

Language Issues in the Internationalizing University: Experiences of Students, Faculty, and Staff

by

Camila de Campos Miranda

B.A. Social Sciences, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas, 2008

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in the
Teaching English as an Additional Language Program
Faculty of Education

© Camila Miranda 2018
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Spring 2018

Copyright in this work rests with the author. Please ensure that any reproduction or re-use is done in accordance with the relevant national copyright legislation.

Approval

Name: Camila de Campos Miranda

Degree: Master of Arts

Title: Language Issues in the Internationalizing
University: Experiences of Students, Faculty, and
Staff

Examining Committee: **Chair: Sepideh Fotovatian**
Lecturer

Roumiana Ilieva
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor

Kumari Beck
Supervisor
Associate Professor

Steve Marshall
Internal Examiner
Associate Professor

Date Defended/Approved: April 4, 2018

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

Abstract

This research project investigates the experiences of students, faculty, and administrative staff regarding linguistic diversity in an internationalized Canadian higher education institution. Through qualitative interviews I investigate ideologies and assumptions about language and linguistic diversity that shape participants' experiences with internationalization of education. I find that most student and faculty participants see linguistic diversity on campus as a problem to be fixed in light of the hegemony of the English language. This can lead to inequality and negative perceptions of multilingual students. On the other hand, most staff participants present critical perspectives about the role of language in processes of internationalization. I highlight the need for holistic analysis of the intersections of language and internationalization that consider the voices of staff, in addition to students and faculty. My recommendations for more linguistically-inclusive practices include flexibility in communicative practices, institutional and pedagogical practices that value linguistic and cultural diversity, and cross-cultural professional development for faculty and staff.

Keywords: internationalization of education; language ideologies; linguistic diversity; linguistic inequality; inclusive internationalization

The limits of my language are the limits of my world.

Ludwig Wittgenstein

Acknowledgements

I am thankful for all the support I received during my masters' program. I would like to express my gratitude to the following people who encouraged me throughout this process.

To my mentors, Dr. Roumi Ilieva and Dr. Kumari Beck for presenting me with several invaluable opportunities to learn and grow academically. The chance to be a part of the CRIE research team will always be cherished as the basis of my academic career.

To my husband and best friend, Vinicius Manrique, for his unconditional support in all areas of my life. I would not have achieved this milestone if not for his willingness to leave the comforts of an established life and embark on this journey overseas with me.

From my parents I learned crucial skills that guide me in academia and life in general. My mother, Roseli de Campos taught me independence and resilience. From my father, Mario Miranda I learned curiosity and flexibility. I thank them for all the love and for understanding and supporting my impossibility to stand still.

I recognize the importance of friendship throughout this process. I thank Clarisse Cardoso who, despite living 10,987 km away, has always been close. I also thank Afrina Khan, Angela Inkster, Laura Baumvol, and Stephanie Lim for bringing warmth to such a cold city.

Table of Contents

Approval	ii
Ethics Statement.....	iii
Abstract	iv
Epigraph.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Acronyms	x
Chapter 1. Brief Introduction.....	1
Research Setting: Internationalization of Education	1
My Study	2
Chapter 2. Theoretical Framework and Review of the Literature	5
Theoretical Framework.....	5
Globalization and internationalization of education	5
Internationalization ideologies and articulations	7
Internationalization in Canada and MU.....	9
Internationalization, linguistic and cultural diversity, and inequalities	11
Language ideologies	14
Race and language ideology	16
Literature Review	18
International student experience.....	18
Institutionally ascribed student identities.....	21
Faculty and internationalization	22
Staff and internationalization.....	26
Chapter 3. Methodology.....	29
How This Study Emerged from My Personal Experiences	29
The Study - An Institutional-Ethnography-Informed Qualitative Study	31
Participants.....	32
My involvement in the project	32
Using Secondary Data: Implications, Benefits and Challenges.....	34
Analyzing the Data.....	35
Chapter 4. Student Experiences	38
Language Matters in the Institution	38
“Every day I feel my English is not good enough”: Standard language ideology	38
“People here don’t really see race, BUT (...)”: Raciolinguistic ideology	41
“You don’t have time to sit and correct the English along the way.”: Challenges for students who work as teaching assistants	43
“Globalization? Maybe unification, I think.”: Challenging language ideologies (challenging the status quo).....	44
Language and Culture	46

“‘What they take for granted was not familiar to me.’: Language and culture connections	46
“‘They stick to their own cultures.’: (Lack of) cultural negotiation	48
Conclusion	50
Chapter 5. Faculty Experiences	52
“‘There has been a lowering of standards.’: Perceptions of Multilingual Students’ Language Proficiency	52
“‘I have adapted.’ versus “‘I’m refusing to compromise’”: Teaching in Increasingly Multilingual and Multicultural Classrooms: Instructional and Testing Accommodations .	57
“‘I still feel culturally inadequate.’: Non-Native English-Speaking Faculty	62
Conclusion	64
Chapter 6. Staff Experiences	66
Findings from Staff Interviews	66
“‘They have to meet the standards of the people who grew up here have.’: Standard language Ideology and the Hegemony of English	66
“‘[We have to be] honest about what the real challenges are.’: Practical Challenges Brought by Internationalization	68
“‘Diversity by itself might not bring as much benefit.’: Internationalization = Intercultural Learning?.....	70
“‘He was looking at the job as an opportunity to learn English.’: Language as a Commodity at University and at the Workplace.....	71
“‘Kind of like an informal partnership, in a way.’: Staff Going the Extra Mile and Blurring of Professional Roles	73
Conclusion	75
Chapter 7. Discussion and Implications	77
Internationalization	78
Language Ideologies	79
Multiculturalism	81
Complexity of Working Conditions.....	82
Institutional Goals and Participants’ Perceptions	83
Standardized Language Proficiency Tests	85
Suggestions for a More Inclusive Internationalization.....	85
Limitations and Possibilities for Future Research	87
Reflecting Back and Moving Forward.....	89
My experience with language ideologies	89
Becoming a writer.....	89
Becoming a researcher	90
References	92
Appendix A. Interview Guides	99
Faculty Interview Guide	99
Staff Interview Guide.....	101
Student Interview Guide	103

Appendix B. Consent Form 106

List of Acronyms

MU	Mountain University
ESL	English as a Second Language
EDL	English as a Dominant Language
NS	Native Speaker
NNS	Non-native Speaker

Chapter 1.

Brief Introduction

Research Setting: Internationalization of Education

The global landscape of higher education has been characterized over the past decades by internationalization processes. Expanding on Knight's (2003) widely accepted definition of internationalization, de Wit and Hunter (2015) define it as "*the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society.*" (p. 3, italics in original).

One of the drivers of internationalization is student mobility, mainly towards countries in the global North/West (Maringe & Foskett, 2012). As a consequence, there has been an increase in the diversity of cultures and languages coexisting in higher education institutions around the world. Language, which is both "globalizing and globalized" (Fairclough, 2006, p.3) plays a crucial role in the process of internationalization of education. In particular, the English language plays a dominant role (Jenkins, 2012) since the number of courses taught in English in institutions around the world has increased significantly over the past decades (Dearden, 2014).

In addition to the popularization of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) courses, Anglophone countries are the most common destinations for international students. According to OECD (2016) statistics, English speaking countries host 54% of incoming international students. Thus, institutions in countries where English is the Dominant Language (EDL contexts, Ilieva, personal communication) are becoming increasingly multicultural and multilingual, with a large number of international students using English as a second or additional language. Even though extensive research is being conducted on the consequences and challenges associated with the role of English used as medium of instruction in non-Anglophone countries (Smit & Dafouz, 2012), in discussions of internationalization in institutions where English is the dominant language, the role of language is often "overlooked, assumed, or not considered at all"

(Byrd Clark, Haque, & Lamoureux, 2012, p. 2). According to Byrd Clark et al (2012), discourses of language and internationalization in Canada focus on an idealized “understanding of language as commodity, skill, and deficit” (p. 7) that disregards linguistic variation and plurilingualism. Baker (2016), highlights the unique landscape of internationalized universities, where different languages and cultures coexist but are not always valued in light of standard academic practices. When institutions fail to recognize diverse linguistic and cultural practices, there is a negative impact on students’ perceptions of their academic experience (Baker, 2016), which as I will argue in this thesis, impacts the experience of faculty and staff as well.

The ideological aspects of the English language (Byrd Clark et al, 2012), and the power relations inherently associated with it (Baker, 2016), are important factors that influence people’s overall experience at universities. Therefore, the linguistic complexity of internationalizing higher education institutions in EDL contexts requires multifaceted analysis and resources.

My Study

My study analyzes the perceptions and experiences of different actors (students, staff, and faculty) in relation to linguistic diversity at an internationalizing Anglophone institution in Western Canada¹. My interest in this issue stems from my personal experiences and struggles as an international, multilingual graduate student in an internationalized university in Canada, which will be expanded upon in chapters 3 and 7.

My study draws on qualitative data from an institution-wide SSHRC funded project about internationalization of higher education in which I worked as research assistant (Beck & Ilieva, 2011). In the process of interviewing participants, transcribing, and coding the data I was struck by the frequency in which language issues were mentioned in light of participants’ ideas and experiences with internationalization at Mountain University (MU), even though they were not asked specific questions about language (see Appendix A). This shows that language matters and their many

¹ For anonymity purposes, I will refer to the institution as Mountain University.

ramifications are a central aspect of internationalization of education for staff, students, and faculty at MU. As a consequence of my personal investment in this issue, I became very interested in learning more about participants' experiences with linguistic diversity on campus and wanted to get a better sense of possible ideological assumptions about language in their narratives. I then decided to work on secondary data analysis of the interviews that had already been done by our research group. The following are my research questions:

- How do students, staff and faculty perceive and experience linguistic diversity in the context of a transcultural university?
- How do ideologies and assumptions about language and multilingualism inform and shape students', staff, and faculty's ideas and experiences in an internationalizing university?

My study aims to contribute to research on internationalization of education and expand on three topics. First, I add to the limited research on language issues in internationalizing Anglophone institutions. Second, I augment the sparse literature on staff's perceptions and experiences with internationalization of education. Third, I address the lack of literature that presents a holistic perspective on some intersections of students', staff, and faculty members' experiences with internationalization. By addressing these gaps in the literature, I aim to contribute to a better understanding of some aspects of internationalization, which can then inform more equitable policies and practices in relation to linguistic diversity.

Throughout this thesis I make use of interchangeable terms: international students and non-native English-speaking students, internationalized university and transcultural university. I acknowledge that the distinction between domestic and international student is intricate. On the one hand this division can be important as an administrative classification for policy and services purposes, but on the other hand it oversimplifies two groups of students that are inherently heterogeneous. In addition, it disregards many students who fall in what might be considered a grey area, such as new/recent immigrants who have domestic student status even though they have lived most of their lives in another country, with a different culture and language as well as students from neighbouring Anglophone countries, who are considered international but

share the same language and many cultural similarities with Canadian-born students. I recognize that the use of binaries (international/domestic; non-native speaker/native speaker) “risks promoting reductive assumptions of students’ difference or sameness that are both unhelpful and inaccurate.” (Anderson, 2014, p. 649). However, I am interested in issues that surround linguistic diversity and those binaries are commonly used by the participants in their accounts of internationalization. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, and unless stated otherwise, the term international student refers to non-native English-speaking students. Even though this study was conducted in the context of internationalization of education, I will also use the concept of transcultural university, interchangeably, to refer to Baker’s (2016) idea that in today’s world universities are complex institutions that need to move beyond nation-based concepts such as home language and culture in favour of multilingualism and multiculturalism.

My thesis is structured as follows. In Chapter 2 I present an overview of the literature on the topics of internationalization of higher education (in general and specifically to the Canadian context), language ideologies, as well as studies that address the experiences of students, staff, and faculty in contexts of internationalization. In Chapter 3 I tell the story of my involvement with the research project and my decision to utilize part of its data for my masters’ thesis. I also explain the methodologies employed both at the data collection stage and during data analysis. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 are data analysis chapters. I analyze the data collected in this research project in relation to language matters separated in three sections: Chapter 4: students, Chapter 5: faculty, and Chapter 6: staff. In Chapter 7 I present some interconnections among the three groups (students, faculty, and staff) in the way they perceive and experience internationalization through the lenses of linguistic diversity on campus. Based on those connections I then offer recommendations for more inclusive internationalization practices in respect to language issues. Finally, I conclude this thesis by pointing the limitations of the present study, suggesting how the topic can be further explored in future research, and reflecting on my experiences with this research.

Chapter 2.

Theoretical Framework and Review of the Literature

I begin this chapter by laying the theoretical perspectives that will inform my work throughout this thesis. First, I provide a brief overview of the literature on the process of internationalization of education and its connection to globalization, followed by a more specific overview of internationalization in higher education in the Canadian context. I will then focus on discussions of linguistic inequality in connection to internationalization where I will explore understandings and issues of language ideologies. Finally, I will present a review of the literature that discusses research conducted on the experiences of students, faculty, and administrative staff within contexts of internationalization, respectively.

Theoretical Framework

In this section I will explore theories and concepts that form the conceptual basis of my thesis inquiry. The theoretical perspectives presented here will inform my analysis and discussion of data in further chapters.

Globalization and internationalization of education

The landscape of higher education has changed and become more complex over the last decades with internationalization undergoing “fundamental changes itself” (Knight, 2013, p. 84). Knight (2003) defines internationalization as the strategy by which universities have responded to globalization by incorporating “an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, function or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 2). In 2004, Knight identified four groups of rationales driving internationalization: social/cultural, political, academic, and economic. Branding, or the need to build an international reputation that could place institutions in a more attractive position in competing with other institutions, was linked to the four groups of rationales, but the question was raised whether it should be a rationale on its own. Nine years later, Knight (2013) describes internationalization as being “increasingly characterized by competition, commercialization, self-interest, and status building” (p. 89). The question

she poses in her 2013 paper is: “have the values related to economic, political and status related rationales trumped the importance and values related to academic and social-cultural purposes and benefits of higher education internationalisation?” (p. 89). The complexity of this question is evident when Knight (2014) talks about an identity crisis of internationalization, since the term “has become a catch phrase used to describe anything and everything remotely linked to the global, intercultural or international dimensions of higher education” (p. 76). To address the new challenges in the field, and as already stated, de Wit and Hunter (2015) refined the definition of internationalization to “the *intentional* process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, *in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society.*” (p. 3, italics in original)

According to Beck (2013), it is not possible to “theorize internationalization without seeing how the economic, political and cultural dimensions of globalization influence internationalization” (p. 45). Even though globalization is a complex, fluid, and contradictory phenomenon with multiple approaches to be considered (social, cultural, political, economic, etc.) that go beyond the scope of this thesis, to analyze internationalization without referring to globalization is to give the “impression that internationalization is conceptually value-free and neutral” (Beck, 2008, 48). Thus, an exploration of the connection between internationalization and globalization is needed for a better understanding of the complexities of internationalization, its purposes, rationales, definitions, and practices (Beck, 2008). After considering globalization as encompassing economic, political, technological and media “flows”/“scapes”, Beck (2012) proposes looking at internationalization through the concept of ‘eduscape’, or the “flow of educational theories, ideas, programs, activities, and research in and across national boundaries” (Beck, 2012, p. 142). The notion of ‘eduscape’ “situates the university in a larger flow of internationalization forces and elements” (Beck, 2012, p. 142) instead of focusing only on the integration of intercultural and international dimension to learning, teaching, and research.

For Beck (2013), “Globalization has intensified the conditions that produce cultural fluidity, and this complicates the question of how we understand our place in the world” (p. 48). The term ‘global education’ is often used to refer to educational practices that “focus on the individual as a member of a global community” (Beck, 2013, p.24), no

longer bounded by national borders (Hébert and Abdi, 2013). As already mentioned, one of the causes, and at the same time consequences, of internationalization of education is student mobility (Maringe and Foskett, 2012). This mobility, or as Pennycook (2005) puts it, “the flow of ‘international’ students” (p. 29), has consequences for educational institutions, classroom dynamics, and for the identities of students, faculty, and staff who participate in internationalization. Regardless of the fluidity of cultural and national boundaries brought by globalization, OECD (2016) statistics show that student mobility follows a pattern of preference for countries in the global North/West as recipient countries (Maringe and Foskett, 2012). The reasons for this North/West influx of international students are varied and include language of instruction, quality of programs, gain of cultural and social capital, immigration purposes, international experience and credentials that will increase chances of employability, limited access to higher education in home countries, and acquisition of knowledge or expertise to assist home countries (Baker, 2016; Garson, 2016). However, positioning North/West knowledge as superior has questionable consequences for students who plan to integrate in these societies, as well as for those who will return to their home countries, and also limits the possibilities of cultural, social, and epistemic exchanges among all students (Garson, 2016).

Globalization and internationalization also affect the skills and competencies one is expected to possess. Beck, Ilieva, Pullman, and Zhang (2013) analyze the emergence of ‘knowmads’, “workers who can work with almost anybody, anytime, and anywhere” (p. 85), as a consequence of internationalization of higher education. This refers to students who seek competencies that allow them to work in multiple settings, but also to faculty who end up becoming “knowmads” themselves to prepare students “to be interculturally and internationally literate” (p. 90). The authors identify that knowmadic practices at the institution are “guided by economic, monolingual, and monocultural imperatives” (p.93), which has the consequence of reproducing inequality.

Internationalization ideologies and articulations

Stier (2004) investigates three internationalization ideologies that “influence policy-makers and educators in their understanding and approach to internationalization”

(p. 93). The first ideology, idealism understands internationalization as good *per se*, with the power to raise the awareness of social injustices and promote a sense of global community. However, this position can be criticized because internationalization is usually done from a Western perspective, which can lead to cultural imperialism. The second ideology, instrumentalism, is focused on the global market and “instrumentalists consider higher education to be one means to maximize profit, ensure economic growth and sustainable development, or to transmit desirable ideologies of governments, transnational corporations, interest groups or supranational regimes.” (p. 90). Academia is compared to other markets since education is considered a global commodity and international students from countries like India and China bring money into the system. Educationalism, the third ideology, sees the contact with unfamiliar academic and cultural practices (both at home and abroad) as an enriching educational experience. Multiculturalism may then lead to a better understanding and acceptance of cultural differences. On the other hand, educationalism may lead to *academicentrism*, “manifested in a conviction that ‘our’ methods of teaching, research and degrees are better than those of other countries” (Stier, 2004, p. 93).

Drawing on Stier’s (2004) ideologies of internationalization, Ilieva, Beck, & Waterstone (2014) present a sustainability frame of reference to critically analyze internationalization in its complexity. Through data collected from surveys and interviews with faculty, students, and staff at a Canadian university, the authors identify two aspects to be considered for a more ethical internationalization: valuing diversity and mutuality/reciprocity. The first focuses on “expanding knowledge of different educational traditions” (p. 885), as well as acknowledging and valuing the multiple experiences of international students. The latter emphasizes collaboration, the need to respectfully acknowledge the other, and to understand “internationalisation as a partnership and not a one-way flow of expertise” (p. 886).

Stein, Andreotti, Bruce, and Suša (2016) attempt to map the landscape of internationalization by critically analyzing its purposes and outcomes. By presenting a “social cartography of four possible articulations of internationalization and considering their relation to an often-unacknowledged global imaginary, which presumes a colonial hierarchy of humanity” (p. 1), the authors touch on unsettling aspects of internationalization that are often ignored in light of a widespread idea that the process is inherently beneficial. The first two articulations presented, the Internationalization for a

Global Knowledge Economy and Internationalization as a Global Public Good are aligned with conceptualizations of Western higher education institutions as well equipped and somewhat responsible for assisting less developed nations with “knowledge capital”, as well as “ensuring that an imagined “global public” will benefit from what is produced by universities” (p. 7), respectively. The Anti-Oppressive Internationalization articulation is critical of the first two conceptualizations and aims to value the knowledge of oppressed people “rather than to import and assert dominant Western knowledge and values” (p. 9). It also aims to “work in partnership for systemic change toward global justice, anti-colonial, and anti-racist approach” (p. 13). The authors give the example of UNILA in Brazil, an unconventional higher education institution in the sense that it tries to address power relations, empower indigenous people, and prioritize reciprocal partnerships and solidarity. The final articulation, Relational Translocalism, is the most critical of the four articulations and goes beyond what is currently possible in the realm of internationalization. Besides criticizing dominant institutions, it also has a “strong commitment to recognize one’s complicity within them” (p. 11). This articulation assumes that knowledge about harmful practices, although necessary, is insufficient to address the problems caused by those practices. Due to the nature of most mainstream higher education institutions as “funded and regulated by nation-states” (p. 14), and therefore subject to “global flows of capital through university-industry research partnerships, grant funding, student loan debts, and other avenues” (p.14), these institutions usually display elements of the first two approaches: Internationalization for a Global Knowledge Economy and/or Internationalization as a Global Public Good. Such seems to be the case of Mountain University.

Stier’s (2004) internationalization ideologies, Ilieva et al’s (2014) sustainability frame of reference, and Stein et al (2016) articulations of internationalization provide useful approaches to analyzing how participants in my study understand the process of internationalization at MU.

Internationalization in Canada and MU

Internationalization is a key aspect of many Canadian post-secondary institutions’ strategic plans, with a focus on investment in student, faculty and staff mobility, recruitment of international students, international partnerships and internationalization of curricula (Larsen, 2015). CBIE statistics show that there was a

92% increase in international students in Canada between 2008 and 2015 and 65% of international students in Canada are pursuing post-secondary education (CBIE, 2016), with more than 200 institutions having developed some sort of international activity (Beck, 2012). In addition, the Canadian federal government has the goal of “doubling international student recruitment by 2022” (Garson, 2016, p. 19). According to Beck (2012), what motivates internationalization in Canada is an economic rationale, represented by

intensified competition in the recruitment of international students, branding, the increase of study abroad programs and exchanges, cross-border delivery of programs including satellite campuses, partnerships with universities in ‘developing countries’ for the delivery of sought- after educational programs (p. 136).

