Sites of internationalised education are the result of, and in turn contribute to, the cultural processes of globalisation. These sites have created new education contact zones that may pose moral dilemmas for teachers—in particular for the teachers employed in the cultural contact zones of ESL, English for academic purposes, and foundation preparatory programs. This article reviews theories of culture, cultural identity, and cultural processes under conditions of globalisation and analyses teachers' accounts of pedagogic choices in designing and enacting educational programs for international students in the contact zone of the global university. It examines the ways teachers navigate and manage the dilemmas created between their professional ethic of cultural respect and the curricula of linguistic-cultural orientation to Western higher education. It is proposed that teachers' different assumptions about the cultural processes of globalisation contribute to the construction of a range of strategies and moral positions when managing such dilemmas. Moreover, it is suggested that holistic, tightly bounded notions of culture no longer adequately inform pedagogic practice in these globalised and globalising sites.

The most visible and widely publicised indicator of educational globalisation is the increasingly diverse ethnic and linguistic composition of the student population on Western university campuses (Levin, 2001; Luke, 2001). In 2002, international students (the term has been used since the 1990s to distinguish full-fee-paying overseas students from domestic students) composed 20% of the total student enrolment in the Australian university sector (Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2003; Noonan, 2003). Moreover, approximately 80% of all international student enrolments in Australian universities were from Asia, with the majority of students (55%) from Southeast Asian countries,
namely, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand\textsuperscript{1} (Maslen 2002, p. 2). Australia now draws more students from Singapore, Malaysia, and Indonesia than does the United States (McMurtrie, 2001). The vast majority of these students are of Chinese ethnic and linguistic background and predominantly from the newly industrialised countries of Southeast Asia (Nesdale, Simkin, Sang, Burke, & Frager, 1995). This predominance of students from Southeast Asia has strongly influenced how the Australian higher education sector imagines the educational needs of the international student and consequently designs preparatory curricula and pedagogy for this student cohort.

Asian international students typically travel to Western universities to acquire Western credentials and expertise because these offer greater workplace flexibility and geographic mobility in the global occupational marketplace (Luke, 2001; Rizvi, 2000). The status of English as the emerging lingua franca of the global networked economy has guaranteed Australia a competitive education export position in the Asia-Pacific region. In English for academic purposes (EAP) and foundation programs, scores in language competence measures such as the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) or the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) are used as manageable proxy measures of academic readiness for mainstream university study. Entry and exit levels into the various stages of the articulated pathways into higher education are dictated by English proficiency. Though English serves as the official rubric governing assessment in these programs, the various curricula in the preparatory pathway are also explicitly geared towards developing the culturally suitable demeanours, dispositions, and behaviours of a Western academic student. Thus students are offered courses in not only English but also cultural orientation and study skills.

Because “globalization changes the conditions in which language learning and language teaching take place” (Block & Cameron, 2002, p. 2), teachers of EAP, ESL, and foundation studies need to critically engage with assumptions about teacher, student, and cultural identities. Communicative relations in such contact zones need to be renegotiated, reworked, and remade in new and contingent ways exacerbating the “postmethod condition” referred to by Canagarajah (2002, p. 140). What matters increasingly is how culture and cultural identity are evoked, by whom, for what purposes, and with what potential consequences in specific locations (see Clifford, 1997). The locations we focused on in this study were Australian higher education EAP, ESL, and foundation

\textsuperscript{1} The top 10 countries with foreign or international students at Australian universities, online or at offshore campuses, are Singapore, 24,400; Hong Kong, 24,300; Malaysia, 23,600; China, 21,400; Indonesia, 10,000; India, 8,300; United States, 7,800; Thailand, 4,700; Taiwan, 3,700; Norway, 3,600 (Noonan, 2003, p. 6).
studies classrooms, where we examined teachers’ understandings of
culture and cultural identity and how these understandings may inform
moral and ethical decision making.

