettle (2005) took up the concerns with agency to examine students’ subjectivity. For Kettle (2005), subjectivity referred to the ways that international students became “a subject in and for the new context” in order to navigate their way through their postgraduate studies in Australia (Kettle, 2005, p. 51).

Kettle’s (2005) work takes a poststructural perspective, so that her focus is on subjectivity. She defined subjectivity using the work of Davies (1990). It was used to refer to the individual’s ways of making sense of self. In her study, the focus was on one international student, Woody, who, it was argued, chose to position himself within multiple discourses to secure agency and a good return on investment in international education. Return on investment was understood in terms of the resources he acquired in Australia that would assist him to be more successful in his native Thailand. Kettle (2005) used the work of Norton Pierce (1995) to theorise
Woody’s investment. The term investment was used in her study to connect each student’s desire to learn a language with their commitment to the practices of a classroom or community and complex identity processes (cf. Norton, 2000).

Kettle (2005) argued that international students’ investment in international education facilitates “a greater range of symbolic (e.g. language, education and friendship) and material resources” that “increase the value of [international students’] social and cultural capital” (p. 56). Resources and capital in this study were not used in the same way as Bourdieu’s studies (cf. 2011); rather the work of Davies (1990) was used to link resources with agency. Kettle (2005) defined agency as “enacted through certain discursive, personal, and social resources which are contingent upon access” (p. 47). She argued that the “agentive subject must have access to recognised/recognisable discursive practices, to alternative positionings, and to ‘interactive others’” (Kettle, 2005, p. 47). According to Kettle, interactive others are other members of a group, the context and the discourses that legitimate the position of the subject as an agent.

In a more recent study, Kettle (2010) examined international students’ engagement with the demands of their international study experience. Following from Ninnes (1999), she critiqued the ways that “institutional mechanisms … aggregate power and privilege within certain types of knowledge and student identities” (Kettle, 2010, p. 2). Using interviews with six international postgraduate students as her case study cohort, Kettle found that teaching for learning and explicitly defining the skills of academic practice overcame the dichotomy between international students’ prior learning style and the learning styles demanded of them in the Western institution. Her primary concern was with the explicit teaching of academic practice, focusing on oral discussions. She defined academic practice as being more than “a set of generic
skills such as summarising, paraphrasing and referencing … the province of many English academic preparation (EAP) programs’ (Kettle, 2010, p. 4). Rather, she argued that academic practice involved a complex process of managing time, language, voice, performance and how to inhabit the floor. She problematised the ways that many academics related to, and engage with, international students’ learning because it simplified these students as stereotyped, passive learners. Instead, Kettle argued, the situation was far more complex because it involved the interplay of time, language, voice and performance.

She found that students should be able to rely on their supporting others, their lecturers, whose job it was to ensure that they were able to learn how to perform the academic practice demanded of them in the institution. Those students who were able to learn this practice had teachers who scaffolded their learning, who explicated and modeled the performance, the time management, the language and the voice that international students needed to demonstrate (Kettle, 2010). It was argued that, with the assistance of teachers who were able to effectively model academic practice, students would learn how to manage their course progression and would be agentive in their courses.

Kettle’s (2010) studies were limited in their focus on the agency exercised by small numbers of postgraduate students. However, their relevance to this study lies in their examination of how students actively use their international education to access future opportunities on return to their home countries. Furthermore, her work suggests that students are actively involved in constructing their cultural identities as learners in ways that cannot be accounted for by the generic descriptions of Asian learners evident in the studies reviewed in Chapter Two.
In another study, Ditton (2007) took up Ninnes’ (1999) work around agency to examine “the process of acculturization of international students in Australian universities” (p. 42). Her concern was with *hegemonic knowledge relations* in international education that “ignores other epistemologies, and generally serves international business and capitalism rather than students’ needs” (p. 42). She examined the delivery of postgraduate public health programs in Australia to Eastern Asian students. She found that students needed a critical perspective on knowledge in order to ensure that what was learned in their Australian study experience could be used to benefit their home country. For Ditton (2007), a critical perspective on knowledge was important because the knowledge learned in the Australian institution would differ from the realities on the ground in their home countries. Thus, she stated that graduates needed to consider how to transpose their knowledge to a different set of conditions. Ditton (2007) argued that if students were able to connect with other cultures and perspectives, they would be able to exercise agency over their doctoral studies in public health. This agency would also extend to health concerns in the home country. While the focus of Ditton’s (2007) study was on health students undertaking doctoral programs, its usefulness to this dissertation is its analysis of students’ awareness of the discourses available to them in the institution.

**Multiple discourses of identity**

Studies by Singh and Doherty (2004), Doherty (2006), Clark and Gieve (2006), Sanderson (2006; 2007) and Gazi (2007) have all critiqued the Asian learner discourse for different reasons related to their interest in student identities. These studies have argued that any cultural learning style discourse is one-dimensional and fails to account for the diverse nature of cultural identity as it is experienced by international students in Western education. The term *Western education* is
significant because these studies have been conducted in countries such as Australia, the UK, Canada, the US and New Zealand. Furthermore, the term implies that Western education is different to the education experienced by students from Southeast Asia. These studies go on to problematise the binary by examining the discourse positions available to international students. In these studies, discourses of academic critique, active learning, individuality and student centeredness, as well as discourses of Asianness, were found to dominate the institutional experiences of Eastern Asian international students. Nichols (2003), Bullen and Kenway (2003), Clarke and Gieve (2006) and Gazi (2007) have argued that these discourses offer international students multiple identities and means through which they can construct their experiences of international education.

For example, Nichols (2003) critiqued the concept of cultural learning styles that was discussed in detail in the previous chapter (cf. Pham & Gilles, 2010; Liu et al., 2010). Nichols (2003) argued that there was a dichotomy of excuses that were used to explain international students’ so-called problems with critical thinking. For example, she argued that, for a Chinese student, problems with critical thinking would be explained as a cultural deficit, whereas for an Australian student, it would be a lack of experience. As a result, she found that the learning styles and attributes of Eastern Asian students in particular were defined as deficient. Their deficiencies meant that they were positioned as the cultural Other against the norm of the Western student (Nichols, 2003, p. 139). Using the work of Fairclough (cf. 1992), she examined how discourses were constructed in studies of the engagement of international students in Western education. Nichols’ (2003) study questioned the simplistic stereotype of Asian students as passive and unable to critique. Instead, she argued that “what appears to be a failure to critique could be a strategy of
resistance to the undermining of valued knowledge” or “a strategy for cultural maintenance. Who knows what silence masks?’ (Nichols, 2003, p. 147). Thus, she argued, there might be other interpretations of the students’ behaviour. Defining all Eastern Asian students as Confucian learners was considered lazy because this label failed to take into account alternative explanations for students’ behaviour.

In two studies concerned with discourses of international students’ identity, Bullen and Kenway (2003) and Kenway and Bullen (2003) explored the multiple discourses used to position female international postgraduate students. They interviewed university staff and female postgraduate students to propose that staff constructed international students as having major educational deficits, and this construction risked becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy. Further, they concluded that there were multiple discourses of identity constructed by international students, and these differences were not adequately represented by staff in the discourses that they constructed about this group.

Similarly, Clark and Gieve (2006) argued that the Asian learner discourse was evidence of a big culture approach. This approach was found to have failed to account for the many socio-cultural differences between students, such as social status, gender, ethnicity and geography. Rather, they advocated a small culture approach, which included an examination of other socio-cultural factors to “[locate] the learner as negotiating with particular others in the class, with the teacher and with content knowledge” (Clark & Gieve, 2006, p. 69). They argued a small culture approach would allow the multiple discourses constructing students’ identities to be considered.

A study by Manathunga (2009) was concerned with the ways that contemporary research essentialised the experiences of Asian researchers. She reviewed
theoretical literature to examine how Asian researchers were essentialised in contemporary research practice. She defined an essentialised discourse as one based on a one-dimensional and fixed notion of culture. For Manathunga (2009), essentialised discourses, through which students were positioned as a cultural other, failed to account for what she termed the *hybridised culture* of international students. She defined *hybridised* as mutual transformations of cultures that are in contact with other cultures. This definition suggested that a hybridised culture involved associating with multiple cultures that may not be bound to geographic places, whereby place refers to geographic location while space traverses fixed locations.

Manathunga (2009) argued that international students positioned themselves within hybridised cultures through their engagement with the Western institution. She cited the work of Singh and Doherty (2004) to argue that hybrid cultures were constructed through “recent, rapid flows of symbolic, material and social resources via the global reach of electronic technologies or ‘technoscapes’” (Manathunga, 2009, p. 168). These two concepts, *flows* and *technoscapes*, were drawn from Appadurai (cf. 1996). Flows referred to the increasingly porous borders through which ideas, culture and money move. Technoscapes referred to the “fluid and irregular shapes of these landscapes” and the “deeply perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness” of technology (Appadurai, 1996, p. 33).

In line with researchers such as Singh and Doherty (2004), as well as the work of Hall (1996a) and Bhabha (1994), Manathunga (2009) argued that cultural hybridity reveals the “dichotomous homogenisation and assimilation, on the one hand, or the polarisation that comes from active resistance to Western domination, on the other” (Manathunga, 2009, p. 168). Thus, a cultural learning style discourse was seen as an
attempt to homogenise all Eastern Asian students as Confucian learners. The failure to consider students' resistance to the Confucian student discourse suggested that the work reviewed in Chapter Two, had limitations in that these studies were unable to account for the multiple and competing discourses of identity and cultures of hybridity constructed by Asian international students in Western education.

Instead of the fixed ‘Confucian student discourse’, Manathunga (2009) called for an approach that considered difference to be productive. She argued that research is conducted in a contact zone that has to consider the symbolic violence enacted upon different cultures. Manathunga (2009) used the work of Pratt (1992) to argue that the contact zone is a social space “where disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination” (p. 4 in Manathunga, 2009, p. 167). She emphasised how the concept of a contact zone was applied to tertiary institutions that enrol international students and can be used to examine “the perception of cultural difference as productive rather than as a deficit” (Manathunga, 2009, p. 168). Moreover, she suggested that there were benefits to be found in “the deconstructive and creative possibilities of cultural exchange” (Manathunga, 2009, p. 168). The perception of cultural difference as being productive was necessary because it considered the extent of “boundary crossing required in contemporary research” while providing the theoretical tools to examine “the symbolic violence, exploitation and assimilation that goes on in the contemporary ‘research game’” (Manathunga, 2009, p. 169).

In relation to symbolic violence, Manathunga (2009) cited Reay's (2004) work, expanding on Bourdieu (1988). This work was used to define symbolic violence as the imposition of the dominant means of comprehending and adapting to the social world by representing power in ways that are taken for granted. She argued that
symbolic violence permitted only one cultural perspective. It was used to suggest the violent repression of alternative viewpoints through silently representing the world through the dominant discourse. She called for an examination of the ways that symbolic violence was enacted in the contact zone through research activities that did not work across cultures in a sensitive and equitable way (Manathunga, 2009). Manathunga (2009) argued that the dominant discourses of the institution, and of research more broadly, were always used, and that alternative discourses were discouraged and devalued.

In a series of studies that also examined the multiple discourses of identity constructed about Asian students in the university as a contact zone, Singh and Doherty (Doherty & Singh, 2002; 2005; Singh & Doherty, 2004; 2008) focused on preparatory programs. Citing the work of Pratt (1992), Doherty and Singh (2005) argued that contact zones were places that have historically been constituted as a site of transculturation, in which “colonizers and colonized, travelers and travelees interact, co-exist, and engage in ‘interlocking understandings and practices, often with radically asymmetric relations of power”’ (p. 55). Transculturation was used to refer to a more nuanced translation from one culture to another. Rather than refer to deculturation, where the culture is lost or acculturation where a new culture is acquired, the term transculturation also includes the concept of neoculturation where a new culture is created from existing cultures. It has been associated with a number of contexts in which cultures come into contact with other cultures including in the international education context. In their work, Doherty and Singh (cf. Singh & Doherty, 2004; Doherty & Singh, 2005) used the term to consider how the Asian learner and Western education were constructed through cultural scripts played out
discursively in the preparatory programs designed specifically for international students.

These studies suggested that, in general, preparatory programs constructed international students as naïve inductees in the institution. In order to counter the ways that preparatory programs constructed international students, they advocated for staff to use, among other approaches, English publications produced in non-Western settings. These publications, they argued, offer a legitimate text for the contact zone classroom (Singh & Doherty, 2004). Furthermore, English resources produced in non-Western settings acknowledge that English is an international language and is part of the students’ world. Thus, its packaging with some localised orthodoxy demonstrated the many versions of English that exist.

In addition, they argued that the use of English language education in offshore settings was an investment. In line with Kettle’s work (cf. 2005; 2010), they argued that, in many cases, international education was accessed as an investment because of limited opportunities in the home country (Doherty & Singh, 2005). Following McKay and Wong (1996) and Norton (2000), Doherty and Singh (2005) noted “that Asian international students make heavy investments in acquiring English proficiency as a form of symbolic or cultural capital which can be exchanged for improved work opportunities in the transnational and local labour market” (p. 11). In much the same way as Kettle (2005; 2010), Doherty and Singh (2005) used investment as a metaphor for the ways in which language learning equates with resources and capital. Further, they emphasised “the role of ‘investments’ by the cross-cultural language learner, in furthering identity-shaping processes across time and space towards future goals” (Doherty & Singh, 2005, p. 4). Hence, investments in language learning become part of what Hall (1996b) termed identity processes (Doherty &
Singh, 2005, p. 5). For Hall, identity is concerned with the ways that people are positioned by and position themselves within narratives of the past. They are points of identification and, as a result, are positions.

Doherty and Singh (2005) argued that cultural discourses, such as the Confucian student discourse, constructed an imaginary binary of Asia and the West. Further they argued that an Asia/West binary reified the identities of both student and institution. For Doherty and Singh (2005) reification inevitably constructed the West in positive terms, while Asia was constructed in negative terms – in terms of a need to change or of remediation. Reification is defined as the means through which differences between groups are obvious. The effect of reification is that differences are enhanced or exaggerated. Reification establishes a binary opposition. Binary oppositions are problematic because they “enable a range of others to be identified as enemies, as the source of problems” which leads to “the positive representation of one group and the negative representation of the other” (Thomas, 2006, p. 91). Thus, the Asia/West binary constructed discourses of difference and hierarchies between groups that reinforced dominant power relations.

In addition, Doherty and Singh (2005) used the work of Appadurai (1996) to examine cultural discourses that emphasised difference. Thus, they argued, the concept of culture is used to exploit difference and generate conceptions of human identities as diverse groups. For them, culture no longer represents a fixed and stable identity (cf. Singh & Doherty, 2004). Drawing on the work of Hall (1996c), they argued that identities were part of “the process of becoming” (p. 3) because it is “a ‘production’ which is never complete, and always constituted within, not outside, representation” (Hall, 2003, p. 234).
Hall (2003) argued that cultural identities, a concept central to Doherty and Singh’s (2005) work, “come from somewhere, have histories” while they “undergo constant transformation” (p. 235). Thus, cultural identities involve an interplay between history, culture and belief that are not grounded in a past that is waiting to be found; rather they are “the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past” (Hall, 2003, p. 235).

To sum up, the aforementioned studies discuss the limitations of reified and essentialised cultural discourses about international students in classrooms, lesson plans, and preparation programs. These studies are concerned with the ways that cultural discourses, such as the cultural learning discourse evident in the research literature reviewed in Chapter Two, position international students’ identities as static, unchanging, and backward based on binary notions of Asian/not Asian, Western/non-Western, static/dynamic.

Culture and identity

This section discusses cultural discourses and pedagogic identities. These two concepts are used to theorise how discourses maybe implicated in international students’ experiences of education. It will be recalled that the concept of discourse is defined in line with Fairclough (cf. 1992) as language use as a form of social practice in that they establish relationships between people.

Cultural discourses

In the studies reviewed in Chapter Two, cultural difference was understood as the defining experience of international students. In those studies, it was the students’ culture that was said to have affected their learning, adaptation and reasons for accessing an international education. In addition, culture was used to suggest that
students might be a curriculum resource to instruct about international as opposed to national perspectives in the institution. The emphasis on culture suggested that it would be significant in the accounts of experiences that Eastern Asian students would have in the institution. As a result of the emphasis on culture in previous studies of international students, the concept was incorporated into the research problem guiding this dissertation.

The preceding sections of this chapter discussed studies that problematised the emphasis on culture. These studies argued that culture is a discourse and, as a result, it positions individuals in ways that are often taken for granted. The studies reviewed in the earlier section of this chapter often utilised Appadurai’s (1996) notion of *flows* in their theoretical framework to point out the limitations of fixed, static notions of cultural identity (cf. Singh and Doherty, 2004; Kettle, 2005; 2010). As the dissertation is concerned with experiences in the particular context of Australian schooling, it draws on Appadurai’s (1993) concept of *cultural discourses rather than cultural flows*. The concept is used to examine how culture is used to account for the experiences of Eastern Asian students. Of course, cultural discourses are not static, and are likely to shift, change and flow.

Appadurai (1993) suggested that cultural discourses are constructed around ethnicities that appear as *natural labels*. He examined how allegiances are developed that encourage individuals to align themselves with a wider, discursively constructed nation that is separate to, and bigger than, the family, the tribe, the caste or the region. Appadurai (1993) stated that “nations, especially in multiethnic settings, are tenuous collective projects, not eternal natural facts” and that apparently natural labels of nationality “create a false divide between the artificiality of the nation and those facts they falsely projected as primordial – tribe, family, region” (p. 414). Thus,
nations are created out of discourses that construct similarities between disparate people for the purpose of keeping these people together. Differences are constructed for those people who are outside the nation.

Appadurai (1993) argued that discourses of nation and national subject are collective cultural products. As a result, a national subject needs to learn the cultural discourse of their nation in order to construct their cultural identity as a national. Appadurai (1993) cited Habermas (1989) and Calhoun (1992) to argue that “modern nationalisms involve … reading books, pamphlets, newspapers, maps, and other modern texts together” (p. 414). The consumption of these cultural products is one of the means through which national discourses are learned. Thus, the modern nation-state is less a product of “natural facts – such as language, blood, soil, and race” (Appadurai, 1993, p. 414) than it is a cultural product constructed through discourses of national culture. For Appadurai (1993), apparently natural labels, such as Australian or Eastern Asian, are used to draw people into a national or supranational identification. Identification refers to the ways that individuals identify with cultural texts. Individuals are drawn into an association with a cultural discourse through media and other texts that encourage the reader to adopt a particular subject position.

A national identification positions individuals within discourses of an individual nation while a supranational identification positions individuals within regional discourses or discourses associated with multiple nations. Identification with a nationality involves those who choose the label, those who are forced into the label and still others who use the label to tidy “messy problems of language and history, race and belief” (Appadurai, 1993, p. 415). As a result, “there are few forms of popular consciousness and subaltern agency that are, in regard to ethnic
mobilization, free of the thought forms and political fields produced by the actions and discourses of nation-states" (Appadurai, 1993, p. 415). Labels, consciousness and ethnic mobilisations form the core of discourses that are used to position individuals into cultural identities.

In recent work that has been concerned with identification, Coupland (2010) examined how identification was one part of the process of positioning individuals in discourse as the other. He argued that, in addition to identification, social practices involved production (of discourses) and representation. In his work on the other, Coupland examined representation as a social phenomenon in the sense that "decisions taken on how we represent ourselves will be taken in relation to how others represent themselves, and how each party may represent the other ... Self representation and other representation can be mutually influencing processes" (2010, p. 243). Other recent studies have used the term to examine New Labour's education policy (cf. Mulderrig, 2011) and gay identities (cf. Levon, 2010).

Further, the identification with a particular supranational or national discourse may be either voluntary or involuntary. A voluntary identification with a discourse involves reflexive positioning. Davis and Harré (1999) argued that reflexive positioning involves “imaginatively positioning oneself as if one belongs in one category and not the other” (p. 36). The voluntary identification with a national discourse would suggest that an agent actively chose to position themselves within discourses of that nation state. Thus, cultural discourses would be used to construct their experiences.

Hall (1997) takes this notion further by discussing the double play of a subject. He argues that subjects are produced through discourses that personify forms of
knowledge produced by the discourse but also through the discourse producing a place for that subject. For example any discourse of the Asian learner produces identities for Asian learners in Western education while simultaneously constructing their place in institutions. In addition, because identities emerge through what Hall (1997) terms modalities of power, they are constructed around differences and exclusions rather than through unities or sameness that are traditionally associated with a notion of identity.

Other studies have used the idea of modalities of power to examine experiences of immigration (cf. Ngo, 2008; Silva, 2010), constructing identities (cf. St Louis, 2009) and classroom experiences of racism among non-white students (Sharma, 2010). Sharma (2010) argues that modalities of power in classrooms make discussing and addressing issues of race problematic. Even more problematic is the exercise of modalities of power that exclude in immigration policy (Silva, 2010). Silva (2010) argues that because the state reinscribes identification and excludes those who are deemed to be a threat, identification and position are used to construct identities as the dangerous other.

Appadurai argued that there is an inherent violence in these associations because they may not adequately represent the cultural discourses that individuals inculcate. Moreover, the discourses through which individuals position themselves and their identity may change over time. For example, the increasing movements among people, such as international students, may result in *translocal loyalties* or *Trojan nationalisms*. Translocal loyalties involve an imagined link between the place of origin and the place of migration (Appadurai, 1993). Trojan nationalisms “contain transnational, subnational links and, more generally, nonnational identities and aspirations” (Appadurai, 1993, p. 417). Cultural identities and loyalties are the
products of a collective imagination of specific nation states and employ many cultural discourses and labels associated with individual nations. Loyalties and nationalisms outside of nation states, such as Trojan nationalisms and translocal loyalties, reflect “the anxieties attendant on the search for nonterritorial principles of solidarity” (Appadurai, 1993, p. 417). Thus, Trojan nationalisms and translocal loyalties are inter- and intra-national identities that reflect the experience of diasporas.

Appadurai (1993) defined diaspora as a community of individuals that utilises the cultural discourse of several nation states. He stated that, “in the postnational world that we see emerging, diaspora runs with, and not against, the grain of identity, movement and reproduction” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 171). While nation states are the cultural spaces into which diasporas must incorporate themselves, the culture of the nation state, which is imagined through discourses of cultural difference, may make it difficult for diasporas to find a place within the nation (Appadurai, 1996). The difficulty in finding a place caused by the multiple cultural discourses that diasporas use to position themselves may also be true of international students studying in Australian schools. Data analysis will examine whether multiple cultural discourses are used by staff and students to position international students in the school and thus account for their experiences of education.

Appadurai (1996) argued that cultural discourses and diasporas are both the work of imaginations drawn from a “specific, historically situated play of public and group opinions about the past” (p. 146). The term imaginations was used by Appadurai (1990) to refer to three major streams of thought, namely: (a) the idea of images, especially those that are mechanically produced (this refers to mechanically produced in the sense of the Marxist Frankfurt School); (b) the notion of an imagined
community; and (c) the constructed landscape of aspirations reflected through images (this refers to the French *imaginaire*). Imagination has become a *social practice* that, in the sense that Appadurai (1990) described, has become ‘work’, so that it is no longer mere fantasy, escape, elite pastime or contemplation. Rather, imagination is “now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of the new global order” (Appadurai, 1990, p. 5).

According to Appadurai (1990; 1993; 1996), cultural discourses work with imaginations to divide things and people into groups. As a result, cultural discourses construct cultural differences along a hierarchy so that the *other* is “simultaneously different and inferior” (Abu-Lughod, 2006, p. 161). In line with Appadurai’s (1990) concept of imagination, the other is an imagined category that is constructed through discourses of difference. Consequently, Appadurai (1996) argued that culture is a “pervasive dimension of human discourse” (p. 13) that both exploits and naturalises difference to generate diverse conceptions of group identity. Cultural difference is constructed using cultural discourses that: (a) imagine difference; (b) naturalise difference; and (c) construct group identities based on difference. It may be that teachers and students in the Australian school imagine and naturalise cultural differences between Eastern Asian and Australian students.

Hall (1997) argued, in much the same terms as Appadurai (1993; 1996), that cultural meaning and identity are produced at several different sites, and are circulated through many different practices and processes. Cultural discourses offer “a sense of identity, of who we are and with whom we ‘belong’ – so it is tied up with questions of how culture is used to mark out and maintain identity” (Hall, 1997, p. 3). Further, just as Appadurai (1993; 1996) argued, Hall (1997) stated that cultural discourses construct identities through the marking of difference.
production, consumption and regulation of social conduct. The production of culture and identity are not fixed, rather they depend on representation of national as well as individual signs (Hall, 1997).

Accordingly, identity is not *found* but is produced, so that it is not so much an “identity grounded in archaeology, but in the *retelling* of the past” (Hall, 2003, p. 235). Thus, identity and cultural discourses inform each other. Both identity and cultural discourses are based on representations of national signs and, as a result, are subject to change and development. Individuals choose to position themselves, and are positioned by others, within discourses. These discourses may be based on representations of national discourses in much the same terms as essentialised discourses described earlier in this chapter. For example essentialist views of culture position individuals who share a geographic region as having the same culture.

Similarly, Hall (1997, p. 287) argued that identity, like culture, is fluid. As such, identity is never a *finished thing*, it comes not from a “fullness of identity which is already inside us as individuals” rather it is a “lack of wholeness which is ‘filled’ from outside us, by the ways we imagine ourselves to be seen by others” (p. 287). He argued that identity is not just about sameness but also about difference. Hall (1997) argued, in line with Appadurai (1993; 1996), that cultural identity is an ongoing process of identification. Moreover, it is “matter of ‘becoming’ as well as of ‘being’ … it belongs to the future as well as to the past” (Hall, 2003, p. 236).

To sum up this section, this dissertation will examine how accounts of staff and students use discourses of culture to position Eastern Asian international students' experiences of Australian schooling. Cultural discourses constructed around what appear to be natural labels create divisions between people (Appadurai, 1993). These divisions mark out and maintain identities through defining who we are and
with whom we belong (Hall, 1993). The next section of this chapter focuses on pedagogic identities. It provides a macro-level theoretical language to describe students’ experiences of culture in Australian schools.

Experiences of belonging

The second area of interest for this research study is how discourses are used to account for belonging in Australian secondary schools. In order to address this, the dissertation draws on, Hall’s (1992) work on hybridity, Bourdieu’s (1992) work on capital and Bernstein’s (1971; 1990; 2000) work on the recognition and realisation rule.

Hybridity and belonging

For Hall (1992) reconciling the old cultural identity with the new involves coming to terms with the new culture without casting off the old culture. He argued that diasporas must learn to reconcile old cultures and new cultures, and learn to speak multiple cultural languages. As a result, diasporas are “irrevocably the product of several interlocking cultures, belonging at one and the same time to several ‘homes’” they are seen as “belonging to … cultures of hybridity” (Hall, 1992, p. 310). Thus, they must recognise “a necessary heterogeneity and diversity” which implies “a conception of identity which lives with and through, not despite, difference, by hybridity” (Hall 1992, pp. 401-402).

Hybridity is central to Hall’s (1992) work on diasporas and ethnicities (cf. Anthias, 2001). Ethnicities relate to both the home culture and the new culture that “is reconfigured within a diasporic space” (Anthias, 2001, p. 625). Anthias (2001) argued, citing both Waters (1995) and Hall (1992), that the term diaspora denotes both a population category and a social condition (p. 631). Diasporas entail “a
particular form of consciousness which is particularly compatible with postmodernity and globalization, and like hybridity, embodies the globalizing principle of transnationalism” (Anthias, 2001, p. 631). However, Anthias (2001) argued that there is a difference between diasporic and hybrid identities. Diaspora is concerned with the ethnic bonds of the origin culture, while hybridity is concerned with “issues of cultural ‘cut and mix’ [which] deploys a notion of identity, however multi-layered or fragmented” (Anthias, 2001, p. 633). Thus, diasporas are concerned with the place of the old culture in the new, while hybridity is concerned with the blending of several cultures through which identities are formed.

The term is used by scholars who examine the experiences of displaced peoples from places such as Bosnia (Halilovich, 2012), Trinidad and Tobago (Conway & Potter, 2012) and South Asia (Kumar, 2011). It is a significant concept in these studies because of the difference between those groups that form diasporas and those that do not. Halilovich (2012) argues that mobility and migration may not result in a diaspora forming. Rather, it is the formation of a community, of belonging, that signals a diaspora. Thus, as Tsagarousianou (2004) has suggested, there is a significance to the novel forms of late modern transnational migration. Failure to consider the significance of these experiences is a failure to understand how the diaspora has formed.

Hall (1992) stated that hybridised identities are formed around a combination of ethnic, cultural and nationalistic discourses. Thus, in order to position themselves, and be positioned by others, as ‘belonging’, Asian international students must negotiate the ethnic, cultural and nationalistic discourses dominant in their home culture, as well as those dominant in the cultural environment of the Australian school. As a result, this study needs a language that will be able to describe the ways
that students demonstrate behaviours, traits and attitudes that mark them as belonging. By contrast, those students who do not demonstrate these behaviours, traits and attitudes will not be described as belonging to the school, or may be described as belonging to a different group. This study will use the theoretical language of capital (Bourdieu, 1993) and the recognition and realisation rule (Bernstein, 2000) to examine whether international students are described as experiencing belonging in accounts from staff and Eastern Asian students.

**Capital**

In previous work on belonging, studies have examined how students require a sense of membership and a feeling of being part of the group in order to facilitate a sense of belonging in the institution (cf. Pyvis & Chapman, 2005; Andrade, 2006). For example, Andrade (2006) argued that, in order to experience a sense of belonging, international students needed to learn how to adjust and involve themselves within the university and to feel part of the university community. She described how international students needed to learn what to do in order to be involved in the life of the campus. Thus, the students needed the cultural and social knowledge to adapt to their new educational environment in order to be constructed as belonging.

The concept of capital has been used in studies that have examined the cultural and social knowledge that is central to the forming of a group identity among international students (cf. Waters, 2006; 2007; Salisbury et al., 2009). In these studies, capital was used as a means of categorising the knowledge, skills and attitudes that group members needed in order to be considered part of a group. Moreover, it was the concept of capital that was central to the characterisation of belonging to an elite overseas educated student group (cf. Waters, 2006; 2007). The constitution of the overseas educated student group was understood to have
occurred through the uptake of Western cultural, social and symbolic capital. These studies used Bourdieu’s (cf. 1984; 2011) theorisation of capital as a type of wealth. It was the wealth of an individual’s cultural, social and symbolic knowledge resources that constituted their capital.

Studies by Arambewela, Hall and Zuhair (2006) and Marginson (2006) endeavoured to examine factors affecting the choice of an institution by international students using Bourdieu’s theory of capital. For example, Arambewela et al. (2006) examined the popularity of *elite* educational institutions by looking at higher education as a field. In these *elite institutions*, which operated in both the secondary school (cf. Waters, 2006) and the tertiary education field (cf. Marginson, 2006), students were able to access valuable cultural and social capital. Valuable cultural and social capital had the effect of reinforcing students’ advantage and social status, which assured *social reproduction* (Stafford, 2004; Marginson, 2006; Waters, 2006). In this sense, *social reproduction* was the means through which middle-class parents assured their children would also be middle-class.

Bourdieu (1993) and later work undertaken by others (cf. Zembylas, 2007) examined how discourses that dominate a context determine the resources of behaviour, attitude, appreciations and expectations that are valued in that context. Bourdieu (1984) termed these resources *capital*, which he defined as the tokens or wealth that an agent possessed that could be exchanged in a field. A *field* was defined as a bounded structure of social relations governed by rules that determine how agents interact (cf. Bourdieu, 2005). The field determines the capital that is valued and how it can be accumulated. Accordingly, the capital that an agent possesses may have value in one field but may not be valued in another. It is the
discourses that dominate the field that determine the social, cultural and economic capital that is valued in that field (cf. Zembylas, 2007; Bourdieu, 1993).

There is a second relationship between capital and field. Bourdieu (1991) argued that relationships between agents in a field are determined by the value of the capital an agent possesses (Thompson, 1991). From this perspective, the success of an agent and their relationship with other agents are dependent on whether the forms of capital they possess are of value in the field. For example, Bourdieu (1973) argued that the field of schooling was dominated by the preferred discourses associated with the culture of the dominant classes/groups. As a result, the school values only the dominant class’s social, cultural and symbolic capital. Students who possess the capital of the dominant class/group will have the resources to secure advantage.