The economic rationale of internationalization in Canada is criticized in Byrd Clark et al (2012):

internationalization has tended to discursively take shape as a neoliberal way of “branding” driven by competing global market forces in this new economy instead of attempting to integrate diverse, international perspectives and understandings in relation to teaching, learning, research, and service functions of universities (p. 2)

Anderson (2016) presents an analysis of the landscape of internationalization in Canada since the 2000s and confirms statistics by CBIE (2016) that international student recruitment has been a prominent aspect of internationalization in the country. However, the author highlights that other destinations, mainly non-OECD countries such as China might be more appealing to students in the future due to lower tuition fees and cost of living. To adjust to this changing landscape, higher education institutions in Canada will have to adapt and provide better support to those students. The author concludes that universities have not yet successfully made the adjustments necessary to support the increasing influx of international students, which has negative consequences for universities, instructors, students, as well as the Canadian and international communities.

Mountain University (MU), the institution in which this study took place is well known in the academic community in Canada for its internationalization efforts. The University’s mission statement focuses on engagement of students, research, and communities, with internationalization being one of its main underlying principles. MU

international student population comprised 19% of the total of undergraduate students, and 28% of the total of graduate students in 2017. The economic rationale of internationalization in Canada explored by Beck (2012) can be found in MU online promotional materials, which highlight how well positioned the University is in different rankings². The University's global perspective and its international partnerships and opportunities, which can be associated with Stein et al's (2016) articulation of internationalization for the global public good, are also a central theme of these materials. I am interested in investigating if participants' accounts of their understandings of internationalization and experiences on campus correspond to MU's internationalization goals.

Internationalization, linguistic and cultural diversity, and inequalities

As already mentioned, language has a crucial but often overlooked role in the process of internationalization of education (Byrd Clark et al, 2012; Jenkins, 2012; Baker, 2016) in EDL contexts. OECD statistics report that 41% of international student enrolment in the last decade has been in countries where English is the dominant language (Baker, 2016). The growing number of courses being taught using English as a medium of instruction in universities around the world, and the increasing international student enrolment in countries where English is the dominant language contribute to the growing role of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), defined by Jenkins (2012) as "English when it is used as a contact language, between people from different first languages (including native English speakers)" (p.2). Jenkins (2012) suggests that "there are probably more non-native than native English speakers using English for at least some purposes on university campuses around the world" (p.5). This speaks to the complexity of higher education institutions in EDL settings, which are becoming increasingly multicultural and multilingual. The readings discussed below argue for the need to recognize and appreciate the linguistic and cultural diversity of internationalized universities.

The idea of the "transcultural" is explored by Baker (2016) to refer to internationalizing universities, which are no longer delimited by national boundaries due to the increasing flow of international students, staff, and knowledge. The concept of

² Source is not provided for anonymity purposes.

transcultural universities more accurately reflects the complexity and diversity of languages, communities and cultures present in many higher education institutions. Therefore, one of the challenges of internationalizing universities is how to adopt an international orientation if they still focus on the idea “of the university as a national institution set within a national context with a corresponding identifiable national language and culture” (Baker, 2016 p.440). Even though English is the dominant language of instruction in Anglophone institutions, Baker (2016) warns of the linguistic inequalities that emerge when institutions fail to “adequately address the complexity of the linguistic landscape of international universities” (p. 442).

The relationship between linguistic inequality and internationalization in the Canadian context is explored by Byrd Clark et al (2012). The authors present a critical analysis of the role of language and linguistic heterogeneity in discourses and processes of internationalization in Canada. The authors explore the implications of the mainstream “narrow understanding of language as commodity, skill and deficit” (p.6), which has been perpetuated in Canada through official language policies and neoliberal discourses of globalization. The authors add that not sufficient attention is given to the role of language in the processes of internationalization by pedagogues and researchers. As a result,

dominant views about what constitutes language(s), how certain linguistic varieties become valued over others in different social institutions, what counts as legitimate international experience, and who gets to decide all have certain stakes and bring about an unevenness in the distribution of symbolic and material resources as well as contestations/struggles. (p. 2)

The authors suggest a multidimensional approach that takes into account the multiple significances of language and considers “linguistic heterogeneity as the “norm” (p. 12) as a way of mitigating the inequalities and social exclusion brought by the current processes of internationalization.

The complex environment of internationalized universities in regard to language issues is also explored by Jenkins (2014). Even though most of Jenkins’ (2014) book focuses on the use of English as a Lingua Franca in non-Anglophone settings, the author also includes findings from interviews with 34 international students from a variety of countries studying in the UK. On the one hand, the idea that ‘native English is the best’ was unanimous among all participants. On the other hand, they all experienced linguistic challenges related to academic writing and understanding native English-

speaking professors and peers, in addition to being aware of the harmful consequences of the native English ideology on their academic identities and self-esteem. Some participants expressed ambiguous perspectives and saw those stressful situations as a normal consequence of being an international student in an Anglophone country. The author details the fact that language is frequently ignored or oversimplified in discussions of internationalization and, as a consequence, international students who are not native speakers of English may face linguistic inequality when Anglophone institutions fail to recognize linguistic practices that deviate from “native” English.

Ryan and Viète (2009) highlight the contradictory rhetoric of internationalized universities that “claim to value ‘international knowledge’” (p. 304) but focus on the one-way flow of knowledge, from faculty to students, without fostering a “genuine intercultural dialogue” (p.304). As pointed by the authors, even though “the discourses of academia are ‘no-one’s mother tongue’ (Bourdieu and Passeron 1994, 8)” (p. 308), perceptions that academic language belongs to native speakers are predominant. In fact, the linguistic environment of internationalized universities is much more complex than the assumption that native-like English is the dominant form being used. Baker (2016) elaborates:

We might also expect a substantial amount of English in the surrounding environment given the geographical location of the university. Nonetheless, at the same time, if the university is internationally oriented, many of the students and possibly also the lecturers, will be using English as an L2 (second language) during the lecture. We can expect a large degree of multilingualism perhaps in the use of different L1s to take notes and in peer interactions, as well as the use of English as a lingua franca between participants from different linguacultural backgrounds. (p.446)

In addition to linguistic complexities, internationalized universities also display complex cultural landscapes. Leask and Carroll (2011) argue that there is a dissonance between the idea that diversity on campus fosters intercultural competencies, transcultural knowledge and collaboration, and the implementation of strategies that might actually lead to intercultural engagement. The authors refute the idea that having people from different cultural backgrounds in the same physical space is enough to create transnational flows of knowledge and collaboration. In fact, ‘the ideal of transforming a culturally diverse student population into a valued resource for activating processes of international connectivity, social connectivity and intercultural learning is still very much that, an ideal’ (De Vita, 2007 p. 165 as cited in Leask and Carroll, 2011 p.

648). Due to the MU's large international student population, I am interested in seeing if there is a difference in institutional rhetoric on internationalization and participants' realities.

The studies reviewed in this section speak to the complexity of internationalized universities in EDL contexts in relation to multilingualism. These studies will inform my analysis of data in future chapters in relation to participants' perceptions and experiences of either being a non-native English speaker or interacting with non-native English speakers on campus.

Language ideologies

The inequalities experienced by non-native English speakers in internationalized universities in EDL contexts is often the product of language ideologies. According to Fairclough (2001), ideologies are common sense assumptions that are implicit in "conventions according to which people interact linguistically, and of which people are generally not consciously aware" (p.2). Those conventions are embedded in relations of power, and they are a way of legitimizing existing social relations through the recurrence of familiar ways of behaving (p.2). Ideological power not only takes shape in language, but it is about language and which meanings, or linguistic and communicative norms are legitimate, correct, or appropriate. Language ideologies mediate social identity, because people rely on their construals of what particular linguistic patterns mean in order to identify speakers as occupying recognizable social positions (Wortham, 2001, p. 256).

Woolard (1998) broadly defines language ideologies as "representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in the social world". (p. 3) In her introduction to the book "Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory", Woolard (1998) identifies different definitions, fields of study, and traditions related to language ideologies, and also provides a brief literature review of language ideology, in particular "approaches to cultural conceptions of language and of communicative behavior as an enactment of a collective order" (p.5). Looking at the broad concept of ideology, she identifies a distinction between two traditions. The first one sees ideologies as neutral and is concerned "with the way that they mediate meaning for social purposes" (p.8), in which all knowledge is considered ideological. The second tradition sees ideology as negative and is concerned with criticality, systems of

oppression, power relations, and ways to legitimize social order. It is important to stress that it is not the case that the neutral tradition does not recognize relations of power, but rather that it “situates it [power] as one aspect (...) of the social positioning of cultural forms” (p.8). In this thesis I will make use of the term language ideology in reference to the critical tradition, since I am concerned with the relations of power and hidden assumptions about social and cultural significance in the discourses of participants in this research.

According to Makoni and Pennycook (2006), “languages, concepts of languageness, and metalanguages used to describe them are inventions” (p.1) and this is a perspective I will discuss briefly here. Pennycook (2006) argues that the idea of English as an International Language is a myth, in the sense that it is a human construction instead of a natural phenomenon. Even though languages are inventions, “the effects of language inventions are very real” (Pennycook, 2006, p.21). Similarly, Woolard (1998) states that, even though in studies of language, standard forms are considered “more as ideological process than as empirical linguistic fact” (p. 21), language standards are still widely naturalized in society. As an example of the connection between language and perceived social status, the author mentions British English and how its speakers are “heard not just as a member of a socially privileged sector of English society but also as a person of greater intellectual and personal worth” (p.19).

The ideological view that languages are separate, enumerable entities was part of a Eurocentric project to categorize everything that is foreign (Pennycook, 2006). Similarly, the identification of a language with a people and nation is, according to Woolard, “not a natural fact, but rather a historical, ideological construct” (1998, p. 16) which has been “exported through colonialism” and is “globally hegemonic today” (p. 16). Its consequences can be perceived nowadays in “various strategies of social domination” (Woolard, 1998, p.17), in the ways language is understood, in how policies and tests are constructed, and in reference to gatekeeping mechanisms that control who has access to different opportunities.

Lippi-Green (2012) explores the ideology, or myth, of standard language and non-accent behind linguistic discrimination in the US. The author questions mainstream assumptions about language. More specifically, Lippi-Green (2012) explains that even

though the so called Standard American English is considered a myth by linguists, it is a widespread idea around the world, rooted in the commodification of language. The propagation of the standard language myth is embedded with relations of power as a way to (de)legitimize social groups and control access to institutions. Chapter 4 in particular is relevant for this study as it details what standard English is, how it came to be, and its pervasive implications to those who are marginalized for not mastering it. The standard language ideology, or the idea that native varieties of North American or British English are desirable in academia is widespread in understandings of internationalization due to dominant neoliberal discourses and a lack of discussion about the role of language in internationalization (Byrd Clark et al, 2012; Jenkins, 2014).

According to the standard language ideology view, non-native English speakers are seen as “deficient” and have their linguistic skills judged in light of “idealized views of language fluency and sophistication” (Ryan and Viete, 2009, p.304). Wortham (2001) explains that with “ideologies that circulate widely in a society, particular speakers position themselves and others in characteristic ways. Consistent positioning over time can establish more enduring identities for individuals and groups” (p.256).

This body of literature will be useful in analyzing my research participants’ assumptions and beliefs about linguistic competence and the hierarchy of English.

Race and language ideology

As previously mentioned, language ideologies are closely connected to relations of power (Fairclough, 2001) and often work to (de)legitimize and control social groups (Lippi-Green, 2012). Therefore, language ideologies are also seen as closely linked to racism. The following literature speaks to the intersections between language ideologies and race.

Flores and Rosa (2015) explore how in appropriateness-based approaches to language education language-minoritized students are expected to model their linguistic practices after the white speaking subject, even though the white speaking subject continues to perceive their language use in racialized ways (p.149). The authors critically analyze the standard language ideology in academic settings and introduce the concept of raciolinguistic ideology. They offer a perspective in which English learners “can be

understood to inhabit a shared racial positioning that frames their linguistic practices as deficient regardless of how closely they follow supposed rules of appropriateness” (p.149). For Flores and Rosa, some racialized bodies are ascribed with linguistic deficiencies that are unrelated to linguistic practices. “Raciolinguistic ideologies produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects” (p.150). They argue that trying to identify what exactly constitutes Standard English is pointless, instead the focus should be placed on how Standard English is produced as a cultural emblem, and how its reproduction perpetuates raciolinguistic ideologies and contributes to social stratification. With this critical perspective, they argue that Standard English should be conceptualized in terms of the racialized ideologies shared by *listening subjects* rather than the empirical linguistic practices of *speaking subjects*. Conceptualizations of notions such as “standard language” or “academic language” (and the discourse of appropriateness in which they both are embedded) “as racialized ideological perceptions rather than objective linguistic categories” (Flores and Rosa, 2015, p.152) will be helpful in some of the data analysis that follows.

According to Woolard (1998), linguistic discrimination in liberal democratic societies might be “publicly acceptable where the corresponding ethnic or racial discrimination is not” (p.19). She gives the example of how it is socially accepted to discriminate against someone for speaking African American Vernacular English or having Asian accent, while it is illegal to discriminate against someone for being African American or Asian.

One of the chapters in Lippi-Green (2012) is dedicated to investigating “what it means to be Asian” (p. 281). She argues that “the concept *Asian* evokes an association not with a specific nation or geographical region, but with race.” (p. 285). Despite the large numbers of non-native English-speaking Asian Americans, and the diversity of the group, “there is a special stigma attached to their presence which is externalized in reactions to the way they speak English” (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 286). Throughout the book the author provides many examples of linguistic discrimination towards Asian Americans and other racialized minorities, which shows that linguistic discrimination is often inseparable from racial discrimination. The discussion of race and linguistic

discrimination is particularly relevant to my study due to the large number of Chinese students at MU³.

Literature Review

Having discussed the theoretical perspectives that will guide me in analyzing the data that follows in chapters 4,5, and 6, I will now turn to a review of studies (conducted from various theoretical perspectives) which indicate what we currently know about the experiences with internationalization in higher education of students, staff, and faculty.

International student experience

In this section I will provide a brief overview of research about the international student experience that has been conducted in Anglophone settings, such as Canada, Australia, and the UK to point that the problems international students experience are very similar in EDL contexts. The literature I chose to summarize here reflects specifically studies conducted in the Canadian context and/or publications that discuss student experience in relation to language. I will then refer to literature that discusses institutional labels ascribed to such students, e.g. “international”, and “ESL”.

Guo and Guo (2017) report on qualitative interviews with 26 international undergraduate students reflecting on their adaptation to a university in Western Canada. The authors focus on how internationalization policies were experienced by those students. Findings suggest that even though participants experienced challenges adapting to university life, they “identified positive aspects of internationalization” (p. 856) among the multiple understandings they have of the term. These positive aspects relate primarily to their own choice of studying abroad mainly because of their perceptions of “academic freedom in Canada” (p. 857). On the other hand, some students criticized

³ Chinese students represent the majority of the international student population on campus. In 2016, 56% of international undergraduate students and 27% of international graduate students were from China. The other undergraduate nationalities represent less than 6% (each) of the international student population.

internationalization at the university as “dominated by the global advantage of English and Anglo-Canadian culture” (p. 862) and were aware of the marketization of higher education that relies on high tuition fees paid by international students. Guo and Guo’s study is an important contribution to the field because it not only analyzes the experiences of students but also points to a gap between these experiences and policies that highlight positive aspects of internationalization and ignore problems such as lack of engagement with local students, racism, and insufficient internationalization of the curriculum.

A comparison of the involvement of international and domestic students in four Canadian universities as it relates to educational outcomes is found in Grayson (2008). Contrary to the findings of Guo and Guo (2017), the international students’ experiences in Grayson’s (2008) study were more satisfactory. The level of involvement of international students in different spheres of university life was equal to or greater than that of domestic students. However, international students were found to have less social and academic support than domestic students.

Several studies focus on international students’ perceptions about their social lives at universities. Myles and Cheng (2003) analyzed interviews with 12 non-native English-speaking graduate students regarding their linguistic and cultural experiences in terms of student-supervisor relationship, teaching assistantships, friendships, and social life in a Canadian university. Results are similar to Grayson (2008) in that students’ adaptation process is multifaceted and depends on internal and external factors. Some students reported feeling well adjusted to the university environment regardless of the little effort they made in seeking contact with domestic students. For them, “their own network of international students with similar culture and linguistic background” (Grayson, 2008, p. 259) provided enough support and knowledge of the host culture. Wright and Schartner’s (2013) research findings suggest that international students often see themselves in a “threshold of social participation” (p. 113), in a state where they want to be more socially engaged and are aware of opportunities to interact with native English speakers, but not succeeding in doing so. Reasons for this tension between wanting to act but not managing to do so include difficulties in understanding accents and slang, the speed of conversation among native speakers, difficulty in expressing ideas, cultural barriers, and homesickness.

Brown (2008) analyzed the role anxiety over English language proficiency plays in the experiences of 13 graduate international students at a university in the UK. The findings from a 12-month ethnographic study indicate that students experience high levels of anxiety and stress in the beginning of their sojourns due to linguistic challenges, such as an “inability to communicate in day-to-day situations, to follow lecturers, and to participate in class” (p. 92). The linguistic progress of the students was followed throughout the year and Brown concludes that overall language-led anxiety had decreased by the end of the study due to students’ exposure to English on a daily basis. A more comprehensive analysis of the changes students go through during an international sojourn was presented by Fotovatian's (2012) study with four English teacher international PhD students in an Australian university in their first year and two years later, at the end of their academic program. Fotovatian emphasizes the role agency played in students’ transition from a university-imposed “international student” label, to a desired “legitimate PhD student’ identity” (p.585).

The many practical challenges students face in terms of navigating an unfamiliar cultural and linguistic environment when undertaking an international sojourn are explored by Ryan and Viète’s (2009) study with international students in an Australian higher education institution. The challenges identified in the study are the result of unequal relations of power in the university’s implementation of internationalization practices. The authors argue that despite the rhetoric of internationalization that claims to value international knowledge, “there is an apparent lack of respect and reciprocity” (p.304) in terms of valuing international students’ contributions. Instead, international students in their study reported often feeling that their contributions were unappreciated and their abilities unrecognized, mainly because of their challenges with the English language. However, the authors argue that students’ participation based on language proficiency can be influenced by “idealized views of language fluency and sophistication” (p. 304). The authors point that “Being able to speak is not enough to ensure acceptance and belonging in a learning community, it also needs to encompass being listened to” (p. 306). In that sense, overcoming personal barriers such as being able to read and write academically, follow fast paced lectures, and engage in classroom discussions is not a guarantee that the student will be listened to. Ideological views expressed by people’s positioning in society in terms of race, gender, and social class have more influence in the access to certain communities than someone’s language skills. In other words,

relations of power dictate who has access to which communities. The authors conclude their paper by suggesting that policy, curriculum, assessment, teaching and learning should value diversity, be grounded in respectful interactions, and have a focus on growth, instead of deficit.

Institutionally ascribed student identities

In Fotovatian and Miller (2014), the authors argue that the university-ascribed identity of “international student” is problematic because it ignores the heterogeneity of the population it represents, besides impacting students’ negotiation of their institutional identity, which comes loaded with pre-existing stereotypes. Similarly, Anderson (2014), explores the complexity of an internationalized university in New Zealand through the experiences of teaching and learning of 12 women participants. For the author, binaries such as Western/non-Western, international/local students do not reflect the heterogeneity of modern higher education institutions and “risk promoting reductive assumptions of students’ difference or sameness that are both unhelpful and inaccurate” (p. 649).

In addition to the problematic stereotypes associated with the label “international student”, being categorized as “ESL” learner/writer also carries a linguistic deficiency connotation. Marshall (2010) states that “ESL is not only a linguistic state, a course, an abbreviation, appreciated by many, disliked by others; it is also as an institutional and learner identity that some students associate with non-acceptance, deficit, and even non-recognition of their multilingual and multicultural knowledge and competence” (p. 51). Marshall explores the narratives of students in an academic literacy course and their experiences negotiating the ESL label at university, which many thought they had left behind in high school. Students’ experiences of “re-becoming ESL” once they entered university shifted from a deficit perception in the beginning of the semester to a more positive view on multilingualism due to the course’s pedagogy.

Waterstone’s (2008) case study about the experiences of Susan, an undergraduate student in a Canadian university, sheds light on the debate of how “received categories” influence students’ access to participation in academic discourses. Susan resists the ESL label for being a “cliché” that does not relate to her sense of identity. She demonstrates awareness of the ideological dimension behind the notion of “nativespeakerdom” (Ryan and Viète, 2009) when after some reflection she comes to

the conclusion that what she needs in order to become a better writer is not to “become a native speaker”, but to “be able to express myself at the level which is *acceptable* as normal by native speakers” (p. 60).

Labels such as ‘international student’ and ‘ESL’ were present in my participants’ narratives. Thus, this body of literature will guide me when critically analyzing these institutionally ascribed identities in future chapters.

Faculty and internationalization

The literature that focuses on faculty members’ experiences with internationalization is varied. Here I will focus on studies from a variety of settings which address topics similar to the ones discussed in this thesis.

Despite the vast body of research on internationalization of education, Criswell and Zhu (2015) and Friesen (2012) identified a gap in the literature on how faculty members perceive and experience their roles as key agents in internationalization processes. Criswell and Zhu (2015) address this gap by presenting data from a survey conducted with faculty from higher education institutions in the United States and Canada with regards to their internationalization priorities. Even though internationalization was supported by the majority of participants, they also identified problematic aspects. These refer to lack of funding and opportunities for engaging in international teaching and research, uncertainty about the institution’s vision and priorities with regards to internationalization, and a gap in institutional rhetoric and the actual funding and support available to implement internationalization programs and strategies. Friesen (2012) employs a phenomenological research approach to investigate the understandings of five Canadian faculty around their involvement with internationalization. Findings show that participants hold multiple understandings of internationalization that not always align to the institutional definition. The level of engagement reported by faculty participants was directly related to the alignment of institutional and individual values. However, most participants were unclear about the meaning of internationalization to their institutions. Friesen (2012) suggests, among other initiatives, that institutions communicate clearly the meaning and purposes of internationalization to its faculty members.

The perceptions and experiences of faculty with internationalization was also the theme of Haan, Gallagher, and Varandani (2017), but their focus was on how these perceptions influence classroom practices. The authors present the ambivalent results of a survey conducted with faculty at a mid-sized university in the United States about their perceptions and practices around internationalization. Most participants demonstrated an awareness of the value of internationalization, but due to the rapid increase in international students on campus they also “expressed reservations” (p. 46) about working with the culturally and linguistically diverse body of students. Reasons for this reservation revolve around an uncertainty about what their role is in the process of internationalization, which led to a resistance in changing teaching methods to accommodate multilingual students. At the same time, they were interested in professional development opportunities that might help them navigate the complexity of the new institutional configuration. Criswell and Zhu (2015), Friesen (2012) and Haan et al (2017) will be useful in analyzing how faculty participants in my study relate to internationalization at MU.