Capital is acquired through what Bourdieu (2011) termed a labour of inculcation. In much the same terms as Fairclough’s (2001; 2003) work on inculcation, for Bourdieu (2011) a labour of inculcation referred to the labour of acquiring a knowledge of the regulation of the social world. It is labour in the sense that it takes time to accumulate and, as a result, will be unequally distributed. Further, it has the capacity to produce profits and to reproduce itself in identical or expanded form, contains a tendency to persist in its being, is a force inscribed in the objectivity of things so that everything is not equally possible or impossible (Bourdieu, 2011, p. 81).

Bourdieu (2011) suggests that capital is relayed by dominant groups and is abstract. Its access is restricted to those who are able to acquire the abstract meanings. Schools and other social institutions distribute success based on the acquisition of the dominant form of capital. Thus, those students who have access to the dominant form of capital will experience success in social institutions such as
schools. It may be that the Eastern Asian international students enrolled in the Australian school setting are endeavouring to acquire the cultural capital that is valued and re/produced through the field of Australian secondary schooling.

Bourdieu (2011) proposed several forms of capital. The form of capital most relevant to this study is cultural capital. He used the term cultural capital to refer to the cultural manners, preferences and orientations that are directly inherited from primary and secondary socialisation, namely home/family context and schooling contexts. Further, he argued that the cultural habits and dispositions inherited from the family comprise resources that can be leveraged in the schooling system (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1979). Furthermore, the cultural and symbolic resources, acquired through schooling, can be exchanged for financial or material resources in the market.

This study uses cultural capital to examine the knowledge, skills, attributes, dispositions and behaviours that are valued in the schools. Bourdieu (1974) proposed that there were three elements of cultural capital. The first, objective artifacts, referred to the books, paintings and other cultural products the students’ possess. The second element was the cultural practices and activities that a student engages in, which include interest in and exposure to live concerts, opera, taking speech lessons, playing musical instruments, certain culturally-valued sporting pursuits and the like. The third was institutional currency, which referred to the academic qualifications and academic style, as well as language forms that signaled an understanding of the school’s language. For Bourdieu, the significance of capital was that it was hierarchical and mirrored the hierarchy of economic capital (cf. Henry, 2002).
For the purposes of this dissertation, *capital* is used to determine the appropriate cultural and social knowledge and behaviours that students in Australian schools need to enact in order to experience belonging. In the studies reviewed in Chapter Two, capital was used to examine the construction of belonging to an elite overseas-educated student group. The next section of this chapter focuses on the recognition and realisation rule that is used to examine the uptake of cultural capital among international students. It will discuss the theoretical language used to describe how students recognise and realise their capital appropriately to experience belonging in the Australian school.

**The recognition and realisation rule**

Both Bourdieu (cf. 1984) and Bernstein (2000) examined how education worked to include some and exclude other groups, and thereby deny access to forms of powerful cultural capital, that is, to school knowledge. For example, Bernstein (2000) proposed that stakeholders in schools have three inherited rights, which operate at different levels of education. The first of these rights is the individual right to enhancement, described as “experiencing boundaries as tension points between the past and possible futures” it is the right to be “more personally, more intellectually, more socially, more materially, it is the right to the means of critical understanding and to new possibilities” (Bernstein, 2000, p. xx). Thus, this right confers on students the ability to improve their position through schooling.

The second right is to “be included, socially, intellectually, culturally and personally” (Bernstein, 2000, p. xx). Thus, the second right confers on students the ability to be included and to belong. Bernstein (2000) described this right as “a condition for communitas” (p. xx), which operates at a social level. Thus, this right operates in much the same terms as social capital (cf. Zadeh, Ahmad, Abdullah, &
Abdullah, 2010, Bourdieu, 2011) study. Finally, the third right is described as a condition for civic practice and is the right to participate. This right implies that participation occurs in “procedures whereby order is constructed, maintained and changed” (Bernstein, 2000, p. xxi). Thus, education confers the right to participate in communities and groups. In each of these three rights, the individual is invited to be part of a community through their engagement with education.

Bernstein (2000) argued that education could be measured against its ability to meet the three aforementioned rights, so that it could be determined “whether all students receive and enjoy such rights or whether there is an unequal distribution of these rights” (p. xxi). He described, in much the same terms as Bourdieu (1984), how some students came to the school with a code orientation that enabled them to access the privileged, powerful knowledge forms taught in schools. This code orientation was acquired mostly by students at home through patterns of social communication and interaction. Thus for students to succeed they need to be able to crack the pedagogic code of schooling in order to access/recognize and realize powerful forms of knowledge. The language of schooling, and modes of communication, that is the pedagogic code often restricted access to students who had difficulty decoding or cracking this code. For these students, as Kettle and others have stated it is important for the teacher to elaborate and make explicit how the pedagogic code works, and make visible the relations of power so that students can access powerful forms of knowledge required to be successful while others did not. Bernstein (2000) stated that there was a differentiated distribution of these rights of education. Thus, just as Bourdieu (1984) argued, there is a different distribution of the knowledge required to be successful in education. Bernstein (2000) stated that “different knowledges and their possibilities are differently distributed to different
social groups” (p. xxi). A differentiated distribution carries “unequal value, power and potential” (Bernstein, 2000, p. xxi). In these terms, students who already possess the capital they require will be successful at school because they will be able to determine what the school is asking of them and present the legitimate text at the school. Unlike critical discourse theorists, for whom the term legitimate text is used quite differently, Bernstein defined the legitimate text as any realisation that attracts an evaluation.

In work undertaken by Bernstein (1990; 2000) and later work undertaken by McDougall, Walker and Kendall (2006), and Lambirth (2009), the recognition and realisation rule was used to examine whether students were able to determine what the school was asking of them in terms of presenting the legitimate text. In other words, previous studies have examined how the recognition and realisation rule can be used to determine whether students have access to Bernstein’s second and third right to belonging and, as such, are able to acquire and present the legitimate text of appropriate behaviour to be accepted into the school community. Students will be successful members of a school community when they recognise what is being asked of them in the school and put meanings together appropriately or realise appropriate school communication.

The school demands that a student produces certain behaviours. Those students who are able to recognise the types of behaviour that the school expects, and realise this, will be considered to have constructed the legitimate text of belonging at the school. Thus, some students will experience themselves as legitimate members of the school community because they understand the speciality of the context and can recognise and realise the rules that are inferred from pedagogic communication. The concept of pedagogic communication acts on
meaning potential, it is the how of pedagogy (cf. Singh, 2002). The ability to determine the pedagogic communication that is expected and to put appropriate meanings together predisposes students to particular behaviours in the school. Bernstein’s (2000) work on the recognition and realisation rule provides the theoretical language that will be used by this dissertation to describe whether Asian international students recognise and realise the capital required to produce pedagogic communication. Students who realise valued capital will have experienced belonging in the sense that they will perform the appropriate pedagogic communication at the school.

Both the recognition and realisation rules are connected to Bernstein’s (2000) interest in classification and framing of knowledge. Classification and framing determine the “modalities of pedagogic practice [that] provide for acquirers the principles for the production of what counts as the legitimate text” (Bernstein, 2000, p. xvi). Classification and framing, and as a result, recognition and realisation, refer to more than just classroom practice. Rather, they refer to how power and control relations are transformed into specific discourses and discourse practices (Bernstein, 2000). Further, they determine what counts as a legitimate text and, in terms of this dissertation, what is required capital to construct belonging.

In brief, classification refers to the relationship between contents; it demarcates knowledge (Bernstein, 1971). Knowledges are demarcated externally and internally. Firstly, classification regulates external relationships between individuals; as a result, it faces outward towards the social order. Secondly, it regulates the relationships within the individual that prevents the revealing of “the suppressed contradictions, cleavages and dilemmas” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 7). Thus, classification is the “means by which power relations are transformed into specialised
discourse” (Bernstein, 2000, p. xvii). Classification refers to the relation between categories of “discourses, practices or agencies” which determine the relations of transmission and acquisition between teacher and taught (Bernstein, 2000, p. 99).

Classification determines the recognition that students need to make of the appropriate content knowledge for the appropriate context. It constructs the nature of the social order and establishes divisions of labour and identities. Students who are able to recognise the nature of the social order will recognise the classification that legitimates communication in pedagogic interactions. Framing, refers to the differentiated forms of communication that can be realised in schools. Bernstein (2000) argued that classification provides the learner with the knowledge of the limits of appropriate discourse, framing provides the acquirer with the realisation of that discourse. Classification determines the recognition rule while framing determines the realisation rule.

The recognition rule allows an agent to recognise what is the appropriate behaviour in the context, the appropriate questions to ask, and what is demanded of them (Bernstein, 2000). As a result, the recognition rule allows a student to know what is appropriate to do in class and at what times (Bernstein, 2000). Students construct the recognition rule as they make inferences to determine the boundaries formed around knowledge. They must determine the ways in which meaning is demarcated to communicate appropriate knowledge or, in the language of this dissertation, appropriate capital for a particular field. Students learn that some knowledge about a topic is appropriate, while other types of knowledge about a topic are inappropriate, in a particular classroom context. As a result, students develop the ability to recognise that certain messages about a topic are probable, while others are improbable or unimaginable (cf. Bernstein and Diaz, 1984; Bernstein 1990).
This dissertation will use the recognition rule to examine, in part, the appropriate capital students need to demonstrate to account for an experience of belonging at the school. It may be that students are unable to recognise the types of capital that are valued in the school. A failure to recognise valued capital may be because they do not have access to the legitimate discourse or because they are unable to determine what capital is valued in the context of Australian schooling. Or, it may be that they have not acquired the capital that they need to be successful at school. For example, perhaps they lack the cultural capital of academic English that they need to complete assignments, to understand the curriculum and to communicate with their teachers.

Nonetheless, recognition is only one part of the equation for appropriate school conduct. Without recognition, students are likely to remain silent or to offer inappropriate information about a topic. However, students also need to develop the ability to present the legitimate text in the classroom. Students require the rule that regulates how to put together, create and publicise the legitimate text in the classroom (Dooley, 2001). Bernstein (2000) termed the rule for the appropriate creation and presentation of legitimate texts the realisation rule.

The realisation rule allows a student to construct legitimate school discourse. It makes it possible for students to form the appropriate text in the appropriate discourse at the appropriate time (Bernstein, 2000). Students who possess the realisation rule are able to make statements that are intelligible in the appropriate pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 2000). As a result, the recognition rule allows a student to determine the specialisation of the context and the realisation rule allows students to construct messages that meet the discursive requirements of that context. Thus, Eastern Asian international students may hold capital that is valued by
the school but they must also know how to realise that capital. Or, perhaps the students are able to recognise the display they are expected to make but they do not have the capital that they need to display and do not have the capital that they require to ask the teacher for help to make the display.

For the purpose of this dissertation, the recognition and realisation rules are used to determine how the resources or capital students bring with them to the school allows them to recognise and realise the legitimate text. As noted above, the legitimate text is used to refer to any realisation that attracts an evaluation. Those students who: (a) recognise the appropriate capital and (b) realise appropriate capital in the appropriate pedagogic discourse will be described in staff and student's accounts of the experiences of Eastern Asian students as belonging.

Examining discourses of identity and belonging in this dissertation

The purpose of this chapter has been to establish a framework that will facilitate the theoretical re-description of this study's empirical data. The theoretical language developed for this study combined belonging (Sachs, 2003; Wenger, 1993), hybridity (Hall, 1992), discourses of culture (Appadurai, 1999, Hall, 1992; 1993, 1997; 2003), capital (Bourdieu, 1992; 2005) and recognition and realisation (Bernstein, 2000). It was noted that culture was understood to be a discourse and, as Hall (1992) has argued, in order to fit in or belong in their new cultural environment, diasporas must position themselves through cultures of hybridity. Hall (1992) stated that hybridised identities are formed around a combination of ethnic, cultural and nationalistic discourses. Thus, in order to position themselves, and be positioned by others, as 'belonging', Asian international students must negotiate the ethnic, cultural and nationalistic discourses dominant in their home culture, as well as those dominant in
the cultural environment of the Australian school. Thus, a theoretical language that could be used to examine whether this particular group of students was experiencing belonging was needed. In order to address this, capital (Bourdieu, 1992) and recognition and realisation (Bernstein, 2000) was used.

Capital has been used in previous studies (cf. Waters, 2006; 2007; Salisbury et al., 2009) to describe the cultural and social knowledge that is central to the forming of a group identity among international students. In one study, Andrade (2006) described international students as using their cultural and social knowledge to adapt to the discourses the institutions required so that they were able to involve themselves in the institution and feel part of the university community. Capital is used by this study to describe the knowledge, skills and attitudes that group members needed in order to be considered part of a group. For both Bourdieu (1984) and Bernstein (2000), educational discourses worked to include some and exclude others, thus preventing some groups from experiencing belonging and accessing forms of powerful cultural capital, that is, access to school knowledge. Thus, just as Bourdieu (1984) argued, there is a different distribution of the knowledge required to be successful in education. Bernstein (2000) stated that “different knowledges and their possibilities are differently distributed to different social groups” (p. xxi). A differentiated distribution carries “unequal value, power and potential” (Bernstein, 2000, p. xxi). In these terms, students who already possess the capital they require will be successful at school because they will be able to recognise the cultural capital that is required and realise that cultural capital. Using the theoretical language of recognition and realisation, the present study examines whether Asian international students in mainstream secondary schools are able to belong because they are able
to negotiate the cultural capital dominant in their home culture, as well as those dominant in the cultural environment of the Australian school.

In what follows, the methods and methodology of this thesis are outlined. In the following chapter, it will be argued that the research problem, which is focused on experiences, required a set of qualitative tools to collect data. In Chapter Five, the Discourse Historical Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis, adapted by the present study, will be discussed.
Chapter Four:
Research methodology
This chapter outlines the research methodology used to collect empirical data. It will discuss the research design and the data collection techniques that underpin this dissertation.

**Research Design**

This dissertation is concerned with the accounts of cultural identity and belonging provided by education staff and Eastern Asian international students at three schools. The focus on accounts necessitates a qualitative approach. A qualitative approach was chosen because it was used in other studies that have examined accounts of students' identities, culture and belonging. For example, previous research utilised qualitative case studies (cf. Maxwell, McConaghy & Ninnes, 2004; Kettle, 2010; Liu et al., 2010), interviews (cf. Kettle, 2005; 2010; Singh & Doherty, 2004; Hazen & Alberts, 2005; 2006; Currie, 2007; Richardson & Hurworth, 2007; Leask, 2009) and document analysis (cf. Marginson, 2006; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Wæraas & Solbakk, 2009; Manathunga 2009). These studies utilised qualitative methods in order to access experiences of culture in contemporary Western education.

Methodologists such as Gall, Gall and Borg (2005) have argued that the methods of qualitative research allow for broad, complex, interconnected aspects of a research problem to be considered in the context of the data analysis process. Case studies are one of the major methods of data collection used by qualitative methodologists (cf. Gall et al., 2005; Stake, 2005). It was also the method adopted by this study. This dissertation has accessed three cases in order to undertake qualitative research about the experiences of Eastern Asian students in Australian schools. As will be noted below, three schools and two international colleges were
approached as case study sites. Interviews, both semi-structured one-on-one and focus group, were undertaken at these five sites. In what follows, the advantages and disadvantages of case studies are described, as is the dissertation’s approach to case study. Following from this, the interview techniques are described. Again, advantages and disadvantages are discussed and the dissertation’s particular approach to interviews is detailed.

**Case study**

This dissertation has used an instrumental case study approach (cf. Stake, 1995; 2005). Instrumental case studies use multiple case study sites and endeavour to understand a phenomenon broadly, beyond an intrinsic interest in one instance or case of the problem under inquiry (Stake, 1995). In line with Stake (2005), who argues that individual cases be selected to lead to better understanding about a “larger collection of cases” (p. 446), three school cases and two international colleges located on the grounds of two of the school cases were also approached. That is, five case study sites at three cases were accessed for this dissertation.

The three cases reflect the three types of schools in Australia (cf. English, 2005). These three school types are government-run state schools, Catholic independent schools and all other independent schools. The three school types were introduced in Chapter One, which noted that international students are more heavily represented in independent schools than in state schools. The category of independent schools was further refined in ABS statistics as *Catholic schools and all other independent schools*. For this dissertation, data were collected at three case sites: one government school, one Catholic school and one independent school. In addition, data were also collected from two international colleges, one located on the
grounds of the Catholic school and the other on the grounds of the independent Christian school.

The first site selected was a state school, given the pseudonym School A. School A was located in the Western suburbs of a medium-sized Australian city in an area that was being gentrified. The school was established in the late 1960s and recruited students principally from a catchment area that favoured the local middle-class community. However, when year levels were undersubscribed, the education department required the school to accept students from the low socio-economic suburbs that bordered the school’s catchment area. The international student cohort allowed the school to sell any remaining places to international students and, as a result, take fewer students from outside the catchment area. A summary of the details about this school can be found in Appendix A.

The second site, School B, was a large independent Catholic school located in an outer suburban area. It was run by the Christian Brothers and offered day enrolments to boys in Grades 5-12 and boarding places to boys in Grades 8-12. It was an elite school in the sense that it was part of the Greater Public Schools (GPS) Association and used sports and academic results to select students. Further, School B had a long tradition in that it had been established in the late 1800s and was therefore one of the oldest schools in the city. The school historically offered places to international students, mainly focusing on education aid arrangements with Papua New Guinea. However, in the last 12 years, the numbers of international students from Mainland China had grown significantly. Chinese international students outnumbered the Papua New Guinean international students at the time data was collected for this study. While the numbers of Mainland Chinese students had grown over the last decade, the total international enrolments were low at approximately 8%
of the school’s population. Of the total international enrolments, the majority (approximately 5%) were from Mainland China, while approximately 2% were from Papua New Guinea. The remaining 1% of international enrolments were from other countries in the Asian region, including Hong Kong, Malaysia, Vietnam, Indonesia, Japan and Korea. A summary of details about School B can be found in Appendix B.

One participant described the international enrolments as capped at 8%. However, other participants stated that the school’s leadership team was considering increasing the enrolment targets for international students towards the 20% threshold. This increase would significantly change the makeup of the school’s enrolments, with implications for curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment practices. As noted in Chapter One, the significance of the 20% threshold was that schools that enrolled more than 20% of their cohort as visa students were required to implement different enrolment and assessment practices.

School B had an international college on its grounds. The international college, School B International, was also accessed as a case study site. This college was run as a semi-autonomous body, which managed the recruitment, pre-enrolment courses and enrolment of international students at School B and other schools. It acted as both a college offering programs to prepare students for the high school they would be attending and an agency whose role it was to place students into School B or one of School B International’s 15 partner schools. However, it was also responsible for securing the most promising boys, in terms of academic and sporting ability, for School B. The principal of School B provided the introduction to the CEO/principal of School B International. Details about School B International have been summarised in Appendix C.
The third school site chosen, the non-denominational, independent Christian school was given the pseudonym School C. This school was established in the 1970s and developed with funding from several church and private bodies. These sources of funding were accessed after the Catholic Education Office rejected the foundation principal’s request to establish a systemic Catholic school at the site. This school was managed and controlled by a nine member Board of Directors. Its structure meant that it was able to run in a for-profit model in the sense that the profits generated by the school were delivered as remuneration to the Board of Directors. Details about School C have been summarised in Appendix D.

In 1986, School C began offering places to international students. This school had the highest international-to-domestic student ratio of the three school sites at just below 20% international enrolment threshold. As noted above, schools with greater than 20% international enrolments became visa schools and had to adopt different assessment and enrolment practices. This school was also part of an exclusive network of schools, although less prestigious than the GPS network to which School B belonged. To illustrate, the results of GPS sporting competitions in rowing, rugby union and cricket would be reported on television and in the state newspaper, whereas the competition results for the group of schools with which School C was affiliated were not. School C had an international college on its grounds, School C International. In a similar fashion to the college at School B, it was run as a semi-autonomous body that managed the enrolments, pre-enrolment courses and recruitment of international students. This college was also approached as a case study site. Details about School C International can be found in Appendix E.

The protocols for accessing each site were set at university, and in the case of School A, government level. Initially, ethical clearance was sought from the university
and approved in 2007. The ethical clearance approval, which can be found in Appendix F, preceded contact with the schools. After ethical clearance was gained, the researcher contacted the principal of School A, Sarah Fitzpatrick (pseudonym). As only one state school was to be used as a case study site, the education department did not need to approve the application. In order to access this school, a letter and information about the dissertation was sent to the principal (see Appendix G). After the principal had approved the application, the protocol was that the principal informed the education department using an online form.

After securing approval from the school and the education department, the principal telephoned to request a meeting to discuss the data sought. After the initial meeting at School A, School B and School C were contacted using the same letter and project information (cf. Appendix G). In the case of School B, the English Second Language (ESL) coordinator, Corrine Johnson (pseudonym), acted as the contact. At School C International the principal Simon Peter (pseudonym), maintained the role of school contact.

At Schools B and C, the principals approached the international colleges on behalf of the researcher, and following this, the same letter and information sent to schools was sent to the Chief Executive Officers of the two international colleges (see Appendix G), Suzanne Smith (School B International) and Peter Scott (School C International). Both CEOs approved the application for research via a telephone conversation. The interview schedule can be found in Appendix H.

In accessing the five case study sites selected for this dissertation, an attempt has been made to address the limitations of this methodology. For example, Dogan and Pelassy (1990) argued that one limitation of case studies is their reliance on a general hypothesis. They argue that a general hypothesis, which they call...
generalisability, can explain one case but cannot be extended beyond this. However, as George and Bennett (2005) have argued, the case study approach allows the researcher to avoid leaving out valuable cases. While the case study did not include rural and remote schools or disadvantaged schools, for example, the instrumental case study approach adapted for this study was used to select a sample of schools representative of the school types in Queensland (cf. Stake, 1998).

In addition to the aforementioned limitation of generalisability, Flyvbjerg (2006) argued that all case study research contains the bias that sites are chosen because they are easy for the researcher to access. It is acknowledged that ease of access to sites was a key consideration in this study. For example, all three cases were located in the urban area in which the researcher resided, and thus, access was easily obtained. It is also noted that, at two schools, School A and School B, the researcher personally knew staff members, who assisted with accessing these sites. For example, the principal of School A had worked with the researcher at another state school. In addition, the researcher knew several staff members at School B through close family friends who had studied at School B.

There was also a similarity across each of the case study sites in that: (a) they were all schools located in one city; (b) all were located in urban areas; (c) the three schools had excellent academic and sporting records, which was emphasised in their marketing materials and noted in staff discussions; (d) these schools catered to a similar target market of middle- and upper-middle-class domestic students; and (e) while only two of the three schools had a religious affiliation, each school had a strong religious education component to the curricular offering. Several of these characteristics – the location in an urban area, the excellent academic results and the
ability to mix with middle and upper middle-class domestic students – were identified by staff as attractive to international students.

However, these characteristics were compensated for by the different characteristics of each of the schools. The three sites represented a mix of: (a) religious denominations; (b) single-sex and co-educational enrolment practices; (c) elite and non-elite schools and (d) locations within the same urban area in the one middle-sized Australian city. These attributes were an attempt to complete the picture of the enrolment of Eastern Asian international students in the same medium-sized Australian city.

It is noted that, while a case may be chosen because it is convenient for the researcher to gain access, Flyvbjerg (2006) and George and Bennett (2005) argued that this does not prevent such a case from contributing to theory making. As three different school types were chosen, each with different organisational and funding structures, different philosophies on education, different religious or spiritual affiliations, and different relationships with government, these cases allowed the researcher to test the similarities and differences between accounts of Eastern Asian international students’ experiences of education. In particular, accounts of cultural identity and belonging are likely to differ within and between schools. The selection of the three case study schools enabled an analysis of similarities and differences within and between schools.

There are criticisms of case study, particularly around generalisability and their failure to capture a wide cross-section of the population. However, as Ragin (1982, in Flyvberg, 2006) has noted, the advantage of a case study is in its access to in-depth analysis of a particular instance of a case. Further, as Becker (1992, in Flyberg, 2006) argued, this allows for theory making and testing in the context of a rich source
of data. The international college sites were chosen in order to examine the accounts of these students’ experiences were collected from the point of entry into Australia, that is, from the point of these students’ entrance into a preparatory program.

In defence of case studies, Flyvbjerg (2006) argues that good case study research contains a “substantial element of narrative” which is “often a sign that the study has uncovered a particularly rich problematic” (p. 237). The use of a case study reveals a large quantity of information about the case because, as Stake (1995) has argued, the role of case study research is to understand the phenomenon and the associated “political, social, historical and especially personal contexts” (p. 17) that surround the case under inquiry. The data collected at these five case study sites, principally through interviews, yielded a substantive narrative about various perspectives and contexts of the enrolment of Eastern Asian international students into Australian schools.

**Data collection**

The primary means of data collection was interviews. In-depth qualitative interviews were conducted with two groups of participants, namely the staff at each of the three schools and at each of the two international colleges. Focus group interviews were conducted with small groups of international students enrolled at the three schools.

**Interviews with staff**

A total of 14 in-depth interviews were conducted with principals, ESL staff and the leadership team at the three schools. The principals of Schools B and C introduced the researcher to the international college CEOs at School B International and School C International who were also interviewed. At School B International, several staff members were also interviewed.
The staff interview process followed the ethical clearance protocols observed by Griffith University. All interviews were conducted with school staff and international college staff between March and May 2008. Once the information sheet had been read (see Appendix I) and the informed consent instruments had been signed by interviewees (see Appendix J), all interviews followed a schedule (see Appendix H). The staff interviews were flexibly structured and recorded using an MP3 recorder. Interview recordings were later transcribed.

Staff were asked to participate because they held an expert role in the school (cf. Flick, 2009). Flick (2009) defines an expert interview as one that involves interviewing relevant people with a particular expertise, or a specialised knowledge of a situation. In these terms, an expert is a staff member whose role is concerned primarily with the experiences of Eastern Asian students. The staff interviewed were considered experts because they were involved in the enrolment and daily management of international students, and thus had a great deal of contact with these students. That is, they were expected to be best placed to account for the experiences of Eastern Asian students. At School A, the principal determined who would be interviewed. She arranged for two interviews to be conducted, one with herself and one with the ESL counsellor who was in charge of the management and organisation of international students. At School B, the ESL coordinator was responsible for organising the interview participants and the schedule. Following an initial telephone conversation, she recruited staff participants.

At School C, the principal approved the letter and his secretary telephoned the researcher to make an interview appointment. At the conclusion of his interview, he took the researcher on a tour of the school. During this tour, he approached the two ESL counsellors and organised for them to also act as participants. A time for an
interview was negotiated with them at this meeting. At the request of the two staff members, they were interviewed together. This joint interview was an important means of eliciting data from these staff members.

The CEO of School B International provided contact details for the members of staff who were to be interviewed. The interview participants then individually negotiated an interview time via telephone. At School C International, only the CEO who acted as principal was interviewed. There was only one staff participant at this site because the CEO/principal would not allow other staff members to be interviewed. Apart from the CEO’s reluctance, there was a further problem with interviewing these staff members as they were mainly casually employed and were not at the school outside of lesson times.

All the staff members approached agreed to participate and signed the informed consent instrument (cf. Appendix J). Each interview followed a set pattern. They began with questions about the interviewee’s life experiences, experiences of education and how they had come to their position. The interview then turned to the organisation of Australian schooling by asking which schools they thought were most similar to their own school, and what they considered to be their school’s major advantages (the term Unique Selling Proposition1 was used). Then, the participants were asked to recount their experiences of dealing with Asian international students, their role in the international program and the reasons they believed international parents and students had chosen their school (cf. Appendix K for a list of questions).

1 A marketing term used to refer to the distinct value that distinguishes one product or service from another. It is connected to the company’s brand (Avraham & Daugherty, 2009).
These questions were used to provide staff with a wide array of questions through which they could describe the experiences of Eastern Asian students.

It is noted that there were more interviews at School B than at School A and School C combined. As a result, the data set was skewed towards the results of this school, as it provided the greatest numbers of participants. While this may be viewed as a limitation of the present study, when compared with responses from staff members occupying similar roles at the other schools, the similarity in responses became apparent. Similarly, there was consistency across the questions asked of staff members.

As this study is concerned with the experiences of one group of students, it is noted that the gaze was directed at international students. However, as in other studies (cf. Sherry, Thomas & Chui, 2010), this study interviewed staff to gauge their experience with international students. One of the major drawbacks of this focus was that it possibly invited participants to focus on problems with international students rather than discussing their positive experiences. While some positive experiences were discussed, the overwhelming focus was on negatives and problems. In order to try to counteract this, the design of the research was such that there was an emphasis on other topics to discuss outside of their experiences with international students. Staff were asked to describe their experiences of education and their beliefs about education in their state. In addition, most of the questions that were specifically related to international students were related to the pathway they followed to come to Australia. Four questions focused specifically on international students in their schools, and these questions were balanced by seven questions asking about the school, its structure and its staffing arrangements. The questions can be seen in Appendix K.
However, as the participant information sheet made clear (see Appendix I), the staff knew the focus of the study was on the international student cohort. As in previous studies (cf. Ye, 2006a; 2006b; Green, 2007; Zhang & Brunton, 2007; Leask, 2009), the interviewing of staff was central to the data collection. Staff were chosen as a study cohort for several reasons. Firstly, they were chosen because they were able to describe the enrolment patterns and processes of international students that other studies have argued present a significant contributor to the experiences of international students (Leask, 2009). This contribution about enrolment process was the main reason that the agents were approached. Secondly, they were approached because it was hoped they would provide a discussion of the whole school, not just the international student cohort. The discussion of the whole school, it was hoped, would identify how belonging was enacted across the school. Finally, the staff were approached because they were in contact with the international students daily. Thus, it was hoped, they would be able to identify how the students were adapting and to identify instances of international and domestic students mixing and getting along. The notion that staff would be able to attest to students’ adaptation was a key finding of previous studies (cf. Ye, 2006a; 2006b; Green, 2007; Leask, 2009). It was hoped that discussion around adaptation and mixing with domestic students would attest to the students’ experiences of belonging at the school.

In addition, the interview numbers and participants reflected the organisational structure of each school as it managed the international enrolments. At School A, there were so few international students that there were limited staff required to manage their enrolment. Details about the staff participants at School A can be found in Appendix L. In spite of the limited numbers of international students enrolled at School B, there were a large number of staff members who were involved in their
day-to-day management. The details about the staff participants involved in the management and organisation of international students at School B can be found in Appendix M.

While there were large numbers of international students enrolled at School C, only three staff members were involved in the management of this group because the CEO/principal of the international college managed and arranged the enrolment of their international students. Details about the staff participants at School C can be found in Appendix N. Finally, details about the staff participants at the two international colleges can be found in Appendix O (School B International) and Appendix P (School C International).

The length and range of individual interviews varied with the interviewees’ responses. The average interview was 41 minutes in length but a few interviews were shorter or longer than this. While all staff members were asked the same basic questions, and similar probing questions were asked in order to attempt comparability across the corpus, differences between interviewees’ responses in terms of quantity and length must be considered when the data is analysed in this dissertation. However, by providing opportunities for every participant to provide further information, and through probing questions, as equitable an approach to data collection as was possible was attempted for this dissertation (cf. Thompson, Donnison, Warnock-Parkes, Turpin, Turner & Kerr, 2008).

The specific interview technique used to gather data from staff at the five case study sites was flexibly structured interviews. This type of interview seeks “in-depth understandings about the experiences of individuals” (Scott & Morrison, 2006, p. 134). The technique was chosen because it allowed the participants to reflect and describe their experiences in-depth. Consequently, the interview accounts allowed
the researcher to examine the discourses constructed in participants’ talk (see discussion about Critical Discourse Analysis in the following chapter, p. 132). Further, flexibly structured interviews allowed the staff to account, at length, about the experiences of Eastern Asian international students in the Australian school context.

This type of interview technique requires the interviewer to engage in a conversation with the interviewee (Whyte, 1982; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). The resulting account is a co-construction of meaning between the participant and the interviewer (Gubrium & Holstein, 1998; Scott & Morrison, 2006; Fontana & Frey, 2008). These interviews are open-ended because the interviewee is asked to speak broadly about their perspectives (Scott & Morrison, 2006; Yardley & Bishop, 2008).

The use of open-ended questions generated a large volume of data. To manage the volume of data, Seidman (2006) suggested that transcribing the interview recording allows the researcher to (a) know the data well because of the familiarity generated by typing the transcripts and (b) organise the data effectively. However, transcribing leads to judgements about what is significant (Seidman, 2006). Thus, the use of transcription must be understood as the beginning of the process of analysis, because it involves a judgement about what to transcribe (cf. Kvale, 1996; Alldred & Gilles, 2002).

Although the researcher’s prior relationship with school staff assisted in accessing the school sites, it also impeded data collection. In particular, there were three problems posed by this familiarity. Firstly, there was an assumption that the researcher was aware of the culture and background of the schools, particularly at School B. As will be seen in the data analysis, staff described in vague or general terms aspects of the school’s culture, frequently using the term ethos to define the school. Without providing an explicit description of the ethos, which it appeared
encompassed the Catholic rituals and practices in which the school engaged and competitive sports, it was assumed the researcher would understand the term. The assumption of familiarity may have been based on the researcher’s experience as a teacher in Catholic education schools and experiences of elite, Catholic schooling as a student. Phrases such as, *as you would well know* or, *as you know* were used by staff to acknowledge the assumed knowledge that the researcher held.

Secondly, one participant made sexist jokes about students at another school (not included in this study) as part of the interview process. The jokes relied on a familiarity with schooling in the independent schooling sector. The jokes were very explicit and made the researcher uncomfortable because they were inappropriate. In order to overcome the problems with the participant’s inappropriate jokes, the researcher ignored them and, where possible, tried to direct the interview back to the topic by restating the question.

Thirdly, another participant utilised the researcher’s familiarity with schools to lecture her on the state of schooling in Australia and the problems that Eastern Asian international students presented. This participant began her interview with a long, critical statement of the ways that she had helped overcome problems with international students. The interviewee’s approach to taking charge was redirected by the researcher by drawing attention to the participant information sheet and then restating the interview question in order to discuss only those issues that related to the research problem.

Other participants used educational jargon that was specific to independent schools. In response, the researcher reframed the jargon in plain English during the interview and asked the participant if the meaning was conveyed satisfactorily. Similarly, the staff members who were known to the researcher prior to the interview...
made reference to specific situations that both the researcher and the participant had experienced. These references could not be used in the data analysis because they were too personal and would have exposed the participant’s identity.

Denzin (2009) argued that another consideration with interviews is that they may not penetrate the ‘private’ world of the participant and, as a result, the interviewee may “fabricate ‘tales of the self’ that belie the actual facts” (p. 135). A fabrication of the self can be exacerbated in situations in which the researcher: (a) is conducting one off interviews; (b) is asking questions that are difficult or (c) is trying to “penetrate private worlds of experience … characterised by a great deal of emotion or affect” (Denzin, 2009, p. 135). Techniques such as conducting the interviews in places where the interviewee is in control and comfortable, and developing a rapport with the interviewee that assures their safety, can overcome interviewees fabricating tales of the self (Denzin, 2009). In order to address the interviewees’ fabrication of tales of the self, all interviews were conducted in the staff members’ offices, with the exception of the ESL coordinator at School B, who wanted to have the interview conducted at the school’s café located near the school pool. She did not have a private office. These were places in which the interviewee was both in control and comfortable. In addition, data were de-identified through the use of pseudonyms.

Table 1 contains the numbers of interviews at each case study site.
Table 1

Interview data collected at the three schools and two international colleges, showing number of participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School B International</th>
<th>School C International</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School principals</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dean of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dean of studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL staff</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>(2 participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 ESL staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEOs of International Colleges</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 CEOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 international college staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group interviews with international students

Focus group interviews were conducted with international students to address the question that asks *how do Eastern Asian international students enrolled in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for their experiences of culture and belonging?* Research methodologists, such as Glesne (2006) have argued that focus group interviews allow for small groups of individuals to co-construct an account of their experiences. In this study, small groups of Asian international
students were asked to co-construct their experiences in Australian secondary schools.

There were several groups of participants who could not be interviewed but whose experiences of the enrolment of international students may have added considerably to the study. These groups include the agents on the ground in the home countries whose role it is to “sell” the Australian schools at trade shows, the parents of the international students who ultimately made (and paid for) the choice and returned students whose experiences were used by students to make a decision. Each of these groups will be discussed.

Firstly, while there is no way to access the agents in the home countries, it is possible that their views would have been significant. As the participants, in particular the Australian school agents whose role was to coordinate and sell their institutions, discussed the role of the agents in the interviews, it became increasingly apparent that what they were saying to students, how they were describing and defining the different institutions, and which institutions were favoured, would have been useful. There was no means for the present study to capture these agents’ role. It is possible that their role in influencing the students’ experiences would be great as it outlined for the students what they could expect in different institutions.

Secondly, the parents of the international students would have been a significant addition to the dissertation. They are the group that, as acknowledged by all participants, made the choice and paid for the choice of the Australian school. The reasons they chose the individual schools they chose, their role in preparing their children for their education abroad and even the ways that they interacted with their children while they were on the ground in Australia would potentially have added a great deal to the analysis of the experiences of Eastern Asian international students.
in Australian schools. In addition, as they were mentioned many times by the students in the interviews, their perspective on the choice, and on what their children were saying about their role in the children’s lives while in Australia, may have provided a different perspective on the data collected for this study. However, due to their many different geographic locations, it would have been impossible to interview the parents.

Thirdly, the role of returned students in influencing choice was mentioned informally by several of the agents after the interviews. The agents in the home country are said to use returned students to influence potential students to choose one school or one country. These returned students are said to influence potential students because they tell stories of their experiences. It is presumed that these students’ experiences of their education would be significant in preparing the potential students for what they could expect in Australia and, as a result, may have a significant influence over the experiences the students expect to receive in Australia. However, as with the other groups, it would have been impossible due to geographic constraints, to interview this group.

There were several reasons why the focus group technique was chosen to collect data from this group of participants. Firstly, focus groups have been found to be useful when interviewing young people or children because they reduce the authority imbalance between adult and child by providing the child with a voice equal to that of an adult (O’Kane, 2000; Scott & Morrison, 2006). Secondly, focus groups allow for the exploration of differences between individuals’ responses (Kitzinger, 1994; Scott & Morrison, 2006). Thirdly, focus groups allow the participants to change their mind in the interview when they hear another’s opinion and elaborate on the opinions of others (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2008). For example, when one of the
students had finished explaining how English was taught in China, other students were asked to elaborate using the phrase *Do you feel the same way? Was the English different?*. As a consequence, the focus groups were used to encourage small groups of 15-19 year old international students to co-construct an account of their experiences of being an international student in a secondary school in Australia. Prospective participant students were given information about the study (see Appendix Q) and an informed consent instrument (see Appendix R) several days before the interviews were scheduled.

Seven focus groups were conducted for this study, each with five student participants. At School A, two focus groups were conducted in the office of the ESL counsellor. The first focus group was scheduled during class time and attracted very few students. Two students volunteered to be involved and only one remained for the duration of the focus group. The second focus group was scheduled during morning tea break and the requisite five students returned signed informed consent instruments (see Appendix R) and were prepared to participate in this session.

At School B, there were four focus groups. There were some problems with the recruitment method employed for the focus groups at School B. Two teachers who were responsible for three classes (the Year 12 class, the Year 11 English class and the Year 10 class) did not stay with the class to manage the students who were not participating. The teachers did not stay because they learned that the researcher held a valid teaching registration (and was legally allowed to be left alone and unsupervised with the class) and stated that they would be in the staff room if they were needed. While this did not cause problems with two of the classes, the lack of supervision with the Year 10 class proved problematic. The students who were not participating, but were in the same classroom as the focus group, were noisy during
the lesson and complained about the work they had been asked to complete. As a result, the researcher was required to stop the focus group interview several times to manage their behaviour.

A list of questions was developed to guide the discussion (see Appendix S), however these were not strictly followed. When students introduced other areas to the discussion, these were followed up and discussed. Similarly, where students wanted to focus on a particular issue, for example their homestay families, this topic was discussed in more depth. To illustrate how the students lead the discussion, the Year 11 English participants at School B volunteered that failure was a major reason for the enrolment of international students into Australian schools. The topic of failure dominated the discussion and the students spent seven minutes of the total 32 minutes discussing this topic. By contrast, failure was not discussed in the same depth in other focus groups where students led the discussion in a different direction. Thus, while there were questions that were developed and used to guide the discussion, there were instances where focus groups did not follow the questions as students led the discussion in a different direction.

In line with Kincheloe (2005), Glesne (2006) and the principles of the Mallan et al. (2010) study, participants in the focus groups led the discussion. To illustrate how the students lead the discussion, the Year 11 English participants at School B volunteered that failure was a major reason for the enrolment of international students into Australian schools. The topic of failure dominated the discussion and the students spent seven minutes of the total 32 minutes discussing this topic. By contrast, failure was not discussed in the same depth in other focus groups where students led the discussion in a different direction.
Several limitations have been highlighted with the focus group technique. For example, it can be difficult to control and manage a focus group because it may be prone to sabotage by reluctant or overly dominant members (Glesne, 2006; Scott & Morrison, 2006). In a study of young people’s identity and experiences as mediated through education, Ball, Maguire and Macrae (2000) found that by using prescriptive interview techniques the “young men” of their study “[who] were particularly monosyllabic” were encouraged to talk freely (p. 19). In this study, a prescriptive approach was adopted to overcome reluctance and dominance which could have been related to varying levels of English language proficiency of focus group members.

The use of focus groups with the international student cohort was chosen in order to reduce the authority imbalance, to allow for differences between individuals and to allow participants to change their mind. However, there were some problems with this particular method that were specific to this study. For example, while studies of international students have relied on focus groups (cf. Leask, 2009; Mukohara, Otani, & Ban, 2011; Volet & Ang, 2012), there may be some problems with the use of this particular method. The students were not communicating in their native language and were using a language with which they were familiar but not totally fluent. This lack of fluency may have affected their ability to understand the question or to respond to the question. As will be seen from the data analysis chapters, the students’ responses were often difficult to understand and were frequently phrased in a way that was different from the phrasing of native English speakers. It is possible that the students’ English proficiency may have affected their ability to respond to the questions. As such, while every attempt was made to ensure students were clear about the question, were able to consult their friends if they had trouble
understanding or responding to the question and had adequate time to answer, the students may not have been able to effectively and totally explain their experiences in the interviews.

It is noted that, as Halcomb, Gholizadeh, DiGiacomo, Phillips, & Davidson (2007) argue, the use of one-off focus groups is an effective means of overcoming the above problems that may come about when interviewing linguistically and culturally diverse populations. The effectiveness of focus groups is said to derive from, as Barbour (2005 in Halcomb et al., 2007) notes, the peer group that occurs naturally in a focus group. The peer group is said to encourage “relatively uninhibited discussion” (p. 732) which can compensate for the language deficits. In the present study, students who were struggling to express themselves often spoke to a friend in their native language who then translated their friend’s point in the interview. In addition, as the focus groups were conducted away from their teachers and domestic student peers, it was hoped that the students would feel free to discuss their experiences which may be facilitated by the choice of a one-off focus group with an interviewer who has no role in the students’ day to day lives (cf. Halcomb et al., 2007).

The students were not communicating in their native language and were using a language with which they were familiar but not totally fluent. This lack of fluency may have affected their ability to understand the question or to respond to the question. As will be seen from the data analysis chapters, the students’ responses were often difficult to understand and were frequently phrased in a way that was different from the phrasing of native English speakers. It is possible that the students’ English proficiency may have affected their ability to respond to the questions. As such, while every attempt was made to ensure students were clear about the
question, were able to consult their friends if they had trouble understanding or responding to the question and had adequate time to answer, the students may not have been able to effectively and totally explain their experiences in the interviews. However, the schools would not allow the researcher back to discuss the interview responses with the students as they did not want their classes disrupted again. In addition, as the students were from multiple language backgrounds, it would have been impossible to have a translator available for each of the students. For example, in the Year 11 English focus group at School B, students’ language backgrounds included Cantonese, Mandarin, Japanese, Vietnamese and Malaysian.

Table 2 lists the details of the focus groups. It will be noted that there was a disparity between male and female participants. There were 25 male participants compared with only seven female participants. These numbers were consistent with the numbers of students interviewed at the all boys’ school, School B, the site with the largest numbers of participants. Moreover, the disparity between male and female responses reflects the international student numbers cited in Chapter One. It was noted in Chapter One that the majority of students who are sent offshore to attend secondary schools in Australia are male (cf. Australian Government: Australian Education International, 2009a).
Table 2
Details of the focus groups with students at the three schools showing student numbers, numbers of boys and girls and total length of the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
<th>Number of boys</th>
<th>Number of girls</th>
<th>Total length of the focus group recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 11 and 12 no specific class</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10 English</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11 English</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11 Study of Religion</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16 minutes (recorder breaks after this time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12 Study of Religion</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12 English</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total student numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The methods used by this dissertation

To sum up, this study has taken a case study approach. Three schools, School A, School B and School C and two international colleges, School B International and School C International, were accessed as case study sites. The main data collection technique was interviews conducted with two participant groups: (a) flexibly structured interviews with staff and (b) focus group interviews with students. There
were 14 flexibly-structured interviews conducted with school and international college staff members at the three school and two international college sites accessed for this study. There were seven focus group interviews, four focus groups were conducted at School B, two focus groups were conducted at School A, and one at School C. In what follows, the framework for analysing this data is detailed.
Chapter Five: Analytic Framework
The previous chapter outlined the data collection methods employed by this study. In this chapter, the analytic framework that allows the everyday language used by participants to be translated into the theoretical language, discussed in Chapter Three, is described. The application of the analytic framework is illustrated using examples drawn from the data.

**Critical Discourse Analysis**

In order to analyse the data collected for this dissertation, a framework was developed that combined the work of several of the Discourse Historical Approaches (DHA) within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), thus extending the contribution that DHA can make to the analysis. This chapter outlines the ways that this dissertation extends the DHA through the blending of several discourse historical tools while drawing on the concepts of languages of description, as developed in the work of Basil Bernstein (cf. Bernstein, 2000). In so doing, it will describe how this dissertation has combined the work of Reisigl and Wodak (1999; 2009), Matouschek, Wodak and Januschek (1995), Titscher, Meyer, Wodak and Vetter (2000) and Wodak (2001; 2004) and employed the work of Bernstein (2000) on languages of description to develop an analytic framework.

It is useful to begin this section by reviewing the characteristics of CDA, a method that examines the role of discourse in social practice (Diriker, 2004). It is concerned with “relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 135). Thus, the discourse practices that are of interest to CDA are: (a) evident in text and talk and (b) related to wider cultural, social and relational processes.
CDA’s focus is with social problems, not with language itself (Titscher, et al., 2000). It is concerned with the linguistic character of social and cultural processes through which discourses are constructed (Titscher, et al., 2000). Due to its interest in the discourses used in everyday language, CDA is interested in issues of power. Specifically, CDA examines how power relations are relayed in discourse. Fairclough (2000) argued that power, especially in the form of unequal power relations, is enacted in language. He described CDA as considering the ways that power controls the access to, and production and consumption of, texts in a context (Fairclough, 1995; 2001b), thus enabling those with power to restrict or limit their access. In addition, the focus on power is in reference to the asymmetrical relations between agents in a context (cf. Fairclough, 1995). Thus, as Weiss and Wodak (2003) argued, “CDA takes an interest in the ways in which linguistic forms are used in various expressions and manipulations of power” (p. 15). Power is enacted through language that is not powerful on its own, but rather becomes powerful when those who hold power use it in specific ways (Fairclough, 2001b). According to Fairclough (2001b), context is crucial to an analysis of the power of discourse as it has been enacted through language. It was noted in Chapter Three that previous studies had examined how the discourses constructed about international students manipulated their power in institutions (cf. Kettle, 2005; 2010; Manathunga, 2009). Thus, any study into international students’ experiences of cultural identity and belonging must consider how discourses constructed about groups influence access to power in the institutional context. The notion of context is important to the DHA, which is a hermeunetic approach that is underpinned by the assumption that the meaning of discourse can only be understood in context. The context may become visible only through tracing one discourse.
CDA endeavours to make visible power relationships that are frequently hidden. However, as van Dijk (2001) argues, CDA does not have a specific direction of research, nor does it rest on a single theoretical framework. Rather, it allows a researcher to adopt and incorporate a range of theories, making explicit links between theory and practice (van Dijk, 2001). As such, CDA can be considered to be more than an interpretive framework; rather, it has an explanatory intent (cf. Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). The explanatory intent means that CDA does more than interpret data; it is a tool that explains the means through which individuals and groups exercise power.

While lacking a singular research focus or theoretical framework, CDA may encompass a variety of approaches including the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA), the approach that has been taken up in this study. The following discussion will first describe Wodak’s (2004) model of the DHA. It will then outline how this approach has been elaborated on and refined to develop an analytic framework to address the research problem of this dissertation.

**Wodak’s Discourse Historical Approach**

The Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) endeavours to “work with different approaches, multimethodically, and on the basis of a variety of empirical data as well as background information” (Wodak, 2001, p. 65). It applies multiple theories and methods to practical problems by examining the “relationships between various ‘symptoms’” (Wodak, 2002, p. 64). Symptoms are defined as the evidence of discourse in social practice and are seen in the context of the discursive event,
usually a linguistic utterance (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). In the DHA, symptoms are the first stage of analysis.

The approach examines discourses that construct inclusion and exclusion, difference and sameness for different groups (Wodak, 2004). Thus, its usefulness to this study is its ability to access students’ experiences of belonging. Specifically, the tools of the Discourse Historical Approach allow for accounts of experiences, which shape identities constructed in groups and belonging to groups, to be made visible. Wodak (2004) argues that the Discourse Historical Approach to CDA allows for an analysis of the influence of wider social processes, relations and structures, especially culture, on the construction of discourses through an analysis of the context of the utterance as well as the discourses constructed by the utterance. While all approaches to CDA incorporate an analysis of the historical circumstances of discourse practices (cf. Fairclough, 2001b; Wodak, 2001; 2002; Rogers, 2004; Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui & O’Garro Joseph, 2005; Rogers & Mosley, 2008; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009), the DHA allows for a thorough analysis of how discourses construct identities, as well as inclusion and exclusion, and thus belonging (cf. de Cillia, Reisigl & Wodak, 1999). This interest in identities and belonging, and the focus on power relations, makes DHA a useful approach to investigate the research questions of this dissertation.

**Dialecticism and the DHA**

Like all approaches to CDA, the Discourse Historical Approach takes a dialectical approach to data analysis (cf. Wodak, 2001; 2003; Fairclough, 2009). In much the same terms as Bernstein’s (2000) languages of description, the dialectical approach to data analysis allows for a translation of the empirical language of the data collected in interviews into the theoretical language developed for a study.
Dialecticism is usually achieved over three levels of analysis, using the Fairclough (2004) approach to CDA, namely the micro, meso and macro levels of analysis (Fairclough, 2004). Wodak (2004) argued that, using the DHA, dialecticism is achieved over four levels. These levels are linguistic analysis, discourse theory, mid-range theory and grand theory. These four levels form the model of the Discourse Historical Approach are shown in Figure 1 below.

The first level of analysis is linguistic analysis, which describes the immediate context of the linguistic utterance and is akin to Fairclough’s (2004) micro level of analysis. At this level, there are four tools of analysis, *perspectivisation, self-representation strategies, argumentation strategies and intensification and mitigation strategies*. *Perspectivisation* is the perspective offered by a speaker and the evidence they rely upon. *Self-representation* is concerned with how the speaker frames himself or herself in the text. *Argumentation* is concerned with the argumentation strategies employed. Finally, *intensification or mitigation strategies* examine how the speaker constructs group membership (Wodak, 2004).

The next levels, the discourse and mid-range theory levels, work at the meso level analysis of data (Fairclough, 2004). Wodak (2004) argued that this level of discourse theory deals with the discursive relationships between utterances and their connection to wider discourses. The mid-range theory level is concerned with the broader social and sociological variables and their impact on the discursive event. In the model, the theories are not stated because as van Dijk (2001) has argued, there is no single theoretical framework or set of theories that must be used in CDA.

Grand theory is concerned with the macro level analysis described by Fairclough (2004) and examines broader socio-political and historical consequences that are embedded in the data (Wodak, 2004). The Discourse Historical Approach is
dialectical in the sense that it moves between theoretical and empirical between high levels of abstraction and the everyday language that is used by participants, between the theory developed for the study and the participants’ accounts of their everyday worlds or social practice (Wodak, 2004; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). The Wodak (2004) model is diagrammatically represented in Figure 1.

Figure 1 Wodak’s model of the discourse historical approach (Wodak, 2004, p. 206).
As a result of its dialectical nature, the DHA allows for a theoretical re-description of empirical data. Bernstein (2000; Morais, 2002; 2007) described a dialectical approach as one through which conceptual or theoretical concepts could describe empirical data. He proposed that the theoretical and the empirical comprised two languages, called the languages of description (Bernstein, 2000; Morais, 2002; 2007).

Using the terms $L^1$ and $L^2$ in a manner different from systemic functional linguists, Bernstein (2000) described the $L^1$ as the internal language of description. He defined the $L^1$ as the “syntax whereby a conceptual language was created” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 132). The second language of description, the $L^2$, was defined as the “syntax whereby the internal language of description can describe something other than itself” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 132). Bernstein argued that the internal syntaxes of the $L^1$ “are the condition for constructing invisibles” because they are abstract and theoretical in nature (Bernstein, 2000, p. 132). The $L^2$ is the “means of making those invisibles visible” and are the concrete experiences that are explained by the $L^1$ (Bernstein, 2000, p. 132). The $L^2$ must be “derived from the internal language, otherwise it will not be possible to describe anything except itself” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 132) but it must go beyond a mere account of practice, such as that produced by interviews. At the same time, the $L^2$ must “be permeable to the potential enactments of those being described” otherwise “their voices will be silenced” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 135). In order for the $L^2$ to be translated into the $L^1$, a reading device needs to be activated.

In this dissertation, the analytic framework was developed to act as the reading device to activate the $L^2$ into the $L^1$. Thus, the analytic framework used in this dissertation is the reading device that translates between the $L^1$ and the $L^2$. It builds
on the DHA work of Wodak (2004) by including other DHA tools. These tools allow the theoretical concepts of cultural difference and belonging to be read in the data because they facilitate the translation of the data gathered in the interview scripts into theoretical language. Rather than imposing the theory on the data, these tools are applied so that the students’ experiences of difference and sameness as well as their experiences of inclusion and exclusion are identified and are able to be explained theoretically.

In Wodak’s (2004) model, the theoretical level, Bernstein’s (2000) L₁, is shown to be the main concern of analysis. This level is concerned with three of the four levels of the model and incorporates grand theory, mid-range theory and discourse theory. Below the level of discourse theory, the empirical level, or Bernstein’s (2000) L₂, is concerned with linguistic analysis of the discursive utterance at a micro analytic or textual level. At this level, several DHA strategies, specifically self-representation, perspectivisation, argumentation and intensification and mitigation strategies are applied to the text.

In this dissertation, grand theory and mid-range theory were combined into a single L₁. The Wodak (2004) model of the Discourse Historical Approach has been adapted in Figure 2 to demonstrate the L₁ and L₂ used in this dissertation. It will be noted that Wodak’s (2004) concerns with symptoms have been added to this model. As stated earlier, symptoms are the evidence of discourse in a linguistic utterance. They are the first stage of analysis. Figure 2 demonstrates the way that the L₁ is translated into the L₂ through the use of linguistic analysis. Further, it adds symptoms, the initial analytic level that identifies the evidence of discourse in a linguistic utterance. Thus, this study undertakes a DHA over three, rather than four, levels.
Figure 2 The adaptation of Wodak’s original model showing the L$^1$ and L$^2$ for this study, the theoretical framework and the use of symptoms (Adapted from Wodak, 2004, p. 206).
In addition to the model shown in Figure 2, several other tools of the DHA have been incorporated into the analytic framework. In this dissertation, the argumentation strategy tool (Wodak, 2004) and the three dimension analytic apparatus (Matouschek, et al., 1995 in Titscher, et al., 2000) were used.

The argumentation strategy tool

In addition to the four linguistic analysis tools proposed in Wodak’s model of the DHA (Wodak, 2004), Wodak and Reisigl (2009) have proposed that the argumentation strategy tool could be used to further examine the argumentation strategies speakers use. This tool allows for an analysis of how: (a) inclusion, exclusion and thus belonging are justified and legitimated; (b) particular social, political, psychological or linguistic goals are realised and (c) identities are constructed through an analysis of the arguments that a speaker frames in their accounts (Wodak, 2004; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). The analytic framework developed for this dissertation employed the argumentation strategy tool to facilitate an examination of the experiences of Eastern Asian international students in Australian schools as represented in staff and student accounts.

Argumentation strategies are useful in analysing the “set of processes which operate consciously or unconsciously at different levels of communication” (Titscher et al., 2000, p. 158). The argumentation strategy tool describes an argument’s level of complexity as well as its use to demonstrate a point of view (Titscher et al., 2000). It makes it possible to analyse: (a) the degree of association a speaker has with their argument; (b) the complexity of the argument that the speaker uses; and (c) the speaker’s ability to demonstrate their point of view using argumentation (Titscher et al., 2000; Wodak, 2004; Reisigl and Wodak, 2009).
The tool analyses five strategies of argumentation. The first is referential/nomination that involves membership categorisation and the construction of in and out groups. This strategy constructs references to biological, social or symbolic group membership. Referential/nomination constructs social actors using names, deictics and phoric expressions, antroponyms related to professions, collectives, concrete and abstract constructions of phenomena and events and material, mental and verbal constructions of process and actions (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009).

The second is predication. Predication is evident in the attributions and stereotypes a social actor uses to label and evaluate others. It involves the discursive characterisation of social actors and natural or environmental processes (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009). Reisigl and Wodak (2009) argued that predication could include the construction of both identities and belonging through an examination of processes of displacement and diasporas.

The third strategy is argumentation, in which a social actor describes the positive and negative attributes that they identify with another group. Argumentation is constituted through claims to both truth and righteousness. These claims may or may not rely on evidence (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009).

The fourth strategy is perspectivisation, which sees the speaker involve themselves in the social world by expressing involvement and using anecdotes. Ideological perspectives are used to position the speaker’s point of view (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009). The point of view adopted by a speaker will imply the level of involvement they have with their argument.

The fifth and final strategy is intensification and mitigation, which sees the speaker mitigate or intensify the status of the other (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009).
Epistemic mitigation involves the construction of uncertainty and will use qualifiers such as ‘so-called’. Epistemic intensification is the establishment of negative parallels and equations that construct a discourse of distrust of the truth claims of an argument. Deontic mitigation is seen in the false portrayal of background evidence to demonstrate an argument, while deontic intensification involves the construction of moral fallacies of a particular policy (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009). These fallacies play with ambiguity, take meanings out of context and reinterpret discourse in a more favourable way to prove an argumentation claim (cf. Reisigl and Wodak, 2001).

The argumentation strategy tool is arranged hierarchically, so that the arrangement of the strategies in the tool is meant to imply both the increasing complexity of an argument and the increasing association between the speaker and the argument (Wodak, 2004). For example, mitigation and intensification are the highest levels of the argumentation strategy tool. These strategies also involve the greatest connection between speaker and the greatest degree of complexity in formulating the illocutionary points in an utterance (cf. Wodak, 2004). Intensification and mitigation, the highest level of the tool, are usually constructed around assertions, commitment, declarations, constructions/directions or expressive emotions. The argumentation strategy tool is shown below in Figure 3.
### Figure 3
The argumentation strategy tool (adapted from Wodak, 2004, p. 207; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p. 94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensification and mitigation strategies</td>
<td>Modifying the epistemic or deontic status of a preposition or utterance. May modify the illocutionary force of the utterance that may or may not be attributed to another</td>
<td>Hesitations, vague expressions, questions, hyperbole, indirect speech acts (including the use of questions rather than statements, passive rather than active voice). Verbs of saying, feeling and thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectivisation, framing, discourse representation</td>
<td>Expressing involvement or distance in a story or an anecdote. Positioning the speaker's point of view.</td>
<td>Reporting/describing/narrating/quoting events or utterances Animating prosody or other poetic devices Using metaphors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>Justification and/or questioning of claims to truth and righteousness. The justification of positive and negative attributes associated with a particular group.</td>
<td>Topoi are used to justify political inclusion and exclusion/discrimination/preferential treatment. Fallacies are introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predication</td>
<td>The labelling of social actors more or less positively, negatively, deprecatingly or appreciatively. The discursive qualification of social actors, objects, events, phenomena, processes and actions.</td>
<td>Stereotypes, evaluative attributions of positive or negative traits. May use adjectives and prepositional phrases that group peoples together Explicit comparisons, similes, metaphors and other rhetorical devices Allusions and evocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential/nomination</td>
<td>The discursive construction of social actors/objects/phenomena/events/processes/actions and the construction of in and out groups.</td>
<td>Membership categorisation Biological, naturalising and depersonalising traits are emphasised Verbs and nouns are used to denote processes and actions that exist in the social world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increasing level of complexity**
The argumentation strategies of referential/nomination, predication, and intensification and mitigation have been added to the model, as shown in Figure 4 below. These strategies exist at the level of linguistic analysis because, as Wodak (2004) has argued, they are tools of linguistic analysis. They are arranged in the order set out by the argumentation strategy tool. The remainder of the model demonstrates how the theoretical language developed for this dissertation is used at the level of the $L^1$, the internal language of description while the tools of linguistic analysis are used at the $L^2$, the external language of description. The dialectical nature of the model allows this dissertation to translate between these two languages.
Figure 4  The adaptation of Wodak’s original model showing the L₁ and L₂ for this study, the theoretical framework and the use of symptoms and the argumentation strategy tool (Adapted from Wodak, 2004, p. 206).
Three dimension analytic apparatus

The *three dimension analytic apparatus* was an earlier tool of the Discourse Historical Approach (Titscher et al., 2000). This dissertation has used the three dimension analytic apparatus, in addition to the aforementioned tools of linguistic analysis. It was noted above that the tools of linguistic analysis in Wodak’s (2004) model were self-representation strategies, perspectivisation strategies, argumentation and intensification and mitigation strategies. In addition to these four strategies, the analytic framework also utilises analysis of predication strategies and referential/nomination strategies. Different strategies, specifically those that construct we-you discourses are analysed using the three-step analytic apparatus.

Matouschek, et al. (1995) developed the three dimension analytic apparatus to examine the strategies that speakers use to define those who belong and those who do not through an analysis of the construction of a *we-you discourse* (cf. Matouschek et al., 1995 in Titscher et al., 2000).

The three dimension analytic apparatus’ focus on the construction of a we-you discourse facilitates analysis of the student’s experiences of belonging described in accounts from staff and students. Further, by tracing the we-you discourse, the study is able to analyse binary oppositions. The we-you discourse facilitates analysis of binaries through tracing the groups that are positioned through a we-discourse and the groups that are positioned through a you-discourse. In Chapter Three, binaries were defined as a strategy through which others were named, groups were formed and one group was represented positively at the expense of another (cf. Thomas, 2006). In the analytic framework developed for this dissertation, binaries are examined through analysis of the construction of we-you discourse. It is noted that
while there is one we-you discourse, there are multiple positions within this discourse.

The three dimension analytic apparatus was modified for this dissertation and is shown in Figure 5. In Figure 5, as in Matouschek et al. (1995 in Titscher et al., 2000), the we-you discourse is shown as the principal concern of the apparatus. From this, the construction of the we-you discourse is achieved through: (a) categorisation and evaluation; (b) the use of grammatically cohesive elements and (c) disclaimers, positive self-assessment and norm-respect. There are seven types of justification that are identified by the apparatus. Further, the apparatus identifies the linguistic realisations used to construct the seven different types of justification.

It will be noted that, in the model below, prejudices and silence are justifications that have been added to the apparatus developed by Matouschek et al. (1995 in Titscher et al., 2000). They have been added because, when an initial analysis of the data was undertaken, it became apparent that both were significant in the accounts of Eastern Asian international students’ experiences. As such, to facilitate a description of the apparatus as it has been modified and used by this dissertation, the use of both prejudice and silence justifications will be analysed.