The challenges and beliefs of faculty in dealing with multilingual students was further explored in Gallagher and Haan (2017). Responses from 197 faculty from a mid-sized university in the United States were used by the authors to analyze faculty’s beliefs about emergent multilingual students’ language proficiency, about their perceptions on linguistically responsive instruction (LRI), as well as the influence of the university context in processes of teaching and learning. Overall, the results of the survey show that “faculty consistently described [emergent multilingual] students as being deficient, vulnerable, and insufficiently supported” (p.9). The responses to the survey questions were overwhelmingly negative, with language proficiency being compared to cognitive and moral ability. Part of the blame for students’ inability to succeed in the academic environment was placed on dubious recruitment and admission practices, as well as in the lack of support services provided by the university. Participants also had negative views on instructional accommodations to multilingual students, mainly because they saw these strategies as remedial, with concerns about academic standard being lowered as well as an undesired increase in their already full workload.

Sawir (2011) reports the results of a qualitative study, in which 80 faculty members participated, about their perceptions on the increasing number of international students on campus. Participants’ responses to classroom accommodation vary

according to the discipline taught and the number of international students in the classroom. 34% of the participants were not making adjustments to their teaching. A common reason for that was the presumption that all students are to be treated equally due mainly to the difficulty in identifying who international students are, but also due to the belief that well-planned teaching methods benefit all students. The issue of western academic standards was also brought up as a reason for denying accommodations. On the other hand, 66% of the participants reported making some kind of accommodation, from more abstract ways such as valuing cultural differences and making international students feel welcome, to more concrete ones such as changes to the curriculum due to the nature of the subject taught, and strategies to deal with language issues, such as carefully explaining expectations, and referring students to the language support units. Sawir then criticizes the “sameness” approach, where all students are seen as equal.

Tange (2010) analyzes the influence of internationalization on faculty’s actions and interactions in the classroom. Even though her research was conducted in EMI Danish institutions, several aspects of the study are not exclusive to EMI settings, such as faculty’s anxiety in teaching multicultural and multilingual students and their lack of involvement in internationalization policy-making in the institution which affects their teaching. Qualitative interviews conducted with academic and administrative staff identified the difficulty brought by cultural diversity. Participants had ambiguous perceptions of cultural diversity because on the one hand it may promote intercultural learning. On the other hand, they reported having to learn intercultural skills by themselves to deal with unfamiliar cultural behaviour, due to a lack of institutional support for faculty. Challenges with the language of instruction came from the realization that it affects “the quantity and quality of classroom interaction” (p.147) as well as being “confined to a limited linguistic repertoire” (p. 147), which makes faculty unable to use personal anecdotes, jokes, or even give more detailed, student-friendly explanations. Although the focus of my study is not on the implications of using English in EMI settings, faculty’s challenges in such settings can be similar to those of non-native English-speaking faculty that work in Anglophone institutions, where classrooms are linguistically diverse.

Together with the limited literature on the experiences of faculty in multilingual environments in EDL contexts, a gap in the literature focusing on non-native English-speaking faculty in Anglophone settings has been identified by Pherali (2012) and

Samuels (2016). Samuels (2016) PhD dissertation focuses on the experiences of 14 non-native English or French speaking faculty teaching in Quebec, Canada. The author investigated faculty's "perceptions of themselves as able classroom teachers" (p. ii) and concludes with a list of suggestions on how Canadian institutions can address the challenges faced by faculty, which includes different support systems, but also changing the culture of the university to a greater awareness of the "challenges of teaching and learning at linguistically diverse Canadian universities" (p. 201). Pherali's (2012) study with 7 international faculty in five different British higher education institutions also identifies linguistic and cultural challenges. To tackle those issues, the author suggests that any support system developed by universities should be characterized as training or professional development, since "the provision of standard support system may stereotype the problem with international academics and is likely to dissuade them from using the system" (p. 330).

Despite focusing on academic literacy instead of internationalization per se, Marshall's studies provide relevant insights to issues around multilingualism. The implications of a linguistically diverse student body to content faculty teaching in the Canadian context is the focus of Marshall and Marr (2018). This study is relevant to my thesis because it explores faculty members' understandings of multilingualism, their pedagogical responses to an increasing linguistic-diverse body of students, as well as their perceptions of their role as instructors. Marshall and Moore (2013) focus on the literacy practices of multilingual students, which highlight the complexity and fluidity of students' experiences with multiple languages.

Faculty member's challenges in dealing with increasingly multilingual and multicultural classrooms in internationalized universities are a central aspect in the studies presented in this section. Issues regarding the personal decision of whether or not to make teaching accommodations (Sawir, 2011), challenges posed by international students' language proficiency (Gallagher and Haan, 2017), ambiguous perceptions of internationalization of education (Haan et al, 2017; Tange, 2010; Criswell and Zhu 2015, Friesen, 2012), and pedagogical responses of disciplinary faculty to student linguistic diversity (Marshall and Marr, 2018) are relevant to the experiences of faculty participants in my study and will be further explored in Chapter 4.

Staff and internationalization

The experiences of administrative staff are still underrepresented in the literature (Szekeres, 2004, 2011; Whitchurch, 2008). Judy Szekeres has published extensively on the invisibility of administrative staff in academic and non-academic literature in Australia. In her 2004 paper, “The Invisible Workers” she analyzed a variety of texts about universities, such as academic articles, government reports, and novels, and concluded that administrative staff are often neglected or erroneously portrayed in the literature. This erroneous portraiture came from outdated perceptions of the role these professionals perform in the increasingly complex environment of modern universities. In a following article, Szekeres (2011) argues that even though changes have occurred where universities have become more corporate (Szekeres, 2006), staff still see much of their contribution to the university as “invisible”. A recent example confirming staff invisibility in research on internationalization is Arthur’s (2017) study, which focuses on 3 aspects of academic life that influence international students’ experience: academic faculty, counsellor, and local students, without referring to other administrative or managerial staff who are also important to the overall student experience.

The changes in administrative staff’s roles resulting from the increasingly complex environment of modern universities is analyzed by Whitchurch (2008b). The author identified professional staff in contemporary higher education settings in the UK as having roles and identities that are more complex than what their job descriptions state. Whitchurch identifies a *third space* that has emerged from the increasing blurred boundaries in staff’s activities. Within the *third space* is a combination of professional and academic roles. The author argues that the redefinition of the nature of work in internationalizing universities calls for universities to recognize this trend and the impacts it might have in staff’s identities and professional development.

Pitman (2000) reports the results of a survey about staff’s perceptions of academics and students as “customers” in an Australian university. The results pointed to “ambivalent feelings towards academics as customers and highlighted interpersonal skills between the two groups as a major challenge in facilitating quality customer service” (Pitman, 2000, p. 165). On the other hand, participants identified a positive relationship with students and most reported going beyond the role of service providers by also acting as mentors for students. This association with students came from the

belief that administrative staff “play a vital role in the teaching and learning processes of the University” (Pitman, 2000, p. 173). Pitman’s study, as is the case in Szekeres’ (2004, 2011) research, also reports staff’s perceptions that their work was not recognized or valued, despite their belief that their work is crucial to the institution.

Banta and Kuh (1998) reflect upon the importance of collaboration between faculty and what they called “student affairs professionals” for the success of academic programs and the quality of the student experience. Justification for shedding light on these professionals’ views in the study comes from two premises: first that faculty not always know enough about students’ motivations, needs, experiences and expectations, and second, because faculty alone cannot be held responsible for accomplishing “the college’s objectives for students’ intellectual and personal development” (p.41). Learning does not happen exclusively inside the classroom, and both in-class and out-of-class experiences are crucial for a successful student experience. Therefore, the authors state that collaboration between both parties is essential because “cognitive and affective development are inextricably intertwined and ... the curricular and out-of-class activities are not discrete, independent events; they affect one another (sometimes profoundly) in ways that often are not immediately obvious” (p. 42).

Staff’s views on multilingualism in the context of internationalization at a university in Spain were studied by Llurda, Cots, and Armengol (2014). The research participants were separated in two groups. The first included those who were involved with the implementation of internationalization and multilingualism policies and, consequently had a broader perspective on the issue such as valuing inbound/outbound mobility of students, staff, and faculty, awareness of the necessity for degrees to be offered in different languages, and preference for a heteroglossic approach to multilingualism in which other languages are considered as important as English. Those who were not directly involved with internationalization activities perceived internationalization as being characterized by international student enrolment, saw the use of Spanish, Catalan and English as evidence of multilingualism in the institution, and acknowledged the necessity of degrees offered in English. Both groups believed internationalization requires more effort from the university in terms of funding, training staff and faculty in a third language, and hiring multilingual staff and faculty. A strong connection was made between internationalization and multilingualism, and staff in general have optimistic views, even though they do not necessarily see themselves as

agents of internationalization. The studies reviewed in this section are relevant to my study because they speak to the experiences of staff in internationalized universities from several perspectives.

Chapter 3.

Methodology

How This Study Emerged from My Personal Experiences

I arrived in Canada as an international student in the Fall of 2015 to pursue my post-graduation studies. Living and studying abroad had always been a dream of mine and I chose Canada for its quality of life and multiculturalism, which I believed to be an asset when looking for a job as a foreigner in the country. I was not expecting to easily adapt to my new environment, but I had not anticipated some of the difficulties I faced. Even though I had studied English for more than ten years before coming to Canada and had more than six years of experience teaching the language in a prestigious college in my home country, Brazil, I experienced several linguistic challenges both in and out of the university. I now realize that learning about theories of second language acquisition and sociocultural perspectives in education at university, in addition to expanding my knowledge of the field, also made me realize how native-English speakers might see me: as an ESL learner, a non-native English-speaker, an outsider. I had never identified with these labels before, but I saw my identity shifting and my confidence in my skills fading. I began to feel inadequate and self-conscious about my English proficiency and accent when taking graduate courses and interacting with native English speakers. These moments revealed my 'looking-glass self', in the sense that "our sense of self is a result of our perceptions of how others see us" (van den Hoonaard, 2015, p. 18). In informal conversations with my non-native English-speaking peers I noticed that my feelings of inadequacy were not exclusively mine and I wondered why that was the case⁴.

Soon after I started my graduate program I got a position as research assistant in a project about internationalization of education (which I will explain in detail further in this chapter) which led me to my study. I was interested in the theoretical aspects of globalization and internationalization, in particular the intersection of language and internationalization. But how could I narrow it down to a researchable topic from such a

⁴ I will return to my reflections about my personal experiences in Chapter 7, where I consider what I have learned with this research.

broad theme? The answer was clear to me when I started looking at the data from the research project and noticed that the narratives of different participants addressed the same linguistic challenges I and my non-native English-speaking classmates experienced. Thus, from my involvement with the project I saw an opportunity to begin addressing my burning question: Why do these people (myself included) feel this way about the English language?

Thus, I started this study interested in how my fellow non-native English-speaking students were coping with studying abroad and how being non-native English speakers influenced their experiences. Drawing on Smith (2002), I considered myself part of a 'deviant' group and I was interested in learning more about the experiences of other members of the 'deviant'⁵ category. However, during data analysis I found that other people also expressed their views on non-native English-speaking students: faculty, staff, and native-speaking students as well. Thus, I also became interested in the 'normal' (Smith, 2002) group's perceptions on, and experiences with, the 'deviant' group. By looking closely at their narratives, I could see patterns in their way of thinking and even in their attitudes towards international students. I could also see that beliefs people held about language proficiency (their own or of others) influenced their actions or how they behave. For example, an international student who used to teach English at university level in his home country did not participate verbally in his graduate seminar because he was insecure about his language proficiency. A faculty member who believes in an inclusive classroom environment chose to let students look at the dictionary in the beginning of their tests, so they do not lose marks for misunderstanding vocabulary. An administrative staff member who believes that multilingualism and multiculturalism are positive for the university decided to take an interest in students' lives and connect with them more meaningfully by showing interest in their cultures and languages. My data was filled with stories where it was clear people were acting according to their beliefs. With so many examples of so many people expressing their views on linguistic diversity, I shifted my focus from the experiences of non-native

⁵ As it will become clear below, the work of Canadian sociologist Dorothy Smith informed significantly how the research project I worked on was conceptualized and thus her writings impacted my thinking on the data we collected. In Smith (2002), 'deviant' refers to single mothers and 'normal' to a family constituted by a generating income father, wife/mother at home, and children at school. In my analogy, 'normal' is the local native English speaker (student, staff, or faculty) and 'deviant' is the international, multilingual student.

English speakers, exclusively, to a more broad and holistic analysis concerning the involvement of student, staff, and faculty with linguistic diversity and internationalization.

The Study - An Institutional-Ethnography-Informed Qualitative Study

I draw the data for my study from a SSHRC-funded research project which aimed to develop an in-depth understanding of the experiences of students, staff, and faculty who are “engaged in the practices of internationalization in order to better understand the many dimensions of internationalization” (Beck & Ilieva, 2011). Approaches of institutional ethnography (Smith, 1987, 2005, 2006) informed the qualitative study conducted at a medium-sized Canadian University to address the following research questions:

1. How do administrators, faculty, staff and students in a Western Canadian university understand and experience internationalization? What is an international, intercultural or global dimension?
2. What does it mean to “prepare graduates who are internationally knowledgeable and interculturally competent” (Knight, 2000, p. 17) (otherwise known as academic rationales), according to administrators, faculty, staff and students in a Western Canadian University?
3. What conceptualizations of internationalization inform the curriculum and pedagogy of academic programs directly related to supporting internationalization? (Beck & Ilieva, 2011, p. 1)

Institutional ethnography is a method of inquiry developed by Dorothy Smith that “begins with the issues and problems of people’s lives and develops inquiry from the standpoint of their experience in and of the actualities of their everyday living” (Smith, 2002, p. 27). Institutional ethnography starts from the premise of “the everyday world as problematic for investigation” (Smith, 2002, p. 27) and it aims “to create a sociology *for* rather than *of* people” (p. 28). Therefore, the institutional ethnographic approach is centered on dialogue between the researcher and the participant instead of looking for generalizable answers to pre-formulated questions. In fact, different perspectives and interests are expected. The unique experiences of each participant matter and the language used in their narratives matters because “they are the expert practitioners of their everyday worlds” (p. 29).

Central to institutional ethnography is the concept of ruling relations, which “refers to an expansive, historically specific apparatus of management and control that arose with the development of corporate capitalism and supports its operation” (Devault, 2006, p. 295). The work of the researcher is then to identify and map those relations in an attempt to raise awareness of “how [participants’] own lives and work are hooked into the lives and work of others in relations of which most of us are not aware” (Smith, 2002, p. 27). Therefore, this research project aimed to look at the social relations present in students’, staff, and faculty’s narratives to illuminate the ruling relations existing in this internationalizing university.

Participants

The participants in this project were recruited from across the departments and disciplines at MU. The first step of the project was the application of an institution-wide survey to participants recruited via e-mail lists from each of the 8 MU faculties. Following the surveys, participants were invited to a qualitative interview. The surveys and semi-structured interview questionnaires were tailored to the specific group of participants: faculty, staff, and students (see Appendix A).

A total of 92 students, 24 administrative staff, and 26 faculty were interviewed from 2014 to 2017 by the research team, which included 2 faculty members and 5 research assistants (myself included). Each semi-structured interview varied from 45 minutes to 1h30. After each interview, the audio file was transcribed by one of the research assistants and stored in a protected file in the Internationalization of Education Research Centre (IERC) computer. Even though the position of the researchers, as “producers of discourse” (Cheek, 2008, p. 359) is never neutral, in order to minimize researcher bias, each interview was coded and subsequently re-analyzed in a collaboration effort between the professors and the research assistants.

My involvement in the project

My involvement in the qualitative aspect of the research project in the capacity of research assistant occurred from 2015 to 2017. In my role as research assistant I participated actively in all aspects of the research: participant recruitment, interviewing, audio transcription, coding, and interview data analysis. The data shared later in this

thesis includes the experiences with linguistic diversity at MU of three staff members and two students whom I personally interviewed while other participants' views discussed here were part of interviews conducted by other members of the research team.

As a novice researcher I did not have prior experience in any aspect of the research process. First, I learned the basics of each process from observing more experienced members of the team, listening to previous interviews, and reading transcripts and codes. Later, I learned from my own experience. I interviewed students and staff, and the difference between interviewing both groups was significant. As a student myself I already had the necessary background knowledge to establish rapport, but with staff I had to be much more prepared before each interview. Preparation included research on the position the person occupied, the department, and if available online, some personal background. I noticed that some participants were as anxious as I was for the interview, specially students who were unsure about the meaning of internationalization. Fortunately, I was able to connect with each interviewee by providing information about the study, by explaining that there were no right or wrong answers, and by demonstrating curiosity about their experiences and opinions. According to Kvale (2007), "a good interview question should contribute thematically to knowledge production and dynamically to providing a good interview interaction" (p.56). It took me a couple of interviews to achieve a good balance between theme and dynamics. Although the interview guides (see Appendix A) were essential to the process, they were easier to follow in student interviews. Staff's responses were usually more elaborate and often encompassed more topics. Even though I did not interview any faculty members, I transcribed and helped code their interviews, which made me familiar with the three groups being researched.

In my first encounters with the data I noticed that approximately one third of the total number of participants identified language as an important aspect of internationalization of education and their academic experience. This realization sparked my curiosity and prompted me to observe more attentively what exactly participants were expressing when they brought up language issues. With the permission of Dr. Kumari Beck and Dr. Roumi Ilieva I submitted a proposal to the university's Office of Research Ethics for the use of the research secondary data for my MA thesis.

The theme of my study emerged from participants' narratives in connection to one of the original research questions from the project: How do administrators, faculty, staff and students in a Western Canadian university understand and experience internationalization? Understandings and experiences with internationalization are, as predicted by the research team and later on confirmed by the data, complex and multifaceted. Therefore, in this study I look at one aspect of the many possible understandings of internationalization expressed by participants: language issues, which in and of themselves reflect a variety of understandings.

Using Secondary Data: Implications, Benefits and Challenges

The use of secondary data has implications for the process of data analysis. Johnston (2014) argues that “while secondary analysis is flexible and can be utilized in several ways, it is also an empirical exercise and a systematic method with procedural and evaluative steps, just as in collecting and evaluating primary data” (p. 619). Therefore, the author suggests that the process of secondary analysis starts with the development of research questions. However, as van den Hoonaard (2015) explains, the design of qualitative research is emergent and allows for flexibility and adaptation. My process followed an approach of “finding a question in the data” (van den Hoonaard, 2015, p. 159). My process of data analysis was cyclical (van den Hoonaard, 2015) and the preliminary coding helped me refine the following research questions:

How do students, staff and faculty perceive and experience linguistic diversity in the context of a transcultural university?

How do ideologies and assumptions about language and multilingualism inform and shape students', staff, and faculty experiences in an internationalizing university?

After defining my research questions and identifying the major themes in relation to language issues, I started creating sub codes for students, staff, and faculty using the software Nvivo. As a novice researcher I once again followed van den Hoonaard's advice to not get overwhelmed by the data trying to find elements in it that confirm a predetermined hypothesis. Instead I chose to “trust the process” (van den Hoonaard, 2015, p. 155) and analyzed the data carefully to see what were the prominent themes

that emerged. In the end, I narrowed down my data sample to focus on the narratives of 18 students, 12 faculty, and 8 staff who consistently talked about language when asked questions about the consequences, challenges, and benefits of internationalization of education.

Lack of data can be an issue in secondary analysis. However, differently from missing quantitative data, which requires specific measures to ensure the results can be adequately analyzed and replicated (McKnight and McKnight, 2011), in qualitative research what is left unsaid can also be interpreted by the researcher (van den Hoonaard, 2015). Many times, I felt I needed more information from certain participants. However, I then relied on Smith's (2002) tenet that

recognizing interviewing or observation as essentially dialogic recognizes the researcher's interests in the research as integral to the dialogue while at the same time relying on the other to teach, if you like, what the researcher must learn from him or her (p. 37-38).

By using secondary data for my study, I had the advantage of analyzing a larger sample than it would have been possible if I was conducting my own research. Furthermore, it gave me the opportunity to look at my topic, language issues, from a broader perspective: internationalization of education. When participants problematized language in the context of internationalization, their answers emerged as a response to a process that has been happening at MU and which they are a part of. Therefore, their perceptions on language issues are not only ideas, they are part of their lived experiences.

Analyzing the Data

Instead of a systematic method to analyze the data, I employed a *bricolage* of methods, mainly aspects of qualitative interviewing and Foucauldian discourse analysis. I was also guided by theoretical readings, or the use of "different theoretical positions" (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 269), which are explained in the Theoretical Framework and Literature Review chapter.

Even though Foucauldian Discourse Analysis does not refer to a set of research methods (Hook, 2001), I am interested in the relations of power expressed by the participants when they talk about their perceptions of linguistic diversity in the

internationalized university as historically and socially situated. As explained by Cook (2008), “a Foucauldian approach to discourse, rather than exploring the rules that govern meaning-making, focuses on the power inherent in language and seeks to understand how historically and socially instituted sources of power construct the wider social world through language” (p. 217).

In addition, Cheek (2012) explains that

Foucauldian discourse analysis offers the potential to challenge ways of thinking about aspects of reality that have come to be viewed as being natural and therefore tend to be taken for granted. It can enable us to explore how things have come to be the way they are, how it is that they remain that way, and how else they might have been or could be. (p. 356)

Participants’ beliefs and assumptions about language are historically, socially, and ideologically situated, and they include perceptions of multilingualism, connections between multilingualism and cognition, and “correct” and appropriate ways of using language. Therefore, besides hearing what they have to say, I was also interested in digging deeper and look for similarities in their ways of thinking and connecting their ideas to the ruling relations (Smith, 2002) and ideologies that tend to legitimize recurrent and familiar behaviours with respect to language matters (Fairclough, 2001). The way participants talk about language and linguistic proficiency reflect assumptions that are viewed by them as natural, and even the act of challenging those assumptions implies recognition of the dominant discourses in that respect. I also had in mind that “social relations are already implicit in *how* people talk about their work”⁶ (Smith, 2002, p. 31) so in their narratives I looked for what participants said that connected their experiences to the actions and perceptions of other people at the university.

According to Cheek (2012) “drawing on Foucauldian understandings, discourse refers to ways of thinking and speaking about aspects of reality. Discourses operate to order reality in certain ways”, (p. 357). This approach is compatible with institutional ethnography, since Smith draws on Foucault’s concept of discourse and goes further by “introducing the presence of people and how discourse coordinates their doing” (Smith,

⁶ In institutional ethnography, work means all intended activities that involve “effort, competence, resources” (Smith, 2012, p. 437).

2012, p. 435). Participants' views on language and linguistic proficiency are one of the many possible interpretations of this aspect of reality.

Relations of power affect which discourses are afforded legitimacy and even existence. Since discourse can be used "both to claim authority and presence in certain settings and to exclude other possible discursive framings" (Cheek, 2012, p. 357), by analyzing recurrent themes in participant's discourse it is possible to unveil which discourses have been allowed and how the reality of having multilingual students at the university is being interpreted.

This study thus began with students', staff, and faculty's experiences and concerns in the institutional setting of an internationalizing university. My goal was to analyze how language, one of the different aspects of the complex institutional relations organizing the university, shapes their lives and activities. More specifically, I looked at the interplay between assumptions about language proficiency, power, and everyday/everynight (Smith, 2002) experiences. From the data it becomes clear that the work (or activities) of other people (either a professor, a colleague or classmate, a student) directly influence each participant's experience. These social relations are mediated by texts: university policies, job descriptions, classroom materials, university mission statements, and advertisements, as well as texts that reinforce an ideological view of language proficiency, such as the mainstream media. Therefore, when analyzing participants' narratives I looked for references to ruling relations, or how the texts and/or work of others shape the way these people experience university life. It is important to emphasize that participants' accounts are understandings rather than descriptions of the reality (Cheek, 2008). Thus, I did not look for 'proof' that certain ideologies were present at MU, influencing participants' activities. Instead, I looked at each participant's understandings of their own experiences.

Chapter 4.

Student Experiences

In total, 92 students were interviewed for the SHHRC project about internationalization of education at MU (Beck & Ilieva, 2011). From those, I will focus specifically on the interviews of 18 participants: eight domestic and 10 international who discuss language matters in great detail. The majority of observations with respect to language had a negative connotation. Participants focused mainly on what are perceived as problematic aspects of either being or interacting with non-native English speakers. Few participants highlighted the positive aspects of cultural and linguistic diversity on campus and presented a critical perspective that countered what could be viewed as the dominant discourse representing international students as academically inadequate. The most common topics revolved around discrimination, academic/linguistic standards, and cultural differences.

Language Matters in the Institution

The data in student interviews overwhelmingly reflects a monolingual lens in perceptions of language matters in the institution evident in students' comments on several related topics discussed below.

“Every day I feel my English is not good enough”: Standard language ideology

Alex, an undergraduate domestic student in the Faculty of Applied Sciences, described his experience in a class that is known for being group-focused: “There’s been a lot of horror stories around that one class because you get someone like me, that only speaks English, and if they don’t know anybody in the class, you get stuck into a group of people that don’t speak English.” Many students talk about low proficiency levels, lack of fundamental language skills, and even use the expression “broken English”, but Alex went beyond that and referred to some students as non-speakers of English. Such characterization ignores individual language skills, linguistic variation, not to mention university entry language proficiency requirements that, flawed as they might be, still

ensure that every student has language proficiency deemed by the university as acceptable. Alex then describes what it was like to be in the same group with an international student: “It was a handicap because she wasn't able to communicate with the rest of the team effectively. I think it's very much a language barrier.”

When asked about the positive and negative impacts of internationalization, Alicia, a local undergraduate student in Business, replied that a good thing was learning more about the world, but the downside was having to work “with people who cannot write a sentence”. She also expressed that “ESL students” are the only ones who benefit from group work because, due to their low English proficiency, their work ends up being done by the native speakers: “In previous classes I have had groups with ESL students and you do the work for them. You carry the people along and it benefits them.” For her, English proficiency has to increase on campus and standards have to be met, even though she does not expand on what those standards are.

The “native/non-native speaker” ideological dichotomy was invoked with different terminologies: as “speaker/non-speaker of English” (Alex), and also as “us/them”, in the case of Alicia and Tpool, an undergraduate student in psychology. Tpool's reductionist categories refer to native English speakers (us) as able to efficiently work in groups and understand academic concepts, and non-native English speakers (them) as people who add extra work for the group and for whom the content is challenging:

sometimes it is very challenging. The work they provide. For us, since English is our first language, we are able to get it right. But for them, since it's not their first language, some of them just moved to Canada (I don't know the history of my groupmates), so it's challenging.

In Alex, Alicia, and Tpool's examples of challenging interactions with international students it seems that the responsibility of an effective communication was placed entirely on the speaker, in this case the international student in their group, without considering the role the rest of the team played in the communication process. Their positioning reflects standard language ideology and whomever deviates from a hypothetical standard is assumingly not speaking the language at all. For example, self-positioning as superior to the other group members due to the fact that he only speaks English relates to the so-called “language as a problem” orientation where “monolingualism in a dominant majority language is valued” (Hult & Hornberger, 2016, p. 33).

A preoccupation with maintaining the standards of the English language is also present in students' accounts. The preoccupation is that by having large groups of students speaking other languages on campus, Canadian values and culture are supposedly endangered. Sharalyn, a graduate student in the Faculty of Education emphasizes the ideological assumption that people should aspire to a standardized national language as a way of "respecting" the "English culture and language". Links between language and culture drawn in some students' interviews will be discussed in more detail in another section of this chapter, but it is important to note here that Hult and Hornberger (2016) reflect on the language as a problem orientation pervasive in many settings as a monolingual perspective which values linguistic assimilation and sees "linguistic diversity as a threat to national unity which is best achieved with a single, common language." (p.34).

Most international students agree that the English language and Canadian values are very important for their education and life abroad and some of them share similar views on the need for maintaining linguistic standards. For non-native English speakers, the enactment of standard language ideology was evident in their self-consciousness, feelings of inferiority, and lack of certainty in one's academic competence. Samantha, an undergraduate student in Business, talks about the challenges for newcomers and how even though she went to an English medium high school her English is "not perfect". Ji-woon, a graduate student in Education, explains that he does not often participate in discussions because his English is "not good enough". Sreejit, an MBA student, says his "proficiency is lower" when compared with Canadians. Assumptions about linguistic standardization can be problematic when students start to compare themselves and their peers to an idealized version of the language, which does not actually exist (see Lippi-Green, 2012).

Denise was an English teacher in Brazil but nevertheless she felt challenges associated with language during her masters' program at MU. She talks about her expectations when she arrived in Canada and her frustration when she perceived that academic English expected at graduate school was different than the English she thought she had mastered. Ji-woon, who was also an English teacher in his home country, describes similar issues:

In Korea I teach English, but ironically, I have kind of inferiority about my English because generally speaking my English ability is not that bad, compared to other Korean teachers in Korea, but here in Vancouver I think my English is not good enough to take some courses in grad school, and every day I feel my English is not good enough.

A similar view is shared by Ratna, one of the participants in Fotovatian and Miller (2014), who reports that her greatest challenge was her perception of “being judged on her professional legitimacy” (p.291) as a NNS English teacher. According to the authors, the academic environment does not always correspond to students’ idealized views of academia. Both Denise and Ji-Woon report difficulties in reading academic articles and following fast-paced language in lectures, which, combined with their self-consciousness about their language skills, affects their participation in class. These challenges were also identified by participants in Ryan and Viete (2009).

“People here don’t really see race, BUT (...): Raciolinguistic ideology

Besides blaming their language skills for unsuccessful interactions, some international students also made a connection between race and linguistic discrimination they have sensed in communicating with other students and professors. Samantha and Megan talk about discrimination they and their friends seem to have experienced for being Asian and their struggles to make themselves understood by a professor. Samantha, an undergraduate student in Business, explains that many times she does not think language is the problem, instead she perceives an unwillingness from others to engage in conversation and understand international students’ points of view:

one of my friends, he told me his prof is really don’t like him because he go to the prof to ask question and the prof always say, “I don’t understand you.” But he said that he don’t think it is like the language thing. He had explained really clear and he even just brings a note to the prof and say, “That’s what I’m unclear.” Like the prof say, “Oh, I don’t get you.” So, sometimes you don’t really—because it is embarrassing, right. It is really hard to tell, you don’t know if the prof really don’t understand you or just don’t want to tell you the answer, right.

Similarly, Megan, an undergraduate student in Finance, believes that miscommunication between her and a professor goes beyond linguistic issues and actually might reflect that her questions “may be too Asian based”, while the professor might be “too North-America focused”. Even though Megan believes her cultural positioning is the reason why the professor did not understand her question, she blamed

herself and her language skills for the unsuccessful interaction: “He didn't listen to me. I think if my English is better he'd feel more comfortable when listening to me.” Megan's perception that the professor was not listening to her because of her language skills or her cultural background is not uncommon. One of the participant's in Morita's (2004) study, Rie, reports that her classmates and teachers were ignoring her due to her inadequate language proficiency. Straker (2016) cites several examples from the literature in which international students' participation is negatively influenced by their perceptions of being judged based on their linguistic competence. Samantha's and Megan's words illustrate some international students' struggle to negotiate their voice and participation in class when they feel that their voices are not as valued as other students'. In addition to Morita's (2004) and Straker's (2016) findings that international students' participation is negatively impacted by their language skills, Samantha and Megan's narratives draw attention to another feature that perhaps hinders their interactions: raciolinguistic discrimination. As discussed in chapter 2, for Flores and Rosa (2015) it is not the way some people use the language, but the fact that the listening subject interprets the message based on the speaker's racial positioning in society that reflects raciolinguistic ideology in action. In that sense, changing the way racialized students speak might not change the response they get.

Sharalyn, a graduate student in Education who is from Asia, criticizes the language proficiency of Asian students in particular, which raises the question of whether raciolinguistic ideology can be manifested towards people from the same background:

I took course in TA, and there were 20 students in the class, and I'd say 80% are Asian. You must be a grad student to attend that program, and the way they speak, I can't even understand the way they speak English. And they were all hired as a TA.

The raciolinguistic ideology was also explicitly present in one domestic student's accounts. When asked about how internationalization is showing up on campus, Ray said:

I see different people from different places on the hallways and in lecture halls, I see them talking even they look like they are from different countries, and people here don't really see race, but it also depends on how someone communicates and holds him or her, because some people only talk to people who speak their first language, then those who don't see race will

suddenly see it. I don't see races in different people, though I could see the differences.

In addition to this explicit reference to race, during some interviews I myself conducted I seemed to perceive a somewhat veiled racism from some domestic participants towards international students, in terms of the tone of voice used to refer to some students, references to cultural practices and behaviours in class associated with certain groups, and mentions of neighbourhoods known for having large populations of immigrants especially from China. Thus, even though only one domestic student mentioned race in his interview, the raciolinguistic ideology might be implicit in narratives that talk about the low level of English proficiency of international students due to the predominance of Chinese students on campus. Overall, the data presented in this section confirms the interrelation between language ideologies and race found in literature (Lippi-Green, 2012; Flores & Rosa, 2015).

“You don’t have time to sit and correct the English along the way.”: Challenges for students who work as teaching assistants

Participants expressed dissatisfaction with low levels of language proficiency not only reflecting standard language ideology that epitomizes aspirations to conform to an idealized and inexistent form of language, or raciolinguistic ideology that views racialized minorities as linguistically deficient, but also due to practical problems, mainly when marking assignments.

Paula, a graduate student in Environmental Science who also works as a Teaching Assistant, shares an insightful analysis on the issue:

Having worked as a sessional instructor and also as a TA, I find that from an undergraduate perspective sometimes the language skills of some of the, not so much the grad students, but the undergraduate students, that can be quite a challenge. So I think that in some cases, I don’t know, I know that there’s a TOEFL test exam that they need to pass, but I find that in practice they don’t necessarily have the skills to really succeed in the same way and it becomes quite a challenge when trying to be teaching English at the same time as helping them come up with advanced university level concepts, and trying to grapple with that. From a teaching perspective it’s frustrating for other students in the classroom, and the students themselves who are going through that stress of trying to figure it out. And I think there’s not much support for faculty to be able to deal with that as well. I think that’s the other side of it too, it’s not necessarily providing them ways of working through that. So, it’s an added stress on teaching as well.

For Paula, lack of support from the university creates an unfair situation for (1) TAs, who have to try and teach language at the same time as the course content, most of the time without the proper background to be able to do it, (2) students who do not need language assistance get impatient in class, and (3) students who need language assistance feel frustrated trying to figure out the concepts without the proper assistance.

Debbie, a graduate student and Teaching Assistant in Archeology complains about the lack of guidance and resources for training TAs on how to address language issues and explains that she had to learn how to deal with those problems by herself. She thinks it is unfair to students that TAs/TMs do not have the time to assist them with language:

I don't think they [the University] are providing them [international students] with a good education because there isn't that help around the actual English language skills. The instructors don't have time. I have a four-course load ... so you don't have time to sit and correct all the English along the way.

Paula and Debbie's comments highlight the need to recognize the complexity inherent in addressing language matters in the university setting and the need for institutional support in dealing with these matters not only for students perceived as lacking sufficient language proficiency, but also for those who work with them.

“Globalization? Maybe unification, I think.”: Challenging language ideologies (challenging the status quo)

Few students indicated a critical perspective by questioning linguistic inequality, the hegemony of the English language, and fixed institutional practices that do not take international students' needs into consideration.

Grace, an undergraduate student in Business, tries to be sympathetic with students for whom English is an additional language by suggesting that local students volunteer to help them with their speaking skills. This idea is in fact the premise of the Mentorship Program, where students are assigned a mentor to help them navigate university life. However, as Jennifer, a graduate student in the Faculty of Education points out, labels like “international student” or “non-native English speaker” have negative connotations and are used to marginalize groups of people, a point clearly

expressed in the literature (see for example, Anderson, 2014; Fotovatian and Miller, 2014; Marshall, 2010; Waterstone, 2008):

When I look at this label (international students), it's a label that's attached to non-native speakers in an English-speaking country, so to me that label is the same as non-native English speakers and often it has negative meanings, and also when we discuss international students, the descriptions we come up with, they're marginalized.

In that sense, the use of the term "mentee" may also carry a negative tone and be associated with the marginalization of students who need mentorship.

Jenny, an international undergraduate student in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, compared the term internationalization to globalization and believes every culture and language should be respected, but what actually happens is that the English language is the only one being used. She makes the critical remark that for her it is ironic that even though the research assistant who interviewed her for the project and she are Asian, the interview was conducted in English. For her, a better term than "globalization" would be "unification", an allusion to acculturation:

Actually, it is really ironic, people say like we should globalize, right, but we still use only one language, actually English, right. But I feel like maybe globalization means like we have to respect every single culture, so it means that we should respect every single language or like food or other things but just, yeah, like in Canada or United States we just use English. Yeah, even though I'm sitting here, yeah, I have to use English, right, but it is not. It is really ironic. Globalization? Maybe unification I think—yeah.

Ian, a domestic graduate student from the Health Sciences faculty who works as a Teaching Assistant questioned his own way of correcting international students' writings:

I think it's unfair that the school is not more lenient on international students. Some of them have a different way of writing and expressing themselves, but that doesn't mean they're not expressing themselves in a way that makes sense to them. I think we need to listen to what these students have to teach us in the way that they know how to express themselves because it's not like there is only one way to write a paper. I can see the mistakes they make based on what I have learned about what is the right way to write a paper, and I correct their papers, but I get sad sometimes because I am changing something that they are expressing in a really nice way.

Ian's comment relates to the critical awareness demonstrated by Susan, the international undergraduate student in Waterstone's (2008) case study, when she states

that “[What I need] is to express myself at the level which is *acceptable* as normal by native speakers” (p. 63-64). Both Ian and Susan understand that “what is acceptable is a norm determined by the speech of the dominant-class native speakers” (Waterstone, 2008, p. 64). Ian thinks professors, TAs, and other students should be more open and listen to different voices and forms of expression. He adds: “It feels like for all the rhetoric at MU about being a place for international students, they don’t do much to appreciate them”, which confirms Ryan And Viete’s (2009) statement that Western knowledge is often legitimized as international in focus, yet there is no indication that the focus is developing through “genuine intercultural dialogue”. (p.304)

Overall, the value of multilingualism as an asset supporting learning (Marshall & Moore, 2013) is absent from student interviews and language matters in the institution are only discussed in terms of the ruling relations of English shaping participants’ experiences.

Language and Culture

When non-native English-speaking participants talked about language and culture, two sub themes prevailed: connections between language and culture; and a tension between wanting to adapt to the host country culture and at the same time having their home culture valued.

“What they take for granted was not familiar to me.”: Language and culture connections

The choice to participate in classroom discussions and the extent of students’ participation is a complex process. Ji-woon’s reasons for not always participating in classroom discussions captures the complexity of the issue and reflects reasons that were also given by other participants in this study.

When I took classes with Canadian teachers we could share our teaching experiences, the differences and similarities, so that was good. But sometimes I felt it was really hard to take part in the discussion because they were so fast in speaking and all of them know well about Canadian society and what they take for granted, was not familiar to me. And because of my English proficiency it was really hard for me to take part in discussions. I normally didn't speak a lot in class. But when I took [a] course with [predominantly] Chinese students I felt, it was easier being relaxed in

class because my English proficiency is similar to theirs, and we, even though there's some historical tension between Korea and China, still as just normal, regular people we share Confucian theory so I could understand how they feel. I felt much more relaxed with them. But I wanted to improve my English, so I wanted to take courses with Canadians. (...) And the other reason was because of my personality, because I don't like being in front of others, I don't want the spotlight from others. The third reason is my English is not good enough. There's a process time when I listen to them, I need some time to understand them, because I listen in English, I process in Korean, so there's some process time, but the discussion moves quite fast, so when I wanted to say something they moved to the next theme or next one, so it was very hard for me to get in the conversation. The fourth because of the cultural difference between Western countries and Asian countries. In Korea we think that modesty is very important, we don't usually show ourselves a lot, but here it's OK for people to speak out their opinion. But in Korea we don't speak our opinion quite directly.

Findings from Morita's (2004) study of two international students' participation in class suggest that "behind their reticence were multiple, interrelated issues, including not only language related issues, but also issues of culture, identity, curriculum, pedagogy, and power" (p. 596). A similar conclusion may be drawn about Ji-Woon's narrative, given his four different explanations for his silence in class. Ji-Woon's comment also brings the attention to the importance of culture in the overall experience of international students when he talks about feeling more comfortable among Chinese students than with Canadian students, despite language differences between China and Korea and the historical tensions between both countries. Therefore, language is only one aspect that impacts international student experience. As indicated by Ryan and Viete (2009), important elements in student experience are overlooked when universities focus solely on international students' language difficulties.

Sharalyn seems to express the connection many students make between culture and language: "I do think we need to respect the English culture as one of the primary language." This association can prove to be problematic when there is the assumption that if someone is not speaking English then consequently this person is not participating in the local culture. It also raises the question of what English one needs to speak to be considered part of the culture. The respect for the English language and culture mentioned by Sharalyn may lead to ideological assumptions of a standard language that should be everyone's goal, without considering different people's histories, assets, and purposes.

Besides reflecting on connections between language and culture, some students attempted to differentiate both concepts. When asked what internationalization means to her, Samantha associated the term with being able to understand different cultures:

I think it [internationalization] is more like you understand different culture. I don't think like really languages, although if you live here, language is really important, you have to communicate, you have to explain yourself. But I think the most important is, for myself, I think is the culture. Culture is more the thing you should understand because even though you have to communicate with others, if you don't know the culture sometimes the communication will be interrupt and it will be misleading to another.

Clearly, addressing language matters in the internationalized university inevitably requires engaging with matters of cultural diversity as well, a point well developed by Baker (2016) in his discussion of the transcultural university and expanded upon later in this thesis.

For Debbie, globalization “ideally would allow an intercultural exchange of ideas and ways of knowing and doing things”, but lack of resources for TAs to deal with language issues prevents that from happening. On a similar note, some participants in Guo and Guo's (2017) criticized internationalization as “dominated by the global advantage of English and Anglo-Canadian culture” (p. 861). According to Leask and Carroll (2011) simply having students from different cultures sharing a classroom does not guarantee intercultural learning.

“They stick to their own cultures.”: (Lack of) cultural negotiation

The second sub-theme relates to Ryan and Viete's (2009) question of how much the international student has to adapt to the host institution conventions and norms and how much the academy should change its teaching and learning practices to include students from different cultures. A common understanding among participants in my study is that international students need to adopt the culture of the host country and, interestingly, this view is shared by both domestic and international students.

When international students from the same country get together and form their own groups on campus they are often judged for not trying to integrate into the local community and can even be the target of racist comments. Tim, an international Economics graduate student, thinks it is obvious that international students will not use

English to talk to people from their own countries. However, many students think that speaking other languages on campus creates what Ray, a domestic undergraduate student in Criminology, called “barriers between people”, can reflect disrespect for the local culture, and often times is seen as a sign of isolation and unwillingness to integrate into the local environment. Mike, a domestic graduate student in Geography, shared a similar view. For him, internationalization “has attracted a very specific cohort of people who are defining their own almost segregated community.” When asked how he felt about the Canadian Federal Government plans to double the number of international students by 2020, Ray talked about students from the same cultural backgrounds forming groups:

I wouldn't mind more international students to BC and even [MU], but there should be more help for them to adopt to the new culture because Canada is a multicultural country, but some international students don't recognize it as multicultural. Instead they bring their cultures here which is fine because they're supposed to do that; but they don't take the chance to learn other cultures. They stick to their own cultures and are limited and constrained in the little circle.