*Prejudices* are constructed using linguistic tools such as allusions, generalising references, unreal scenarios and stereotypes. They are a “simplifying, generalizing … judgment, [unjustified] prejudgment of oneself, or another or a thing” or a “fixed cliché-ridden image” (Wodak, 2002, p. 499). Prejudices rely on claims that are irrational, illogical and untrue, which are disguised as criticism (Wodak, 2002, p. 515). Thus, prejudices are presented as criticism and are often disguised using facts so that they appear as judgments that *can be substantiated* (Wodak, 2002, p. 499). However, they are the products of opinion that are adopted and formed in haste.
without analysing facts (Wodak, 2002). They are frequently characterised by hostile feelings (Wodak, 2002, p. 499). To this end, a prejudice is neither “proved nor provable” instead it relies on “beliefs and opinions that are generalized, on judgments that are transferred from individuals to an entire group” (Wodak, 2002, p. 499).

Wodak (2002) stated that prejudices are not discussed openly, rather they are implied in discourses. They are implied because they are affective opinions that confirm world-views without substantive evidence. These world views categorise individuals into we groups and the others. The others are devalued, evaluated, without factual evidence and debate (Wodak, 2002). Wodak (2002) argues that prejudices are essentially hostile judgments of others.

Analysis of prejudice is undertaken at the justification level of the apparatus because prejudice is used to justify two of the three elements of a we-you discourse, namely disclaimers and categorisation and evaluation (cf. Wodak, 2002). As such, prejudice is a justification strategy that is constituted by several linguistic strategies such as stereotypes and membership categorisation. In addition, prejudice operates in much the same way as the reification of difference discussed in Chapter Three (cf. Doherty & Singh, 2005). Further, just as reification of difference constructs and naturalises differences between groups (cf. Chapter Three p. 78), so too a prejudice is a justification that constructs the differences used to position groups through a we-you discourse.

It was noted above that silence was added to the three dimension analytic apparatus as it was adapted for this dissertation. Silences are an important part of the context, which is central to analysis using the DHA. Wodak (2004) described how the context included what is said, what is not said and the background situation of the utterance. Similarly, Fairclough (1992) described silence as one of the ways that
discourses are acted on by individuals who negotiate “their relationship with the multifarious types of discourses they are drawn into” (p. 62). He argued that discourses, constructed through silence, reveal implicit assumptions and presuppositions (Fairclough, 2000). In addition, silence was described by Nichols (2003) who noted that silence may be a strategy that is adopted by international students, who use it to critique the dominance of Western academic discourses (see Chapter Three p. 73).

Wodak (2004) described silence as one of the ways in which prejudices and stereotypes are relayed in discourse. Silence is used when it is taboo to express a particular opinion. It facilitates an analysis of difference and sameness, inclusion and exclusion. However silences are difficult to analyse because “if accused, the speaker can always justify himself – or herself – by stating that s/he did not ‘mean’ what others imply that they had said” (Wodak, 2007, p.208). In her study of anti-Semitic discourses, Wodak (2007) argued that those who knew the background, and had been appropriately socialised, inferred the true meaning of silence used to construct prejudices. Thus, silence is one of the coded ways (Wodak, 2007) that prejudicial discourses can be constituted and transmitted.

Silences were important to this dissertation because, as will be seen in the following two chapters, participants remained silent about groups of students, usually domestic students, when accounting for the experiences of Eastern Asian international students. Participants remained silent about domestic students, in spite of being asked to discuss and describe these students, through eliciting questions. Thus, the prejudices that were constructed through silences were an important symptom of discourse for this dissertation.
A modified version of the apparatus incorporating both prejudice and silence is shown below in Figure 5.

Figure 5 The three dimension analytic apparatus (adapted from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic realisation</th>
<th>Generalising references</th>
<th>Speakers’ perspectives</th>
<th>Stylistics/ situationality</th>
<th>Euphemisms</th>
<th>Text coherence</th>
<th>Metaphorical lexems</th>
<th>Silence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unreal scenarios</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogies</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evocations</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation/ generalisations</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse representation</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>and/or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
- Attribution/denial of responsibility or guilt and/or
- Black-white painting and/or
- Rejection of guilt and/or
- Scapegoating and/or
- Victim/agent reversal and/or
- Devaluation and defamation through distortion and/or
- Exaggeration and conspiracy theories and/or
- Prejudice and/or

**Construction of a we-you discourse**

- Categorisation and evaluation: Constitution of we
- Use of grammatically cohesive elements
- Disclaimers, positive self assessment, norm-respect
The apparatus was used to examine the construction of in and out groups, and thus analytically understand experiences of belonging, at the five case study sites. Further, it used the tools of linguistic realisation, embedded in the apparatus, to examine how discourses construct we-you discourses. We-you discourses allow for a theoretical examination of identities that are constructed about the other, a key concern of studies that examined how cultural discourses affect international students (cf. Singh & Doherty, 2004).

The modified apparatus was incorporated into the model of the Discourse Historical Approach described earlier. It is used in this study to facilitate an analysis of the discourse theory component of Wodak’s (2004) original model. Thus, its concern with we-you discourse forms the discourse level of the model. The model begins with a linguistic analysis of symptoms evident in the participants’ accounts. Justification, argumentation strategies and self-representation strategies are the next stage of the model. These three strategies are applied at the level of linguistic analysis. Self-representation strategies are analysed at the empirical level (cf. Wodak, 2004), however, argumentation strategies and justifications require other tools to translate into the empirical language used by participants (cf. Wodak, 2002; 2004).

In this dissertation, argumentation strategies were examined using the argumentation strategy tool. Common argumentation strategies seen in the data were metaphorical lexemes (the use of the term little emperors), generalising references (for example to the Eastern Asian students’ shame culture) and silences (for example the silence around an Australian identity). These strategies justified the construction of the Eastern Asian student you position in opposition to the Australian
we position. The justification strategy of devaluation and defamation by distortion was evident in accounts that blamed the students culture for their problems at the schools. The analysis of the linguistic and justification strategies enabled a we-you discourse to be traced at the discourse theory or the second stage of the model.

A we-you discourse was traced through a linguistic analysis of the argumentation strategies of perspectivisation, self-representation, referential/nomination, argumentation, intensification/mitigation, and/or predication and the justifications of categorisation and evaluation, disclaimers and positive self assessments and norm respect. The third stage applied the theoretical framework developed for this dissertation.

In Figure 6 below, the analytic framework developed for this dissertation is shown, incorporating the theoretical language of this dissertation, the argumentation strategy tool and the modified three-dimension analytic apparatus. Figure 6 demonstrates how the modified three dimension analytic apparatus was used along with the argumentation strategy tool to examine the context at the level of linguistic analysis. It will be noted that only those linguistic realisations and justifications that were widely used in the dissertation have been noted in the model. As it is dialectical, which means that it moves through the levels from participants’ account to theory and back to the participants’ accounts, the arrows indicating movement between levels of the model have been removed.
Figure 6 The model of the analytic framework showing the L₁ and L₂ for this study, the theoretical framework and the use of symptoms, the argumentation strategy tool and the three dimension analytic apparatus (Adapted from Wodak, 2004, p. 206).
The framework applied to an account

In what follows, an account provided by Corrine Johnson is used to demonstrate how the analytical framework works to move from empirical data to theoretical description. Corrine was identified in Appendix M (details of staff at School B) as the ESL coordinator at School B. She was also the teacher responsible for the Year 12 Study of Religion class, students from which were interviewed for this study. In the following account, Corrine responds to the question, *How do Asian international parents find out about School B and why, in your opinion, have they chosen it for their children?*

In the following discussion, italics are used to identify words drawn directly from the participant’s account.

**Extract One**

Corrine: *The Chinese are— as you can see with their burgeoning economy— they still want to do everything their way. And it’s the same here. The Thai will adapt, the Korean will adapt. The Chinese say— ‘No, we want to be part of you, but this is how we’re going to do it— and we’re paying you, so we will’. And they’re doing that now with the [Beijing] Olympic Games. They’re releasing very little information; they’re keeping a tight rein on how many tickets they’ve got.*

In this account, Corrine described the Chinese students as being different from students from Thailand and Korea. The analysis begins with a discussion of symptoms. The symptom evident in Corrine’s account was the repeated use of adaptation or adapting to the school. According to Corrine, the Thai and Korean students did what was required at the school to adapt, however, the Chinese students did not adapt. Corrine used the example of the Beijing Olympic games organisation, prominent in the media at the time of this interview, to demonstrate that a perceived wider problem of the Chinese only wanting to be part of the West on Chinese terms was the reason for Chinese students not adapting to School B. In this
Several **linguistic realisations** are evident in this account. Linguistic realisations, including comparisons, generalising references and nominations facilitate a textual analysis, so that justifications can be analysed. Firstly, Corrine described the Chinese students by using a **comparison** with the Thai and Korean students. She argued that there were differences between different groups of international students. The Thai and Korean students would *adapt* whereas the Chinese students would not *adapt*. Secondly, there was evidence of **generalising references** to Chinese students, and Chinese people wanting to be part the West on their terms. In this account the Olympic games were used as a metaphor for the West because the Chinese were not organising the Olympics the proper way by releasing the tickets openly. The Olympics were not being managed in the same way they had traditionally been managed but the account suggests that the Olympics were a Western experience the Chinese were trying to coopt. For example, the account cites issues surrounding ticketing to the Beijing Olympics as evidence of Corrine’s **nomination** of the Chinese students’ characteristics as untrustworthy.

Further, when moving to the **justification** level of the model, two analytical tools have been used: (1) **devaluation and defamation by distortion** and (2) a **theory of conspiracy**. These two justifications were constituted by the linguistic realisations evident in the account. A **devaluation and defamation by distortion** was evident in this account because of Corrine’s nomination of the Chinese students’ failure to assimilate, which devalued the whole Chinese character. In addition, a generalising reference to the Olympic games was used as a **theory of conspiracy**, to demonstrate that all Chinese people wanted to be part of the West on their terms,
and that as a result, the Chinese students’ adaptation to School B would not be complete because they were only adapting on their terms.

In addition to argumentation strategies, justifications of a we-you discourse were also constituted. The use of the justification strategy of prejudice was evident in Corrine’s account, particularly when she described Chinese students as being unable to adapt, using a cloak of criticism (cf. Wodak, 2002) that appeared to draw on facts, such as her nomination of the Olympic ticketing discussion to devalue and defame these students. Her hostile feelings towards the Chinese students were evident in the judgments that she made about Chinese people, again using the Olympics as evidence, that were transferred to individual Chinese Asian international students at School B. The evidence that she cited, such as generalising references to Chinese people wanting to be part of the West on their terms, was dependent on affective opinions that confirmed her worldview that the Chinese students were untrustworthy. Again, the Olympic ticketing was used as evidence of this. These justifications constituted an intensification and mitigation strategy. The justifications of devaluation and defamation by distortion, as well as prejudice, mitigated all Chinese students into a single, untrustworthy, group.

Tracing the discourses constituted in Corrine’s account at the level of discourse theory, the you of a we-you discourse positioned the Chinese students as being unable to adapt. There were different discourses used to position Thai and Korean students. These positions contrasted with the you-discourse that was constructed for the Chinese students.

The analysis of the we-you discourse allows the discourses traced in Corrine’s account to be translated into the theoretical framework used by the dissertation. It appears that the account has utilised elements of essentialised cultural discourses.
through which all Chinese Asian international students were defined as a culturally
determined other. The Chinese students in this account were constructed using
**cultural discourses** that associated the students’ negative traits with Chinese
cultural characteristics. The cultural discourse constructed about Chinese students
defined Eastern Asian students' experiences of belonging.

Moving from discourse theory to grand theory, the we-discourse through which
Thai and Korean students were positioned, suggests that they were able to
experience belonging. Thai and Korean adaptation was described in opposition to the
Chinese students who did not realise adaptation. Chinese students were constructed,
using cultural discourses, as the other at the school. Chinese students were the other
because they were positioned through a discourse of cultural difference. By contrast,
the Thai and Korean students were able to adapt, and thus were in a different
relationship with their teachers at the school. The school’s expectation of adaptation
regulated the relationship between international students and their teachers. The
Chinese students did not adapt to the school. As a result, Corrine accounts for the
students’ cultural identity as a problem because they do not have a positive
experience of belonging.

**Summary**

Data collected at the five case study sites were analysed using the framework
developed for this dissertation, which drew on Bernstein’s (2000) languages of
description and several tools from the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) to
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The DHA is a multi-level, dialectical approach to
CDA. In order to analyse the data collected at the three schools and two international
colleges, a framework was developed that combined various tools of the Discourse

Analysis of data will begin with an examination of linguistic realisations evident in the interview transcripts. The realisations are then analysed in terms of justification strategies and argumentation strategies. These strategies form the basis of an analysis of the we-you discourse constructed in the accounts. The we-you discourse is significant because it allows the Eastern Asian students’ experiences of cultural identity and belonging to be read in the data. These experiences are examined theoretically at the level of the L1. It has been noted that these experiences were evident in literature reviewed in Chapters Two and Three. In Chapters Six and Seven, the data are analysed using the framework expounded in this chapter.
Chapter six:
Staff accounts of Eastern Asian international students’ experiences
This chapter analyses the data collected in the interviews conducted with staff at the three schools and two international colleges. Analysis of this data follows the same framework as that described in Chapter Five. As such, there are four sections in this chapter. The first section is arranged around the symptoms identified in the extracts, the first level of analysis in the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA). Symptoms are found in linguistic utterances and are the evidence of discourse in a social practice. The second section works at the discourse theory level by tracing the we-you discourse that the participants constructed. The third section works at the level of grand theory by applying the L^1 to the data. Finally, the chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the data analysis in this chapter.

Linguistic analysis of staff data extracts

As noted above, identification of the symptoms was the first stage of analysis. Analysis of the symptoms in the staff data revealed both positive and negative accounts of the experiences of Eastern Asian students. In terms of the positive accounts, the students were described as introducing an international perspective. In addition, these students were said to be important members of a wider multicultural community. In terms of the negative accounts, the Eastern Asian students were said to represent a behaviour management problem because they did not participate in school activities. Moreover, the students were said to have academic problems. In addition, the Eastern Asian students were described in negative terms as posing a risk to Australia’s future.

Internationalisation

The staff were asked how they saw the Eastern Asian students’ influence on the school. In response, seven staff members (Sarah, Madeline, Corrine, Tom, Matt, Dan
and Simon) described Eastern Asian international students as providing an internationalising presence at the schools. In their accounts, these staff stated that, through the enrolment of international students, their institutions were able to develop connections between domestic and international students, which would bridge global and domestic cultural diversity, while encouraging intercultural interactions.

In the following example, Corrine Johnson, the ESL coordinator at School B, describes friendships between domestic and international students as facilitating both interactions between different groups of students and lessons for the domestic students about Australia’s Asian neighbours. The following extract is part of her response to a question about why international students were enrolled.

**Extract Two**

**Corrine:** *It’s been an educating process and it’s broadened people’s perceptions and there have been some good friendships made and by default even, and the students here know more about their nearest neighbours now than they ever did. So I think it would be a poorer place [if the Asian international students were not enrolled]. I think most people would agree with that.*

In this account, Corrine describes the knowledge, experiences and relationships established through the enrolment of international students. Corrine names several benefits afforded to domestic students, such as knowledge of Asia, lessons about countries in the geographic region, and new friendships. These lessons support the contention of writers reviewed in Chapter Two (cf. Guest et al., 2006; Schulz et al., 2007; Gu et al., 2009) that international students facilitate domestic students’ learning about other countries.

Similarly, Sarah Fitzpatrick, the Principal of School A, described intercultural interactions as one of the benefits gained by enrolling Asian international students. Eastern Asian international students were said to facilitate domestic students’ (a) understanding of cultural difference, and (b) knowledge of aspects of culture that
were identified as particularly Asian. In what follows, Sarah responds to a question about the benefits that the school enjoys as a result of enrolling Eastern Asian international students. She describes the students as providing intercultural interactions through the international perspective they bring to the school.

Extract Three

Sarah: *They expose our students to other ways of life, they share their school stories so I think our students realise our system’s pretty good. [Australian students] learn a lot about the culture even as much as how they live, what they eat, traditions, family life, the school systems and the universities and the pathways. And I also think they’re a very good example for our students because they are monitored so closely with [their] academic [performance] and attendance, I think they actually motivate our students a bit because they’re not allowed to have days off, they’ve got to succeed otherwise they get sent home. So they’re a very good motivation for our students when they see them doing well and the hard work they put in, that’s a good one.*

In the above extract, Sarah describes how the Eastern Asian international students present the domestic students with a version of culture that is distinctly Asian. As with the extract from Corrine’s account above, students are divided into two groups, one Asian and the other Australian, with the Asian group perceived as the provider of benefits to the Australian group.

The linguistic realisation of nomination is evident in these accounts. As previously noted, nomination constructs social actors by using names. It works as a justification of an argumentation strategy. This justification involves naming social actors and defining their membership in collectives (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). Nomination collectivises students into particular groups by placing an emphasis on their actions. In the account from Sarah Fitzpatrick, the students’ food, family life, school systems, and educational environments and pathways are nominated as aspects of Asian culture that could be taught through intercultural interactions. The account collectivises Eastern Asian students as a singular group based on their actions at School A. Similarly, while Corrine does not nominate explicitly which
aspects of the Eastern Asian students’ culture are seen in the school, the linguistic
realisation of phoric expressions is used to define the distinct differences in the
Eastern Asian student cohort. The effect is to define Eastern Asian students’
membership as a collective positioned in opposition to Australian domestic students.
Corrine defines the Eastern Asian students' benefits to the school by using the phoric
expression *educating presence*. As nomination names social actors and the phoric
expression of *educating presence* defines their benefits, the two linguistic realisations
are evidence of an argumentation strategy.

The linguistic realisation of nomination constitutes the argumentation strategy of
predication. Predication has previously been defined as a strategy used to construct
identities, processes of displacement and diasporas. It is linguistically realised
through nominations of stereotypes. In Corrine’s and Sarah's accounts, stereotypes,
such as Sarah’s description of the Asian international students’ differences around
family life, food and hard work, constitute an argumentation strategy of predication
through which the Eastern Asian students' identities are defined as a pedagogical
tool.

**Multiculturalism**

In addition to their international presence, seven of the nine school staff (Matt,
Corrine, Dan, Tom, Sarah, Madeline and Simon) linked the Eastern Asian
international students with the schools’ existing ethnically diverse student groups. In
one example, when asked how the school would differ if international students were
not enrolled, Matt Llewellyn, the Principal of School B, stated, *that’s a difficult
question to answer because we are so multicultural that— What you would lose
visually would be the significant Asian face if I can categorise it that way.* In the
following account, Matt describes the visual presence of the school’s significant
In response to a question about the composition of the student body, Matt stated:

**Extract Four**

**Matt**: Indigenous kids, they are part of the face of [School B]. I call them the tall shiny black kids, they’re our Sudanese kids, they’re part of the colour. There are freckle-faced kids with red hair from [rural and remote Australia]— when parents say ‘I’ve got dark skin will I fit in here?’ [I reply that] you can have any colour skin. But there is a significant Asian presence, we would lose that presence but we would also I believe lose the richness of the experience they bring. We’d also lose the intellect that many of them have in terms of mathematics and business, we’d also lose the sharing. For example the Year 12 Economics class have just finished an oral on fiscal policy, the Chinese boys, two or three of them did it on China and there was a great lesson in that for the Australian kids. We have cultural days where the boys would do their— I mean we’ve had Chinese violins, we’ve had kids dancing and dragon dances and so on.

In Matt’s account, the linguistic realisation of generalising references is evident. Generalising references are statements that make generalisations from references to specific instances in a case. Matt makes frequent generalising references to the students’ place of origin by naming Indigenous kids, Sudanese kids, Chinese boys and rural and remote Australian students (the freckle-faced kids with red hair). References to places of origin name the students as a visual presence in the school, associating their place of origin with their roles as markers of multiculturalism in the school.

For example, Matt lists benefits such as richness of experience, intellect, sharing and great [lessons] for the Australian kids. Each of these benefits is drawn from the students sharing through delivering an oral on fiscal policy, Chinese violins, dragon dancing and kids dancing. In Matt’s account, it is the Australian students who are said to benefit. Matt’s account focuses on how the school would be different by considering only the Australian students. He does not discuss the staff at the school, nor does he consider the parents, whose dark skin might pose a problem for their
child with fitting in. In addition, he does not consider the Eastern Asian students who, it is presumed, also gain from the experience of attending an Australian school. As will be seen in later extracts, where staff and students are discussed, it is generally in relation to the problems the students have created. It is also noted that the account tends to separate students into two groups, namely an Australian student group and everybody else. The accounts in the next section are concerned with the challenges that Eastern Asian students present to the schools.

**Challenging behaviours**

Despite their acknowledgment that the Eastern Asian international students were a positive influence on the school, all the staff members interviewed asserted that the students' cultural and social differences also posed challenges to teachers, support staff, Australian students and accepted school practices. One common challenge, identified in 14 of the 15 staff responses, related to the students' behaviour.

In the following account, Simon Peter, the Principal of School C, describes Asian international students’ behaviour issues as resulting from previous experiences in their home countries. His response is part of a discussion about parental motivation for choosing Australian education.
Interviewer: You said the parents are paying a lot of money to be here, how much do you think they control what happens to the students while they’re here?

Simon: I think less so than we thought. We put out these [automatically generated emails sent to parents] because you know we were relying on the kids to communicate messages to parents. But the Chinese kids are very indulged. Ever since the one child policy and the little emperors who’ve got six relatives all around him, all spoiling him. I mean I’ve been over there, I’ve seen it. You’ve got this little bloody fat kid who looks like a little balloon like he’s got a bicycle pump up his bum and blown up, fat and overfed, being wheeled around in a pram. And you’ve got the parents and the maternal and paternal grandparents either side of him, six of them all spoiling him. He becomes a boy, he’s spoiled rotten so they come here and then we have some problems in relation to that and some problems in relation to taking orders from women teachers too. I mean it’s not all plain sailing by any means. But in my view some of them are here for a holiday, yes.

In this extract, Simon describes the students’ behaviour using the linguistic realisation of allusions. Specifically, he alludes to problems that result in the education of Eastern Asian international students not being all plain sailing. The extract also contains assertions. Assertions are statements of belief. Here, they are seen in the explicit statements of belief about the cultural and social differences between Asian and Australian students. For example, Simon uses the assertions of I mean I’ve been over there, I’ve seen it. The account also contains evocations. Evocations are imaginative recreations of experiences or examples used to demonstrate a point and for effect. An example of an evocation is this little bloody fat kid who looks like a little balloon like he’s got a bicycle pump up his bum. In addition, the metaphorical lexeme of little emperors is used. Metaphorical lexemes use metaphors to define a group. In this example, the lexeme is a multiple-word phrase that caricatures a group. Each of these three linguistic realisations, allusions, metaphorical lexemes and evocations, constitute the justification strategy of prejudice.
Prejudice is a justification strategy that, as Wodak (2002) has noted, cannot be proved or disproved because it depends on generalised beliefs, opinions and judgments that attribute group traits to individuals. The linguistic realisations used in this account constitute a justification of a prejudice against Eastern Asian international students because they generalise stereotypical traits about spoiled children of the former Chinese government's one-child policy to individual students. The group traits in this account are specifically associated with China and are negative because they position Chinese Asian international students as spoiled and as acting in a superior manner, and thus as a problem for the school. Simon’s account relies on his experience in China to define his prejudice as a truth behind which his prejudices lie.

Furthermore, any constitution of a prejudice depends on affective opinions. In Simon’s account, the affective opinions are evident in assertions, including in my view, I’ve been over there, I’ve seen it, as well as the phrases, I think and I mean. As noted previously, prejudice devalues, evaluates, defames and insults others without recourse to facts, evidence or debate. It is hostile and relies on stereotyping and simplifying generalisations, judgments and clichés. The account contains generalisations about Chinese students’ behaviour as being not all plain sailing by any means, judgments of the Chinese students’ failure to take orders from women teachers, and the cliché of the six relatives who all have a hand in spoiling Chinese children who are the products of the one-child policy. These generalisations reduce the complexities of the students’ transition from home to Australia to a list of problems.

In a similar account, which also uses the metaphorical lexeme of little emperors, Matt Llewellyn, the Principal of School B, describes Chinese students as behaving in
ways that are a problem for their parents. Matt states that the parents' motivation for choosing an Australian school is that the kids are being naughty at home and they want to save face by sending their child away and that goes back to the notion of little emperor, the single male in the family, the only child. In this account, assertions, such as being naughty at home, in conjunction with the notion of the little emperor, are used to justify and evaluate the Eastern Asian international students as being a problem for their parents. In similar terms to Simon’s account analysed above, a prejudice is constructed in Matt’s account. The use of prejudices is a justification strategy of categorisation and evaluation.

In the following extract from Corrine, a categorisation and evaluation strategy is also evident. Corrine began her interview with a critical description of Eastern Asian students' problems. This extract is drawn from that description.

**Extract six**

**Corrine:** And another stumbling block is often face, because the [Eastern Asian international] students will actually lie quite blatantly to save face.

**Interviewer:** Umm, lie about what?

**Corrine:** Why they haven't done their homework, why they weren't at school yesterday – they tend to take a lot of time off, they tend to come late, they tend to skip classes.

**Interviewer:** So really basic, classic things?

**Corrine:** Yes. And because they don’t want to lose face, they’ll just lie, because they have a shame culture and we have a guilt culture. They don’t have that guilt and they don’t want the shame, so there are two different cultural basics operating.

The linguistic realisation of devaluation and defamation by distortion is seen in the attribution of students' behaviours. The account defines these behaviours as being derived from different cultural basics. Devaluation and defamation by distortion is a linguistic realisation that distorts attributes associated with a social actor for the purpose of defaming and devaluing them.
Devaluation and defamation has the effect of categorising Eastern Asian students as displaying behaviours, such as not doing their homework, not coming to school, skipping classes and lying, that devalue them because they cause the school problems. This linguistic realisation justifies a categorisation and evaluation strategy. Categorisation and evaluation constructs a we-you discourse. It is a divisive strategy in the sense that it categorises individuals based on their attributes. Different attributes are evaluated either positively or negatively. Thus, a categorisation and evaluation strategy groups individuals according to their attributes and then evaluates these attributes as either positive or negative.

In the extract from Corrine’s account, specific examples of inappropriate behaviours are used to categorise the students. She lists several different behaviours that they have lied about. Thus, those students whose behaviours include lying, skipping classes and school days, and not doing homework are categorised as part of the Chinese group. These behaviours are evaluated as a problem. They are categorised as stemming from their shame culture, which is distinct from the guilt culture through which the Australian students are categorised. The categorisation is based on cultural differences in behaviour that are drawn from the students’ cultural background as either guilt or shame. Thus, the accounts above constitute strategies of prejudices that justify categorisation and evaluation. The staff also constructed strategies of prejudices when describing the challenges faced by Eastern Asian students in participating in the school. In the following accounts, different prejudices are constituted.

**The challenge of participation**

Nine of the 15 participants interviewed (Catherine, Dan, Matt, Corrine, Tom, Madeline, Simon, James and Eleanor) described the Eastern Asian international
students as not participating in curricular and co-curricular activities at Schools A, B and C, as well as School B International. In the main, staff were unsympathetic towards those students who did not participate. Students at School B were expected to be involved in school sports, particularly competitive sports. Lack of participation in Rugby Union and Swimming competitions was identified in several accounts (Matt Llewellyn, Tom Cusack, Dan White). In addition, students were expected to be bold, loud and rough (Catherine Hackett, Dan White). Students were also expected to participate in the school’s Catholic rituals and behave quietly and solemnly in Mass (Dan White, Tom Cusack, Matt Llewellyn).

The majority of the staff did not expect Eastern Asian international students to participate in the school as expected. The account from Matt Llewellyn, above, indicates that, in the main, Eastern Asian international students do not participate in the school’s swimming and Rugby Union competitions. He nominates their language difficulties as the reason why it is difficult to motivate them towards participation without considering other factors such as the limited experience of students with Rugby Union and swimming. In addition, other staff stated that the Eastern Asian international student cohort were not involved in the school. The students did not behave in a rough, bold and loud manner, were not Catholic so they did not participate in the school’s rituals, and did not play valued sports.

In the following account from Catherine Hackett, the Public Relations and General Country Manager for School B International, the example of a Chinese student (Fred) is given. This student is named because he is an exception. It is his participation in the school community that marks him as exceptional. This student is described as being not only passionate about the school, but just the biggest ocker [sic] you can imagine. Without explicitly identifying the aspects of Fred’s behaviour
that made him an ocker, the term *ocker* is used to name Fred and to identify him as being out of the ordinary for an Eastern Asian international student. The account supports the assertion that the majority of the Eastern Asian international students do not play sports, do not act in a loud and boisterous manner, and do not engage in particular school activities. Further, it reinforces the dominant description of the Eastern Asian student as quiet and demure with a preference for rote-learning.

**Extract Seven**

**Interviewer:** So they’re quite happy to go back [to their home countries when they finish school in Australia] and take over [their parents’] businesses then?

**Catherine:** Quite often, yes. We had this Chinese boy called [Fred] who was larger than life and he’s just the biggest ocker you can imagine which is the funniest thing. He came in level 2 English, which is the lowest level for us. No, he was level 3 sorry. And he went into high school. He loved [School B], he went up [to School B], he was passionate about it. The passion of the school which is quite often lost in a high school the size of [School B]. [School B staff] tend to think that the international kids don’t want to be part of the community. Quite often they don’t know how to be part of the community … Or they’re scared of it, they don’t know how to do it.

**Interviewer:** The international kids are scared of it?

**Catherine:** Some of them ... and these kids often are quite tiny in comparison. Unless they come in at Year 8 and 9 they struggle with that culture. There’s a couple of examples like him and he’s getting his residence. He wants to become a citizen. He wants to be here forever. He loves the country and he hates going back to China. He goes back, sees the family and can’t wait to get back [to Australia]. He goes for the Christmas break, comes back, oh I’ve forgotten this, I’ve forgotten. And he still visits us. He still comes in and says “hi how are you going?” and very ockerish and it’s really nice to see. It’s really great. But he is probably an exception to the rule. Most of them don’t get the culture; don’t get into it. They tend to stick together within their high school. And [School B] is probably a good example of this. They’ve become a bit of an international ghetto.

In the above account, the linguistic realisations of nomination and text coherence are evident. These linguistic realisations identify traits common to Eastern Asian international students. Text coherence links those students who are nominated as part of the school’s *international ghetto*, who tend to *stick together* and not mix, who *don’t get the culture* of their various schools and who *don’t know how* to be part...
of the community or are scared of the community, particularly by the teachers at School B. For other students, such as Fred, text coherence links their representing a minority of Eastern Asian international students, because they are able to move out of the international ghetto, by being passionate about the school.

The linguistic realisation of nomination and text coherence, evident in this account, constitutes a justification strategy of prejudice. As noted above, prejudices are presented as criticisms and may be disguised using facts, so that they appear as judgments that “can be substantiated”, while at the same time being the products of opinion characterised by “hostile feelings towards someone or something” (Wodak, 2002, p. 499). A prejudice relies on beliefs and opinions rather than on facts. The linguistic realisations evident in Catherine’s account suggest that she does not use the justification strategy of prejudice against the Eastern Asian international students because text coherence is seen linking the reasons that students do not participate with reports of their non-participation. However, the linguistic realisation of allusions to staff opinion, such as they tend to think they don’t want to be part of the school community, is used to define the prejudice that is used by staff to justify their belief that the Eastern Asian international students are not part of the community.

There is also evidence of categorisation and evaluation. Those students categorised as having particular traits and characteristics are evaluated as a problem. The account categorises students, whose traits included tending to stick together; being scared of the community at School B, and being physically smaller than average Australian students. These traits are evaluated as posing a problem for School B teachers. By comparison, those students who, like Fred, are categorised as having different traits, such as hating going back to their home country, loving
Australia, still visiting the staff, being friendly with the staff, and being ockerish, are evaluated as a different type of Eastern Asian international student. Such categorisation and evaluation also suggests that Fred is in a minority, in that he is probably an exception to the rule. It is noted that this failure of the Eastern Asian international students to mix with domestic students has been found in previous studies (cf. Brown, 2009).