His narrative represents the belief that international students need to adapt to the host culture, but also the contradiction between recognizing that Canada is a multicultural country and expecting people to conform to a predetermined, idealized view of what the Canadian culture is. Ray is an immigrant from Taiwan and, therefore has domestic student status, which he is proud of. He did his high school in Vancouver but he had to take ESL classes when he started his undergraduate studies at MU. In his interview, he separates himself from international students because of his status in Canada, even though he shares many similarities with them, including what he calls his “broken English”. His critique of international students “sticking to their own cultures” seems to be a way of distancing himself from his Taiwanese background and reinforcing his identity as Canadian. He also seems to struggle between wanting to be friends with international students and seeing this as retrogressing to when he himself was an international student: “I try to reach out to them [international students] but a lot of times when I want to reach out to them I feel that they want to bring me back to be like them, and spending time with them will make my vision narrower.” Ray is an example of students who are not properly defined by the binary domestic/international and his quote represents one of the complexities of internationalization, the identity struggles many students experience. Ray demonstrates a great sense of agency by resisting the label

ESL that the institution imposed on him despite the fact that he had completed high school in Canada (see Marshall, 2010). Yet, his ambiguity vis-à-vis international students could perhaps be seen through the work of Ryan and Viète (2009). Ryan and Viète illustrate situations where students end up denying their own identities to fit into the academic environment, as an example of “internalized oppression” (Freire, 1970).

Another conflict which is familiar to many international students is on the one hand, the struggle to be a part of the local culture by conforming to the local norms, customs, and language, and on the other hand, the desire to be valued as an individual with assets that can contribute to the local community. Sharalyn feels frustrated that international students’ skills and experience are not valued or deemed as important as those of domestic students. When asked about what internationalization means to her, she immediately made the same connection as most participants in Guo and Guo (2017): that international students are revenue generators to the university:

For me, first thing that comes to my mind it’s business. (...) talking about the population in terms of undergrad, more than 20% and they pay at least 3 times more, so that’s definitely where the money comes from. One international students could support 2 to 3 local students.(...) I don’t think it’s fair. Because coming from a culture that’s different from Canada we bring lots of experience here. And while Canada calls itself multicultural country, I do see as international student, we do have other skills or experience that we can actually contribute to local students. But that’s not being valued by asking us to pay more.

The snippets of data discussed in this subsection exemplify difficulties some international and immigrant students face in attempting to negotiate a position in the institution where they are not forced to choose between adopting Canadian cultural values and feeling proud of the cultural values, skills and experiences they bring from elsewhere to the internationalizing university.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed student data around language matters in the internationalized university. As mentioned, the most pervasive theme in student data reflected engagement with standard language ideology. Participants’ narratives involving language ideologies are surrounded by relations of power (Fairclough, 2001) that (de)legitimize them and other international students based on linguistic patterns

(Wortham, 2001). Perceptions around a standard form of the language assumed different forms for native English speakers and students for whom English is an additional language. The first group mostly evoked the standard English to classify international students as linguistically (and sometimes cognitively) deficient and assert themselves as superior. The latter mainly judged their own linguistic abilities in light of an idealized form of the language, which in their perception they do not master. Even though the references to the standard language ideology were different, they all reflect non-native English speaker delegitimization. The connection between race and linguistic discrimination was highlighted. In addition, the necessity to engage with matters of cultural diversity when addressing language issues in the internationalizing university was evident.

In the next chapter I will focus on the experiences and perceptions faculty members share when reflecting on internationalization as linked to language matters in the university.

Chapter 5.

Faculty Experiences

26 faculty members were interviewed for the SSHRC research project (Beck & Ilieva, 2011), but I will focus on interviews of the 12 participants who identified language as an important aspect of internationalization of higher education and expanded on their answers by providing details, explanations, and examples of their experience. More specifically, I will describe in detail how beliefs and assumptions about language shape faculty's perceptions and experiences in the internationalizing university.

“There has been a lowering of standards.”: Perceptions of Multilingual Students’ Language Proficiency

Many participants attribute the increase in the number of international students on campus and what they perceive as low levels of English language proficiency to the politics of attracting international students. Sarah, a faculty member in Sociology, reflects on the increase in international student enrollment:

the question is then: do you think of international students only as people who come to pay or do you also think of it as something that by attracting students who bring certain qualifications who are actually raising the prestige of the institution, are you raising the overall level of learning?

She also considers the possible impact in faculty-student relationships brought by the economic rationale of internationalization, or instrumentalism ideology, which understands internationalization as market-driven, focused on economic growth mainly by attracting high tuition-paying students (Stier, 2004):

On the one hand, I think maybe people are right to be critical of the economic rationality of bringing in international students, but on the other hand there is a danger that then it affects the faculty's relationship with international students if they think of them as these people are just here because they had the money to pay or there is also this kind of intimation that they kind of bought their way into the system.

Steve, a faculty member in Archeology, believes that, on the one hand internationalization in education has the power to “make all of the knowledge of the world available to everyone, at least in theory”, but on the other hand the commodification of knowledge and education “can have a really negative impact on the quality of education on not fulfilling the needs of local students because you are filling up seats with folks from elsewhere”. Consequently, many students have English as an additional language and “do not have the means to communicate effectively”, which in his view affects the attention native English speakers receive. Steve’s observations confirm Sarah’s preoccupation with a negative impact on faculty-international student relationships if faculty derive their views on international students from the economic rationale of internationalization.

The standard language ideology was present in faculty’s narratives mainly through the idealized assumption of linguistic academic standards. One of the negative consequences of internationalization identified by Samuel (Faculty of Business) and Wexler (Faculty of Applied Sciences) is a lowering of academic standards, which they regard as resulting from the increase in the number of international students at MU. Regardless of Samuel’s acknowledgement that many domestic students leave high school poorly prepared in terms of English skills, he blames mainly international students for a “profound lowering of standards”:

Certainly, it is great to get different perspectives from people from different countries, but I find overall to be completely frank, it has resulted in a profound lowering of standards. These students, we want their money, they pay double, I’ve investigated it. (...) We market aggressively toward them and, frankly, they are not prepared, which is not to say that my domestic students are all that great either in terms of preparedness for their English language skills either, but I do notice that there has been a lowering of standards.

Wexler shares similar thoughts on the role of international students on a possible lowering of standards:

You know we shouldn’t let less developed countries into our classrooms or people or you know, international students into our classrooms because it will dummy down the classes, but I mean we have to have some level of standards because otherwise that will happen. It will lower the quality of the overall educational experience.

Perceptions expressed by Wexler, that international students can “dummy down the classes” and “lower the quality of the overall educational experience” relate to the findings of Gallagher and Haan (2017) where multilingual students were often referred to as “deficient” and “insufficiently supported”, rather than having their abilities and their contributions to the university emphasized.

Another salient concern expressed by participants is if low English proficiency students should be allowed admission and, perhaps most importantly, graduation. Wexler expressed the concern that some students have only been admitted due to financial reasons:

There is an issue of equity, so if there is a Canadian student, who is applying to gerontology they go through our application process and you know what, there may be arrangements made through this internationalization, students come in and they are parachuted into programs because of the money.

Kathleen worries about the reputation of the institution when “we send students out to the world who can’t put together a paragraph”. She adds:

the amount of time I spend writing and sending students to the Learning Commons and trying to, you know, coaching them on how the work that they produce is not what I would consider to be at the level of somebody who is going to graduate from this university.

Students who are graduating but are perceived to have poor oral and written skills are a valid concern that must be addressed in the institutional and classroom levels. However, some of the concerns faculty have might be the result of cultural prejudice, pervasive language ideologies, and focus on the economic rationale of internationalization. As explained by Straker (2016), when dealing with international students, lecturers sometimes focus solely on linguistic competence and disregard other competences, such as sociolinguistic, and cultural and linguistic conventions. Lack of understanding of the complexities of communication may lead to the simplistic conclusion that international students are the only ones responsible for an effective communication.

Samuel, Wexler, and Kathleen’s assumptions about linguistic academic standards can be classified as ideological because, according to Woolard (1998) standard forms of language are not empirical linguistic facts. In addition, their

assumptions align with the language-as-a-problem orientation, which sees bilingualism or multilingualism as a disability associated with low academic achievement. Even though the language-as-a-problem orientation “is a set of values that stem from a monolingual ideal and assimilation mindset” that originally sees “linguistic diversity [as] a threat to national unity” (Hult and Hornberger, 2016, p.34), it can also be associated with participants’ beliefs that non-native English speakers pose a threat to academic standards.

Apart from expressing personal beliefs about who deserves a diploma or not based on linguistic abilities, and the view that international students may lower the standards of the university, the faculty mentioned above did not elaborate on what they consider to be adequate levels of proficiency. With findings very similar to Gallaguer and Haan (2017), issues with oral fluency, grammar mistakes, paragraph structure, and ability to understand complex concepts were mentioned by several participants, while students’ assets and strengths were seldom considered. Instead, the focus was more on students’ perceived weaknesses, lack of reliability of proficiency tests such as IELTS and TOEFL, and dubious admission standards. Most faculty expressed awareness that high IELTS and TOEFL scores do not always guarantee academic or linguistic success (Seelen, 2012; Simner & Mitchell, 2007) with some faculty characterizing proficiency tests as “meaningless”, while others, such as Wexler, expressed a somewhat naive view that high scores equal academic success: “I see people coming in passing TOEFL and you read their writing and it’s just not even close”. The latter also expressed insufficient knowledge of the role of proficiency tests, including how and what is actually measured by them. Sharad, on the other hand, demonstrates a better grasp of the issue: “the level of comprehension and reading and writing skills required for that [a standardized test] is way different than what is required to excel or pass even at a higher-level course at university”.

Interestingly, faculty dissatisfaction with levels of language proficiency in written essays was not uniquely targeted to international students. Canadian born students and immigrants who went to high school in Canada were also identified by David (Faculty of Environment) as having “limited ideas on how to construct sentences, paragraphs and certainly arguments”. His criticism is accompanied by a reflection and a suggestion on how to improve this situation:

[there is] an institutional focus on improving the English skills of the kids who are coming from elsewhere and that actually could be problematic, not only because you're not dealing with kids who are from around here but also it creates a streaming in programs where actually both sides might do better if they were in classes, you know, writing classes, where they're interacting you know, kids from China for example interacting with kids from Coquitlam. And probably that's a better way of educating them than separating them.

Shifting the focus from international students' writing problems to a general student population problem opens the door for more inclusive measures, such as writing classes with no distinction of nationality, and it might challenge overall assumptions that international students lack some linguistic abilities (Hult and Hornberger, 2016) that native English speakers possess. Murrey (2016) identifies that centralized approaches to language provision that focus on non-native English speakers can reinforce the deficit view associated with these students. It can also stigmatize native English-speaking students, "who are often wrongly seen as having the language skills to succeed by the virtue of being native speakers" (p.437). Therefore, moving to a context-specific-approach benefits student as well as instructors who can better serve students by having more specific, relevant, and engaging materials.

Positive perceptions of multilingual students were present in a small number of faculty's narratives. As in Marshall and Marr (2018), there was a "general absence of complex understandings" (p. 41) of multilingualism. While the benefits of having different cultures represented in the classroom is acknowledged by many faculty members in my study, some examples related to language are the recognition that some international students have "fantastic English" and that many times they struggle simply because they are using a different variety of English than the standard one expected in Canadian universities, and examples of international students who wrote the best paper in their classes,

An interesting thing to share with you is last week I graded the term papers for one of my courses and the best paper overall in the class was by a Japanese student, whose language was not perfect, you know, there is problems with syntax, usual things, but it had more information and that information was better organized and better presented than anyone else's in the class. (Steve)

There is evidence that faculty member' beliefs influence the types of examples they will emphasize in their narratives for even the participants that highlighted positive

experiences with international students assert that the overall level of English proficiency is problematic.

“I have adapted.” versus “I’m refusing to compromise”: Teaching in Increasingly Multilingual and Multicultural Classrooms: Instructional and Testing Accommodations

All faculty members agree that what are perceived as low levels of English proficiency pose challenges to their work. Most participants believe that the university should play a more pronounced role in the process of internationalization, especially when it comes to supporting multilingual students, and some participants express the belief that there is a standard form of the language that must be used in their classes. In relation to instructional and teaching accommodations, results similar to Gallagher & Haan’s (2017) were found, in which most faculty reported making some sort of accommodation, while a minority of participants refused to make any changes to their teaching or classroom dynamics to the benefit of international students.

Samuel, who teaches at the Faculty of Business, thinks it is unfair to admit international students, having them pay expensive tuition fees if they “have a lower probability of success”. This belief relates to Ruiz’s (1984) language as a problem orientation, in which bilingual students are viewed as having “cognitive difficulties and reduced academic achievement” (Hult and Hornberger, 2016, p. 33). Samuel refuses to alter his essay questions to true/false or multiple-choice questions because his course is heavily centered in communications. He says that “If they can’t communicate, they shouldn’t be in my class”. On a similar note, Kathleen, from the Faculty of Health Sciences, does not make testing accommodations because she thinks a standard should be maintained and applied to all students:

I have heard from others that they don’t mark the work of those students as rigorously as they mark others; they sort of cut them some slack because they are not speaking English as their first language. You know, I tend not to. I think if you are going to earn this degree from this university then why should I shift the standards for you? I mean then I must shift the standards for people with other kinds of challenges and, yes, we differentiate to a certain extent and we do shift the standards a little bit but, you know, generally speaking it seems you should be able to perform commensurate with the degree that you earned.

The maintenance of academic standards was also brought up by participants in Sawir (2011) as a reason not to make classroom accommodations. Samuel and Kathleen's refusal to make any type of accommodation based on the need to maintain idealized linguistic standards (Woolard, 1998) can be associated with the lack of discussion on the important role of language in processes of internationalization (Byrd Clark, 2012, Baker, 2016, Jenkins, 2014). In addition, as explained by Tange (2010), university lecturers might "not have been involved in the decision-making process leading (...) to internationalization, and yet they are expected to transform the management strategy into a sustainable teaching practice" (p. 142).

Other participants had more nuanced views of what accommodation in the classroom might look like and how it can be used to promote a more inclusive project of internationalization. Since the verbal and written component of classes was identified by participants as the most problematic aspect of their courses, the most common accommodation refers to language and it takes many forms.

The majority of faculty participants believe that much can be accomplished by decision making in the classroom that does not depend on changes to the formal curriculum or additional resources. These are some practical examples of classroom adaptations from Ann and Michel:

I have adapted, I have simplified my language usage, and that's not just for the EAL's-it's for the BC high schools as well. I permit translation devices in tests-the first fifteen minutes or so-so I am not testing them on their language-I basically have to examine these electronic devices and make sure they are not programmable or they are not somehow transmitting information. I've allowed them to have the English dictionary for the first fifteen minutes of the exam, I tell them if they don't understand what a word is to stick their hand up and I will give them an alternate word. (Ann, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)

On a practical level, like I said, my approach to teaching language itself is always with the caveat that I'm teaching a particular kind and [in] particular place and wherever you go you'll have to alter that to fit. Something as simple as "We are in Canada, use Canadian spelling. If you move to England, use English spelling. If you move to Australia, follow whatever standard is local as opposed to this is the best way to do it. (...) So in just about every class at some point I try to sit down and ask that question to say, "Why are we doing this? Why are we doing this in this language?" To make the point very clearly that on a practical level the reason that English is the lingua franca is because of the last two empires who have spoken it. And there is no better reason than that. (Michel, Department of English)

According to Gallagher & Haan (2017), “favourable attitudes towards serving emerging multilinguals” (p. 2) are as important as teaching techniques and skills. These seem evident in how Ann and Michel approach their classes and Michel’s comment reflects as well an awareness of the colonial legacy of English.

Trevor, from the School of Communication, thinks that language issues have to be identified and possibly addressed in the beginning of the semester, so students do not face difficulties with concepts in the middle of the course. Craig, from the Economics department, has a handout with structural English rules, word choices, and grammar for all students, in addition to his own textbook for first year students. He identified that students taking his course have most difficulty with connecting sentences in a logical manner, so he explains his strategy:

I take at least one or two hours in that first two weeks to actually sit down and go through what is good writing—starting at the sentence level, working up through a paragraph, working up through the idea, you know, the logical structure—logic is a huge issue. Just sequencing and argument. Having an argument, making sure that the sentences logically connect, that one thing follows from another.

Nevertheless, similarly to participants from Sawir (2011), he refuses to compromise the “standards” and makes it clear to all students what is expected of them and gives them the tools he believes will help them succeed. Here is how Craig talks about academic standards:

At the first-year level, at least when it comes to the material, I’m refusing to compromise. I’m sort of saying, “Look it, this is the standard that we have, you have to learn some vocabulary, you have to know what foreboding means, you can bring a dictionary to class, you can ask me any question you want, but this is the standard”. So, I’m trying to dumb things down.

Jenkins (2014) advocates the “need for a change of mind-set so that the accommodation of international students’ English language needs is not seen as ‘dumbing down’, but as the incorporation of a genuine international perspective” (p. 202). Such an attitude is not prevalent among faculty participants in this study.

Minori from the Faculty of Health Sciences offers the perspective of a non-native English-speaking faculty’s struggle in accommodating language issues. He talked about his challenge marking assignments when students ask him for better grades by justifying that they understand concepts, but have difficulties explaining them because English is

not their first language. On the one hand, as someone who also faces challenges with the English language himself, he feels inclined to accommodate students: “well I myself is not a good English speaker but I saw some student have problem in writing and sometimes when I mention about it, the student argue that this is not their first language so forgive them”. On the other hand, he understands that there are specific and appropriate ways to communicate disciplinary knowledge. He appears to have found a balance of how much he can accommodate, and the formula seems simple enough: “if their sentence doesn’t make sense to me I cannot give them good mark”. One aspect of his method that he does not consider simple is that there is no way for him to actually know if the students have a good grasp of the content and are only struggling with language:

they said they understood it, but they couldn’t write in proper English to show they understood it. But to me, of course you know, how can I tell? (...) they understood it but simply it is a matter of the communication. Even though the content is universal, but we have to communicate in one way or the other.

Minori exemplifies the tensions some faculty face in trying to recognize language difficulties some of their students’ experience, but also having a good sense of whether these students have mastered the content presented to them.

Some faculty believe that the University should be more supportive of other languages and cultures on campus as a way to truly internationalize the university. Michel, from the English department and Ann, from the department of Women Studies, share the view that diversity can be recognized and incorporated not only at a university and curriculum levels, but also at the classroom level by the everyday decisions made by faculty. When Michel teaches fiction in his English literature courses he likes to bring narratives from different countries and cultures that resonate with his students, in addition to exploring issues of racism and colonialism. Michel also talks about a strategy he usually employs in his teaching to create a more inclusive environment to all students:

when I do grammar with students who are from all those different places, one of the things I stress is that I happen to be teaching a certain form of Canadian formal speech. That this is one form of English among many, it is just as valid as whatever is being spoken in Singapore, Calcutta, London—anywhere. That there is no one higher version of this, but instead what we have is a particular version that I am bound to teach it because of

where we are and when we are. So, on a practical level, the internationalization in that moment is me acknowledging that I'm a particular subject, just like the students are.

By recognizing that the kind of language students are expected to use at MU is just a particular version bound by time and place, and not a higher form of the language, Michel is validating students' background and knowledge. He justifies his thinking by stating that: "If we are importing students and teaching them to be westerners, then we are just doing colonialism again". His reasoning seems to relate to Ilieva et al's (2014) concept of mutuality/reciprocity, in which to foster sustainable practices of internationalization it is important to question the normalization of Western academic practices.

Similarly, Ann believes that professors should be cognizant that often times the struggles students face with language are because they are using a different variety of English:

I am just thinking about some of the students who really kind of struggle with-and it's not that their English is wrong, it's different. And so that's what I think when we internationalize, that we, what we have to recognize that academic norms, use of English academic English, what's viewed as knowledge we need to be cognizant that what we don't see Canada as first and everything else as lesser. Or Canada is second, America first and everything else is lesser.

She then emphasizes the importance of recognizing diversity at the same time as being straightforward about what is expected at the institution: "And maybe that's what we need more, if we are going to really push to have students from overseas. We are going to, I think, have to consider these things more. You take Canadian academics 101." Besides helping students with language, she also makes it clear what she expects from them in terms of classroom behavior, because she does not assume that students from different cultures will arrive at MU with a clear understanding of what Canadian norms are. By doing so she believes she is preparing students for academic success.

According to De Beuckelaer, Lievens, and Bückler (2012), who analyze the connection between faculty cross cultural competencies and teaching evaluations in data gathered in France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Germany, students expect foreign faculty to conform to the local culture, but international students do not usually expect cross-cultural sensitivity of domestic faculty. However, results from this study

show that most faculty do demonstrate cross-cultural sensitivity which takes shape in the several different forms of classroom accommodation described by some participants. These faculty members' efforts to make the classroom a more inclusive environment show a more positive attitude towards internationalization than the participants in Gallagher and Haan (2017) study. Yet, the question of linguistic accommodation is fraught with ambivalence in the narratives of many of the faculty who participated in my study.

“I still feel culturally inadequate.”: Non-Native English-Speaking Faculty

In addition to comments about students, one of the participants also expressed concern about the language proficiency level of non-native speaker faculty. Wexler worries that visiting professors from developing countries do not have the language necessary to give talks and collaborate in a way that benefits both parties equally.

They struggle and can't give a seminar and they can't, they don't collaborate to the extent that we want them to. That's not all of them, I am saying half of them are like that and half of them are great and they meet our expectations and it's reciprocal. So, I am just saying with respect to you know, opening our doors internationally, I think we have to be careful because typically. (...) I am not talking about collaborating with other top-level groups in the world. Then there is no issue around reciprocity you know that it is balanced, right? I am talking about here, I am referring to developing countries who are looking to upgrade and increase status and learn and get ahead through partnerships with MU.

For him there is a unilateral benefit specifically for “developing countries”, as he points that “top level groups” do not present the same problem. Linguistic remarks are never isolated from political and cultural views. He generalizes by grouping faculty in two categories: the ones from developing countries who have language difficulties and whose ability to contribute to the university is limited, and those from developed countries who are here to collaborate and whose language is not an issue. His view can be associated with Stier's (2004) instrumentalism ideology, in which economic aims of internationalization are emphasized. As stated by Stein et al (2016), internationalization that focuses on the global knowledge economy is “subject to careful cost-benefit analysis, and relationships are assessed according to their potential for calculable gain” (p. 6). In addition, Wexler's quote exemplifies the lack of reciprocity/mutuality expected in sustainable projects of internationalization, as formulated by Ilieva et al (2014).

Two faculty members, Peter and Minori, who are non-native English speakers shared their experiences and challenges of teaching in a second language. They focused their narratives on their personal struggles in adapting to a new culture, their feelings of inadequacy, and their sympathy towards multilingual students.

Peter talks about his experience as a former international student from a South American country trying to adapt to the culture of the host country. He believes one of the purposes of having an international experience is to be exposed to and learn new things, so it is problematic when students isolate themselves in their own cultural groups. However, he does show empathy to those students because he had to overcome a big cultural shock in which he felt that his language, humor, and behavior were barriers:

So, having been an international student I think that there are a lot of things that we can do to prevent that because international students tend to seek refuge with each other because they are not from here and they feel isolated and they feel un-understood and they feel under siege most of the time. Their language is a barrier, their humour is a barrier, their behaviour is a barrier. I mean I still remember feeling—I still feel inadequate—culturally inadequate very, very often (...)

Minori's narrative of his experiences as a non-native English-speaking faculty focuses on two features: an emphasis in the universality of the natural science field, and the challenges of teaching in English. For him, the Natural Science field is universal by nature, and since the content has no geographic boundaries and must be true universally, he thinks it is possible to teach it regardless of the language.

So, in a sense the contents in our discipline is, from the beginning, universal. So, wherever we go we teach the same thing in a different language—that's all. So that's why I, a natural science professor in this university even though I never educated in Canada or in this English language. I finished all my education in my mother tongue, but to me it is possible to teach the content with another language even though I may have difficulties to understand the culture or those kind of things in other places than somewhere I was grown up.

He acknowledges he might have difficulties understanding the local culture, and that he does not feel as comfortable teaching in English as he would in his first language, especially in terms of resourcefulness when explaining something that students did not understand.

Even though the content - I emphasize the content - content is international. It must be communicated in certain local way like language, so I still have

difficulty in teaching in English though perhaps in my mother tongue I can tell the same thing in more various ways if students do not understand a portion of it. So, yes, it is affected by the locality and the language especially.

Minori's remarks share similarities with participants in Tange's (2010) study, who felt their linguistic repertoires in the classroom were impacted by having to teach in a foreign language. On a more positive note, he sees his presence in the classroom as a reminder that internationalization is happening. Minori sees language as a tool for communication and, therefore, it should be "extensively taught to all students before they start any advanced study". He uses himself as an example of someone who had to learn the language well enough to be in academia, even though he does not use English at home or thinks he is a good English speaker.

The small sample of non-native English-speaking participants in this study in combination with their short recollections about their experiences teaching in a foreign language does not allow for generalisations or conclusions. Even though support for international students was a topic explored by many participants in this study, this important aspect was not mentioned in relation to the resources available to assist foreign faculty. One reason for the silence on this matter might be, as identified in Pherali (2013), that support for faculty is a sensitive topic. Both NNES participants in this study touch upon issues considered important to other NNES faculty in the literature (Pherali, 2013; Samuels, 2016) that are worth further exploration in future studies, more specifically culture shock and language barriers.

Conclusion

The following themes were salient in faculty members' narratives: (1) their role as content area teachers in an increasingly multilingual and multicultural classroom, which includes reflections on classroom accommodations and the role of the institution in the process of internationalization, and (2) thoughts on multilingual students' language proficiency.

International students with perceived low levels of English proficiency is a recurrent concern expressed by faculty, especially at the undergraduate level. Proficiency issues assume different forms and impact different dimensions of the classroom dynamics such as reading and marking assignments, participation, and

faculty's impressions of students. Some participants expressed the concern that having international students in their classes increases the amount of work faculty and departments have to do, mainly expressed by the difficulties in marking assignments and, for some, the tough decision of when and how to be flexible and make grade concession. Most faculty do not see themselves as well equipped to deal with international students, even though many reported using specific techniques to accommodate those students. Overall, the data shared in this chapter reinforces some of the findings around faculty and internationalization noted by Beck et al (2013) who state that "faculty members work on their own initiative, do not enjoy institutional support, are concerned about the neoliberal ideologies that drive institutions to embrace internationalization, and query the unintended consequences of such efforts, such as neo-colonial practices" (p. 90).

Chapter 6.

Staff Experiences

Findings from Staff Interviews

Out of 24 interviewees from the SSHRC project (Beck & Ilieva, 2011), 13 identified language as an important aspect of internationalization. I will focus on eight participants from the following units: Faculty of Education, Faculty of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, Student Services, and the International Office, who expanded on their thinking about these matters and shared their views on the relationship between internationalization and language. The narratives of staff in managerial positions are somewhat different from those of administrative staff. The first focused on the possibilities of the internationalized university and the latter more on practical challenges brought by internationalization.

Jane, a staff member who works with student services identified the gap in literature of internationalization and the experience of staff members: “When we looked at studies of internationalization, no one has asked staff members, but yet (...) a lot of international activity from co-ops to other things are actually happening with staff”.

“They have to meet the standards of the people who grew up here have.”: Standard language Ideology and the Hegemony of English

Eloise has worked in the Faculty of Education for more than 15 years and she talks about the increase in international student admission during that time. She has very strong opinions about the levels of proficiency of international students and new immigrants, and she thinks the university should not be admitting students who do not have native-like language skills: “When you have international students who want to learn academically in English (...) they have to meet the criteria, the levels, the standards of the people who grew up here have.” Her statement refers to an idealized form of standard language held by citizens of a nation-state (Lippi-Green, 2012). However, she contradicts herself by also criticizing local students for the poor language skills they present after leaving high school. Her indignation with linguistic expressions other than the standard English goes beyond the university environment as she openly criticizes

well known Asian neighbourhoods in Vancouver for having signs written in a language other than English:

When you go to Richmond you see, or even when you go to Lougheed mall, everything is in native language, foreign language, there are no English signs anywhere. And that's just offensive. I'm not being rude to expect that you should read and write in English and I think that a lot of students here are slipping through the cracks.

Her choice of words reflects an awareness that it is not socially accepted to discriminate against Asian people, but the same is not true for linguistic discrimination (Lippi-Green, 2012; Woolard, 1998). Since Eloise's narrative seems permeated by raciolinguistic ideology (Flores and Rosa, 2015) it is possible to assume that elements other than linguistic accuracy are responsible for what she complains to be a difficulty in communicating with some students because "language is a huge barrier".

As illustrated above, standard language ideology was present in some interviews with students and faculty, but Eloise was the only staff member who expressed discomfort and even contempt for non-standard forms of the English language: "you can see that this person doesn't have good grammar (...) it's something that irks me". According to Woolard (1998), "moral indignation over nonstandard forms derives from ideological associations of the standard with the qualities valued within the culture" (p.21)."

In contrast, Nash believes that internationalization is inherently beneficial but there are "perceptions of the negative side of it" such as the feeling that "people in class do not speak the language well enough". Nash's belief that internationalization is inherently beneficial can be associated with an idealist rationale that sees internationalization as good per se and "should eventually enable a sense of global community and solidarity and prevent ethnocentrism, racism, and self-righteousness" (Stier, 2004, p. 89). Nash also demonstrates awareness of the contradiction of the idealistic approach to internationalization: the propagation of Western ideas and values (Stier, 2004). For her, "being around people who don't speak English very well is a great opportunity for us to learn a different way of thinking, to support somebody in their aspirations to develop that international competence". She believes foreign languages should be given more importance on campus as a way of countering the hegemony of English: "I think we should be able to teach Shakespeare in Mandarin, what's wrong with

that? We all have something to learn from the Mandarin interpretation of Shakespeare, right?”. This view can be associated with the ideology of educationalism, which implies that being exposed to an unfamiliar setting “may contribute to personal growth and self-actualization” (Stier, 2004, p. 92).

Laura is an undergraduate advisor in the Faculty of Applied Sciences who recognizes the importance of linguistic and cultural diversity on campus but is also aware of the challenges posed by what are perceived to be students’ low levels of English proficiency on their academic and professional careers. Due to her role in the department she is able to see the different struggles students face. She is aware of the power and capital associated with English language and she questions the different expectations of Canadian students who go abroad to study and international students who come to Canada: “We certainly don’t expect English as a first language student to pop over in China and be able to study in Mandarin, even if they are doing a double degree.” Those different expectations have a pervasive result on many international students who are not valued for having different ways of thinking, expressing themselves, and writing academically. Laura adds: “I don’t know how many times in this job students apologize to me for having an accent, for not being totally fluent in English. So, you think of all the initial assumptions that go into that happening.” She goes on to say that she does not apologize for not speaking the students’ mother tongue and how, in fact, that is not expected from an English-speaking person. On the other hand, she talks about exchanges with graduating students where she had trouble understanding what they were trying to say, which is a real problem for both the student and the institution. Two important issues can be identified in her narrative: first that the standard language ideology shapes the assumptions students make on how they and others should be performing linguistically, and second that language proficiency can impact the choices and opportunities students have access to.

“[We have to be] honest about what the real challenges are.”: Practical Challenges Brought by Internationalization

In general, staff participants were concerned with the practical, day-to-day aspects of internationalization, such as how to support English as an additional language students, how to integrate international and domestic students, and the resources available. These concerns confirm Arthur (2017), in the sense that universities’ efforts to

recruit international students must be done in consideration of the conditions that impact these students' "adjustment, academic preparedness, and access to resources" (p.888).

Christine, who works in the Student Services office, highlights the importance of having additional resources to support additional work brought by engaging with multilingual and multicultural students. For her, with the increased number of international students coming to MU every year and the pressure for internationalization of curriculum, some adaptations are necessary but require specific resources. Christine uses an example that was a common complaint of some students who participated in this research project: that of an international Teaching Assistant who does not have the level of language proficiency necessary for the job. She argues that this challenging situation is happening in many classrooms and has a negative impact on the TA, the students, and the institution, and therefore must be addressed:

We're really trying to move away from this sort of deficit model that international students are problems to be solved and really, you know, have the opportunity to celebrate their gifts and allow them to contribute the way they can, but we can't do that without being honest about what the real challenges are.

Laura reports that it is not uncommon for her to see students failing courses or having to change their choice of major or minor because they could not get the minimum academic requirements to pass the courses due, mostly, to language difficulties. She reflects on how frustrating it is for an international student to have to change their degree of choice because they were not able to follow complex readings or pass written exams.

Jane, who works in the Faculty of Health Sciences, and Charlie, from the Faculty of Applied Sciences, share a concern about how to get international students to succeed in the workplace. Charlie's reflections focus on the commodification of the English language and will be discussed further in this chapter, while Jane's narrative focuses more on the challenges related to language students face when applying for a position. For Jane, the difficulty is in how to manage students' expectations in light of their language issues:

How do you deal with an international student who has an accent, who also has a slight speech impediment, and wants to work in health promotion and education in a presentation verbal communication style? That is a tough call. (...) And having to help students think about, you know, if you have

this barrier, is that going to impede your ability to move into this kind of role?

Jessica, from the International Student Services office, believes people should focus on the benefits of having non-native English speakers on campus and she is aware that this positive perception does not always emerge by itself, that work needs to be done by the university in order to foster an inclusive environment:

We have so much diversity, and I think that if everyone would kind of see the benefits and not always see, let's say, deficiencies, if someone's English is not their language, which is actually a good thing, that they have something else to bring to the table. But (...) if you do nothing, nothing will actually happen by itself. You have to help things, right, you have to kind of integrate people, it's not just gonna happen by having them here.

Guo & Guo's (2017) study of undergraduate students' perceptions of internationalization in a Canadian university suggests "a gap between the rhetoric and the reality" (p. 864). According to the authors, even though internationalization is a fundamental aspect of Canadian universities' strategic plans, "there has been a lack of support to help international students successfully integrate into Canadian academic environments" (p. 864). This gap between rhetoric and reality is also described by staff members in this study, who seem to have an in-depth understanding of the goals of internationalization and yet have to manage challenging situations that emerge due to a lack of institutional support services needed to achieve those goals.

“Diversity by itself might not bring as much benefit.”: Internationalization = Intercultural Learning?

Some participants demonstrate the awareness that simply having students from different nationalities and cultures is not a benefit in itself, and that strategies need to be implemented to stimulate meaningful cross-cultural interactions. Jessica believes more work needs to be done to highlight to students, faculty, and staff that even though going abroad is a “fantastic opportunity”, they can actually take advantage of being surrounded by different cultures, languages, and experiences without leaving their campus. She elaborates:

I don't think a lot of students realize that you don't really have to go abroad to, specially being at [MU], to be surrounded by so many different cultures and different experiences (...) we need to definitely take more advantage

of what we have here in our own campus. (...) Anyone can benefit from diversity, but diversity by itself may not bring as much benefit.

Similarly, Nash believes internationalization has to be done “in a thoughtful way, in an intentional way that actually makes learning happen”. Jessica and Nash’s views resonate with Leask and Carroll’s (2011) assertion that diversity on campus does not guarantee transcultural knowledge, collaboration, nor intercultural learning. The authors argue that universities should focus on “strategic and informed intervention to improve inclusion and engagement” (p.647) instead of expecting the benefits of cultural diversity on campus to manifest spontaneously.

“He was looking at the job as an opportunity to learn English.”: Language as a Commodity at University and at the Workplace

A large part of the linguistic repertoires used in academia are a reflection of the linguistic practices of the workplace (Byrd Clark et al, 2012). At university students learn not only theory and skills that will help them succeed in the job market, but also the linguistic repertoires expected in order to perform specific professional roles, even if these are not explicitly taught. The workplace influences what is taught at University and vice versa, and that includes language. Challenges faced by newcomers in terms of language in the workplace can be similar to the ones faced by newcomers at university, as both scenarios are embedded with linguistic assumptions and norms. Nash, who works with international development as well as with communities of immigrants and refugees, compares the struggles they face in regard to lack of Canadian credentials and language barriers in the workplace with the struggles international students face in the classroom:

We don’t take enough time to say what are the assets of this person, we don’t evaluate those assets, we don’t even acknowledge that they exist (...) We just assume that if someone doesn’t speak my language or look like me or dress like me that they’re not conforming to my idea of what University or learning should be and I don’t agree with that.

Many times, international students go through the experience of working during their studies and this can increase the challenge of having to perform in a second (or third) language. Charlie talks about an episode when she acted as mediator between a co-op international student and his supervisor. The student got fired from a job due to language performance issues and Charlie reached the conclusion that “he was looking

at the job as an opportunity to learn English. But he never communicated, and the environment did not actually give the student that opportunity.” The student was learning more than English in his job: he was also learning the culture of the workplace, but he was doing so in an informal way, without being explicitly taught, and his boss did not realize what was happening nor was he equipped to deal with the situation. Charlie points out that:

(...) they (employer and faculty) will perhaps expect students to learn java or c++, but the student is learning in the environment more on the work in the country, soft skills and all that, and the transition from a culture to another.

She was able to explain the situation to the student’s supervisor, who agreed to give him another chance at the job.

English is also a commodity for students who are going abroad to non-Anglophone countries. Nash problematized the practice of teaching English as a way of perpetuating colonialism. She was advising a student who wanted to go to Cambodia to teach English in a small community and she questioned the student’s reasons for doing so.

If they’re living in a small community that only speaks Khmer and they have no intention of ever leaving why do they need to know English? It’s just perpetuating this, which is a power thing. I think language is really important, language is a way to teach culture and ways of thinking and knowing, right? So, when you’re teaching someone English is not just a practical thing, you’re teaching them ways of knowing which is a little bit like colonialism.

The two stories above show two different and complementary ways in which staff’s understandings of linguistic and intercultural skills influence their dealings with students. Charlie’s understandings allow her to explain to the employer, and sometimes faculty members, that international students are learning specific language needed for the workplace at the same time as learning the culture of the country. Nash’s views allow her to question the power of the English language, both at MU and outside Canada.

“Kind of like an informal partnership, in a way.”: Staff Going the Extra Mile and Blurring of Professional Roles

In this section I will focus on four participants, Jessica, Barbara, Helen, and Charlie, who can be classified according to Whitchurch’s (2008a) category of *unbounded professionals* for their ability to assist students with their individual needs by focusing on a larger institutional strategy goal and, often, working around and beyond their job descriptions.

Internationalization and the growing influx of international students at MU has led to the creation of informal partnerships of faculties and departments, and to a blurring of professional roles for some professionals who deal directly with international student issues. Jessica, who works at the student services office talks about the increase in number of phone calls from other departments asking for information about immigration and work permits after some people in the respective department received an immigration consultant training. She thinks it is important that departments ask those questions, but at the same time, few people at Student Services have received training and their primary role is not to assist other departments with those issues. Helen talks about the strengthening of informal partnerships between the Faculty of Business and the International Services for Students’ office to better assist students with their needs:

I’d say I always feel like I have one foot in the door with [The Faculty of Business] and one foot in the door with [The International Office], so I work really, really, close to [The International Office], I work with their study abroad advisors and also working very closely with the international coordinator at [The International Office]. So, we’re constantly working together with communication with partners and details for inbound/outbound students. (...) There’s nothing on paper that says there’s a connection. It is, I guess, kind of like an informal partnership in a way. But everything we do ties to closely together that we work very well and very closely together. But there’s nothing on paper, no one’s reporting to someone on the other side.

Whitchurch (2008b) identifies that administrative staff in internationalizing higher education settings “are not only interpreting their given roles more actively (Whitchurch, 2004), but are also moving laterally across functional and organizational boundaries to create new professional spaces, knowledges and relationships” (p. 379). Helen can be described as occupying what Whitchurch (2008b) calls third space, which is not necessarily a physical space, but is characterized by having people working in joint

projects and building relationships that go beyond organizational boundaries. In addition to departmental collaborations, some staff who deal directly with international students go beyond their job description to help these students with various aspects of their academic lives that derive mainly from linguistic and cultural (mis)interpretations.

Barbara identifies a series of issues students might have:

Immigration is one thing they always find confusing and I don't blame them cause the instructions are not very clear at all. The second would probably be language I would say. But language have a lot of side effects. So, how to integrate to the communities, and also impact a significant way on their academic success, we're talking about academic honesty, dishonesty, misconduct, probation, all that, how to work on team settings, how to communicate, how to look for jobs you know, all those kind of go back and tie back with language challenges some of our students they have. But the other thing you kind of, from my own experience, what I can see some of the challenges, another challenge is how to make friends with Canadian students. That's another thing. Let's just say you're in a classroom there's a group project, the instructor say "Ok, you can go and get your own groups yourselves", probably the Canadians will stay with the Canadians and the Chinese will stay with the Chinese you know, and it's going to be pretty separately, the group. But do you really want to force them together? You probably don't want to do it. But without the enforcement how can you make sure that the students are really engaged when you get a very good mix of student population in your class? That's an ongoing challenge and, so how to break the ice? How to knock on a door? How to make friends with domestic students? I think, or even it's about the domestic student being open minded, trying to learn the cultures.

Some participants described interactions with students where they ended up acting as counsellors in an attempt to help students facing a problematic situation, even though that is not their specific job. Charlie goes beyond the rules and standard procedures of her role as co-op coordinator and takes the time to "understand why students from a certain culture behave the way they do, or say things they do, do things they do" in order to "foresee some of the problems and be proactive in solving them". For her it is not enough to, for example, inform a student they missed a deadline. She thinks it is important to investigate why the student missed the deadline and explain to them why meeting deadlines is so important in Canada. Such instances are evident as well in Pitman's (2000) survey of staff's perceptions about students and academics in an Australian university which suggests that administrative staff see themselves as crucial to the educational process and usually go beyond their job description by incorporating the role of mentor when dealing with students. Charlie's narrative can be seen as

another example of a professional who is moving away from fixed roles and structures and who is building credibility on a personal basis (Whitchurch, 2008b).

Jane summarizes what she thinks is one of the biggest barriers between staff and students: “I think too many of us in administrative roles or educator roles it is like the privacy of a person, we are afraid to step on boundaries, we are afraid of cultural barriers, what is appropriate, what is not appropriate.”. For her, a simple enough strategy in order to connect to students on a more personal level to assist them is “Not being afraid to ask [about students’ countries and cultures]”.

Leask and Carroll (2011) identify that the informal curriculum is as important as the formal one for the learning process that takes place at universities. For Banta and Kuh (1998) “cognitive and affective development are inextricably intertwined and ... the curricular and out-of-class activities are not discrete, independent events; they affect one another (sometimes profoundly) in ways that often are not immediately obvious” (p. 42). Administrative staff have a crucial role in the application of informal curriculum strategies because of their positioning on campus, as they assist students, and often times faculty, on cultural issues that are not being addressed in the classroom. As stated by Banta and Kuh (1998), in order for students to achieve their personal and intellectual goals, a collaboration is necessary between faculty and “student affairs professionals” (p. 42). A lack of effective collaboration between faculty and staff might bring about what Whitchurch (2008b) calls third space, in which staff have complex, blurred professional boundaries, and move between “professional and academic domains” (p. 378).

Conclusion

While all participants in this study contributed to the expansion of our understanding of how people experience internationalization of education, staff’s contributions are especially significant because their views are underrepresented in the field (Banta and Kuh, 1998, Pitman, 2000) even though their work is fundamental for the success or failure in implementing of internationalization policies and strategies (Llurda et al, 2014; Pitman, 2000).

Student and faculty’s narratives shared a few common themes, such as standard language ideology, beliefs about academic standards, and challenges in dealing with

non-native English speakers in the classroom (in the case of faculty and TAs), most of which were very similar to findings from the literature (Fotovatian & Miller, 2014; Morita, 2004; Straker, 2016; Waterstone, 2008). Staff's narratives, on the other hand provided invaluable insights on themes such as linguistic and cultural discrimination from the perspective of people whose work crosses over the student, the academic, and the institutional realms of the university. Thus, their critiques to, for example, low levels of English proficiency, did not focus on the student as a problem, or even on internationalization strategies of attracting international students. Instead, they focused on internationalization as an everyday reality they have to experience and talked about what they do to minimize linguistic and cultural discrimination, and on what the institution can do to foster a more inclusive environment.

The complexity of administrative staff's roles in the internationalized university, as supported by the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, was salient in the narratives of staff who participated in this study. A critical analysis of the gap between theoretical conceptualizations of internationalization and the everyday reality of an internationalized university from the perspective of staff was especially prominent in the data.

Having analyzed data from students, faculty, and staff interviews in chapters 4, 5, and 6 respectively, I will in my next and final chapter summarize and discuss the major themes found in the data as well as their implications for the field. I will also outline the limitations of my study and some possibilities moving forward.