In the accounts of Dan and Matt, the linguistic realisations of analogies, generalising references and allusions were also seen. The linguistic realisations were seen in descriptions of the staff members’ struggles to engage Southeast Asian students in the school. In the following account from Matt Llewellyn, the Principal of School B, the linguistic realisation of allusions is apparent in his description of the school as struggling to engage the Chinese cohort of Eastern Asian international students with its ethos. While suggesting that there have been improvements, in this extract he explains why the students still struggle with engagement.

Extract eight

**Matt:** I’m speaking as though it’s mainly Chinese and that’s one categorisation I suppose. Those we struggle really hard to get those kids involved in the ethos of the school but we do it and I must admit over time the kids who come in here in Year 11— and let’s face it they’re coming to do 20 weeks of language and then they move straight into a rigorous curriculum in Year 11, they struggle to survive with communication. So to get them all gung ho about being in a swimming team and all that sort of stuff— it’s getting better only because we’re working hard at it.

The linguistic realisation of allusions is evident, particularly allusions to the school’s ethos. Nebulously described, the ethos appears to be constituted around participation in school sports (to get them all gung ho about being in a swimming team and all that sort of stuff), which Matt describes as a challenge because the students were unable to cope with the curriculum that they were undertaking.

Similarly, Dan White, the Dean of Students at School B, describes the Chinese
international students as struggling to fit into the ethos of the school, unlike the other large group of international students, who were from Papua New Guinea.

Before Dan’s account is discussed, however, it is useful to describe the different features of the enrolments of Papua New Guinean international students and Chinese international students. As noted in Chapter Four, School B has had a long history of enrolling Papua New Guinean students. Both Tom Cusack and Matt Llewellyn describe the historical connection between School B and Papua New Guinean students. Under the Colombo Plan, these students have been enrolling as scholarship students for over 50 years. In addition, Matt Llewellyn states that our Papua New Guinean group … is a relationship which we had going back many, many years ago when we offered [Colombo Plan students, funded by the Australian government, access to places at School B through] scholarships. He describes how the native Papua New Guineans … come down here to board … those parents are Catholic, they know who we are.

Thus, the students from Papua New Guinea enrolled in School B were part of a long-established practice, with the boys being actively engaged in the school’s Catholic traditions. Furthermore, the Papua New Guinean students’ active involvement in Rugby Union was a further aspect of their success in adjusting to the school’s ethos.

By contrast, Dan describes the Chinese international students as very collective … whereas the [Papua New Guinean] students want to engage and be involved where our Asian international kids are more— they’re happy to come here for an education. By education, Dan is referring to narrowly-defined classroom and school mediated co-curricular (particularly sporting) experiences. A notion of community is also alluded to frequently in this extract. The linguistic realisation of allusions to
community may also be identified in other places in the account, for example, where Dan describes the Eastern Asian international students as far more interested in socialising in the Asian communities in [the school’s city] rather than with the school community here.

There are several linguistic realisations evident in the accounts from Matt and from Dan, particularly analogies, generalising references and allusions. Analogies are seen in Dan’s account, in which the school’s preference for Papua New Guinean students over Chinese students is illustrated by the analogy of socialising preferences. He uses the analogy of the Eastern Asian international students socialising with the local Eastern Asian community to define how they differ from the other cohort of Eastern Asian international students, those from Papua New Guinea. The students’ level of participation is the criterion through which they are positioned.

Generalising references are also widely used in these two accounts. Generalising references to the Eastern Asian students’ struggles with English defines them as a separate group from those students who do not struggle with English. As a result of their struggles with English, it is impossible to expect Eastern Asian students to involve themselves with co-curricular or extra-curricular activities.

Similarly, generalising references to the Eastern Asian international students’ different community affiliations are seen in Dan’s account. These generalising references explain why the Eastern Asian students are less involved in the school than Papua New Guinean students. Again, the level of participation in the school, particularly the positive participation of the Papua New Guinean students as opposed to the Eastern Asian students, reinforces the differences between these student groups. Finally, allusions are also used where, for example, Matt alludes to the types of behaviours and activities required by the school to demonstrate community spirit.
and involvement by mentioning the swimming team. Similarly, Dan alludes to the Papua New Guinean students’ desire to engage and be involved, which he contrasts with the Eastern Asian students, who are more interested in gaining an education. Again, differences between the Eastern Asian students and other students are reinforced by this strategy.

Finally, these linguistic realisations constitute a categorisation and evaluation strategy. The categorisation and evaluation is justified by attributions, which highlight differences such as language skills and sporting involvement between student groups. To illustrate, Matt’s account categorises students by using attributions such as they, them, Asian international kids, these kids, Chinese. Such categorisation is used to evaluate all Chinese students as having trouble in fitting into the school.

By contrast, the students from Papua New Guinea are evaluated differently. Students categorised as Papua New Guinean are evaluated positively because they involve themselves in the sporting life of the school community. In each case, students are evaluated against stereotypes of Australian culture, which are neither questioned nor explicitly described. Rather, implicit assumptions about what it means to be an ocker and what sporting involvement means to the school are used. In the accounts that follow, the argumentation strategy of epistemic intensification is used to define the Eastern Asian students as having experienced academic failure in their home countries.

**Academic failure**

In nine accounts of the 15 staff interviewed, (Suzanne, Matt, Dan, Corrine, James, Eleanor, Simon, Peter and Karen), Eastern Asian international students were described as failing at school in the home country, which had led to their being sent
overseas for schooling. As a result, a small sample of the participants appeared to argue, in line with Waters’ (2006) study, that Eastern Asian international students were sent to schools in Australia was because they had failed at school in their home country, often multiple times. As a result of their supposed prior academic failure, these staff members appeared to suggest that the Australian school was their last chance to finish an education at high school because they stated that these students would not be able to finish high school in their own countries because of their prior academic record. In one example, Suzanne Smith, the Principal and CEO of School B International, stated that Chinese and Korean international students were sent to schools in Australia because often they might be rejects within their own education system. The parents have had enough of that. The result was that these parents were trialing a new system. The linguistic realisation of generalising references can be seen in Suzanne's account. The account makes a generalising reference to the students as rejects within their own education system and to the parents’ thoughts and feelings, such as they have had enough of that, to explain why Eastern Asian international students were enrolled into Australian schools.

Similarly, James Huang and Eleanor Ga, the ESL councillors at School C, made multiple references to the students’ problems with the competitive education system in their home country. In the following account, previous academic failure is used to identify the reasons why Eastern Asian international students had been sent to School C.
Extract nine

Interviewer: Why is it that the parents want them to be here?

James: No, because they can’t cope with the education system in China – they are failures in China, under the Chinese system. And then when they finish [school as a] senior high graduate or junior high graduate, they can’t go further. Then, they think – well, I’ve got the money – give him another chance. Why don’t you send the children overseas?

Eleanor: Yes, perhaps he can cope with it.

[...]

James: Yes, because we think the educational system’s better here. So that’s why—because people—you can imagine, in China, Chinese local people are always complaining about the educational system over there. If my son or daughter can’t survive under that system, why not just send them overseas? Try another system.

Interviewer: So is it the same for the Koreans as well?

Eleanor: This is one of the major systems—sorry reasons students are here. That’s one of the reasons why there’s a lot of trouble with them, because they are failures back in their country ... Yes, I just realised – if the student has a problem in their own country, they’ll still have a problem here.

James: Yes.

Eleanor: The problem doesn’t go away when they move.

James: Yes, but it’s just a different problem.

In this account, the linguistic realisations of generalising references, quotation, assertions and rhetorical questions were evident. Generalising references were seen in James’ description of Chinese local people as always complaining about the educational system, assertions were made about the problems faced by the students, including they are failures back in their country, and finally, rhetorical questions were posed of the child’s situation, such as why not just send them overseas?

In the accounts of James, Eleanor and Suzanne, the linguistic realisation of quotation was seen. These accounts have quoted from parents by defining what the parents’ reasons for accessing an Australian school education for their children.
accounts quoted the parents’ motivations for choosing an Australian school. For example, Suzanne’s account nominated that the parents had *had enough of that* and they were *triaing a new system*. Similarly, James and Eleanor nominated the reason for choosing an Australian school as the parents’ wish to *give him another chance*.

*Why don’t you send the child overseas?* The accounts nominate these parents’ motivations for choosing an international education as a means of overcoming their children’s social, behavioural and educational problems. However, the accounts do not quote directly from the parents; rather, they appear to presume what the parents would say if asked why they had enrolled their children in an Australian school. The accounts provide no evidence of actual quotes from parents, nor are instances of discussing the motivations with parents nominated.

In addition, the linguistic realisation of assertions was seen in the links that were made between existing and new problems. For example, staff from School C, James and Eleanor, stated that *the problem doesn’t go away when they move/it’s just a different problem*. In much the same terms as those discussed in the work by Doherty and Singh (2005), Waters (2006), and Brooks and Waters (2009a; 2009b), the students were described as accessing the Australian school to overcome their problems. For example, in Suzanne’s account, the assertion that these students were *rejects within their own education system* was seen as the explanation of why they were enrolled in Australia’s schools. Similarly, in the account from James and Eleanor, assertions were seen in the links between prior school problems and enrolment in Australian schools. The clearest example of an assertion was the statement, *Chinese local people think if my son or daughter can’t survive under that system, why not just send them overseas? Try another system*. Assertions were a linguistic realisation that justified why Eastern Asian international students often had
no choice but to come to an Australian school. Thus, just as Doherty and Singh (2005), Waters (2006), and Brooks and Waters (2009a; 2009b) have argued, students may have accessed an international education in order to secure another chance at success. However, unlike the students of the Doherty and Singh (2005), Waters (2006), Brooks and Waters (2009a; 2009b) studies, the Eastern Asian international students described in the staff accounts had limited choices. The students in the Doherty and Singh (2005), Waters (2006), and Brooks and Waters (2009a; 2009b) studies were accessing a second chance at success. By contrast, the students described in the staff accounts above were accessing their last chance at success.

The linguistic realisations constituted the argumentation strategy of epistemic intensification. Epistemic intensification established parallels between the students’ previous problems and their problems in the Australian school. This argumentation strategy involves the development of negative parallels and equations (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). Intensification was seen in the use of grammatically cohesive elements, such as can’t cope/give him another chance and major … reasons/here, reasons/trouble. No evidence of the old or new problems was provided, other than assertions.

In contrast to the strategies of predication, devaluation and defamation by distortion, and categorisation and evaluation used in previous accounts, epistemic intensification was the argumentation strategy evident in these accounts. While the justification strategies of prejudice and categorisation and evaluation were evident in previous accounts, in the accounts given here it was argumentation strategies that were significant. Argumentation strategies worked to separate the Eastern Asian students into a single group. By defining their difference from Australian students and
emphasising their problems, these argumentation strategies divide the student body into an Australian student group and everyone else. In the final symptom, students are differentiated from Australian students and defined as a danger to Australia.

**Fears of a powerful China**

The final symptom of discourse, evident in two accounts from two schools was fear. Both Corrine Johnson at School B and Peter Scott at School C expressed fears about the consequences of enrolling Eastern Asian international students. They stated that coming to the West to learn and copy Western ideas, innovations and ways of life would lead to problems for Australia in the future. These two participants argued that they were fearful of the effect that Australian education would have on a superior China, which had copied Western ideas while imposing Chinese culture over the top. They feared that this powerful China would dwarf the West. In the following extract, Peter Scott, the Principal and CEO of School C International, answers a question about the reasons why Asian parents choose to send their children to schools in Australia.

**Extract ten**

*Peter: I think— I always thought and I might be changing my mind now— that what they were after was their student to be able to operate as a Westerner in a Western society for business reasons, and it's only for business reasons. They're not doing it for any other reason. What I think they could be doing now is a little bit— if we really probably look at it, I wonder if they're not doing what the Japanese did to us and the Japanese did to the Germans. They're coming and learning, almost copying, they’re going to go back and then impose their culture over the top, because you know there’s all the threats. You know you hear even, was it [the then US Secretary of State] I think talking to [Australia’s then Prime Minister], about the concern about the power of China taking over as the world economy. I’m not sure that maybe— I don’t think on a decision making basis at a parent level that’s the thing, but at a country level they’ve allowed these students to come out of the country …. But I just wonder whether they’re just coming out here and sapping everything they can get and then they’re going to beat us, you know? I don’t know. That’s just the last six months or so I’ve been thinking about that.*
In this account, the linguistic realisations of unreal scenarios, quotation and speaker’s perspectives are evident. For example, the account contains the unreal scenario that the Eastern Asian international students from Mainland China are coming to Australia to beat us. The unreal scenario suggests that the participant is justifying a prejudice against Chinese international students because it is based on “illogical, irrational and untrue claims … under the cloak of ‘criticism’” (Wodak, 2002, p. 515).

The claims made by this participant appear both illogical and irrational because they suggest a Chinese government-level conspiracy to send young children overseas to learn and copy Western ideas for the purpose of beating the West – to what end, though, remained unclear. It was noted that, as Wodak (2002) has argued, prejudice is a justification strategy that cloaks criticisms under the illusion of a fact that so that negative views can be substantiated. In this account, the linguistic realisation of quotation, for example, the [US Secretary of State] I think talking to [Australia’s then Prime Minister], about the concern about the power of China taking over as the world economy was used as substantiation. By relying on the reputation of the two world leaders, Peter has attempted to lend weight to his criticism and establish this claim as fact.

In addition to these two linguistic realisations, Peter has used a speaker’s perspective, seen in his use of the words I think, I always thought, I might be, I wonder, I’m not sure, I don’t know, I’ve been thinking. The use of a speaker’s perspective is also linguistic realisation that is seen in justification strategy of prejudice. The speaker’s perspective highlights “beliefs and opinions that are generalized” as well as “judgments that are transferred from individuals to an entire
Prejudices “depend on group-formation, on the constitution of ‘we’ and ‘others’” (Wodak, 2002, p. 499). The ‘others’ are devalued or evaluated, without factual evidence and debate (Wodak, 2002). The speaker’s perspective appears to constitute a group formation through the constitution of seeker/sought groups.

These linguistic realisations constitute a categorisation and evaluation strategy because they divide individuals into groups. Categorisation and evaluation is evident in the linguistic realisations of: (a) unreal scenarios; (b) quotation and (c) speaker’s perspectives. These linguistic realisations constitute a prejudice in the sense that they suggest the unreal scenario that the Chinese are going to beat us (Australia) at something. The use of quotation of important people, such as the world leaders and the speaker’s perspective (I just wonder) is an attempt to disguise the prejudice as fact.

It is interesting to note that this discussion contradicts the discussion of failure seen above in accounts from other staff. The Chinese international students cannot be used to further China’s power if the students sent offshore to learn and copy Western culture are those who have failed in their home country’s schools. The suggestion that the students are sent to Australia to copy Australia’s ideas and innovations, and learn Western culture, is at odds with the suggestions made by a large number of the staff members interviewed, and, as will be seen in the accounts from students in the following chapter. The students who are sent to Australia have no choice because Australian education represents their final chance to finish school. The linguistic analysis conducted above traces the construction of a we-you discourse in the staff data.
Tracing the we-you discourse in staff accounts

As noted in Chapter Five, a we-you discourse constructs an identity for a particular other. It is grounded in a binary opposition that is established between what van Dijk (1998) calls an us and a them. The binary of the we-you discourse is constructed around two positions – the us or the we-discourse position, which is positive, and the them or the you-discourse position, which is negative. Thus, in the DHA, the we-you discourse reveals the binary opposition between two agents or two groups of agents.

The first group of agents is represented through the we-you discourse position as the we/us. The second group of agents is represented through the you-discourse position as the you/them. Tracing the we-you discourse identifies the strategies that speakers use to define those who belong and those who do not (cf. Matouschek et al., 1995 in Titscher et al., 2000).

In these terms, there are two groups, one represented positively, and the other represented negatively. It was noted in Chapter Five that, while there is only one we-you discourse, there may be multiple groups positioned as the we and multiple groups positioned as the you. Thus, as will be seen below, in the we-you discourse constructed in the accounts of staff, there were multiple you-positions within the same we-you discourse.

In all of the staff accounts, the we positioned Australian students positively because they were the group against which all other students were compared. The use of the we-discourse position to represent Australian students positively is in line with Matouschek et al. (1995) and van Dijk (1998), who argued that the us or the we is the positive representation of a binary. It is noted that, with the exception of the account from Corrine, Australian students were not explicitly described in the extracts of data. Thus, silence was the strategy through which students were positioned as
the we. In the interviews, opportunities were given for staff to discuss their experiences when dealing with all students, not just the Eastern Asian international student cohort. Rather than describing their experiences with the Australian students, the staff chose to focus their interview discussions on their experiences with the Eastern Asian cohort. The Eastern Asian students were explicitly named in the staff accounts. All of the students who were explicitly named in the accounts were positioned as the you. In these staff accounts, several agents were represented through multiple you-discourse positions. As it was noted above, the questions facilitated a discussion of all students at the school, including the domestic or Australian students, however, the staff responded by describing the Eastern Asian students they dealt with at their schools and ignoring or rarely mentioning the Australian students.

The staff positively positioned the Eastern Asian students because they were able to teach Australian students about their Asian neighbours (cf. Corrine Johnson) and to help them to learn about other cultures (cf. Sarah Fitzpatrick) and were a representation of multiculturalism (cf. Matt Llewellyn). However, in naming the Eastern Asian students’ influence on the school, they constructed the you-discourse position. While there were positives associated with the you-discourse position, it was generally associated with representing Eastern Asian international students as having problems or as a negative influence at the schools. These students were positioned as a ‘you’ or other because they were identified with a variety of problems. For example, Corrine Johnson nominated that these students *lie quite blatantly to save face ... they tend to take a lot of time off, they tend to come late, they tend to skip classes.* In this account, Eastern Asian international students were represented negatively.
In other accounts, the you-discourse position was constructed through a focus on different problems, such as a failure to engage with the school (cf. Matt Llewellyn, Dan White and Catherine Hackett), a failure to behave properly (cf. Simon Peter) and previous failures at other schools (cf. Suzanne Smith, James Huang and Eleanor Ga). Thus, the accounts established a binary opposition between the Eastern Asian international students, who caused the staff problems, and other students, presumably Australian students, who did not. Binary oppositions are used to represent those groups who are identified with causing problems for the dominant group as a nuisance (cf. Corrine Johnson) or a problem (cf. Catherine Hackett).

The binary opposition constructed through a we-you discourse was also illustrated in Peter Scott’s account. His account was not concerned with current problems at the school. Rather, he focused on the long-term consequences for Australia if the enrolment of Eastern Asian international students continued. He nominated that the Eastern Asian international students from Mainland China were here because they’re … sapping everything they can get. The we-you discourse of his account involved a binary opposition, representing one group positively at the expense of the other, which is represented negatively. The Mainland Chinese other was the group that was represented negatively because these students were in Australia sapping ideas and innovations. By contrast, the Australians were depicted positively in the short-term, as the group whose ideas and innovations were sought. Beyond this, Australians were represented in the long-term as victims of the other, who were trying to steal those ideas and innovations. The representation of the Mainland Chinese group was particularly problematic because sapping implies that the students were undercutting and undermining the schools. However, this is difficult
to reconcile with the large amounts of money that the Eastern Asian students were paying in fees in order to be exposed to these ideas and innovations.

A binary opposition was not constructed in all extracts. In particular, where the accounts concerned the Eastern Asian international students at School B, multiple you-discourse positions were constructed. This was because staff at this school identified exceptional international students. The Papua New Guinean students and Fred were positioned as a positive you, because they were the students whose behaviours and interests were most like those of the Australian students. The you-discourse position through which they were represented was different from the negative you-discourse position through which the Eastern Asian student majority (at this school, the majority of international students were from Mainland China) was represented.

The positive you-discourse position was associated with students who were not identified as having specific problems; they were the ‘safe’ Eastern Asian international students. These students did not present a challenge to the Australian school because they were engaging with the school in ways that were acceptable or expected because they were the same ways that Australian students engaged with the school. Rather than obviate how the Australian school was changing, because of the different cultures associated with the negative you-discourse position, the positive you-discourse position represented those students who, while different, were not challenging the dominant discourses of the school. Dominant discourses were discussed in Chapter Three where it was noted that dominant discourses reinforce the dominant social order, which in turn reproduces the social and political power. By stopping in and saying hello to staff, being ockers, playing competitive sports, being Catholic and having a tradition at the school, Fred and the Papua New Guinean
cohort were seen to be more like the ‘us’ of the we-discourse position, in opposition to the negative you-discourse position through which the Eastern Asian student majority were represented. It was noted in Chapter Five that there was one we-you discourse and multiple positions within that discourse, however, the dichotomy between good and bad proposed by Matouschek et al. (1995 in Titscher et al., 2000) and by van Dijk (1998) is unable to account for the multiple you-discourse positions evident in the accounts from School B staff. As such, this study found that there were positive you positions and negative you positions constructed by the accounts.

Reification was also seen in these accounts in much the same way that it was evident in the work of Doherty and Singh (2005). They identified how reification constructed Eastern Asian international students negatively as needing to change and adapt, while Australian students were constructed positively. In much the same terms, the staff extracts analysed above demonstrated how Australian students were constructed in positive terms and were the group against which all other students were compared. The Australian students were reified because they were the model students who were the we with whom the you was compared.

**Imagining, recognising and realising cultures**

By constructing a we-you discourse, the majority of the staff accounts compared two groups: Australian students and Eastern Asian international students. This comparison was based on assumptions about the cultures of Australian students and Eastern Asian international students. The assumptions about culture were particularly marked in Corrine Johnson’s account, in which she described students as having either a guilt or a shame culture. A guilt culture was associated with Australia, seen in the statement, and we have a guilt culture. It was also the culture that was
privileged. The *shame culture*, which she described as typical of Eastern Asian international students, was constructed through stereotypes. For example, she stereotyped a desire to save face as typical of all Eastern Asian students because of their *shame culture*. These stereotypes suggest that Corrine was constructing cultural difference. As noted by Appadurai (1993), cultural difference is constructed through discourses associated with ethnicities. These discourses rely on labels and stereotypes to naturalise differences between cultures.

In a further example, Sarah Fitzpatrick used stereotypes to label the Eastern Asian international students and naturalise differences between this group and the domestic student group. Her account described the Eastern Asian students as having differences in *how they live, what they eat, traditions, family life, the school systems and the universities and the pathways*. The effect was that Australian students would *learn a lot about the culture*. Appadurai (1993) noted that cultural difference, constructed through labels and stereotypes, not only naturalises the differences between cultures, but also imagines differences. Cultures are imagined through the use of discourses and labels associated with individual nations. Appadurai (cf. 1990; 1993) argued that that the effect of imagining cultures was to divide and group people.

Discourses of culture were significant in the accounts of Eastern Asian international students’ experiences of belonging because these accounts divided and grouped the students. In order to be constructed as belonging, students needed to recognise and realise the cultural capital that was valued by the schools, which was associated with the hegemonic discourses of Australian schooling. In particular, at School B, these discourses were identified as playing competitive sports, involvement in religious rituals of Catholicism and behaving as an ocker. In Chapter
Three, cultural capital was defined as the cultural manners, preferences and orientations that were valued by the schools. Possessing valued cultural capital generates profits in the education system (cf. Bourdieu & Passeron, 1979). However, not all students possess the cultural capital valued by the school system. The staff accounts suggest that Eastern Asian international students, particularly those from Mainland China, were not associated with dispositions that were able to generate profit in the school system, thus, they did not possess valued cultural capital. The accounts of these students’ behaviours emphasised their problems and their differences in relation to the cultural capital that was valued at the school. It appears that the Eastern Asian students’ problems stemmed from the students’ failure to realise valued cultural capital.

As noted previously, Bourdieu (cf. Bourdieu and Passeron, 1979) nominated three elements of cultural capital. As noted previously, the first, *objective artefacts*, refers to books, paintings and other cultural products. The second, *cultural practices and activities*, refers to the types of cultural practices in which students are expected to engage. *Cultural practices and activities* are seen in the accounts of School B staff. These staff members referred to the *cultural practices* of involvement in the school community through the playing of competitive sports in school teams (cf. Dan White; Matt Llewellyn) and through being Catholic (cf. Matt Llewellyn). In addition, *cultural practices* also referred to the *ocker* stereotype associated with Australian students (cf. Catherine Hackett). The third element of cultural capital is *institutional currency*. This term is used to refer to the capital recognised by institutions, usually in the form of qualifications. In addition to qualifications, the element of *institutional currency* also refers to language forms and academic vocabulary that is valued by schools.
Of most significance to these accounts are cultural practices because these were referred to frequently. The data analysis suggests that the students represented through the positive you-discourse position were able to realise valued cultural practices and activities. These students were realising valued cultural practices and activities because they were associated with the playing of sports (cf. Dan White), with being Catholic (cf. Matt Llewellyn) and, in the case of Fred, with being ockers (cf. Catherine Hacket). Of particular note is the way in which the cultural practices valued in the schools were used to position Eastern Asian international students into different groups that were hierarchically arranged.

The we-you discourse positioned the majority of the Eastern Asian international students as a negative you because they did not realise valued cultural capital. Both the Papua New Guinean students and Fred recognised and realised capital that was valued at School B. These students were able to put together the appropriate capital in ways that were valued in the schools. As a result, the data suggests that they were able to be represented in staff accounts as belonging to a wider school community. However, because they were named, and the capital they possessed was described, the data suggest that they were positioned as different from the Australian students, who constituted the majority of the school community. The difference between the positive you-discourse position and the we-discourse position was in the naming of students associated with the positive you-discourse position.

However, the staff were unable to account for whether students had recognised valued cultural practices and activities. While they commented extensively on the students’ inability to realise the valued cultural practices of acting in an ockerish manner and playing sports, it is unclear whether the students recognised this
element of cultural capital. The recognition of valued cultural capital will be taken up in the next chapter, where student data is analysed.

Bernstein (2000) used the term *legitimate text* to refer to any realisation that attracts an evaluation. Thus, as in the staff accounts, realisation is highly significant. Bernstein (2000) and others (cf. McDougall, Walker & Kendall 2006; Lambirth, 2009) argued that the recognition and realisation rule could be used to examine whether students were able to determine what the school was asking of them in terms of presenting the legitimate text. The accounts suggest that, at School B, the legitimate text was associated with successful involvement of students in competitive sports and in behaving as ockers. The students who did not involve themselves in competitive sports or were not being ockers did not form the legitimate text at the school. Thus, the data suggests that the majority of the Eastern Asian international students could not be accepted into the school community and experience belonging. Because they did not realise the legitimate text of involvement in competitive sports, religion and being ockers, the Eastern Asian international students did not experience belonging within the wider school community. By contrast, the silence around Australian students, and the nomination that Papua New Guinean students and Fred both realised the cultural practices and activities that were valued, suggests that these students did realise the legitimate text.

The data suggests that the students from Papua New Guinea and Fred were positioned through a hybridised cultural discourse. A hybrid cultural discourse combines different cultural discourses into a new relation with each other. In much the same terms as Manathunga (2009) found in her study, a hybridised discourse was one that involved mutual transformations of culture because of contact with other cultures. Thus, it was not bound to a geographic place, rather it was a combination of
discourses that positioned individual students. The data suggest that some students were constructed through multiple discourses of culture. Thus, when Fred was described as having adopted aspects of the ocker cultural stereotype into his behaviour, he may have been performing a *hybrid cultural discourse*. The cultural discourse was hybridised because it was engaged in a cultural cut and mix, bringing Australian and Chinese cultural discourses together in a new relation with each other. It appears that, rather than simplifying his cultural identity as Mainland Chinese ex-patriot educated in Australia, Catherine’s account of Fred’s experience of culture at School B was multilayered and fragmented (cf. Anthias, 2001). The account suggests that this particular student was mixing his home culture and the Australian culture he had learned in School B. Similarly, the Papua New Guinean students’ Catholic religion and interest in sports, as well as their exposure to the school’s ethos over several generations, suggested that these students were engaged in combining ethnic discourses, cultural discourses and school discourses to form a hybrid cultural discourse.

**Concluding discussion**

This chapter has analysed the accounts of staff members. The extracts, drawn from staff interview data, were grouped based on their symptoms, and data were then analysed by identifying the linguistic realisations evident in accounts. Identification of symptoms and linguistic analysis was the first level of the model of the analytic framework developed for this study. The effect of the analysis of the linguistic realisations was to reveal the justification and argumentation strategies that were evident in accounts. As noted in Chapter Five, justification and argumentation strategies are seen in the complexity of the argument and demonstrate the speakers’ points of view. Justification strategies are used to construct we-you discourses and
are seen in seven different types of linguistic realisations including devaluation and defamation by distortion and prejudice. The second level of the model identified the we-you discourse. In these accounts, there was one we-discourse position and several you-discourse positions. In all accounts, the Australian groups were represented through a we-discourse position. These students were rarely defined, and in only one extract were they even nominated. However, they were the group against which all others were compared. Thus, the you-discourse positions were constructed around similarities and differences from the we-discourse position.

The Papua New Guinean students, for example, while positioned as a you, were compared favourably with Australian students. The you-discourse position, through which these students were represented, was constructed around their assimilation into Australian culture. By contrast, the majority of the Eastern Asian international students, also represented through a you-discourse position, were compared less favourably with Australian students. The negative you-discourse position, through which the Eastern Asian international student group was represented, was constructed around their differences from Australian culture.

The positions through which students were represented were more complex than the binary suggested by Matouschek et al. (1995 in Titscher et al., 2000) or van Dijk (1998). Rather than a simple binary us/we versus a them/you, there were complexities and nuances in the representation through a we-discourse position and a you-discourse position. Thus, the students associated with the positive you-discourse position were those who did not challenge the dominant discourses of the school. These students were did not challenge the staff to rethink the discourses of the school because they positioned themselves within school discourses. By contrast, the negative you-discourse was used to position those students who did not
position themselves within dominant discourse practices such as playing sports. These students were constructed as the other who rejected the schools’ hegemonic discourses.

The tracing of the we-you discourse facilitated translation into the theoretical language. The discourses associated with the negative you-discourse position were used to construct discourses of cultural difference. The Eastern Asian international students were positioned as culturally different in all of the staff accounts. The cultural differences between the students were constructed through discourses that relied on labels and stereotypes. The Eastern Asian international students’ culture was constructed through nominations of difference that labeled and stereotyped them. Their differences from Australian students were imagined in accounts, so that they could be arranged along a hierarchy. This hierarchy constructed Eastern Asian international students as an other who were different and inferior from Australian students. Holliday (2005) argued that othering stereotypes cultures. The use of stereotypes of culture, in relation to Eastern Asian international students, establishes an us for domestic students and a them for international students. The construction of categories of us and them was evident in the we-you discourse constructed by the staff accounts.

However, not all students were constructed as a negative/problematic other. Some students were constructed through a hybridised identity. Hybridity was seen in the accounts of the Papua New Guinean students and Fred. These students were described in the accounts as engaging in what Anthias (2001) described as a cut and mix. They were described as bringing discourses of their cultural identity as Papua New Guinean or Mainland Chinese together with new cultural discourses from the Australian school setting. The discourses were blended in ways that benefited them,
if only that it made their experiences of schooling in Australia more comfortable. Thus, these students were constructed as belonging because they were able to recognise and realise the cultural capital valued by the schools.

The cultural capital that was valued at the schools was associated with the hegemonic discourses of Australian culture. In particular, at School B, these discourses were identified as the playing of competitive sports, the involvement in the religious rituals of Catholicism and behaving as an ocker. Possessing valued cultural capital generates profits in the education system; however, not all students possessed the cultural capital that enabled them to profit from their schooling experiences. The staff accounts suggest that the Eastern Asian international students, particularly those from Mainland China, were able to generate profits in the school system. The accounts of these students’ behaviours emphasised their problems and their differences from the cultural capital that was valued at the school. The Eastern Asian students’ problems stemmed from their failure to realise valued cultural capital. This failure is detailed in the analysis of student accounts in the following chapter.
Chapter seven:
Student accounts of their experiences
As in the previous chapter, this chapter applies the model of the DHA used to analyse the staff interview data. There are four parts to this chapter. Initially, analysis of the data is undertaken using the tools of the Discourse Historical Approach to CDA. Following from this, the we-you discourse constructed in students’ accounts is traced. The data is then described using the L.light concepts of cultural identity and belonging. Finally, there is a concluding discussion.