Chapter 7.

Discussion and Implications

My research was concerned with how students, staff, and faculty perceive and experience linguistic diversity in the context of internationalization, and how ideologies and assumptions about language and multilingualism shape those experiences. I attempted to address three gaps in the literature with my study. The first refers to the often-overlooked role of language in processes of internationalization, especially in Anglophone settings, identified by Byrd Clark et al (2012), Jenkins (2012), and Baker (2016). The second addresses the lack of research emphasis on the important role of administrative staff in the implementation and maintenance of internationalization practices (Szekeres, 2004; 2006; Whitchurch, 2008, Llurda et al, 2014). The third gap I began to address is an issue I identified while researching literature for this study: the lack of studies that address the experiences of students, staff, and faculty together.

This study draws on data from qualitative interviews with students, faculty, and staff from a larger SSHRC-funded institutional ethnography (Smith, 2012) in Western Canada. For Smith (2012), in institutional ethnography the lives and work of people are directly connected and influenced by the lives and work of others around them. In this study it becomes clear how the lives and work of students, staff, and faculty are intertwined on campus and how their actions in relation to linguistic diversity shape the experiences of others. Students' narratives were filled with how other students and professors impact their academic experience. Faculty participants reported on how the growing number of international students on campus impacts their work and the institution as whole. Even though neither students nor faculty referred to staff in their narratives, staff's work is directly interconnected to both groups. At the same time, the way participants experience linguistic diversity on campus is influenced by their assumptions and ideologies about language. Thus, both my research questions are intertwined and cannot be answered in isolation. In this chapter I attempt to summarize and discuss the connections between participants' experiences and the ideological assumptions that inform participants' beliefs.

Internationalization

Internationalization is a complex process that universities undergo as a consequence of globalization. What internationalization looks like varies according to universities' policies, but in general its practices are driven by socio-cultural, political, academic, economic, and branding motivations as identified by Knight (2004, 2014). Mountain University highly values internationalization in its goal of becoming “the leading engaged university”⁷ through international partnerships, recruitment and retention of international students, mobility, and community engagement. Overall, participants in my study understood internationalization in general as a positive process and associated it with mainly student mobility, but also with other tenets present in MU's International Engagement Strategy: global citizenship, cultural exchanges, respect for diversity, and international perspective in courses. The aspect of internationalization at MU most criticized by participants, mainly faculty, staff, and some domestic students, was related to the economic rationale (Knight, 2004), or instrumentalist ideology (Stier, 2014) of recruiting high-tuition paying international students. Even though the influx of international students was oftentimes the first answer that came to mind when participants were asked what internationalization means to them, the consequences of dealing with international students and/or being an international student were identified as, mostly, problematic. The majority of participants reported some dissatisfaction with what were perceived to be low levels of English proficiency of non-native English-speaking students. Even non-native English-speaking participants were overall unsatisfied with their own level of language proficiency. If one of the most essential characteristics of internationalization - student mobility - is also one that has an element considered problematic - multilingualism - then there is a fundamental problem with either the common assumptions participants hold on language proficiency and internationalization, or with the implementation of internationalization. I argue that both are the case in this study.

⁷ Source is not provided for anonymity purposes.

Language Ideologies

As is evident in previous chapters, the narratives of many participants in my study are permeated by assumptions about linguistic competence and the superiority of certain varieties of English that can be classified as ideological based on the literature on language ideologies (Fairclough, 2001; Lippi-Green, 2012; Pennycook, 2007; Woolard, 1998; Wortham, 2001).

Two ideological assumptions about language proficiency can be inferred from participants' narratives. First, that non-native English speakers can and should master an assumingly standard variety of "native" English. Embedded in this is the assumption that this standard form of the language exists, which according to Lippi-Green (2012) is a myth constructed to ascertain power over people that speak different varieties and have different accents. The standard language assumption was expressed by students, both domestic and international, faculty, and one staff member. It usually took the form of a comparison between domestic and international students, but it was also targeted towards visiting scholars and non-native faculty. The central component of this assumption, the standard language, instead of being a fact supported by linguists is an ideological construction (Lippi-Green, 2012; Woolard, 1998), resulting from the commodification of language. Participants used the "standard language myth" (Lippi-Green, 2012) to delegitimize non-native English speakers and ascertain the superiority of native speakers. Different categories were used by participants to determine otherness: "international student", "ESL", "non-native speaker", "them" (as opposed to "us"). Those labels were criticized by Anderson (2014), Fotovatian and Miler (2014), and Marshall (2010) for the same reason: they are often used to marginalize students. Not surprisingly, several students, faculty, and one staff used those labels to justify why non-native English-speaking students' performance is not ideal. Domestic students reported being negatively impacted by the presence of non-native English-speaking students in their classes, especially when they have to work in groups. International students did not report any problematic interactions with domestic students. On the other hand, two international students reported problematic interactions with professors who were not well equipped to deal with diversity. Those students reported a different kind of discrimination reflecting raciolinguistic ideology (Flores and Rosa, 2012), which puts race in the equation when linguistically discriminating someone. The students were

certain their English skills were not the problem in the problematic interaction with the professors, but the fact that they are Asian. International students' perceptions of their own linguistic skills as being not good enough compared to native English speakers, combined with their self-awareness of how some professors perceive their language skills, made them doubt their abilities and impacted their participation in class and their social interactions. Even though a few students and faculty members provided a critical perspective on the issue, it was mainly in staff's narratives that the standard language ideology was questioned in light of the university's internationalization efforts, as will be summarized further in this chapter.

The second ideological assumption about language refers to "native" English as the academic lingua franca. This assumption is clear in some student, faculty, and one staff's narratives about academic linguistic standards and their beliefs that international students' low language skills might harm the university's reputation. Some international participants, despite reporting challenges with language and culture, seemed to understand that it is their duty to adapt to the "standards of the institution". However, Jenkins (2012) suggests that the number of non-native English speakers surpasses the number of native speakers in academia. Similarly, Bourdieu and Passeron (1994) argue that "the discourses of academia are no one's mother tongue" (p. 8). This assumption is further complexified by the geographical location of the institution. Since English is one of the official languages in Canada, it is understandable that participants make the connection between the language of the institution and that of the country. However, the process of internationalization transforms universities in transcultural institutions where English is one of the many coexisting languages (Baker, 2016). Some participants such as Nash, a staff member, and Jenny, a student, question the hegemony of native English in academic practices, but most participants judge participation and legitimacy based on current practices. A few faculty like Michel and Ann incorporate a criticism to the hegemony of English language into their classes by explaining that what is expected from students in terms of linguistic competence stems from the geographical location of MU, and not from an assumed superiority of this variety of English. Yet such critical awareness is not present in the narratives of other faculty.

In general, staff's perspectives differed from most students and faculty members in the sense that most of them do not see international students as linguistically deficient or as a problem to be fixed. With the exception of one participant, staff emphasized the

benefits of having international students on campus and transferred the blame for linguistic challenges from the individual to the institution. Going further on Michel and Ann's criticisms of "standard" English in their classrooms, Nash and Laura would like the institution to actually recognize different linguistic practices brought by students in terms of having other languages being officially used for some purpose on campus.

Even though the nature of academic practices requires that certain standards be met, those are subject to the inevitable changes in society. Given the geographical location of MU and the importance of English as the global lingua franca, English is expected to be the main language of instruction. The key issue is that the linguistic and cultural complexity inherent to the process of internationalization should not be disregarded in favour of fixed academic practices (Baker, 2016) in EDL contexts. The diversity of languages and cultures at MU is evidently an important aspect of internationalization that has significant impacts in the experiences of students, faculty, and staff. Most narratives revolved around negative experiences of people expecting themselves and others to adjust to fixed models of education based on the hegemony of the English language.

Multiculturalism

Multilingualism and multiculturalism are two important characteristics of transcultural universities, according to Baker (2016). A connection between language and culture was present in international students' narratives, illustrating that challenges faced by those students are complex and cannot be simply reduced to difficulties with language. Culture was associated by many Asian international students as a reason for not always participating in class the way it is expected in the institution. Together with language difficulties and personality traits, it became very difficult for some students to act in a more extrovert manner. Other students expressed their struggle in trying to preserve their cultural backgrounds and at the same time integrate into the Canadian culture. Even though multiculturalism and intercultural knowledge were identified by some domestic students as a benefit of internationalization, many criticized international students wanting to preserve their home cultures in Canada, or for having different ways of interacting in class. Leask and Carroll (2011) point to a possible outcome of disregarding cultural and linguistic difference: "outsiders' will adopt new skills and behaviours until they appear to be so 'like us' that they are almost invisible, thereby

precluding the opportunities inherent in diverse campuses and classrooms” (p. 648). The issue of expecting international students to assimilate to Canadian cultural and linguistic norms was present in narratives across the three groups of participants.

Part of faculty members’ dissatisfaction with international students seems to be cultural rather than linguistic - a distinction that is not always straightforward. Multilingualism often means multiculturalism, and in the same way not every professor is well equipped to teach non-native English students, not every professor is trained to deal with the increase in cultural differences in the classroom (Haan et al, 2017). Common examples were faculty commenting on students who do not participate or ask questions, students who only interact with other students from the same ethnic background, and students who are used to a certain classroom dynamic such as following the textbooks.

With the exception of one participant who made negative comments about students from other cultures, staff mostly talked about multiculturalism on campus in relation to helping international students navigate the Canadian culture, which most of the time is not part of their job description and illustrates the blurred boundaries in staff’s roles explained by Whitchurch (2008a).

Complexity of Working Conditions

Internationalization has increased the complexity of working conditions for many participants in my study due mainly to the influx of international students on campus. Three local students who work as TAs shared similar views with faculty in regard to the institution’s lack of linguistic support for international students. Their narratives were marked by a struggle between wanting to better assist those students and not having support necessary to develop skills in order to do so.

Due to a range of levels of English proficiency, faculty are faced with the decision to adapt or not their teaching to be more inclusive of those students. Opinions on this matter differed, but most faculty reported making some sort of adjustment. Those who chose not to change their teaching reported that their work is, nevertheless, impacted by those students when they have to mark “poor language quality” assignments and when classroom interactions do not flow the way it was expected. It is interesting to see how for some faculty making adjustments to their teaching is inadmissible, due to a belief that

there are somewhat fixed norms to be followed in order to maintain standards. Those who express this point of view also think that international students are someone else's problem, mainly the institution for admitting them and not supporting them adequately. These views relate to the findings of Gallagher and Haan (2017) in which participants "rejected the notion that language instruction was within the scope of their responsibilities and expressed a strong preference for support provided outside of class time" (p.1). While all participants agree that the institution can improve its support systems, many of them recognize that they themselves play a crucial role in students' experiences at university and go the extra mile trying to create better solutions with the resources available.

Staff also report having their work impacted by the large number of international students. For some, there is an increase in workload due to specialized services offered to international students; for others, it means having to redefine their work, many times without proper training to better assist those students. Both trends are common in internationalized universities, according to Whitchurch (2008a), where staff's roles are becoming increasingly blurred.

Participants' challenges in relation to work conditions also relate to the emergence of 'knowmads' in higher education, (Beck et al, 2013) who are expected to learn and work in multiple configurations. However, as Beck et al (2013) indicate, "while institutions may appear to adopt knowmadic ideals, those ideals are not simply unrealized, but severely constrained by institutional practices" (p.93).

Institutional Goals and Participants' Perceptions

One of the key principles in MU's International Engagement Strategy's guiding principles is "We foster global citizenship and encourage the development of international and intercultural competencies"⁸. Mentions of language are found in the document in respect to language support systems and English proficiency requirements for admission. No mention of supporting or valuing linguistic diversity was found, though, which confirms Byrd Clark et al (2012) stance that

⁸ Source is not provided for anonymity purposes.

Despite immigration, increased mobility, and the emergence of trans-global identities, official education policies and curriculum have not expanded to include the explicit development of multilingual repertoires or societal multilingualism in classrooms. (p.5)

Most participants' beliefs about language seem to be aligned with the university's positioning that English language is the official language of the institution and there are mechanisms in place in order to help students achieve linguistic requirements. The complexity of a linguistically diverse student body is not considered beyond English remedial practices, which seems to confirm Byrd Clark et al (2012), Baker (2016), and Jenkins' (2014) observation that language is overlooked or not considered in discussions of internationalization in EDL contexts. Participants' narratives that seem to conform to the university's positioning are varied. Most faculty reported low levels of English proficiency as a problem in their classrooms and the majority of those who reported making classroom accommodations to international students did so in a remedial way; some domestic students reported discriminatory actions towards non-native English-speaking students for not being able to communicate in a way deemed appropriate by them; international students questioned their linguistic and academic abilities when compared with native English speakers; one staff member openly criticized the institution for allowing admission to non-native English speakers. Most participants seem to view non-native English speakers through a language as a problem orientation (Hult and Hornberger, 2016), and through idealized notions of language (Lippi-Green, 2012; Byrd Clark, 2012). Therefore, the institution's mission of fostering global citizenship and intercultural knowledge seems to lack an important aspect: valuing linguistic diversity, which has been identified and its absence criticized by many staff participants. Jessica, a staff member understanding that "diversity by itself does not bring as much benefit", resonates with Leask and Carroll (2011)'s idea that cultural diversity does not automatically mean intercultural learning. Staff in general were critical of the institution's rhetoric of internationalization and the hegemony of English on campus. They suggested that structural changes in the way the university supports students and faculty should be made to better address everyone's needs. Most staff participants highlighted the importance of recognizing and supporting linguistic and cultural diversity on campus as a key aspect for the success of internationalization.

Working on an intersection between students and faculty, staff's holistic views provide invaluable insights into the functioning of the university as a whole and its ruling

relations. By looking at their narratives through the lens of Foucauldian discourse analysis, it is possible to identify and challenge ways of thinking “that have come to be viewed as natural and therefore tend to be taken for granted” (Cheek, 2012, p. 356). In addition, this lens stresses one of Smith’s (2002) institutional ethnography aims, which is to uncover the ways in which people’s “own lives and work are hooked into the lives and work of others in relations of which most of us are not aware” (p. 27).

Standardized Language Proficiency Tests

Although passing a standardized language proficiency test, usually IELTS or TOEFL, is one of the admission requirements for international students in many Anglophone universities, including MU, evidence from the literature (Seelen, 2002; Simner & Mitchell, 2007) indicates that such tests do not guarantee that students will succeed in courses. Seelen’s (2002) case study of students in the National University of Lesotho illustrates that there is weak correlation between English testing and actual performance in a university context, and the language that is needed to succeed academically. Findings from Simner & Mitchell’s (2007) research conducted at a Canadian university indicate that TOEFL is not an accurate predictor of academic performance.

Most participants who mentioned language proficiency tests such as IELTS and TOEFL in their narratives recognized that passing them does not guarantee that students have the skills to succeed in the academic environment. However, two participants, one staff and one faculty, expressed surprise that students who passed those tests have problems with English proficiency. This indicates that the institution should be cautious in relying on standardized tests to predict academic success.

Suggestions for a More Inclusive Internationalization

This study points to contradictions in the model of internationalization in place at MU and can be used as a reference for the design and implementation of more linguistically inclusive practices. An ethical and inclusive process of internationalization should consider the important role of linguistic diversity on campus. It also requires modifications to the traditional learning and teaching practices that might include

changing the curriculum to include global themes, training in intercultural skills, and techniques that enable language development.

Linguistic practices are an important aspect of internationalization, as discussed throughout this thesis. In spite of the importance of English as a global lingua franca, and the economic and cultural capital associated with it, the current landscape of internationalization requires a reconsideration of established Western academic practices. Baker suggests that:

a balance is needed between knowledge and awareness of established communities and communicative practices, together with language choices, and adaptability and flexibility in regard to the complexity of any grouping, as well as the dynamic and emergent nature of many communicative practices in transcultural universities. (2016, p. 446 - 447)

On a similar note, Pennycook's (2005) concept of "pedagogy of flow" aims to engage and include cultural and linguistic knowledge students bring to the classroom, since classrooms can no longer be considered as locations with fixed cultural practices that emerge from local traditions. That being the case, a curriculum that is inclusive of multicultural and multilingual students also cannot be static, "pedagogy needs to get with the flow" (2005, p. 41). I suggest that MU should support multilingual and multicultural adaptations to curricula by providing support for faculty to implement changes in their classrooms. This support should come as incentives rather than impositions, and can take the form of professional development, institutional grants, and initiatives that count towards tenure.

Anderson (2014) points that the legitimization of certain types of knowledge is ontological and epistemological, instead of pedagogical. The author suggests "responsive teaching that is open to both students' needs and their diversity" (p. 649) as well as "the importance of fostering opportunities to develop connections in order to facilitate students' communicative confidence, discovery and development of shared understanding (Lugones, 1987)" (p. 649). Since student experience is shaped by both the formal and informal curriculum (Leask and Carroll, 2011), I argue that the same rationale used by Anderson (2014) can be applied to extra-curricular activities. In practice I envision that internationalization at MU needs to go beyond policies and classroom practices and also involve student societies and other groups on campus. Since MU has a strong internationalization orientation as part of its strategic plan, the

implementation of campus-wide initiatives can be achieved by a collaboration between administration and student groups.

For Hébert & Abdi (2013), internationalization should foster practices that lead to “more equitable social and learning relationships” (p. 23) together with inclusive learning practices. A detailed frame of reference for more equitable and sustainable practices of internationalization of education is found in Ilieva et al (2014). The framework focuses on two main themes that I believe are central in addressing the issues identified in this study: valuing diversity, and mutuality/reciprocity. The first theme refers to “valuing the resources international students bring and opening up to diversity while negotiating curriculum with more attention to global/local interactions” (p. 884), as well as “expanding knowledge of different educational traditions” (p. 885). Valuing diversity was pointed by staff participants in this study as a way of creating a more inclusive campus environment. The second theme refers to resisting relations of power that normalize the Western cultural and academic imperialism, and actually building international relationships based on a reciprocal collaboration.

My suggestions for a more inclusive internationalization are based on Stein et al. (2016) Anti-Oppressive Internationalization articulation, which aims to value knowledges beyond the dominant Western model in order to enable “systemic change toward global justice” (p. 13). These include flexibility in communicative practices (Baker, 2016), more linguistically inclusive pedagogical practices (Anderson, 2014; Ilieva et al, 2014; Pennycook, 2005), and professional development focused on cross-cultural competencies (Leask and Carroll, 2011) not only for faculty as suggested by these authors, but for staff as well. Based on the interconnections in student, staff, and faculty’s experiences unveiled by this research, I argue that the implementation of internationalization initiatives has more chances of being successful when they target the academic community as a whole, instead of operating in silos.

Limitations and Possibilities for Future Research

Much has been written on the experiences of students and faculty with the implementation of EMI post-secondary courses in non-Anglophone settings (Smit and

Dafouz, 2012). My study demonstrates that more attention should be paid to language issues in internationalizing Anglophone settings. It also demonstrates that different actors share similar perceptions about linguistic diversity and that their experiences influence to a large extent the experiences of others in the institution. Therefore, initiatives that focus on improving student experience cannot disregard staff and faculty's perspectives.

The limitations of this study emerge from its nature of offering a secondary analysis of data collected on the basis of a different set of research questions. I had limited access to participants' views on language matters since the questions asked were not specific about language or multilingualism. Even though my role as research assistant in the project gave me opportunity to interview participants with a certain liberty, it prevented me from fully pursuing the threads I was personally interested in by adding specific questions linked to language. By looking at a large sample of data I was able to find common themes that resonate to different participants experiencing internationalization in different capacities, which provided me with a broad understanding of their experiences. However, I was not able to monitor changes in participants' perspectives and experiences.

Participants' narratives I analyzed in this study led to more questions. An aspect I would like to explore in more depth in future research is the transformative potential of action research in the lives of participants. In particular I would be interested in a longitudinal study with focus groups in addition to individual interviews. Structural changes related to internationalization may take quite some time to be implemented, but people can be inspired and empowered by the experiences of others, whether or not they share the same difficulties.

While this research was being conducted, the English Language Research Centre (ELRC) was established at MU with the aim to provide "students, staff and faculty with teaching and learning services that support them in [MU's] multilingual and multicultural environment"⁹. Such a holistic approach is to be commended and future

⁹ Source is not provided for anonymity purposes.

research could assess the impact it has on students, staff, and faculty experience in the internationalizing university.

Reflecting Back and Moving Forward

The exercise of research has had profound implications for my personal and professional identities. During the research process, and more strongly during this thesis writing process, I saw myself navigating different realms of experience previously unknown to me.

My experience with language ideologies

The biggest challenge I overcame with this research was recognizing to myself that the assumptions I have about my English language proficiency have an ideological dimension. This was only possible by being honest with myself about the feelings I experienced when analyzing my participants' narratives. Throughout my data analysis I felt an array of emotions: discouragement, identification, empowerment, and hope. I often felt a compassion for non-native English speakers who either expressed negative perceptions about their own language proficiency, or who were the target of negative comments by native English speakers, that I did not feel in relation to myself. Little by little I recognized that the linguistic standards I (still) impose on myself are the same ideological assumptions about language that I criticize in my work. This reinforces my argument on the power of language ideologies and on the importance of understanding and challenging them at internationalized universities.

Becoming a writer

“The Limits of my Language are the Limits of my World”

I open my thesis with this quote and in this concluding chapter I reflect on the meaning of Wittgenstein's words. I emphasize that this is a personal reflection rather than an attempt to explain the philosopher's words.

The process of becoming a writer has been a struggle in which the limits of my language were indeed the limits of my world. I saw myself in a cyclical process where my ideas shaped my writing to the same proportion in which my writing shaped my

ideas. As per Brand (1987), “written discourse is considered a quintessential representation of thought” (p. 436). Thus, it was through the written word that I could make sense of my thought process. This gave me a new understanding of my own thought-making process and expanded the limits of my world as I now embrace two new in-progress aspects of my identity: researcher and writer.

Becoming a researcher

The exercise of research has been rewarding. I appreciated every aspect of the process, from the initial phase of recruiting participants, to interviewing, coding, and finally analyzing the data. Observing participants’ reflections on their experiences made me reflect on my own trajectory throughout my Masters’ studies.