**Linguistic analysis of student data extracts**

In the student focus group accounts, the emphasis was on the differences between the Eastern Asian students and the Australian students. These differences were used to describe what distinguished them, as Asians, from their Australian counterparts. As the students used the term Asians to describe themselves, this chapter will use the term Asian international students to refer to these students.

The students focused on a number of distinctions between themselves and the Australian students, the staff and their homestay host families. The distinctions were framed in terms of: (1) English language differences and difficulties; (2) struggles with classroom and assessment practices; (3) reasons for enrolling in Australian schools; (4) variations in family life; and (5) differences between Australian and the Asian students’ behaviours. Each of these distinctions constituted a symptom in the accounts.

**English language**

In each of the seven focus groups, students from Mainland China, Hong Kong and Vietnam stated that they had not been properly prepared to communicate with native speakers in an English-speaking environment. The English that they had acquired or learnt in home nations was formal, written English. The focus of the English teaching
they had experienced in their home countries had privileged rote learning of grammar and short-response tasks. They said that, if they had been able to listen to English spoken by native speakers, practice effective spoken English, and use English in context, they would have been better prepared to communicate in the Australian school context.

While their problems with English generally came down to a lack of speaking practice, in many cases, written English was also identified as a problem. The students blamed their communication problems on the English syllabi in their home countries’ schools, and thus on their prior English preparation. In the following extract, Sean and Andrew, both Chinese students in the Year 12 SOR (Study of Religion) class at School B, describe English instruction in schools in Mainland China. These students are responding to a general discussion about the differences between the English language used in Australia and the English used in their Mainland Chinese English classes.

**Extract ten**

*Sean:* In China the teachers actually they can’t speak much English at all, I guess most of the teachers they just know the grammar and they just teach you the grammar nothing else.

*Andrew:* Yeah and now it’s exam, the exam now it’s taking— China has changed its focus onto the grammar, just only grammar it used to be we used to have some listening test but now it’s all cancelled by the Chinese Education Department. So I guess it’s not very what you say— reality, not very good for the students because they can’t communicate with the foreign people when they’re learning English in China.

In the above account from Sean and Andrew, the linguistic realisation of nomination is used. Both students nominate that it is the Chinese teachers, who can’t speak much English. Similarly, they nominate that the school system in China is
focused onto the grammar, just only grammar, which is the reason that they can’t communicate with the foreign people.

Similarly, School A students described their previous English instruction in schools in their home countries as being flawed. Their prior instruction was flawed because it, too, was focused on written examinations rather than on spoken communication. The students in the second School A focus group described their experiences of learning English in Vietnam (Leonie) and China (Jenny and Anthony). They were asked why they felt that they lacked confidence speaking in English to their teachers.
Extract eleven

**Leonie [Vietnam]:** First of all, most of the teachers who teach English in Vietnam, they just know about grammar and their pronunciation is not really good, and so we used to go to the language centre, and most of the teachers there are from America. Some of them are from America and some are from England – so the … Vietnamese are a little bit funny – half English and half American.

**Interviewer:** Do you feel the same way? Was the English different?

**Jenny [China]:** Yes, it’s different, but I think the situation in China is different— it’s a little bit different from Vietnam … our English teacher in senior high school speaks very good English, and they know a lot of things, and like my teacher, the government has organised for them to go to the UK or America for study – like three months or five months every year. But English lessons were [based around] the college entrance examination in China. So we’ve learnt a lot more about reading and writing and grammar in the English class, and we didn’t know— like some daily English, we didn’t know that, because we don’t use it in the exam, so we don’t know … because they didn’t test our speaking.

**Interviewer:** So they only ever tested you writing English?

**Jenny [China]:** Writing, reading, listening – three parts.

**Interviewer:** Is that the same [in your experience]?

**Anthony [China]:** Yes, but I was in a district, and then at my school we can just study grammar and new words, vocabulary, and we cannot— the teacher did not teach us how to [write extended prose] in English or listen. The teacher just reads one time and then writes the new word and the meaning of the new word, and then on the test, we just did how the word fits in this sentence, and what’s wrong with this sentence. That’s all we do.

In much the same terms as Sean and Andrew, Leonie, Jenny and Anthony nominated syllabus requirements as the reason that Vietnamese and Chinese schools failed to teach their students to speak English. In addition, the School A account contains an assessment of multiple sites of English learning among Asian international students, with Leonie describing the language school she had accessed to learn English.

The linguistic realisations of allusions and generalising references were also used. Allusions to their teachers' lack of skill, for example Leonie's allusion to her
teachers’ pronunciation as not really good, and Andrew’s generalising references to
the Chinese entrance exams, around which all English instruction in China was said
to have been based, were used to explain why the students didn’t know … daily
English. The linguistic realisations in these two accounts justify a positive self-
assessment.

Positive self-assessments allowed the students to assess their opinions and
experiences favourably at the expense of others. Through positive self-assessment,
these students were able to blame their problems with English on someone else –
their teachers, their schools and Chinese education policy. The positive self-
assessments allowed the students to argue that they could not communicative
effectively in English because of poor ELT pedagogy in their home countries. Their
teachers had not adequately prepared them for speaking and communicating in a
foreign country because they too, with the exception of Jenny’s language centre
teachers, did not know how to speak English effectively and fluently. Further, the
structure of the school systems, with its focus on exams, writing, grammar and
vocabulary, was also at fault because there was no opportunity for the students to
learn to speak English well enough at high school to communicate effectively in
Australia. Only students who accessed specialised language school centres learned
spoken English. So while the Australian teachers blamed the students for their
unwillingness to fit in at the schools and assimilate, the students nominated English
language difficulties as one of the main reasons for not their failure to participate.

In what follows, students describe further problems in the school, specifically
focusing on issues with adapting to Australian classroom practices.
Classroom and assessment practices

In addition to struggling with basic communication, the students described struggles with assessment expectations in Australia. Assessment in Malaysia, China, Vietnam, Japan and Hong Kong, was exam-based, usually comprising multiple choice or short written responses. By contrast, in Australia, students were expected to produce extended argumentative essay assignments and to use their English to construct various genre-based texts. The genres, such as scientific essay or science report, were unfamiliar to the students. While their EAP programs had focused on some discipline-specific instruction, the time students had spent in the EAP had not adequately prepared them for the English language used in specific subjects.

In the following account, Gregory, a student from the Year 10 English class at School B, recounts his problematic experience with the genre of extended written response in science. It is unclear which science subject Gregory was studying, as is seen in his use of both Physics and Chemistry to name the subject he has failed. The extract is part of this student's response to the question, *is class and assessment work very similar to what you're used to?*
Extract twelve

**Gregory**: Last term I did a Physics assignment— it was Chemistry and I handed in maybe five page assignment ... yeah, five page assignment to the teacher, and the teacher— after two days the teacher decided it was incompleted. I think I tried my best and I talked to my teacher, I said it is my best ability and that is my language ability, I can’t reach anymore, but the teacher said that you should have tried more harder and I said, alright and I get it back and maybe two pages or more I written down, but still the final results I still get D.

[...]

**Interviewer**: Would you sit down with your teacher next time and ask them for help do you think?

**Gregory**: Yes, I tried it about once or twice but still useless I think. The teacher told me just about— not the details, just about how to organise it and I get a [sample assignment from another student] from them last term from the last two years student who graduated from here I got the [sample assignment] and I read it and I think it very hard to read even very hard to read.

In Gregory’s account, there is evidence of the linguistic realisation of nomination. The student nominated several problems that he has experienced in preparing the assignment, such as: (a) his best ability was not enough; (b) the assignment he submitted and subsequently failed constituted the sum total of his language ability; (c) he thought that to have tried more harder meant to add pages to the assignment; (d) he did not know either the details of what to include in the assignment or how to organise it and (e) he did not understand, nor was he able to easily read, the sample assignment he was given.

The linguistic realisation of nomination constitutes an argumentation strategy of intensification/mitigation. Argumentation strategies are read in data through an examination of linguistic realisations such as nomination. Deontic intensification involves the construction of moral fallacies of a particular policy; these fallacies emphasise ambiguity to prove an argumentation claim (cf. Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). It
has been noted that ambiguity assists the speaker to take a meaning out of context and construct a more favourable account of practice.

Deontic intensification is seen in Gregory’s account, which plays with ambiguity in two specific ways. Firstly, there is the nomination of his problems in understanding the process, format and content of a science essay. He nominated both the details (the content that should be included) and the organisation (how to lay out and arrange the assignment) as ambiguous. The ambiguity was not clarified by the reading of a sample assignment because that proved to be very hard to read. Secondly, the student was confused about the role of the teacher, which he described as ambiguous. The teachers’ role was described as ambiguous because the student nominated that he did not know how much help to expect from his teachers. As such, the role of the Australian classroom teacher, who helps somewhat but does not explicitly describe what needs to be included in an essay, was also ambiguous.

Deontic intensification shifts some of the blame for the failure in this assignment from the student to his teacher. While the student nominated areas where he could have improved, it was the nomination that the teacher had not provided adequate assistance during the writing of the assignment or during the phase between receiving his first and second failing grade that was emphasised. The student returned to a discussion of the role of the teacher five times, including the reference to accessing a sample assignment.

Moreover, the linguistic realisation of affective opinions are framed in the account. Affective opinions, such as I tried my best; I talked to my teacher; I said it’s my best ability; I can’t reach any more; two or more pages I written down; I got the [sample assignment]; I think it is very hard to read, are evident in this account.
Nomination and affective opinions contributed to the student’s explanation of his failure. After talking to the teacher, *about once or twice*, it was still found to be useless. The teacher was unable to help this student to understand the genre of a written science essay. The account disguises the affective opinions about his failure as a fact. For example, the fact that the teacher was responsible for deciding *it was incompleted*, and that *the final results was a D*. These facts offer substantiation of the claim to a proportion of the fault for the failure lying with the teacher that allowed the student to accept partial responsibility for his failure in this assignment while passing some of the blame to the teacher.

**Failure**

Further academic problems were described in terms of the usability of the Australian qualifications. In the students' accounts, particularly at Schools B and C, the students from Mainland China stated that they were unable to go back and use their Australian school qualification to gain entrance into Chinese universities. The majority of the Mainland Chinese students interviewed stated that they would like to enrol in further education in China following completion of their Australian school studies. Thus, the literature on migration, which suggests that it is a motivating factor for international students (cf. Hawthorne, 2005; 2010; Jones, 2006; Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007), was not supported by the students of the present study.

However, the students described themselves as unable to return home. According to the students in the focus groups conducted at School B and School C, it would not be possible for them to enrol in the universities and colleges in China. These institutions would not accept any Australian senior school leaving certificate as a valid entrance qualification. To illustrate, the students in the Year 11 SOR (Study of
Religion) focus group at School B were asked where they wanted to go at the completion of their Australian school qualification.

Specifically, they were asked if they wanted to: (a) stay on and study in Australia; (b) study in another foreign country; or (c) go back to their home countries and study in a university there. The three Chinese students who were known by Anglicised names at the school, Shamus, Vincent and Lachlan, stated that they wished to go home and study in a Chinese university. However, reports from a Chinese high school and marks in Chinese school subjects were essential to gain entrance. Lachlan said that it was a *shame* he would be unable to study in Chinese higher education institutions because *we haven’t any reports from China, [from] the [Chinese] high school*.

At the same time, students in the focus groups at School B and C described the overseas school leaving qualification as many international students’ last chance to complete high school. In much the same terms as the staff accounts in the previous chapter, the students appeared to describe their being sent to schools in Australia as resulting from their failure in schooling in the home country. For example, Albert from School C stated that his homestay host family, who were from Mainland China, had assumed he had failed school in his home country because he was here. He stated that this was not the case, unlike for many of his peers who were in Australia because they had failed, and that he was here for a different experience and to learn English. Thus, a small number of the participants (10 students of the total 32 interviewed) mentioned failure in their accounts and suggested that it might be a reason that international students, particularly from Mainland China, were sent to Australian schools.
Similarly, Raymond, a student in the Year 11 English class at School B, said that he enrolled at School B because *I didn’t study in Hong Kong, I go to school and just play basketball and then go anywhere instead of school … no school would have me.* He stated that it was his father who had made the choice to send him to Australia for school because *he has some funny ideas about these things.* When asked if he was behaving now he was in Australia, Raymond replied that *my dad is so strict. I have to be good, to make good friends.*

In these accounts from Albert and Raymond, the emphasis was on what constituted inappropriate behaviours for Asian international students. The linguistic realisation of nomination was seen in the identification of those behaviours. Students nominated the behaviours that were unacceptable for Asian international students. These behaviours included: (a) playing basketball instead of going to school; (b) skipping classes and (c) not having the apparently elusive *good friends*. Further, the students nominated the effects of these behaviours, for example, the nomination that *no school would have* [Raymond].

In another example Lucas, who was in the same focus group as Raymond, stated that, in his experience, parents sent their children to Australia *just because they don’t have time to care for us, they send us here* because they worked long hours. The linguistic realisation of text coherence is seen in Lucas’ account. This linguistic realisation is seen in the link that was made between the parents’ lack of time and the reasons many Asian children are sent overseas for a school education. In Lucas’ account, text coherence links the abstract phenomenon of the impact that work and time constraints had on parents’ ability to care for their children – *they don’t have time to care for us* – with the phenomenon of Eastern Asian international students’ enrolment in Australian secondary schools. Text coherence is a linguistic
realisation that positioned Asian international students as unable to be cared for properly by their parents.

The students’ accounts, which suggest a link between Asian international students’ behaviour and their enrolment in Australia, support the data collected in interviews with staff members. In the staff accounts, Suzanne Smith, the CEO of School B International, and James Huang and Eleanor Ga from School C, described many Chinese and Korean international students as failing at schools in their home countries (see Chapter Six, pp. 177-181). They reported that failure in the home country had led many students, such as Raymond, to be rejects within their own education system (Suzanne Smith) and that it was one of the reasons why there’s a lot of trouble with them, because they are failures back in their country (James Huang). Thus, like the participants in the Waters (2006) study, the students and staff, whose accounts have been analysed for this dissertation, nominated prior educational problems as the reason that Asian international students were sent to Australian schools.

Further, the data analysed in this section reinforces the findings of a series of studies by Brooks and Waters (2009; 2009a), Waters (2006) and Doherty and Singh (2005), who argued that international students sought an international education to achieve a second chance at success. In the study by Waters (2006), for example, students were found to have sought an international education because they were unable to cope with the highly competitive education system of their home country of Hong Kong. The students in the Waters (2006) study had accessed an education in Canadian schools because they had failed at schools in Hong Kong. In the same terms as Waters’ (2006) study, Raymond described himself as having no alternative. If this student had not accessed secondary education at School B, or another
overseas school, his failure in the Hong Kong education system would have meant that he was unable to finish secondary school.

**Living arrangements**

In addition to problems in the classroom, the students also stated that they experienced problems in their homestay host families. In all seven focus groups, the homestay situation was identified as a challenge. In order to begin this discussion, it is useful to revisit the homestay provisions that were introduced in Chapter Two. Homestay is a paid arrangement in which an international student stays with a host family, usually one that also has children at the international student’s school. There are usually no more than two international students staying with the one host family. At School A and at School C, all of the students interviewed were staying with a host family. As in a boarding situation, the host family is expected to provide laundry services, internet access, meals and accommodation, as well as to involve the homestay student in the family’s activities. Involvement in the family’s activities includes family holidays, picnics and social occasions, sports commitments, going to adventure parks, and other activities in which members of the family participate. At School B, while the majority of the students were settled in homestay settings, they could choose to live in the boarding house if they preferred. One student, Stanley, was in boarding.

In previous research, the homestay context was described as being central to students’ adaptation to the international educational context (cf. Zhang & Brunton, 2007). Schmidt-Rinehart and Knight (2004) argued that homestay had been found to provide “students an immediate entrée into the cultural and linguistic environment while protecting them in a smaller, ‘caring’ unit” (Schmidt-Rinehart and Knight, 2004, p. 254). However, the students in the present study did not describe their homestay
as a caring unit that provided an entrée into the culture and language of Australia. Rather, they reported challenges similar to those identified by the Popadiuk (2010) study, especially around the financial nature of the homestay arrangement. Popadiuk (2010) found that large numbers of her participant students had a negative experience of homestay because of a feeling of financial exploitation at the hands of their host families.

Problems with homestay were a dominant symptom in the student accounts in the current study, with 20 of the students interviewed, across the three schools, describing their homestay families as financially motivated. The students cited financial motivation as the principal reason that host families arranged homestay for international students. In addition, financial motivation was implicated in the way that these families treated the students once they arrived in their homes. Thus, contrary to studies that have argued the role of homestay in welcoming students into the dominant culture and facilitating cultural sharing (cf. Zhang & Brunton, 2007; Collins, 2007; 2010), the students were critical of their homestay arrangement because it had not fulfilled this role.

For example, one of the Year 10 students at School B, George, described his homestay family as stingy … because every morning they give me the milk, they give me half a glass of milk and half a glass of water, which were mixed together. Further, he said that his homestay mother was greedy because she was angry with George when I use too much water, do not use too much electric, and then [she says] do not drink too much milk … this is what it is—this is the expensive—you don’t have to—you, don’t waste it.

In a similar example, Robert, who was in the same focus group as George, described his host family’s house as being unclean. In similar terms to the
participants in Popadiuk’s (2010) study, who described homestay as unclean or dirty, he described his homestay as terrible, it stresses you out because barefoot is always dirty, and it has insects as well, many cockroaches, I need to deal with a mouse! Robert’s homestay family had only Robert in their care.

Shamus and Vincent were in the Year 11 SOR (Study of Religion) group at School B. They stated that their homestay families ran their houses as businesses. In the following account, their respective homestay parents are described being as more interested in making money than in building relationships with the Asian international students in their homes. Relationships were central to the Schmidt-Rinehart and Knight (2004) finding that homestay was a caring unit that provided students with support in adapting to the new school environment.

Vincent had two other homestay students in the same homestay arrangement but Shamus was the only homestay student in his family. These students were asked to describe their homestay settings.
Extract thirteen

Vincent: I think it’s business work (laughs) … yeah they deal, just something like business.

Shamus: Just business work.

Vincent: It’s not like a family.

Shamus: They just want my money and they want the most money they can get.

Interviewer: What makes you say that, can you give me some examples?

Shamus: Because most of the homestay they like money … they want the money—they work for money not for relationship.

Vincent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Okay what makes you say that, can you give me an example of why you think that?

[…]

Shamus: Before I share this conversation—I want to say I also have problem of the internet. Because the internet of my last homestay is limited and one day I called—the homestay got a bill about they must pay [an internet bill totalling] $6,800 … Yeah and [they] put all the bill onto me because they said they had nobody at home, just me at home so I must pay for the money. Before this happened they treat me very good … And they see me as their son, but so after this happened everything’s changed, we quarrel with each other all the night and even see the battles with each other … it’s really horrible … because [the telecommunications company] made a mistake … yeah but the relationship is broke.

In this account, the problematic relationship with the homestay family culminated in the discussion of the internet bill that Shamus was asked to pay. It is interesting to note that, in spite of the seemingly extreme amount of the internet bill, which is the focus of this account, Shamus suggests that the family did not question the high cost, nor did they consider it a mistake. Denzin (2009) has argued that interviewees may “fabricate ‘tales of the self’ that belie the actual facts” (p. 135). As such, it may be that the size of the internet bill was inflated or the experience was exaggerated in order to construct Asian international students generally, and Shamus more specifically, as a victim of homestay greed and negligence. It was stated above
that the findings from the Popadiuk (2010) study were that students’ problems with homestay included a feeling of financial exploitation. It may be that the student exaggerated the size of the bill in order to emphasise that he was the victim of financial exploitation in the homestay situation.

The linguistic realisation of nomination is most evident. It is seen in Shamus’ nomination of his homestay’s reaction to the bill as evidence of his family’s interest in money not … relationship. The linguistic realisation of nomination defines the student’s problems with the family and the reasons why adaptation to the school has been difficult. Shamus was a vocal member of the focus group, and when the researcher was leaving the classroom at the end of the focus group, he spoke privately to her to complain that the Asian international students were seen as a rich and exploitable commodity by the schools.

In the above accounts, the linguistic realisation of nomination constitutes an argument. It has been noted previously that arguments are constituted by a social actor nominating the negative attributes that they identify with another group. These negative attributes rely on claims to truth and righteousness. George’s account used the negative attributes of his homestay family as an argument, through the anecdote of his watered-down glass of milk. The argument was that homestay families were greedy or stingy because they were motivated by money.

In a further manifestation of homestay problems, students also described difficulties in adapting to the lifestyle of their homestay families. In the literature (cf. Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004; Zhang & Brunton, 2007; Collins, 2010), students have been described as relying on homestay to help them adapt to international education. However, the homestay was not assisting these students adapt to Australia. Instead, students stated that the vast differences between the lifestyle they
were leading in Australia and the lifestyle they had led in their home countries were too difficult to overcome. In the following account from Anthony, one of the School A students, differences between the Australian and Chinese lifestyle are described. This discussion is in response to a general question about what it is like to live in homestay.

Extract fourteen

Anthony: The food, the habits, the lifestyle is totally different.
Interviewer: Can you tell me a little bit about that?
Anthony: The food, obviously—you know that? Yes. And lifestyle—and Australian families are more relaxed and they don't have much pressure from the job, from money.
Interviewer: How do you know they're more relaxed? Tell me about that.
Anthony: Because they usually go to the beach for holidays and the relaxed method is not the same as Chinese people … they can just sit there, sit in the park for the whole day, read the newspaper—I can't … I can't bear it … I prefer to—[be with my] friends, go to a restaurant to eat something and chat with them—I prefer that. But I can't stand just lying on the beach for the whole day.

In this account, generalising references to the relaxed method of Anthony's Australian homestay family is used to constitute a prejudice. The prejudice against the homestay family appears to rely on facts, such as Anthony's anecdotal evidence of Australian styles of relaxation. The prejudice is characterised by hostile feelings towards the family, such as the use of the phrase I can't stand. In addition, a nomination of differences in lifestyle categorises and evaluates both Chinese and Australian families. Chinese families are categorised as relaxing in the same manner as Anthony, which is evaluated as the proper way to relax. By contrast, Australian families are categorised as relaxing in the same manner as the host family. This manner is evaluated negatively because it is different from Chinese styles of
relaxation and because it signals the lack of pressure Australian families are perceived to be under.

**Asian and Australian students’ behaviours**

Another distinction between Asian and Australian lifestyles was seen in the behaviours that the participant students described Australian students as exhibiting. In five focus groups – the four focus groups at School B and the School C focus group – students described these distinctions. Students in the Year 12 SOR (Study of Religion) class at School B used the metaphorical lexemes of *crazy*, *active*, *quite loud* to describe the Australian students they had met. Similarly, the students at School C described the Australian students as noisy. For example, one student, Andrea, stated that *girls here are so much … different … noisier than girls in Vietnam*.

Further, students used anecdotes to describe the differences between Australian and the Asian international student cohort. In one such example from the Year 12 SOR (Study of Religion) focus group at School B, Sean said *like here, if you [are riding on] a bus you can talk to [a] stranger, it’s like normal things but in China the bus is pretty quiet*. Alex stated *yeah, if you’ve got a friend next to you, you can talk but [if] there’s strangers everywhere you don’t talk*. Max, from the Year 11 English class, stated that Australian children laughed too *loudly* at jokes and were too *emotional*. He said that *our Indonesian student is more older than the Australians are … the friend of mine is like a child and you like a father and you have to teach them something [or else] they do [some] childish things*.

In addition, the Year 12 SOR (Study of Religion) and Year 10 English students at School B described Australian students as involving themselves in many hobbies
outside of school activities. The hobbies undertaken by Australian students were contrasted to their experiences of the after school activities undertaken by youth in China and Korea. The following account is from Robert (China) and David (Korea), two students from the Year 10 English class. They are discussing the things that surprise them most about their Australian peers, in response to a question about what Australian students are like.

Extract fifteen

**Robert [China]:** I think students here have so many hobbies but in China no, and the student’s study is the most important thing and they will get good reports, they must have studied very hard and during the extra camps they must have studied the extra class. Maybe they will pay more to get the extra academy class and not sport and— Maybe they can play some instruments and some like piano or guitar, but, maybe they have to go the music player class, not the normal class.

[...]

**David [Korea]:** Yes similar to [Robert], like [School B], they’ve got many— they can— we can do many sports, like various sports in this [School B] but in Korea we [don’t have as many after school sporting competitions as the students here], yeah. So after school, friends and I actually go to like places like internet cafe, just playing games up there so there is no— less sports playing with my friends and actually we go to another school, some sort of [cram] school yeah to get education, more education.

In these accounts, David’s and Robert’s ideas about acceptable behaviours for Australian students are contrasted with those of Asian international students. These behaviours are described as the freedom, the craziness, the activity levels, the loudness, the noise and the hobbies undertaken by Australians.

The linguistic realisation of generalising references is also evident. For example, Robert refers to his previous school experiences, *the student’s study is the most important thing*, to constitute a comparison between School B students and the Asian international students’ peers in their previous schools. The comparison between Chinese and Korean students’ behaviour and Australian students’ behaviour...
devalues the Australian students as immature, while valuing the Asian international students’ behaviours.

Comparison justified a categorisation and evaluation through which Australian students were categorised around their hobbies and behaviour. The categorisation evaluated Australian students’ behaviour as a problem because it elevated fun over studying. By contrast, the students categorised Asian students, particularly those in the home country, as participating in different activities and as having more interest in school work than in sporting hobbies. The behaviour of Asian students was evaluated as more mature. These justifications categorised the Asian international students positively. By contrast, Australian students were evaluated negatively.

In a further manifestation of the distinctions between Asian international students and Australian students, the students described instances of Australian students’ racism. While only four students specifically mentioned racist incidents, these were in three separate focus groups – the School C focus group, the School A focus group and the Year 11 SOR (Study of Religion) focus group at School B. At School C, one student, Christopher, described a situation in which he had met some Australian students who were very rude. Christopher did not say what the rude comment was or whether these students were also enrolled in School C. He stated that the Australian students were racist, because they—when we pass them, they shouted at us, so we want to fight them. Similarly, Steven, from the Year 11 SOR (Study of Religion) focus group at School B, stated that the hardest thing about being sent to Australia for an education was racism. Australian students were nominated as racist through anecdotes such as sometimes the students [do] not really like you and they will say something or else throw a stone before, in [School B], they threw a stone … yeah we fight with them so they will stop. In these two accounts, the
linguistic realisation of anecdotes defined these students' experiences with Australian students' racism. In constructing these anecdotal accounts of racism, the students draw on linguistic strategies of self-representation, perspectivisation strategies and positive self-assessments.

Self-representation strategies were constituted through framing the category of Asian international students positively, and characterising the category of Australian students with negative attributes. Self-representation strategies are defined in the Discourse Historical Approach as the means through which the speaker frames himself or herself in the text. The accounts framed the Asian international students positively because they allowed them to blame the fight on the name calling. Similarly, the anecdotes constituted perspectivisation because these linguistic realisations privileged the perspective of the Asian international students without providing an alternate perspective. Finally, the positive self-assessments were constituted through the use of attributions of responsibility. While physically fighting with other students could be considered as negative behaviour, the situationality we pass/they shouted, and not really like you/throw stone/we fight with them/they stop positioned the students as victims and as powerless.

The students' accounts emphasised the differences between the experiences, behaviours and knowledge of Asian international students, and the experiences, behaviours and knowledge expected among students at these schools. These experiences affected the behaviours of these students, both in schools and in the homestay. The experiences also affected the knowledge that the students did not possess but that would have assisted them to transition into the schools. The students' experiences, behaviours and knowledge were central to the construction of we-you discourses.
Tracing the we-you discourse in student accounts

In the accounts above, the we-you discourse was constructed in a binary us versus them (cf. van Dijk, 1998). There were similarities and differences with the we-you discourse constructed in staff accounts. As in the staff accounts, the speakers were positioned as a ‘we’. Thus, just as the staff positioned Australians as the we, so the students positioned the Asian international students as a we. The students represented all other groups, the Australian teaching staff, Australian students and the Australian homestay host families as a you. As in the staff accounts, the us of the we-discourse position was presented positively at the expense of the them or the you-discourse position. The students’ data extracts followed Matouschek et al. (1995) in that they constructed a we-you discourse characterised by a positive self-portrayal and a negative portrayal of the other.

In the students’ accounts, the we-discourse was constructed around an international students as victims discourse. The Asian international students positioned themselves through a victim discourse, which positively represented the students, even where their behaviours were problematic (such as fighting with peers) or challenging for the school staff (such as where the students’ English skills were limited or they failed assignments). For example, the student who had failed his Year 10 science assignment twice used several linguistic realisations to emphasise that his problems were due to his being a victim of his circumstance. He was unable to determine what his teachers’ roles were in relation to his studies and, because he stated that they did not adequately explain to him, he was unable to determine how to access the help he needed. Thus, he represented himself as a victim of the circumstance of his not understanding his teachers’ roles in guiding his work.
In another example, the students in School A and School C positioned themselves as a \textit{victim we} in relation to English preparation. The students described their English instruction in their home country as limited and this meant that Asian international students lacked the English speaking, reading and writing skills required in their Australian schools. The effect of their limited English skills was that they struggled to communicate in an appropriate manner. Again, their problems with communicating in Australia were attributed to their being victims of circumstance. Their circumstances, which meant that they were improperly prepared to communicate with native English speakers, led to their problems in the Australian school. They represented themselves as victims of their lack of adequate preparation for English speaking. They lacked adequate preparation for English speaking because their teachers in their home countries’ schools could not effectively communicate in English. They also lacked adequate preparation for speaking English because the home countries’ schools did not cover speaking in their English curriculum.

In a further manifestation of the \textit{victim we}-discourse, the Asian international students interviewed for this study named themselves as victims of their homestay host families. The students nominated the problems they faced in their homestay families in order to represent themselves as victims. For example, Shamus and Vincent shared an anecdote about Shamus’ experience with his homestay host family’s internet bill. This had led to problems with the relationship because the family had assumed that Shamus could have spent thousands of dollars on the internet. This anecdote was used to position Shamus as a victim of his host family’s greed and lack of trust. He represented himself as a victim twice over: firstly because he was expected to pay for a bill for which he claimed he was not responsible, and
secondly, because his relationship with his homestay family had broken down in the wake of this experience.

In each of the above examples, the *victim discourse* was used to construct a we-you discourse through which the students positioned themselves as the we/us victims, in opposition to the multiple groups positioned as the you/them. One of the groups positioned as a *you* was the Australian teaching staff. This group had access to preferred discourses of Australian schooling. It has been noted that the preferred discourse is a version of the world that is naturalised as common sense. It is hegemonic in the sense that it is the one, true discourse valued in a social space such as a school (cf. Thomas, 2003; 2005). In terms of the students’ accounts, the teachers had access to the preferred discourse because they established what counted as common sense and naturalised knowledge. For example, the staff determined the preferred discourse of acceptable written assignments and failed those students who did not produce work in that discourse. The victim discourse allowed these students to evaluate the staff unfavourably because they did not help the students to overcome their problems. It is assumed that the Australian students also had access to this discourse because they were the group with which the Asian international students were compared.

The Asian international students constructed alternative discourses that positioned them as victims in order to challenge the preferred discourse of the school. As such, while there were multiple groups positioned as the *you* who had access to each school’s preferred discourse, the group positioned as the *we* was constant. In all accounts, the students positively represented themselves, and negatively represented the group positioned as the *you*. 
In spite of the shifting groups positioned as the you, the you-discourse position was always represented negatively in a binary opposition. Thus, unlike the staff accounts, there was no positive you-discourse position. As a result, there was a binary opposition constructed in the students’ accounts, which follows Matouschek et al. (1995, in Titscher et al., 2000), Thomas’ (2003; 2005) and van Dijk’s (1998) work on binaries. Only one group was positioned as the we/us, which was the Asian international student group. While multiple groups were positioned as the you/them, they were never positioned positively in the same way that the Papua New Guinean students or Fred in the staff accounts had been.

It has been noted that binary oppositions reify differences between groups. Reification allows differences between groups to be made obvious in ways that enhance or exaggerate these differences. The differences evident in the students’ accounts included Asian international students’ different English speaking style, different ability to complete assignments, and different values around schooling and leisure. These differences were obvious in the sense that the Asian international students shared anecdotes and nominated specific instances of these differences to position themselves as the we, in opposition to the you-discourse position through which the Australian students, teachers and homestay host families were represented. The binary opposition, which positioned groups through either a we or a you, was constructed using discourses of culture. These discourses were implicated in the students' accounts of their experiences of belonging.

Recognising andrealising valued culture and cultural capital

The Eastern Asian international students interviewed for this study constructed a we-you discourse around cultural difference. In much the same terms as the staff, the
students constructed the we-you discourse using discourses of cultural difference. The effect of the we-you discourse was to naturalise differences between the Asian international students, positioned through the we-discourse, and the Australian groups, positioned through the you-discourse. The discourse of cultural difference, through which the you-discourse was constructed, relied on labels, such as *loud*, that were used to describe the Australian students. Similarly, the we-you discourse was constructed around stereotypes, such as those used to represent the Australian students as *loud*, the Australian families as *lazy* and the homestay hosts as *stingy* or *greedy*. Thus, just as Appadurai (1993) argued, cultural difference is constructed through discourses associated with ethnicities. These discourses rely on labels and stereotypes to naturalise the differences between cultures.

As noted in Chapter Three, the ethnic discourses that construct cultural difference are the products of imagination. The we-you discourse was constructed around imagined differences between Asian and Australian students, schools and families. Through the we-you discourse constructed in the student accounts, Asian international students imagined all Australians as *the other*. Appadurai (1993) noted that *the other* is a category that is constructed around discourses of cultural difference. Differences were imagined by the students and were used to construct them as a distinct and different group in the Australian school setting.

In addition to othering Australian groups, the we-you discourse constructed in the student accounts reveals that the students realised different cultural capital to the cultural capital valued by the schools. It was noted in Chapter Three and Chapter Six that cultural capital has three elements. These three elements are *objective artifacts*, *cultural practices and activities* and *institutional currency*. The elements of *cultural practices and activities* and *institutional currency* were prominent in the data.
For both staff and students, the emphasis was on the *cultural practices and activities* in which the Asian international students did not engage. Both groups focused on competitive sports as a valued *cultural practice and activity* in the Australian school. As noted above, neither the staff nor the Asian international students considered the international student cohort to be involved in competitive sports. While the staff valued the *cultural practice* of involvement in competitive sports because of their connection to the school, the students did not value this activity. As a result, while the students were able to recognise the value of competitive sports to the Australian school, they evaluated the *cultural practice and activity* of sports negatively. Thus, the data suggest that the reason that Asian international students did not realise the *cultural practices and activities* of sports participation, which the schools valued, was that they evaluated them negatively.

*Cultural practices and activities* were also evident in the students’ discussion of the lifestyle differences between Australian and Asian families. The students negatively represented the types of *cultural practices and activities* in which Australian families engaged. The example was given of a student, Anthony, who described his family as *lazy* because they valued the *cultural practice* of sitting on the beach and relaxing to be a useful pastime. Anthony evaluated this *practice* negatively by stating that he couldn’t *stand it*, suggesting that he did not value the *cultural practices and activities* that were dominant in his homestay host families.

In addition to *cultural practices and activities*, the accounts analysed above suggested that Asian international students did not realise *institutional currency*. Foster (1981 cited in Henry, 2002) defined *institutional currency* as the academic styles and relationship with academic knowledge, as well as valued vocabulary and language forms. The we-discourse, through which the students represented
themselves, was constructed around their failure to realise the academic styles, such as the writing of a Year 10 Science essay, demanded of them (cf. Gregory, School B). Nor were they able to realise the language forms and vocabulary valued in the school (cf. Sean and Andrew, School B and Leonie, Jenny and Anthony, School A). The students’ accounts suggested that, while they were able to recognise culturally valued language forms, vocabulary and academic styles, they were unable to realise the institutional currency typical of Australian native English speakers, which was the only institutional currency valued at these schools.

While it appears from the data that the Asian international students in this study were able to recognise the cultural capital valued in the Australian school context, they did not realise this capital. Significantly, the data suggests that the students valued only some of the same cultural capital as their schools. The students valued the cultural capital of institutional currency they were expected to realise but did not value the cultural capital of cultural practices and activities. The Asian international students recognised the value of the institutional currency for communication with native English speakers (cf. Sean; Anthony) and for their grades in their subjects (cf. Gregory). However, in spite of their recognising both the institutional currency that was valued in the school, and its value to their schooling, they did not realise that capital. Thus, they tried to pick and choose the cultural capital that they realised, which was problematic for them. They appeared to try to realise the cultural capital of institutional currency while describing the cultural practice and activities negatively, thus they did not choose to realise this element of cultural capital. It was problematic because, as seen in the staff accounts, it meant that the staff did not appear to consider the Asian international students to belong at the school. They did not belong because the students were selective about the elements of cultural capital that they
realised. The valued cultural capital of institutional currency and cultural practices and activities both needed to be realised by the Asian international students in order for them to be accepted in the school. Failure to realise the institutional currency of the school and the schools’ culturally valued practices and activities were associated with the we-discourse position in the student accounts. In order to counter the hegemonic discourses of the school, the students, as noted above, used a discourse of victim to construct the we-discourse position. The victim discourse was used to represent the Asian international students as inadequately prepared for the Australian school. This inadequate preparation for schooling was used as a justification for the Asian international student cohort’s failure to realise the valued institutional currency.

Similarly, the Asian international students’ anecdotes and nominations suggested that they were able to recognise the cultural practices and activities that were valued, such as playing sports. By contrast, although the data suggest that the Asian international students wished to realise the institutional currency, these students did not value the cultural practices and activities that were dominant in the schools and thus chose not to realise this form of cultural capital. They demonstrated that they did not value the cultural practices and activities of the Australian school because they were judgmental of that capital. Thus, they recognised, but did not realise, valued cultural practices and activities. Unlike institutional currency, the students did not value the cultural practices and activities that may suggest why they did not realise this element of cultural capital. The students devalued the cultural practices and activities valued by the Australian other. Thus, they would not realise valued cultural capital because they devalued it.
Concluding discussion

This chapter has analysed the accounts of students at the three schools. It began the first level of analysis by identifying symptoms of discourse in linguistic utterances and grouping the extracts based on the symptoms evident in the data. The symptoms were then analysed by examining the linguistic realisations evident in the accounts. Several linguistic realisations were seen in the data, including nomination and text coherence, allowing the we-you discourse to be traced. The we-you discourse suggests that the context of the enrolment of Asian international students into the Australian school has an impact on the students’ experiences of education. Rather than being seen as a part of the school, they are considered, and consider themselves, to be separate and different. The students’ accounts of the experiences of Asian international students emphasised difference.

The final level of the model was the application of the theoretical framework. It is noted above that the students’ accounts constructed the we-you discourse through discourses of cultural difference. The students constructed themselves as culturally different by relying on stereotypes and labels, such as their descriptions of loud, boisterous Australian students or lazy Australian families at the beach. Through these labels and stereotypes, the students imagined differences between Asian and Australian families, students and schools.

The focus on cultural difference defined the Asian international students’ experiences of belonging. Belonging was theorised through the recognition and realisation of valued cultural capital. It was noted that there are three elements of cultural capital, objective artifacts, cultural practices and activities and institutional currency. The elements of cultural practices and activities and institutional currency were prominent in the data. Students were able to recognise the institutional currency.
of speaking in English in the same manner as a native English speaker, and fluency in writing in English, however they were unable to realise this capital. They appeared to value this capital, as it would have made their transition into the academic life of the Australian school more complete. The students’ valuing of this element of cultural capital was seen in their descriptions of the problems that they had when communicating with the foreign people. The accounts of the Asian international students collected in this study suggested that they recognised the institutional currency valued in the school but were unable to realise it because we didn’t know—like some daily English, we didn’t know that, because we don’t use it in the exam, so we don’t know.

The students were also able to recognise the cultural practices and activities that were valued. The students nominated the playing of sports as important, the behaviour of the Australian students as crazy, active, quite loud, and that girls here are so much … different … noisier than girls in Vietnam. The Asian international students also noted that Australian families behaved differently and valued a different set of cultural practices and activities to those valued in their home countries. The example of Anthony’s account was given. Anthony nominated the differences as the food, the habits. He stated that the relaxed method is not the same as Chinese people because they were able to lie down in a park or at the beach and not do anything. The students’ accounts suggest that the students did not realise valued cultural practices and activities, such as playing sports, because they did not value these activities. The accounts were critical of these cultural practices and activities. The criticisms of the valued cultural practices and activities suggest that they did not realise this element of cultural capital because it was not valued by the students.
Chapter Eight:
Conclusion
This dissertation set out to examine the experiences of Eastern Asian international students in Australian secondary schools. Its particular focus was on students’ experiences of culture and belonging. In this chapter, the key areas of the dissertation will be revisited.

The chapter first reviews the findings that were suggested by analysis of the staff and the student interview data. The chapter will then discuss the findings in terms of the research questions. The next section examines the theoretical and methodological implications of this dissertation. Finally, future directions following from this research will be proposed.

**Major findings**

This thesis set out to explore a gap in the research around the experiences of international students in Australian secondary schools. It was interested in experiences because, as Matthews (2002) and Smith (2003) have noted, there is limited research into the experiences, choices and destinations of international students who access a school education. According to Matthews (2002) the literature gap has led to a situation in which “we know little about the experience … of international secondary students” (Matthews, 2002, p. 373). The dissertation explored the gap around experience. It specifically focused on experiences of culture and experiences of belonging. Culture and belonging were the focus because, after the review of literature in Chapters Two and Three, these concepts were identified as the most significant areas for research. Thus, the significance of this study is its emphasis on the Asian international students’ experience of culture and belonging while enrolled in an Australian secondary school.
In line with Matthews (2002) and Smith (2003), the focus of the study was on experiences. The research problem was concerned with the experiences of a group of students who were studying in a mainstream Australian school. Two experiences were the focus. After a review of literature conducted in Chapter Two, culture became a significant concept. In previous studies (cf. Kashima & Loh, 2006; Jung, Hecht & Wadsworth, 2007; Swami, Arteche, Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2010), it was argued that international students' cultural background was significant in their adaptation and learning in Western institutions. These studies argued that culture was significant in explaining international students' problems with education as these students had a different culture from domestic students in the UK, US, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Similarly, these studies argued that the students had trouble adapting and fitting in to Western education because they were culturally different. In this study, the concept of cultural discourses was used to examine how things and people are divided into groups (cf. Appadurai, 1990). These discourses were said to construct group identities and naturalise differences so that, as Hall (1997) has argued, identities are marked and maintained and individuals can identify with whom they belong.

The further significance of this study was its findings that the students were positioned through discourses of culture. While this was a finding of many previous studies (cf. Kashima & Loh, 2006; Yang, Noels & Samure, 2006; Jung, Hecht & Wadsworth, 2007; Swami, Arteche, Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2010), its relationship with their experiences of belonging was a new finding of the present study. The students were found to have been positioned by staff through discourses of culture that were determined by their having a Confucian cultural background. Thus, the students were positioned as an other who was different from the majority of
the students in each of the three schools. As noted in Chapter One, in all schools, international students were a minority, the schools had to enroll more Australian students in order to remain a mainstream school.

Similarly, a further finding was the ways that the students appeared to position themselves through discourses of culture. Most of the students appeared to use a discourse of victim, through which they explained their problems in the school. By positioning themselves as a victim, it appeared that the students were able to challenge the dominant discourses of culture that were evident in each of the three schools. Thus, while other studies have argued that discourses of culture were constructed by international students in Western education (cf. Ninnes, 1999; Maxwell, McConaghy & Ninnes, 2004; Leder & Forgasz, 2004; Kettle, 2005; 2010; Ditton, 2007; Klerides, 2009), the apparent use of a discourse of victim by the students is a new finding of this study.

Discourses of culture affected the students’ experience of belonging. In Chapter Two, it was found that previous studies (cf. Bartram, 2007; Rosenthal et al., 2007; Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping, & Todman, 2008; Leask, 2009) had argued that the students were not adapting to their Western institution and were not fitting in, resulting in loneliness and feelings of homesickness. Thus, belonging was considered to be a significant concept. Hall (1992) argued that in order to fit in or belong in their new cultural environment, diasporas must belong to cultures of hybridity. Hall (1992) stated that hybridised identities are formed around a combination of ethnic, cultural and nationalistic discourses. Thus, in order to position themselves, and be positioned by others, as ‘belonging’, Asian international students must negotiate the ethnic, cultural and nationalistic discourses dominant in their home culture, as well as those dominant in the cultural environment of the Australian
school. The theoretical language of capital (Bourdieu, 1992) and recognition and realisation (Bernstein, 2000) was used to explore belonging in this dissertation.

While both staff and students accounts suggested that the Eastern Asian international students were not realising culturally valued practices in the school, their accounts differed in terms of recognition. It was noted that the recognition and realisation rule was used in this study. It was used because it facilitated analysis of whether students were able to crack the pedagogic code of schooling in order to access/recognise and realise powerful forms of knowledge. Recognition referred to the agent’s ability to recognise what is the appropriate behaviour in the context, the appropriate questions to ask, and what is demanded of them (Bernstein, 2000). As a result, the recognition rule allows a student to know what is appropriate to do at what times (Bernstein, 2000). Students construct the recognition rule as they make inferences to determine the boundaries formed around knowledge. They must determine the ways in which meaning is demarcated to communicate appropriate knowledge or, in the language of this dissertation, appropriate capital for a particular field. Thus, when the students identified the cultural capital that was valued in the school, in particular at School B where they identified certain behaviours (rough and tumble), knowledge (sports) and ways of speaking (as a native English speaker) that were valued, it suggested that the students had recognized the capital that was valued in the school. In addition to the recognition rule, the realisation rule referred to the ability of the students to construct legitimate school discourse. It makes it possible for students to form the appropriate text in the appropriate discourse at the appropriate time (Bernstein, 2000). Students who possess the realisation rule are able to make statements that are intelligible in the appropriate pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 2000). Thus, while the students’ data suggested that they were able to
recognise the capital that was valued in the school, it appeared from both the staff and student data that international students were not realising culturally valued behaviours. Thus, the study’s significance was in its identification of the students’ apparent ability to recognise the culturally valued activities, behaviours and beliefs in the school.

Secondly, there was a significant emphasis on belonging. Much of the data on belonging showed that discourses of cultural difference impacted on the levels of belonging that the students experienced in the three Australian schools accessed for this study. The accounts from both staff and students positioned the international students as culturally different from Australian teachers, families and students as they used discourses of cultural difference to explain why international students they did not participate in acceptable ways at the schools. Acceptable participation was described in many ways, including speaking in fluent English, writing in effective extended prose, involvement in school sports and immersion in the wider school community.

Choice

Both staff at two schools and students in two of the focus groups stated that international students were attending an Australian secondary school, in many cases, because they had exhausted their alternatives in the home country. Thus, the choices that led them to Australian schools were due to limited options at home. Analysis of the data revealed that students enrolled in the three Australian schools accessed for this study were there in order to complete their education. In most cases, these students were unable to complete an education in their home country because, as noted by four staff and two students, behavioural problems had led to their being excluded from multiple schools in the home countries. It was noted by
these four staff members that the behaviours were a problem for the students’ parents. Further, three of the staff members interviewed reported that the students’ had problems with academic work, as well as with behaviour. Three staff and two students also noted that poor academic performance had resulted in the students failing in their previous schools. The international students sought an education in an Australian school in order to compensate for their previous failures in their home countries.

Thus, several staff and student interviewees reported that the students of this study were enrolled because they were unable to attend a school in their home country. While previous research found that international students accessed an education in a foreign country in order to achieve a second chance at success (cf. Waters, 2006; Brooks & Waters, 2009a; 2009b), the staff and student participants of this study were suggesting that international students in the three schools were not seeking to overcome what Brooks and Waters (2009a) termed a potential failure. They argued that, particularly in terms of their academic success, these students’ failure had impacted on their education in their home countries. Rather than failing to be accepted into an elite school (cf. Brooks & Waters, 2009b), the nine staff and ten students suggested that the students of the present study had been excluded from a large number of schools. It was suggested that the students of this study were not accessing the Australian school as a form of ‘elite’ education (cf. Waters, 2006; Brooks and Waters, 2009; 2009b), nor were they accessing it as a ‘soft option’ compared to the Asian schooling systems (cf. Waters, 2006; 2007).

The data analysis revealed that the students lacked control over their enrolment in an Australian school. The students' parents had made the decision after limited, or in many cases no, consultation with the student. For example, one account
suggested that the students were sent overseas because the parents could not cope, and another account suggested that enrolment was at the behest of the parents because it was his father who had made the choice to send him to Australia for school because he has some funny ideas about these things. In addition, the students reported that their parents made significant choices for them while they were at the school by managing and controlling their experiences. For example, one student described his father as being very strict because he made sure he chose good friends.

In addition, the data suggested that many students had failed significantly in their previous schools and thus, their parents decision to send them to Australia was, in the words of one participant, an attempt to save face. Several participants noted that the parents had decided to send the children overseas because, while overseas, they did not have to deal with their child being a failure or a problem. Thus, the choice of an Australian school was often taken in order to hide the children’s previous academic or social problems that had led to their failing at schools in the home country.

The study’s findings around choice have contributed significantly to the field. While the studies discussed in the literature review were concerned with choice, none of them reported that the choice of an Australian school was due to the students’ prior failure to progress successfully in schools in their home countries. While there were studies that examined the choice of an institution in the tertiary sector, the present study’s findings were the first to suggest that international students in the three schools of the present study had chosen the school or, as was noted above, had the school chosen for them, because of previous academic and behavioural failure. Similarly, while research had reported that Asian international
students were sent offshore to finish school because of their failure to cope with the competitive education system in their own countries, the students’ academic, social and behavioural failures were a new finding of this study. Other significant findings involved belonging.

**Belonging in Australian schools**

The study found that the students of this study were positioned as not belonging in the schools. They were positioned as not belonging because the staff and students suggested that they did not realise valued cultural discourses. The study found that realising the hegemonic discourses of Australian schooling was essential to the students’ experiencing belonging. The international students who were able to realise the schools’ valued cultural discourses were described as a positive influence at the school. However, they were not positioned as belonging in the same way as domestic, Australian students. Australian students, about who the staff were silent, were the only group who were described as belonging in staff data because they were the group against which all other students were compared.

*A we-you discourse and discourses of cultural difference*

A significant finding of the study was the lack of belonging experienced by the international student cohort at these three schools. It was noted that the staff constructed discourses of difference about the international student group while remaining silent about the Australian students, in spite of being encouraged to talk about all students. In all staff accounts, except one, the Australian students were implied but not mentioned. Corrine Johnson was the exception when she described the Australian students as having a guilt culture in opposition to a shame culture. Thus, hers was the only account that specifically identified Australian students. It was proposed earlier in the dissertation that silence was used in ways that divided and
separated because it was one of the coded ways (Wodak, 2007) that prejudicial discourses were constituted and transmitted. By failing to describe the Australian students, the staff accounts defined belonging through silence. Only those students about whom the staff were silent were positioned as belonging at the schools.

Silence was used to construct the we-discourse position. For all other students, a you-discourse was constructed. However, unlike in previous studies, the you-discourse position was not necessarily negative. Eastern Asian international students were positioned through either a positive you-discourse or a negative you-discourse.

The staff accounts positioned all students through the hegemonic discourses of the Australian school. However, discourses of cultural difference, were constructed about the majority of the international students that positioned them negatively. However, the Papua New Guinean students and the Mainland Chinese student, Fred were positioned positively. By positioning students from Papua New Guinea, and the Mainland Chinese student, Fred, positively, these students were positioned as a positive you. These students were thus the positive you because they were able to be constructed through discourses associated with Australian schooling. For example, valuing sports was an example of the ways in which staff positioned these students as the positive you. These activities, playing competitive sports, observing the Catholic religion and being ockers, were examples of the cultural activities that were valued at the schools, particularly at School B. Students who participated in these activities did not challenge the schools’ discourses and were, thus, positioned positively.

The data analysis suggested that there was a hierarchy of positions as opposed to the binary us/them or we/you suggested by Matouschek et al. (1995 in Titscher et al., 2000) or van Dijk (2001). The we-discourse position was constructed around
silence. Those students, about whom the staff were silent, were the we. A we-discourse position was constructed around silence because these students were not described in staff accounts as challenging the discourses of the Australian school. The we-discourse was used to position Australian students. By contrast, those students who were positioned through discourses that challenged the school were represented as the negative you. Between these two positions was another position, the positive you. The complexities of the discourses of culture, and the way they were used to position students on a hierarchy of belonging, were a new finding from this study.

The data suggest that the students positioned as the positive you were performing a hybridised discourse of culture. They were engaging in a cultural cut and mix that brought together at least two discourses of culture, discourses from their home cultures and discourses of Australian school culture in a new relation with each other. The ways that the staff members selected, reimagined and combined various cultural discourses constructed multilayered and fragmented identities for the international students.

However, the majority of the students were positioned through a negative you-discourse. They were positioned through a negative you-discourse because they were represented as having problems or as being a negative influence at the schools. The negative you-discourse was constructed using discourses of culture. It has been noted that discourses of culture are constructed through discourses associated with ethnicities. The use of the guilt/shame discourse was one example of a discourse of cultural difference constructed through ethnic discourses. Another example of cultural difference used the metaphorical lexeme of little emperors that positioned students as entitled. The little emperors positioned students as entitled
because of the ethnic discourse of the one-child policy. A further example was the passive Asian student discourse, for example, the Asian student who does not engage in rough play and sports. A final example of ethnic discourses through which the Eastern Asian students were positioned was the stereotypical discourse of Asian students sticking together in small groups and socialising only with Asian community members. Thus, the staff members used stereotypes and labels to imagine the differences between international and domestic students. Ethnic differences and stereotypes were used to position Eastern Asian students as different from Australian students. They were also used to position the students, in many cases, negatively.

There were similarities and differences between the staff accounts and the student accounts. In both data sets, the speakers positioned themselves as the we-discourse position, in opposition to a you. However, unlike the staff accounts, there was no positive you in the student data. Thus, in the student accounts, the we-you discourse was a binary us/them (cf. van Dijk, 1998) rather than a hierarchy. The us or we-discourse was constructed around an international students as victims discourse. It was found that this discourse allowed the students to position themselves as victims of their circumstances when explaining why they were not behaving in ways that were expected of them in the school. The students constructed themselves as victims of their circumstance in order to challenge the hegemonic discourses of the Australian school. The you position was constructed around the hegemonic discourses of the school and the Australian family. Failure to construct hegemonic discourses positioned the students as the we.

The we-you discourse of the students’ accounts was also constructed using discourses of cultural difference. Thus, just as in the staff accounts, the students constructed discourses of cultural difference that relied on stereotypes and labels.
Stereotypes included the lazy Australian family at the beach while labels such as *loud*, were used to describe the Australian students, and *stingy* or *greedy*, were used to describe the Australian homestay host families. Stereotypes and labels constructed the you-discourse position. The labels and stereotypes, through which the cultural discourses of difference were constructed, othered the Australian groups positioned as the you. It is noted that cultural discourses of difference were the product of imagination and were used to construct the Eastern Asian international students as a distinct and different group in the Australian school setting.

The staff positioned the international students as different because they were not positioned through the discourses valued by the schools. The positioning of international students as the positive you/negative you in staff accounts, or the we of the students’ accounts, was associated with the recognition and realisation of valued cultural capital. The significance of the realisation of valued cultural capital will be discussed in the following section.

*Recognising and realising cultural capital*

As noted above, analysis of the discourses of culture, through which Eastern Asian students were positioned, suggested that these students were not realising the cultural capital that was valued in the school. The data from the staff accounts suggested two of the three elements of cultural capital. These elements were the culturally valued practices and activities of the Australian school, and institutional currency. The culturally valued practices and activities included playing competitive sports and practicing Catholicism. The institutional currency that was valued at the schools involved speaking as an Australian student and presenting assessment items in effective connected prose. These two elements of cultural capital had to be
realised in order for belonging to be experienced by the Eastern Asian students because they were emphasised in staff accounts.

Analysis of the staff accounts suggested that the cultural capital valued at the schools was associated with certain behaviours and activities that were expected of students who were enrolled in an Australian school. These behaviours included the value of active participation in the school. Further hegemonic discourses the use of colloquial Australian language and the playing of competitive sports. These behaviours were particularly evident at School B. The data analysis revealed that the majority of the students of the present study did not realise valued cultural capital, and thus, were not constructed as belonging at the school.

Analysis of student data suggested that, while the students acknowledged that they were not realising valued cultural capital, they were able to recognise the cultural capital that was valued. For example, the students were able to recognise that the playing of competitive sports was a valued cultural practice and activity. In two accounts, the students described Australian students as actively engaged in sporting pursuits. While able to recognise that sports participation was a valued cultural practice at the school, the students did not realise these activities. Similarly, they were able to recognise cultural practices and activities valued by their homestay host families, such as relaxing in a certain manner, but they did not realise these activities either. The data suggests that, while the students were able to recognise cultural practices and activities that were valued, they did not value these activities themselves, and thus, they did not realise them.

In addition to cultural practices and activities, the students also recognised the institutional currency that was valued by the schools. The students nominated the academic styles, demanded of them, such as the writing of a Year 10 Science essay.
Five students also nominated the language forms and vocabulary valued in the school, such as clearly spoken English. However, they were unable to realise valued institutional currency. The students constructed themselves as victims as a way of representing the reasons why they were unable to realise the valued institutional currency in the school. For example, they were victims of their Australian teachers’ inability to prepare them for their assessment tasks, as in the case of Gregory at School B, who failed his science assignment twice. Similarly, they were unable to realise the language forms and vocabulary valued at the schools because their home countries’ schools had not properly prepared them to speak in English with native English speakers. Thus, while they were able to recognise valued cultural capital, they constructed a victim discourse to explain why they were unable to realise this capital. The victim discourse was chosen by students to explain their inability to realise the institutional currency they clearly valued.

Thus, the study found that, while the students at these three schools were able to recognise the culturally valued practices and activities, and the institutional currency, valued at the schools, they did not realise these elements of cultural capital. The reasons they did not realise culturally valued practices and activities were different to the reasons they gave for not realising institutional currency. The data revealed that the students were choosing not to realise the culturally valued practices and activities. Both staff and students stated that the students did not engage with the school, by playing sports, by being ockers or by participating in Catholic rituals. However, in the student data, the analysis revealed that they were making a choice not to engage. The notion of choice suggests that the students were exercising agency in the limited ways their position in the schools allowed. In the literature reviewed earlier in the dissertation, Kettle (2005; 2009) suggested that one
of the problems with previous research into Eastern Asian students in Western education was that they denied students agency. However, this study indicates that these students did exercise agency, albeit a limited agency. This finding needs to be explored in future studies.

The students did not appear to be making a choice to realise institutional currency. They constructed a victim discourse to explain why they did not realise this element of cultural capital. This finding suggests that the institutional currency was of value to the students, perhaps because it would have made their classroom and assessment tasks easier. By contrast, the cultural practices and activities did not appear to be of value to the students. Perhaps they did not see it as valuable because, as they identified in their accounts, students in their home countries were not active participants in school sports. Although the staff data suggested that the realisation of cultural practices and activities would have been of assistance to the students, for example Matt Llewellyn and Corrine Johnson both suggested that a failure to participate made the students less involved in the school and thus kept them from a full experience of the school, it appears that the students did not share the view that the cultural practices and activities valued at the schools would be of value to them.

The study’s findings around belonging have contributed significantly to the field. While studies reviewed earlier in the dissertation were concerned with Asian students’ adaptation to their Western institution, no study has examined how the cultural discourses of difference influenced the realisation of valued cultural capital. Through its emphasis on the theory of recognition and realisation, data analysis has shown that, while the students of this study identified valued cultural discourses in the school, they were unable or unwilling to realise these discourses. In addition, the
study has found that the students exercised some choices over the cultural capital they realised. Where the students did not value cultural capital, such as the culturally valued practices and activities, they chose not to realise this cultural capital. However, where the Eastern Asian students did value cultural capital, such as the institutional currency, they chose a victim discourse to explain why they were not realising the cultural capital.

Answering the research questions

The discussion of the findings above were the result of the research questions. The questions were:

1. How do staff members in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for the experiences of culture and belonging among their Eastern Asian international student cohort?

The staff constructed discourses of culture that accounted for the differences between international students and their Australian peers. Similarly, when describing the students’ problematic behaviours, staff used discourses of culture and cultural difference to account for the students’ experiences. The reliance on culture constructed students as the other in the schools. Discourses of cultural difference othered the international student group because it emphasised their cultural and social differences from Australian students.

In terms of their accounts of the students’ experiences of belonging, the staff did not describe the Eastern Asian students as belonging at the schools. The Australian students were the group that belonged in the Australian school, which was evidenced by the staff members’ silence about the Australian students. By contrast, the international students were not described as belonging in the Australian school.
While some students were described positively because they were compared positively with the Australian students, they did not belong as the Australian students belonged.

As has been noted above, the staff constructed hierarchies of belonging. Rather than a binary which suggested Australian students belong and all other students do not, the staff accounts constructed a we, positive-you, negative-you discourse that positioned all Australian students as belonging while differentiating between those students who did not challenge the discourses of the school and other international students who did challenge these discourses. The we-you discourse positioned students through discourses of culture that othered those students who behaved in ways that challenged the schools. These cultural discourses positioned these students as challenging using stereotypes of culture. For example, the discourses positioned the students as problems because they were passive (would not play sports), antisocial (would not socialise with the school community) or were trouble (for example, those students who were enrolled in Australia because of previous academic and behavioural problems). Thus, the staff accounted for the experiences of culture and belonging among international students by constructing cultural discourses that prevented them from belonging at the schools.

2. **How do Eastern Asian international students enrolled in mainstream Australian secondary schools account for their experiences of culture and belonging?**

In the students’ accounts, culture was used to emphasise their difference from the Australian student cohort in terms of behaviour, interests and English language use. Similarly, discourses of culture were also used to describe wider, non-school based experiences, such as the homestay setting. In addition, the Australian students were
described as lazy, boisterous, noisy and immature, which were explained as cultural
differences. Thus, as in the staff accounts, discourses of culture were used to
account for their experiences of Australian schooling.

In terms of experiences of belonging, the students defined themselves as
belonging to a student group that was separate from the domestic, Australian
students. The students defined themselves as belonging to that group because they
positively positioned themselves, while negatively representing all other groups. As a
result, the international students’ accounts revealed that they did not experience
belonging to a wider, school based community. Rather they belonged only to an
exclusive Asian student community.

It was noted above that, while the students were able to recognise the elements
of cultural capital, the culturally valued practices and activities and the institutional
currency, they were unable to realise that capital. It was noted that the students were
exercising agency and were choosing not to realise the culturally valued practices
and activities. In terms of the institutional currency, capital that was valued by the
students, they positioned themselves as a victim of their circumstances to explain
why they did not realise the cultural capital that they valued. Thus, the students of the
present study accounted for their experiences of culture and belonging by exercising
agency over their experiences of schooling. Contrary to the deficit view of the Asian
student that is prevalent in the literature, the students of this study were actively
constructing their identity and exercising agency over their belonging in the school.

**How do the findings extend theory and method?**

This section will discuss the ways in which the findings reviewed earlier in this
chapter contribute to the theoretical and analytical framework developed for this
study. In terms of theory, the study has used the tools of Bernstein’s theory of pedagogic discourse, the recognition and realisation rules. It has augmented these tools with an examination of school valued cultural capital.

The use of the theoretical tools of recognition and realisation and cultural capital were taken to examine belonging. These three tools were used together because they address how education works to include some and exclude others. The tools address the inclusion and exclusion of groups because, as both Bernstein (2000) and Bourdieu (cf. 1984) have noted, the denial of access to school valued cultural capital limits success in schools. School knowledge is determined by the students’ access to cultural capital thus, those students who lack access to valued cultural capital also lack access to school knowledge. In addition, these tools are able to examine the differentiated distribution of the cultural capital required to be successful in education, which results in a perpetuation of a differenced distribution of the rewards of education.