The aspect of my experience doing research that stood out to me is the researcher relationship with the data. Even though I understood (in theory) the impossibility of researcher neutrality in social sciences I was surprised by the impact some narratives had over me. During my encounter with the data I experienced an unexpected overidentification with some narratives. When this happened, I sought guidance in Mason’s (1996) words: “a researcher cannot be neutral, or objective, or detached, from the knowledge and evidence they are generating. Instead, they should seek to understand their role in that process” (p. 6). I believe that my role as researcher is to utilize my findings to improve certain aspects of people’s lives. Being personally invested in my research topic gave me an understanding that narratives have the power to influence and even shift mindsets (as it happened with me). Moving forward I wish to use my study to empower other people on the pervasive power of English-dominant language ideologies in Anglophone institutions.

I envision my research informing the following five domains. First, students would benefit from listening to their peers’ ideas and experiences. By listening to other voices students might challenge their established perspectives about themselves and others. Second, findings from my study can be used in faculty professional development initiatives as a way to inform them on students’ and other faculty members’ perspectives on linguistic diversity. Third, my study demonstrates that staff’s voices matter and are important in research on internationalization of education. Their invaluable contribution can inform institutional decisions around internationalization. Fourth, throughout my

study participants shared ideas to improve current internationalization practices at MU. These can be used to inform more linguistically inclusive policy and practices in an institutional and departmental level at MU, which take into consideration the needs of different groups of stakeholders. Finally, my study can be used to raise the awareness of other higher education institutions, especially in EDL contexts, of the importance of language issues in the interconnected experiences of students, faculty, and staff.

Through future research, in addition to continuing to investigate language issues, I hope to uncover other pervasive aspects of internationalization that negatively affect different experiences, as a way of contributing to more sustainable and equitable practices of internationalization of education. Thus, this thesis is just a beginning.

References

- Anderson, T. (2015). Seeking internationalization: The state of Canadian higher education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 45 (4), 166-187.
- Anderson, V. (2014). 'World-travelling': A framework for re-thinking teaching and learning in internationalised higher education. *Higher Education*, 68. 637-652.
- Arthur, N. (2017). Supporting international students through strengthening their social resources. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42 (5), 887-894. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2017.1293876
- Banta, T. & Kuh, G. (1998) A missing link in assessment: Collaboration between academic and student affairs professionals. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 30 (2), 40-46. doi: 10.1080/00091389809602606
- Baker, W. (2016). English as an academic lingua franca and intercultural awareness: student mobility in the transcultural university. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16 (3), 437-451. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14708477.2016.1168053>
- Beck, K. (2008). Being international: Learning in a Canadian university. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from: <http://summit.sfu.ca/item/8752>
- Beck, K., & Ilieva, R. (2011). *SSHRC Proposal*. Unpublished manuscript. Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada.
- Beck, K. (2012). Globalization/s: Reproduction and resistance in the internationalization of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 35 (3), 133-148.
- Beck, K. (2013). Making sense of internationalization: a critical analysis. In Hébert and Abdi (Eds), *Critical Perspectives on International Education*, (pp. 43-60). Sense Publishers.
- Beck, K., Ilieva, R., Pullman, A., & Zhang, Z. (2013). New work, old power: inequities within the labor of internationalization. *On the Horizon*, 21 (02), 84-95. doi: 10.1108/10748121311322987
- Brand, A. (1987). The Why of Cognition: Emotion and the Writing Process. *College Composition and Communication*, 38 (4), 436-443. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/357637>
- Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications.

- Brown, L. (2008). Language and anxiety: An ethnographic study of international postgraduate students. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 21 (2), 75-95. doi: 10.1080/09500790802152167
- Byrd Clark, J., Haque, E., & Lamoureux, S. (2012). The role of language in processes of internationalization: Considering linguistic heterogeneity and voices from within and out in two diverse contexts in Ontario. *Canadian and International Education / Education canadienne et internationale*, 41 (3), 1-15. Retrieved from: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci/vol41/iss3/5>
- CBIE. (2016). A world of learning: Canada's performance and potential in international education 2016. Retrieved from: <http://cbie.ca/media/facts-and-figures/>
- Cheek, J. (2012). Foucauldian discourse analysis. In Lisa M. Given (Ed), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Criswell, J. R., & Zhu, H. (2015). Faculty internationalization priorities. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, 2 (2). Retrieved from <http://preserve.lehigh.edu/re/vol2/iss2/3>
- Dearden, J. (2014). English as a medium of instruction – a growing global phenomenon. Retrieved from: https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e484_emi_-_cover_option_3_final_web.pdf
- De Beuckelaer, A., Lievens, F., & Bücker, J. (2012). The role of faculty members' cross-cultural competencies in their perceived teaching quality: Evidence from culturally-diverse classes in four European countries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83 (2). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2012.0007>
- Devault, M. (2006). What is institutional ethnography? *Social Problems* 53(3), 294-298. Retrieved from: <https://academic.oup.com/socpro/article-abstract/53/3/294/1613057>
- de Wit, H. & Hunter, F. (2015). The Future of Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe. *International Higher Education*, 83 (Special Issue), 2-3. Retrieved from: <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/9073/8180>
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and Globalization*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Education Review*, 85 (2), 149-171.
- Fotovatian, S. (2012). Three constructs of institutional identity among international doctoral students in Australia. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 17 (5), 577-588. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2012.658557

- Fotovatian, S., & Miller, J. (2014). Constructing an institutional identity in university tea rooms: the international PhD student experience. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33 (2), 286-297. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2013.832154
- Friesen, R. (2012). Faculty member engagement in Canadian university internationalization: a consideration of understanding, motivations and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 17 (3), 209-227. doi: 10.1177/1028315312451132
- Gallagher, C. E., & Haan, J. (2017). University faculty beliefs about emergent multilinguals and linguistically responsive instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 0 (0). 1-27. doi: 10.1002/tesq.399
- Garson, K. (2016). Reframing internationalization. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 46 (2), 19-39.
- Grayson, P. (2008). The experiences and outcomes of domestic and international students at four Canadian universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27 (3), 215-230. doi: 10.1080/07294360802183788
- Guo, Y., & Guo, S. (2017). Internationalization of Canadian higher education: discrepancies between policies and international student experiences. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42 (5), 851-868. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2017.1293874
- Haan, J. E., Gallagher, C. E., & Varandani, L. (2017). Working with linguistically diverse classes across the disciplines: Faculty beliefs. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 17 (1), 37-51. doi: 10.14434/josotl.v17i1.20008
- Hébert, Y., & Abdi, A. (2013). Critical perspectives on international education: Redefinitions, knowledge-making, mobilities and changing the world. In Hébert and Abdi (Eds), *Critical Perspectives on International Education*, (pp. 1-42). Sense Publishers.
- Hook, D. (2001). *Discourse, knowledge, materiality, history: Foucault and discourse analysis*. London: LSE Research Online. Available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/archive/956>
- Ilieva, R., Beck, K., & Waterstone, B. (2014). Towards sustainable internationalization of higher education. *High Educ*, 68. 875-889.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The Politics of Academic English Language Policy*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Johnston, M. (2014). Secondary data analysis: A method of which the time has come. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries* (3), 619-626.

- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8 (1), 5-31. doi: 10.1177/1028315303260832
- Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalization – For better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17 (3), 84-90. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2012.753957>
- Knight, J. (2015). International universities: Misunderstandings and emerging models? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19 (2). 107-121. doi: 10.1177/1028315315572899
- Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing Interviews*. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/10.4135/9781849208963.n5>
- Larsen, M. (2015). Internationalization in Canadian higher education: A case study of the gap between official discourses and on-the-ground realities. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 45 (4), 101-122.
- Leask, B., & Carroll, J. (2011). Moving beyond 'wishing and hoping': internationalisation and student experiences of inclusion and engagement. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30 (5), 647-659. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2011.598454
- Lippi-Green (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Llurda, E., Cots, J. & Armengol, L. (2014) Views on multilingualism and internationalisation in higher education: administrative staff in the spotlight. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35 (4), 376-391. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2013.874435
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and reconstructing languages. In Makoni and Pennycook (Eds), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*, (pp. 1-41). Multilingual Matters.
- Marshall, S. (2010). Re-becoming ESL: multilingual university students and a deficit identity. *Language and Education*, 24 (1), 41-56. doi: 10.1080/09500780903194044
- Marshall, S. & Marr, J. W. (2018). Teaching multilingual learners in Canadian writing-intensive classrooms: Pedagogy, binaries, and conflicting identities. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 40 (2018). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.01.002>
- Marshall, S. & Moore, D. (2013). 2B or Not 2B Plurilingual? Navigating Languages Literacies, and Plurilingual Competence in Postsecondary Education in Canada. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47 (3), 472-499. doi: 10.1002/tesq.111

- McKnight, P., & McKnight, K. (2011). Missing data in secondary analysis. In K. H. Trzesniewski, M. B. Donnellan, and R. E. Lucas (Eds). *Secondary Data Analysis: An Introduction for Psychologists*, (pp. 83-92). Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12350-005>
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity negotiation in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38 (4), 573-603. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588281>
- Myles, J., & Cheng, L. (2003). The social and cultural life of non-native English speaking international graduate students at a Canadian university. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2 (2003), 247-263. doi: 10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00028-6
- OECD. (2016). Indicator C4: Who studies abroad and where? *Education at a glance 2016: OECD Indicators*. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2016-en>
- Pennycook, A. (2005). Teaching with the flow: Fixity and fluidity in education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 25(1), 29-43. doi: 10.1080/02188790500032491
- Pennycook, A. (2007). The myth of English as an international language. In Makoni and Pennycook (Eds), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*, (pp. 90-115). Multilingual Matters.
- Pitman, T. (2000). Perceptions of academics and students as customers: A survey of administrative staff in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 22 (2), 165-175. doi: 10.1080/713678138
- Ryan, J. & Viète, R. (2009). Respectful interactions: learning with international students in the English-speaking academy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14 (3), 303-314. doi: 10.1080/13562510902898866
- Sawir, E. (2011). Dealing with diversity in internationalised higher education institutions. *Intercultural Education*, 22 (5), 381-394. doi: 10.1080/14675986.2011.643136
- Simmer, M.; Mitchell, J. (2007). Validation of the TOEFL as a Canadian university admissions requirement. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 22 (2), 182-190. Retrieved from: <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/10.1177/0829573507307689>
- Seelen, L. (2002). Is performance in English as a second language a relevant criterion for admission to an English medium university? *Higher Education*, 44 (2), 213-232. Retrieved from: <https://link-springer-com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/article/10.1023/A%3A1016356515600>
- Smith, D. (2002). "Institutional Ethnography." in Tim May (ed.), *Qualitative research in action: An international guide to issues in practice* (pp. 17-52). London: Sage.
- Smith, D. (2005). *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people / Dorothy E. Smith*. (Gender lens series).

- Smith, D. (2006). *Institutional ethnography as practice / edited by Dorothy E. Smith*.
- Smith, D. (2012). Institutional Ethnography. In Lisa M. Given (Ed), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (pp.434-436). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Stein, S.; Andreotti, V.; Bruce, J. & Suša, R. (2016) Towards different conversations about the internationalization of higher education. *Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée et Internationale*, 45 (1). Retrieved from: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci/vol45/iss1/2>
- Stier, Jonas. (2004). Taking a Critical Stance toward Internationalization Ideologies in Higher Education: Idealism, Instrumentalism and Educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2(1), 83-97.
- Straker, J. (2016). International student participation in higher education: changing the focus from “international students” to “participation”. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20 (4), 299-318. doi: 10.1177/1028315316628992
- Szekeres, J. (2004) The invisible workers. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 26 (1), 7-22. doi: 10.1080/1360080042000182500
- Szekeres, J. (2006) General staff experiences in the corporate university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 28 (2), 133-145. doi: 10.1080/13600800600750962
- Szekeres, J. (2011). Professional staff carve out a new space. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33 (6), 679-691. doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2011.621193
- Tange, H. (2010). Caught in the Tower of Babel: university lecturers' experiences with internationalisation. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 10 (2), 137-149. doi: 10.1080/14708470903342138
- van den Hoonaard (2015). *Qualitative Research in Action: a Canadian Primer*. Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Waterstone, B. (2008). “I hate the ESL idea!”: A case study in identity and academic literacy. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 26 (1), 52-67.
- Whitchurch, C. (2008a). Beyond administration and management: reconstructing the identities of professional staff in UK higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 30 (4), 375-386, doi: 10.1080/13600800802383042
- Whitchurch, C. (2008b). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: the emergence of *Third Space* professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62 (4), 377-396. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00387.x

- Woolard, K. (1998). Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity (Eds), *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory* (pp. 20-85). Oxford University Press.
- Wortham, S. (2001). Language ideology and educational research. *Linguistics and Education*, 12 (3), 253-259.
- Wright, C.; & Schartner, A. (2013). 'I can't...I won't?' International students at the threshold of social interaction. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 12 (2), 113-128. doi: 10.1177/1475240913491055

Appendix A.

Interview Guides

Faculty Interview Guide

Begin with demographics: name/faculty/ educational background, years teaching, research interest/ etc.

Concept and practices of internationalization

This research relates to finding out about internationalization of the university – and international education in general.

a) What does internationalization mean to you?

b) How is it showing up at the university? How does it impact your department? Does this differ from other universities you may have worked or studied in?

c) Can you give me some examples of how internationalization impacts your teaching? Do you have choice in regards to this impact? How do you navigate this? (This last question is slightly ambiguous, and will have to be reworded depending on the direction of conversation.)

What do you think of internationalization? What do you think is being achieved by internationalizing? For students, and for the university? Do you think you are benefitting from internationalization? Why or why not?

Internationalization as ‘developing intercultural competencies’

3. Researchers within a Canada-wide study described internationalization as developing “international knowledge” and “intercultural competencies” among students. Do you agree with this description? Do you have examples of why or why not this may be true?

a) How do you understand international knowledge and intercultural competency? How does this come into your teaching and/or research?

b) Do you feel you have gained, through your experiences, international knowledge and intercultural competence?

c) How do you think these competencies can be developed among students?
[Do you think this differs for international and domestic students? If so, how?]

Teaching, curriculum and support for internationalizing curriculum/pedagogy

Does the presence of international students in your classes impact teaching practices? (if so: How?)

In your opinion, is bringing an international dimension to the curriculum and teaching/learning process an overall strategic priority within your faculty?

a) If no, do you think it should be a priority? Why/why not?

b) If yes, how is it being implemented? What else would you like to see happening?

c) Can you give some examples of how you bring an international dimension into your teaching? Why have you chosen these methods?

Are there any international themes which come into the courses you teach? If yes, do you incorporate this material? How do students react? If no, what are the limitations to including international themes?

Does your faculty provide support to you on how to use the experience and knowledge of international students or returned Canadian exchange students in the classroom?

a) If yes, how is support provided? b) If no, do you think support should be provided? How?

5. Let's talk about ... (We will probe for anything interesting arising from the interview. Could even ask: Is there anything you would like to add?)

Staff Interview Guide

Begin with demographics: Name, Faculty/ Department (do you work in more than one department?), years at MU, etc.

Concept and practices of internationalization

This research study is trying to understand internationalization of the university – and international education in general.

What does “internationalization of education” mean to you?

Can you provide some examples of internationalization? (university, department etc.)

How do you think internationalization is showing up at MU? What is driving internationalization here? Who is most impacted by this drive?

What do you think is being achieved by internationalizing? For students, and for the university? Do you think you are benefitting from internationalization? Why or why not?

Are there educational benefits to internationalization? (for the students, for the university, for staff?) What are they?

Impact

What international programs do you have in your department? Is it a necessary part of your everyday job requirements? How or how not? Does it result in extra work for you? (probe – how so? What kind of work?) Does this differ from other universities you may have worked in?

Do you deal with international students in your department? Tell me about this.

Do they need more support than domestic students? (p.)

How does this impact your workload? (ask for examples, if possible)

Has the impact changed or altered over time?

Do you think you need special skills to deal with international students, or international programming? What are they?

Do you feel you have enough information about these areas to do your work well?

Do you have opportunities to increase your knowledge and skills related to these areas?

Are you gaining international knowledge and competences through your job? How or how not? Do you think it's beneficial?

Does MU provide info sessions or professional development opportunities? Or of internationalization

do they provide sessions for students on international issues?

Who makes decisions about international programs and activities in your department? Do you have any control to how these decisions and procedures impact your job?

Who implements procedures surrounding internationalization in your department? Do you have any control to how these decisions and procedures impact your job?

What challenges do you face and what concerns do you have about internationalization in your department? What are the biggest barriers or challenges? From your perspective, are there negative impacts of internationalization in your department?

Communications

What is communication about internationalization in your department centered on? What is your role in this?

In your opinion, is there good communication about international activities and programs in your department?

Can you make suggestions for improvement in communications about internationalization in your department?

Are there any negative thoughts and opinions about international programs in your depth do you think? Why might that be?

Final comments 15. Final comments? (probe for anything interesting arising from the interview. Could even ask: Is there anything you would like to add?)

Student Interview Guide

Internationalizing the university: Critical perspectives Qualitative Component:
Semi-Structured Interview Questions

- Begin with asking a person to tell you a little bit about themselves, where they are from, where they currently live. *For international students:* When did you come to Canada? (How long have you been here?) From where? Why did you choose to study overseas? Why Canada?
- Why did you choose to study at Simon Fraser University? What helped you to make your decision? Are there any documents or printed material (or website information) that helped you to make that decision? Are you enjoying your studies at MU? What do you like, and what is not working for you?

a. What department and program are you enrolled in? Where are you in your program, and when did you start? Why did you choose this direction for your education? *For domestic students:* Is there any portion of your program which includes international opportunities? Do you plan to take these opportunities? *Domestic students:* Are there

opportunities for you to choose international opportunities in the areas that you would like?

Do you have international opportunities in your program? Is there much information about them (if yes to previous). Do you think they are useful? Educational? If interested, is it clear how you can apply? Do you have to pay fees to participate? Do you think this is a barrier?

- What courses are you taking at this time? Are there any international themes which come into the course content? If yes, do you find this information useful? Why/why not? *For international students:* Does the course content differ from what you studied previously in your own country? Are topics of interest issues from your own country brought up in class?
- This research is about understanding internationalization of the university – and international education in general. b. What does internationalization mean to you? c. How is it showing up at the university? d. Can you give me some examples of how internationalization impacts your education? e. Do you think internationalization affects your learning daily? If so, how? *International students:* Does international practices (9 how will they understand practices? Unpack into smaller questions) at MU differ from

(If the participant answers no, we may ask—do you have such experience in the past? If yes, how do they think about it?) universities in your home country? What would be different if you had chosen to study at home?

1. So what do you think is being achieved by internationalizing? For students, and for the university? For yourself?
2. Do you think you are benefitting from internationalization? Why or why not?
3. Do you think international students and domestic students are treated differently at MU? Do you have any examples from your own experiences? Or have you heard about such examples? For domestic students: Premier Christy Clark has announced proposals to increase numbers of international students to BC by

50%. do you agree with the policy of bringing more international students to MU?
Why or why not?


4. *For international students:* Do you think you need to do more work as a student in comparison to Canadian students? Is studying harder for you? Why or why not?
5. *For international students:* Do you face any problems communicating with your teachers as an international student? What about with university administrators? Why or why not? If you face a study related problem where do you get the information you need?

10. *As an international student,* what support is available from the university? What support do you use? Is it valuable for your studies? Is there anything more that the university should be doing to help you?

3. Talk about finances and fees. How has internationalization affected your education costs? How do you deal with these costs? Do you think it will be worth it?
4. Can you say something about your friendship groups, who you make friends with on campus? Do they help you with your studies?
5. How do you foresee the educational choices you are making now, in relation to international education, affecting your future?

Appendix B.

Consent Form



Faculty of Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent by Faculty Participants in a Research Study (Interview)

The University and those conducting this research study subscribe to the ethical conduct of research and to the protection at all times of the interests, comfort, and safety of participants. This research is being conducted under permission of the Simon Fraser Research Ethics Board. The chief concern of the Board is for the health, safety, and psychological well being of research participants.

Should you wish to obtain information about your rights as a participant in research, or about the responsibilities of researchers, or if you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the manner in which you were treated in this study, please contact Dr. Dina Shafey, Associate Director of Office of Research Ethics by email at [REDACTED]@sfu.ca or phone at 778-782-9631.

Your signature on this form will signify that you understand the procedures, possible risks, and benefits of this research study, that you have received an adequate opportunity to consider the information describing the study, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study.

Any information that is obtained during this study will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by the law. Knowledge of your identity is not required. Collected data will be kept in a locked cabinet and all data will be stored on an external hard-drive in a secure location and kept for four years after the completion of the study.

Title of study: Interrogating Internationalization: A Multi-dimensional Case Study

Project Number: 2010s0432

Investigator Names: Dr. Kumari Beck [REDACTED]@sfu.ca) and Dr. Roumi Ilieva [REDACTED]@sfu.ca).

Investigators Department: Faculty of Education

Duration: May 2010 – April 2016

Graduate Student Researchers: Camila Miranda (Graduate student in the Faculty of Education)

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY THINKING OF THE WORLD



Faculty of Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent by Student Participants in a Research Study (Interview)

The University and those conducting this research study subscribe to the ethical conduct of research and to the protection at all times of the interests, comfort, and safety of participants. This research is being conducted under permission of the Simon Fraser Research Ethics Board. The chief concern of the Board is for the health, safety, and psychological well being of research participants.

Should you wish to obtain information about your rights as a participant in research, or about the responsibilities of researchers, or if you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the manner in which you were treated in this study, please contact Dr. Dina Shafey, Associate Director of Office of Research Ethics by email at [REDACTED]@sfu.ca or phone at 778-782-9631.

Your signature on this form will signify that you understand the procedures, possible risks, and benefits of this research study, that you have received an adequate opportunity to consider the information describing the study, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study.

Any information that is obtained during this study will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by the law. Knowledge of your identity is not required. Collected data will be kept in a locked cabinet and all data will be stored on an external hard-drive in a secure location and kept for four years after the completion of the study.

Title of study: Interrogating Internationalization: A Multi-dimensional Case Study

Project Number: 2010s0432

Investigator Names: Dr. Kumari Beck ([REDACTED]@sfu.ca),) and Dr. Roumi Ilieva ([REDACTED]@sfu.ca).

Investigators Department: Faculty of Education

Duration: May 2010 – April 2016

Graduate Student Researchers: Camila Miranda (Graduate student in the Faculty of Education)