These three theoretical tools allowed this study to examine whether students were able to determine what was being asked of them in the schools (recognition) and produce (realise) what Bernstein (2000) termed the legitimate text. As has been noted above, the use of these two theories provided one of the major finding of this dissertation in relation to belonging, that the students were able to recognise the cultural practices and activities element of cultural capital that was valued in the schools but were choosing not to realise that capital. Further, these three tools were used to explain why the students did not realise the institutional currency element of cultural capital. While they were able to recognise that there were certain knowledges that were valuable in the schools, they positioned themselves as victims to explain their failure to realise this valuable school knowledge.
The study also explored the students’ experiences of cultural difference in schools. Using the theoretical language of cultural discourses, the study has found that the Eastern Asian students enrolled in Australian secondary schools are positioned in relation to discourses of culture. These discourses restrict the identity positions available to students and thus, influence their belonging in the school. The study’s findings further extend theoretical examinations of experiences of belonging because they show how students’ experiences of cultural difference restrict belonging because these experiences position students as the other in the school. In response, the data analysis showed that the students accepted this position as other in two ways. Firstly, they actively chose not to realise the valued cultural practices and activities, and secondly, they excused their inability to realise institutional currency by positioning themselves as victims, thus constructing an alternative discourse in these schools.

This study made a particular contribution to the analysis of data using the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). It has extended the tools of the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) to CDA in several ways. Firstly, it has combined several of the tools of the DHA in a new way to develop an approach to data analysis that was able to move from empirical to theoretical in three steps, the L^1, then two levels of the L^2, namely discourse theory and grand theory. Secondly, the study combined the work of Basil Bernstein on languages of description with the tools of the DHA. The combination of these two analytic frames allowed for the data analysis to move from data to theory and back to data in a three step approach that facilitated a thorough reading of the data. The findings of this study, in relation to the use of the DHA, suggest that the reading device, developed for this dissertation, can contribute to studies of experiences of
belonging and cultural difference because they facilitate analysis across the $L^1$ and $L^2$.

There was a further significant addition of this study in relation to the DHA tools. At the level of discourse theory, this study used the work of Matouschek et al. (1995 in Titscher et al., 2000) and van Dijk (1998), which suggests that a CDA examination of data will reveal the we-you discourse or the us/them binary constructed in social utterances. However, as was noted above in relation to the findings from the staff data, the binary was unable to account for the experiences of students in this study. Instead, several discourse positions within the you/them position were found to be present in the data. Thus, this study has extended these tools to allow for multiple discourse positions within a you/them discourse to be examined.

**Future directions**

The findings of this study point to several areas for further research about the internationalisation of Australian secondary education, particularly in terms of students’ experiences. It was noted that the study attempts to go some way to close the gap identified by Matthews (2002) around the reasons why international students choose a ‘Western’ education at a secondary school, as well as its impact on the students’ experiences of education. One of the key findings of this dissertation was that both staff and student participants described international students as a group whose past experiences of education had led to their choosing an Australian school or, having an Australian school chosen for them. The choice of an Australian school was a means of ameliorating the students’ past educational problems/failures/disappointments, which may have been central to their position as the cultural other at these schools. This finding may assist international school
students, researchers, teachers, policy makers, agents who sell education to international students, homestay host families, parents of international students, and other groups involved in international school education, to be clearer about “the experience, needs, future plans, and expectations of international secondary students” (Matthews, 2002, p. 373).

A further suggestion is to examine the homestay conditions of students. As noted in the literature review, there is some research (cf. Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004; Zhang & Brunton, 2007; Collins, 2010; Popaduik, 2009; 2010) that examines the issues faced by international students in homestay settings, however, this study revealed that there were significant and ongoing problems in homestay. As such, a study of policies and practices that could address the conditions faced by international students in homestay settings would be a useful follow up to this study. A study that examined the experiences of culture and belonging, specifically in the homestay situation, would also address some of the gaps identified by Matthews (2002).

In addition, the findings of this study revealed that staff at Australian secondary schools positioned the Eastern Asian international students through cultural discourses. These discourses were found to affect students’ experiences of culture and belonging in schools. It is suggested that a study that examines policy and practice initiatives that would assist staff to position Eastern Asian international students through discourses other than cultural would also be a useful addition to the gap in literature in this field.

It is proposed that the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) could be further developed based on its use in this dissertation. The extension of the tools of the DHA that were developed by this study, as well as the major finding that the binary
opposition proposed by this analytic framework was unable to address the hierarchy constructed in staff accounts, would perhaps be a useful addition to analysis using the DHA. Further work on this tools, specifically to examine the hierarchies of belonging that are constructed in discourses, as well as the positive you-discourse position, provoke interesting questions about alternative discourse positions in relation to the we-discourse.

Further research into the experiences of students in schools could focus on the use of the theoretical tools of recognition and realisation and cultural capital and use the concept of agency in their analysis. In particular, these tools could be useful in analyses of the means through which a choice not to realise valued cultural capital was made. The concept of agency would be helpful to examine how the realisation of selected cultural capital works in conjunction with alternative discourse positions through which the hegemonic discourses of an institution are challenged.

A significant area for future research involves the Australia in the Asian Century White Paper. This paper was released in 2012, after the data had been collected and the work of the thesis had been completed, however, its role in policy directed responses to Asia require consideration. It has been noted that, in the past, policy notions of Australia’s engagement with Asia, which Huggan (2007) has suggested refers to countries as diverse as China, India, Japan and Indonesia, have worked to position these people “as “other” in Australian national discourse” (Graham, 2013, p. 68). Exploring the role of this white paper in the future directions of institutions enrolling international students from the region of “Asia”, is a significant area for future research, in particular to examine how the policy initiatives outlined in the white paper are approached at the level of individual institutions. In addition, it would be interesting to examine the ways that the students’ experiences change, or do not
change, as a result of these new policy initiatives. As it has been criticised for being big on vision but small on detail (cf. Pearce, 2013), the differentiated uptake and implementation of its recommendations, and the ways these recommendations are interpreted by different institutions, would be a significant area for future research.

Finally, as this study’s findings were particularly concerned with choice, a study of alternative education choices would focus on the parents who choose to educate their children in alternative settings. Such a study would examine how the theoretical and methodological frameworks, developed for this study, could be extend to examine the experiences of students enrolled in an alternative education setting. For instance, a study that explored the experiences of students enrolled by their parents in democratic or free schools, or the experiences of children whose parents choose alternative methods of schooling, for example, homeschooling or unschooling/deschooling their children, is suggested as a follow up study. These studies would utilise the theoretical and analytic framework developed for this dissertation to explore educational experiences in alternative education.

This study begins the process of analysing international students’ experiences of Australian schooling, it is just one part of closing the literature gap. Following up on this data, for example, by following further groups of students or by following one group of students in the longer term, will help to examine the experiences of Eastern Asian international students in Australian secondary schools. This study has begun a process which will, it is hoped, provide a much better experience of culture and belonging for future generations of international students in Australian secondary schools and other institutions. The international students of this study were a part of the school, by virtue of their being enrolled, but they were never able to belong.
### APPENDIX A

#### DETAILS OF SCHOOL A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year established</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year levels taught</td>
<td>8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of students (domestic and international)</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of international student enrolments</td>
<td>&gt;5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International college location</td>
<td>Off site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B

## DETAILS OF SCHOOL B

Detailed information about the school’s age, composition, size, percentage of international student enrolments and where the international college was located in 2008 when data were collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year established</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year levels taught</td>
<td>5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of students (domestic and international)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of international student enrolments</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International college location</td>
<td>On site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

### DETAILS OF SCHOOL B INTERNATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed information about the international college’s courses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University entry program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study tours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of partner High Schools</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D

### DETAILS OF SCHOOL C

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year established</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year levels taught</td>
<td>P-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of students (domestic and international)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of international student enrolments</td>
<td>≈ 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International college location</td>
<td>On site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E

### DETAILS OF SCHOOL C INTERNATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed information about the international college's courses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year opened</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses offered</td>
<td>Primary preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University entry program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study abroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXPEDITED ETHICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST
PART A - PROJECT DETAILS

Project / Subject Title: Globalising the Australian school
Element: School of Education and Professional Studies (Gold Coast)

Duration of data collection / human research
Date From: 01-03-2007 Date To: 30-11-2009

PART B - CONTACT PERSON

Title: Ms
Family Name: English
Given Names: Rebecca Maree
Relevant Qualifications: B Bus, PG Dip Ed, MEd
Contact Address: PO Box 771, HAMILTON CENTRAL QLD 4170
Telephone: 0413734700
Email: r.english@qut.edu.au

PART C - IDENTIFICATION OF ETHICAL ISSUES

| C1. Third party identification | Y/N | C13. Psychological or emotional stress | Y/N |
| C2. Participants who cannot consent | Y/N | C14. Civil, criminal or other action | Y/N |
| C3. Minors | Y/N | C15. Sensitive personal information | Y/N |
| C5. Indigenous persons or issues | Y/N | C17. Impact on personal relations | Y/N |
| C6. Collectivity members | Y/N | C18. Coercive inducements | Y/N |

https://ps-app.secure.griffith.edu.au/pse/AP88PD/A1/ENTP/c/GUR_RAD.GUR_ER ...
22/09/2010
or issues
C7. Ingested, Injected or invasive Y/N [x] C19. Covert observation Y/N [n]
C8. Tissue extraction Y/N [x] C20. Deception Y/N [n]
C10. Disease or infection Y/N [x] C22. Genetic testing Y/N [n]
C11. Pain or significant discomfort Y/N [x] C23. CTN / CTX scheme Y/N [n]
C25. If you answered "No" to all QC1-C24, the project appears to qualify for Expedited Ethical Review Level 1. Proceed to Part E.
If you answered "Yes" to one or more QC1-C24, but were not advised that full ethical clearance was required by the corresponding questions in Part D, then your project appears to qualify for Expedited Ethical Review Level 2. Proceed to Part E.

PART D - ELIGIBILITY FOR EXPEDITED ETHICAL REVIEW LEVEL 2

D1.
D1a. Prior warning given Y/N [n]
D1b. Specific consent Y/N [n]
D1c. Confirm accuracy Y/N [n]

D2.
D2a. Supplementary consent Y/N [n]

D3.
D3a. Minor and or parental consent Y/N [n]
D3b. Contrary to best interests Y/N [n]

D4.
D4a. Managed special processes Y/N [n]
D4b. Captive relationship Y/N [n]

D5.
D5a. Community consultation Y/N [n]
D5b. Indigenous person on research team Y/N [n]
D5c. Report and flow of benefits Y/N [n]

D6.
D6a. Community consultation Y/N [n]
D6b. Collectivity member on research team Y/N [n]
D6c. Report and flow of benefits Y/N [n]

D9.
D9a. Prior warning Y/N [n]
D9b. Appropriate screening Y/N [n]
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D9c.</td>
<td>Conducted by experienced person</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9d.</td>
<td>Compliance with WHS procedures</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9e.</td>
<td>Compliance with other standards</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9f.</td>
<td>Licensed / Accredited</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10a.</td>
<td>Prior Warning</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10b.</td>
<td>Appropriate screening</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10c.</td>
<td>Life threatening or significant</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11a.</td>
<td>Prior warning</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11b.</td>
<td>Appropriate screening</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11c.</td>
<td>Life threatening or significant</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12a.</td>
<td>Prior warning</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12b.</td>
<td>Appropriate screening</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12c.</td>
<td>Conducted by experienced person</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12d.</td>
<td>Compliance with WHS procedure</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12e.</td>
<td>Compliance with other standards</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12f.</td>
<td>Licensed / accredited</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13a.</td>
<td>Prior warning</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13b.</td>
<td>Appropriate screening</td>
<td>Y/N/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13c.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14a.</td>
<td>Prior warning</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14b.</td>
<td>Duty of care / duty of disclosure</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15a.</td>
<td>Prior Warning</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16a.</td>
<td>Prior warning</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16b.</td>
<td>Duty of care / duty of disclosure</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17a.</td>
<td>Prior warning</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17b.</td>
<td>Duty of care / duty of disclosure</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19a.</td>
<td>Activity innocuous</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19b.</td>
<td>Identifiable by research team?</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20a.</td>
<td>No alternatives</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20b.</td>
<td>Risks not compounded</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D20c. Debriefing
D20d. Withdraw data
D21a. Appropriate consent
D22.
D22a. Prior warning
D22b. Counselling
D25.
Are the risks easily negated, minimised or managed
Details
D26.
Cleared by another HREC, listed procedure or
Details
APPENDIX G

LETTER AND INFORMATION SENT TO SCHOOLS
[date]

Dear [Principal],

RE: RESEARCH PROPOSAL AT [SHS]

I am writing to request permission to conduct research at [SHS]. The research is part of a PhD program at Griffith University and is being undertaken to examine and understand the ways that international students are enrolled in, why they come to, and how they manage at Australian high schools.

The requirements of the research would be an interview with you, and any other relevant staff, that would take approximately 30 minutes. I would also like to interview, in a focus group setting, small groups of international students who are studying at [SHS].

On a personal note, I am hoping that you remember me. You were my [teacher/supervisor].

Thank you for your time in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Rebecca English
What types of questions will I be asked?

The types of questions will include:

1. What countries are you targeting as part of your school’s internationalising efforts?
2. What advantages will an international education have for the students who are enrolled at your school?
3. Why did you decide to offer places to international students?
4. Do you hope to grow this market? Will that be a measure of the success of the program?
5. Why do you think parents would choose to send their children to your school?

Will anyone be able to identify my school?

No, the school will be de-identified and given either a number (School 1, School 2) or a letter (School A, School B).

Will anyone be able to identify me?

No, you will be asked to choose the pseudonym by which you will be known in the research.

What will I have to do?

Your involvement will be a short, 30 minute, interview. In addition, you will be asked to nominate other members of staff to interview and some students who will be asked to participate in a short focus group interview.

Where will I find out more information?

The ethical clearance application, and associated information is available by contacting:

Manager
Research Ethics
Griffith University
3735 5585
research-ethics@griffith.edu.au

Why is this research being conducted now?

It is important to understand why greater numbers of international students are studying in Australian secondary schools. The numbers of students have grown in recent years and this trend does not look like it will abate. The popularity of Australian secondary schools among international students, and the growing market share for Australia, suggests that increasing numbers of schools, just like yours will eventually offer places to international students in high school. In addition, understanding the experiences of students who are enrolled, while they are studying in the school, can help people to understand how these students engage with the
school, what they experience and why they are enrolling in Australian schools in the first place.

**How many schools are involved?**
There will be a total of three schools, including your school, and two international agencies or colleges involved in the research project. You will not be able to know who the other schools or colleges are.

**Is anyone else involved?**
No, there are no other parties involved in the project.

**Questions / further information**
If you have any questions (even later on) you can contact me or my supervisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rebecca English</th>
<th>Professor Parlo Singh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:r.english@qut.edu.au">r.english@qut.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au">Parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0413 734 700</td>
<td>555 29780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal researcher</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The ethical conduct of this research**
There is a government policy or National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans which I have to follow. If you have any concerns or complaints you can contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

**Feedback to you**
I will place a copy of the report that comes from the interviews at the school for you to look at. If you want, I can send you a transcript of our interview.
APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>10 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL councillor</td>
<td>13 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group one</td>
<td>4 April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group two</td>
<td>1 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>14 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL Coordinator</td>
<td>14 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>10 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of Studies</td>
<td>13 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group one</td>
<td>6 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group two</td>
<td>6 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group three</td>
<td>6 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group four</td>
<td>6 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group five</td>
<td>6 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>20 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>27 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>25 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>10 April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>24 April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL Councillor</td>
<td>1 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL Councillor</td>
<td>1 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>3 April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group</td>
<td>1 May 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

STAFF INFORMATION SHEET
You are invited to participate in a research study to learn about why parents choose a school (of particular interest for their children) (ideas about why parents at your school have made the choice they have). The research is being conducted as part of a Doctor of Philosophy program at Griffith University.

What you will be asked to do?
You will be asked to participate in a short interview (approximately 30 minutes) about choosing a school. I will ask you about the reasons you think parents choose your school in Australia, the potential benefits and how this choice has affected you in your work.

The expected benefits of the research
I believe your experiences will help me better understand the reasons parents choose a school in another country. The benefits to you of doing this is that you might learn some new things about yourself and think about how your school operates, you might enjoy talking to me about your experiences and you might help me to better know how to help your school to find parents who are looking for a school in another country.

Risks to you
You should not experience any risk, however, sometimes talking about why you make certain decisions can be hard.

Your confidentiality
I will be the only person who knows you are participating in this study. Anytime I use the information or ideas you give me, I will change your name, you might like to choose the name you want me to use.

I would like to record our interviews. Nobody else will be able to listen to the recording I make, it’s just so I remember what was said. I might also take some notes to remind me what is going on during the conversation. At the end of the study I will destroy the recording so that it can’t be used again. At the end of this, I will ask you to sign to say it’s okay for me to tape record you and talk to you. If you want any more information, please go to the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/ua/aa/vc/pp or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

Your participation is voluntary
I want you to remember that there are no right or wrong answers, I just want to know what you think.

It is also important to know that, if you don’t want to be in this study anymore, even after we have started, it’s okay for you to make that decision. No decision you make, even if you decide to stop being in the study will not affect any contact you have with Griffith University.

Questions / further information
If you have any questions (even later on) you can contact me or my supervisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rebecca English</th>
<th>Professor Parlo Singh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:r.english@qut.edu.au">r.english@qut.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au">Parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0413 734 700</td>
<td>555 29780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal researcher</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethical conduct of this research
There is a government policy or National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans which I have to follow. If you have any concerns or complaints you can contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Feedback to you
I will place a copy of the report that comes from the interviews at the school for you to look at. If you want, I can send you a transcript of our interview.
APPENDIX J

STAFF INFORMED CONSENT INSTRUMENT
Choosing an Australian School

CONSENT FORM

Name: Rebecca English
Institution: Griffith University
Contact Phone: 0413 734 700
Contact Email: r.english@qut.edu.au

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include a short interview;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the researcher (Rebecca English) or her supervisor (Parlo Singh);
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview questions staff (international colleges)

1. Can you tell me a little bit about yourself, what are your experiences of schooling? How did you come to be in this position at [agency]?
2. Tell me a little bit about your role here at [agency].
3. What schools do you work with?  
   a. Who are they?  
   b. Are there major similarities or differences between them?  
   c. Can you describe those?
4. How do you decide which school to recommend to a particular student?
5. What do you think that schooling in Queensland looks like?  
   a. Are there different categories of schools?  
   b. How are schools differentiated within those categories?  
   c. If you had to draw it as a map or a diagram, what would it look like?
6. Are international parents aware of the differences between schools?  
   a. How do they find out about those?
7. Is it part of your role to discuss the differences between schools with the prospective parents?
8. How do you identify a school’s values and USP? How do you reflect these in the promotional materials?
9. What do you think [major feeder school]’s difference are in the market for education?
10. Why do parents come to you to choose one of your schools?
11. How much of your role is involved in giving support to the feeder schools and their teachers to manage their international student cohort?  
   a. How do you approach this role?
12. Do you support international students as part of your role?  
   a. How do you do this?  
   b. Can you give me an example of the different ways you’ve worked with students?
13. How closely do you work with the parents of the international students?  
   a. Once the kids are placed, how often if at all do you have to contact them?  
   b. What reasons cause you to need to contact those parents?
14. Can you describe the paths that students take to come to an Australian secondary school?  
   a. Do they come directly from school in their home country?  
   b. Do they come via other countries?  
   c. Where do you think they go next?
15. Should teachers approach domestic and international students differently? How? Why?
16. How much influence do the parents have over their children’s schooling once they are in Australia?
   a. How is this demonstrated for you?
17. What are the parents looking for in an Australian school? What do they think it will offer their children? What are their aspirations for their children?
18. Are the children aspirational for their Australian school experience? How?
19. What aspects of ‘Westernisation’ are the parents looking for their children to take on as part of their Australian schooling experience?
   a. Are there aspects of Westernisation that parents want their children to avoid?
20. Do the parents want to control the amount and types of Westernisation their children are exposed to in Australia?
   a. How do they do that?
21. What kinds of differences does an international education make to the students who experience it?
22. Why do you think the students who come here are sent to Queensland? What is it that you think they are trying to achieve by being here? What part do parents play in this decision?
Interview questions staff at the schools

1. Tell me about yourself. How did you come to be in [position]?
   a. What kinds of qualifications do you have?
   b. Do you need those to do this job?
   c. What are your experiences of schooling?
2. Tell me a little bit about the school.
   a. How are decisions made?
   b. Who decides, for example, that international students can be enrolled in the school?
3. What do you think that [school]’s main competitors are?
4. What are the values that [school] represents?
5. How do you think this makes [school] different from its competitors?
6. Do you think this is picked up by international parents?
   a. Are they aware of the differences between [school] and other schools?
   b. How do they find out about the different schools?
7. What about domestic parents?
   a. Are they aware of the differences between [school] and other schools?
8. What do you think that schooling in Queensland looks like?
   a. Are there different categories of schools?
   b. How are schools differentiated within those categories?
   c. If you had to draw it as a map or a diagram, what would it look like?
9. Are these differences reflected in the promotional materials the school produces?
10. How do international students change a school?
11. What advantages do you feel international students bring to the school?
23. What support structures does [school] have to support the students and build on the international program?
   a. Are there any special programs for parents?
24. Do the international students mix with the domestic students?
   a. Do they mix in class or in the playground?
   b. Are there special programs at [school]?
   c. What is the special program like?
25. In the playground, do you notice any particular friendships/relationships between the international and domestic students?
   a. Do they sit together at lunch?
   b. Is there a particular ‘area’ for international students in the grounds?
   c. Do international students mainly stick together at events such as swimming carnivals and sports days?
   d. Do international students attend events like the formal?
26. How do international students relate to their teachers?
   a. Do they get involved in class activities and discussions?
   b. Do they answer questions out loud very often?
   c. How do they treat their teachers?
   d. Are there cultural differences in the relationships they build with their teachers compared to domestic students?
27. How do international students become involved in the life of the school?  
   a. Are there any particular cultural or sporting activities they are likely to join?  
   b. Why do you think this is?  
28. How much influence do their parents have over their schooling?  
   a. How do you see this?  
29. Why do you think the students who come to [school] are sent here?  
   a. What are they trying to achieve?  
   b. What role do parents play in the decision?  
30. Is there a difference between the international students and the domestic students?
### APPENDIX L

#### DETAILS OF STAFF INTERVIEWED AT SCHOOL A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s pseudonym</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Background information provided during the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sarah Fitzpatrick        | Principal             |  - Trained as a business teacher  
  - Spent many years in rural and remote schools.  
  - First appointment to principal at a rural and remote school where she worked for four years.  
  - Second appointment to principal at a large, outer suburban, working class high school for five years.  
  - Left education for two years at the age of 40 to start a family, described as a *mid life crisis*.  
  - Appointed to State School after her return from maternity leave. |
| Madeline Church          | ESL counsellor        |  - Took some time to settle on teaching and dropped in and out of her teacher education course.  
  - Taught in Queensland and the ACT and other places.  
  - Had a significant amount of time off to start a family and continued to move around.  
  - Started degrees in WA and the ACT and then completed a Masters in Educational Psychology externally while living in Papua New Guinea.  
  - Became a guidance officer.  
  - Seconded to State School to work with the international students in 2007. |
### APPENDIX M

School B staff participants' pseudonym, role and background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's pseudonym</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Background information provided during the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matt Llewellyn          | Principal                 | - Held a Diploma in Teaching obtained in 1974.  
- Was in his 44th year of working in education.  
- Spent 38 of those years in state education.  
- Between 1974 and 1996 he worked as a deputy and then principal in a large rural school.  
- Then became a principal at a prestigious state school.  
- Was appointed to run the centre for educational leadership in which his main role was to educate state school principals in leadership skills.  
- Appointed to the state education international agency for two years.  
- Became principal of Elite School in 2002. |
| Dan White               | Dean of students          | - Attended a Christian Brothers’ school geographically close to Elite School.  
- Held a Bachelor of Arts and Diploma in Education.  
- Worked at Elite School’s brother school for 12 years.  
- During long service leave he worked supply and contracts.  
- Spent five years at another Elite School as Dean of students  
- Then to Elite School to undertake his current role.  
- Described himself as feeling most comfortable in Christian Brothers’ schools. |
| Tom Cusack              | Dean of learning and teaching | - Trained as a Physical Education and English teacher.  
- Principally taught English.  
- Was appointed head of senior English at Elite School.  
- Described himself as having an interest in international students’ affairs and middle schooling. |
| Corrine Johnson         | ESL coord.                | - Was in her 13th year of teaching at Elite School.  
- Appointed as an ESL teacher.  
- Worked as part of the reference group that devised the new senior English for ESL students syllabus.  
- Also worked with the union to develop some guides for teachers and international students. |
## APPENDIX N

DETAILS OF STAFF INTERVIEWED AT SCHOOL C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s pseudonym</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Background information provided during the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon Peter</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>- Qualification held: Diploma of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Principal for 25 years in four schools – two state and two non-government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Worked in education for 40 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Worked for 11 years at Christian School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attended a state school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Was due to retire at the end of 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Huang</td>
<td>ESL counsellor</td>
<td>- Worked for Christian School for several years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Had children that attended the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Born and raised in China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Declined to state qualifications held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Ga</td>
<td>ESL counsellor</td>
<td>- Worked for Christian School for several years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Had children that attended the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Born and raised in Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Declined to state qualifications held.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX O

### DETAILS OF STAFF INTERVIEWED AT SCHOOL B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's pseudonym</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Background information provided during the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Suzanne Smith           | Principal                                 | - Educated in South Asia.  
- Two Masters qualifications.  
- Taught in universities in her home country for approximately 12 years.  
- Moved to Australia in approximately 1994.  
- Worked for the state education system as a teacher for 2 ½ years.  
- Taught ELICOS for a university for approximately 3 ½ years.  
- Did various jobs in international education for the state education agency.  
- Came to Elite School as CEO of Elite School International.  
- Role involved overall school management including financial management, marketing management and client services management. |
| Catherine Hackett       | PR and general country manager            | - In her seventh year of working at Elite School International.  
- Born and raised in New Zealand.  
- Left school on completion of Grade 10.  
- Moved to Australia at 18 and held a series of jobs in retail and marketing.  
- Husband in the army and moved around because of this.  
- Appointed to Elite School International initially to work on reception.  
- Was unhappy working on reception and, on the day she was going to quit the job, Elite School International offered her the job of PR officer and general country manager. |
| Clifford Barry          | Country manager – Korea                   | - Born in England and completed school there.  
- Did not go to a selective or public school.  
- Holds a degree in recreation and exercise physiology.  
- Moved to Australia.  
- Worked in various international schools organising recreation or what he termed educational tourism.  
- Appointed to help organise recreational trips for international students in his roles as the study tour program manager.  
- Then appointed as the country manager for Korea.  
- Does not speak Korean. |
| Karen Chan              | Country Manager – China                   | - Holds a degree as a secondary English teacher from Shanghai Teachers’ Normal University.  
- Moved to Australia in 1989 and worked in various state primary schools while expecting her first child.  
- Worked in international student recruitment at a university and for the state school international agency.  
- In 2001 she became the international study coordinator for a beachside Catholic school.  
- She quit in 2002 and worked part time while trying to establish a business.  
- Became the full time Chinese student recruitment officer for Elite School International. |
# APPENDIX P

## DETAILS OF STAFF INTERVIEWED AT SCHOOL C INTERNATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Background information provided during the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peter Scott         | Principal/CEO of Christian School International | - Held a Bachelor of Education.  
- First teaching appointment as a social science teacher for the state education department  
- Was promoted to head of social science at that school  
- Came to Christian School when it was newly established as the first Head of Social Science.  
- Moved into the role of Director of Studies at Christian School.  
- Appointed as the Registrar of Christian School and began enrolling international students in 1986.  
APPENDIX Q

STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET
Information sheet and informed consent instrument:

**Why is the research being conducted?**

You are invited to participate in a research study to learn about why parents choose a school in Australia for their children (ideas about why parents at your school have made the choice they have). The research is being conducted as part of a Doctor of Philosophy program at Griffith University.

**What you will be asked to do?**

You will be asked to participate in a focus group interview with other international students about choosing a school. I will ask you about the reasons you think your parents chose your school, the potential benefits and how this choice has affected you.

**The expected benefits of the research**

I believe your experiences will help me better understand the reasons parents choose a school in another country. The benefits to you of doing this is that you might learn some new things about yourself and think about how your schooling is different here in Australia. You might also enjoy talking to me about your experiences and you might help me to better know how to help your school to find parents who are looking for a school in another country.

**Risks to you**

You should not experience any risk, however, sometimes talking about why you make certain decisions can be hard.

**Your confidentiality**

Anytime I use the information or ideas you give me, I will change your name, you might like to choose the name you want me to use.

I need you to get the form signed by your guardian/parent if you are under the age of 18. I encourage you to talk about your participation with your guardian/parent or someone at the school that you trust.

I would like to record our interviews. Nobody else will be able to listen to the recording I make, it’s just so I remember what was said. I might also take some notes to remind me what is going on during the conversation. At the end of the study I will destroy the recording so that it can’t be used again. At the end of this, I will ask you to sign to say it’s okay for me to tape record you and talk to you. If you want any more information, please go to the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/ua/aa/vc/pp or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

**Your participation is voluntary**

I want you to remember that there are no right or wrong answers, I just want to know what you think. It is also important to know that, if you don’t want to be in this study anymore, even after we have started, it’s okay for you to make that decision. No decision you make, even if you decide to stop being in the study will not affect any contact you have with Griffith University.
Questions / further information

If you have any questions (even later on) you can contact me or my supervisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rebecca English</th>
<th>Professor Parlo Singh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:r.english@qut.edu.au">r.english@qut.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au">Parlo.singh@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0413 734 700</td>
<td>555 29780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal researcher</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethical conduct of this research

There is a government policy or National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans which I have to follow. If you have any concerns or complaints you can contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Feedback to you

I will place a copy of the report that comes from the interviews at the school for you to look at. If you want, I can send you a transcript of our interview.
APPENDIX R

STUDENT INFORMED CONSENT INSTRUMENT
Internationalising Australian Secondary Education

Choosing an Australian School

CONSENT FORM

Name: Rebecca English
Institution: Griffith University
Contact Phone: 0413 734 700
Contact Email: r.english@qut.edu.au

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include a short interview;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the researcher (Rebecca English) or her supervisor (Parlo Singh);
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student’s signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the student is under the age of 18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guardian’s name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX S

STUDENT QUESTIONS

1. Where were you at school before? Was English one of your school subjects?
2. Did you have to do an English language course in Australia?
   a. Where did you do that course?
   b. Did you like it?
   c. What could have been different?
   d. How long were you learning English before you were able to come to this school?
3. Is the teaching here the same as the teaching you experienced back at home?
   a. How is it the same?
   b. How is it different?
4. Is the school life here different to what you experienced at home?
   a. Do you play more sports here for example?
   b. What about other school activities – do you involve yourself in fun activities like school dances or competitive activities representative teams?
5. Is the English you are using here different from the English you were taught at home?
   a. Explain how it’s the same or different.
6. What courses have you undertaken so far?
   a. What have you enjoyed most?
   b. What could have been better?
7. Please tell me about the assignments and class work you are doing at the moment.
   a. Are they different from what you did at home?
   b. How?
8. Have you had any experiences where you were asked to do an assignment and what the teacher expected was not quite what you thought you had to do?
   a. How did you handle that?
   b. What did you do that you thought was right but your teacher thought was wrong?
9. What is your favourite subject?
   a. Why is that your favourite?
10. What is your least favourite subject?
    a. Why?
11. Are Australian kids like the ones you met at home?
    a. How are they different?
    b. How are they similar?
12. What is it like in homestay?
   a. Can you tell me about your homestay family?
   b. What do you do with them?
   c. What do you like about living with them?
   d. What do you dislike about living with them?

13. Did you or your parents choose for you to come to school here in Australia?

14. What is it that you want to get from studying in a secondary school in Australia?

15. What about your parents, what do they want you to get from studying in an Australian school?

16. What are your plans for after school?
   a. Will you want to go to university?
   b. Will you want to do that here?
   c. What do you want to study?

17. After you finish all that, where do you want to live?

18. What is the hardest thing about being sent overseas to go to school?
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