We examine new theories of culture and cultural identity based on
notions of global contact zones and consider their implications for
assessing pedagogic approaches in EAP, ESL, and foundation prepara-
tory programs. Drawing on interview data collected from nine teachers
asked to critically reflect on videotaped extracts of their own classroom
lessons, we examine their strategies for managing the cognitive and
moral dilemmas associated with pedagogic work in global contact zones.
Finally, we connect the global with the local and challenge teachers to
critically consider how new theories of cultural globalisation and global
contact zones may assist in the management of moral dilemmas and
inform the design and enactment of pedagogic work.

GLOBAL CONTACT ZONES—NEW THEORIES
OF CULTURAL IDENTITY

ESL, EAP, and foundation preparatory programs can be theorised as
global education contact zones (see also Canagarajah, 1997). Contact
zones are spatial, temporal locations that have already been constituted
relationally and that enter new relations through historical processes of
displacement (Clifford, 1997, p. 7). Clifford defines location as “an
itinerary rather than a bounded site—a series of encounters and
translations” in space and time (p. 11). In these locations, or contact
zones, people with disparate historical trajectories and cultural2 identities “meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetri-
cal relations of domination and subordination” (Pratt, 1992, p. 4). These
asymmetrical power relations are not only historically constituted as the
aftermath of colonialism, imperialism, and slavery, but are reconstituted
and contested in day-to-day pedagogic interactions. These contact zones
have been historically constituted in relation to various influences and
processes: (a) legacies of Western colonial and neocolonial practices, (b)
recent market-driven imperatives of Western higher education as the
sector shifts from education as aid to export and trade,3 (c) the global

2 Following Appadurai (1996), we use the adjectival term cultural to stress the “contextual,
heuristic, and comparative dimensions” that orient us to “the idea of culture as difference,
especially as difference in the realm of group identity” (p. 13).

3 International education has been described variously as “Australia’s seventh largest export
earner gleaning $4.2 billion in foreign exchange earnings annually” (Noonan, 2003, p. 6), a
“5.2 billion education export industry” (Illing, 2003, p. 19), and an “overseas student market
worth $5.2 billion to Australia” (Contractor, 2003, p. 3).
spread of English language and Western knowledge, and (d) demands of former colonised people for access to dominant language and knowledge resources on their own terms (Canagarajah, 1999).

The teachers and students who meet in these contact zones are active agents who produce, coconstruct, and challenge the design of these programs in and through day-to-day pedagogic interactions. As Clifford (1997) argues, “Cultural centers, discrete regions and territories, do not exist prior to contacts, but are sustained through them, appropriating and disciplining the restless movements of people and things” (p. 3). Moreover, teachers and students travel to and from these contact zones via similar circuits or routes. Many EAP, ESL, and foundation studies teachers have travelled to and taught in Southeast Asian countries, and many of the students who attend Australian higher education institutions have completed years of English language studies often designed and delivered by teachers with Western credentials. Cultural contact therefore is not a one-time event, nor is movement or travel in only one direction.

This theory of contact zones complicates notions of static, fixed, bounded sociocultural wholes as depicted in theories of “‘acculturation’ (with its overly linear trajectory: from culture A to culture B) or ‘syncretism’ (with its image of two clear systems overlaid)” (Clifford, 1997, p. 7). Contact zones are spaces of intercultural import-export and of transculturation (Hall, 1996; Pratt, 2002). The metaphor suggests a dyadic relationship, a mutual entanglement of cultural practices and modes of representing cultural identity with disputes and struggles over interpretative power (Kenway & Bullen, 2003; Pratt, 1999; Papastergiadis, 1997). Contact zones are spaces where “cultural action, the making and remaking of identities, takes place . . . along the policed and transgressive intercultural frontiers of nations, peoples, locales” (Clifford, p. 7). Hall suggests that “the two-way cultural traffic characteristic of the contact zones” was evident in the cities of the colonised long before it became a characteristic feature of the cities of the colonising (p. 251). Colonialism refers to the “whole process of expansion, exploration, conquest . . . and imperial hegemonization which constituted the ‘outer face,’ the constitutive mode, of European and then Western capitalist modernity after 1492” (Hall, p. 249). Some theorists suggest that colonisation processes were earlier versions of current globalisation processes. The colonial relation was never simply a one-way flow of ideas from the coloniser to the colonised.

Western universities have become zones of escalating cultural contact as increasingly large numbers of students from former colonised nations enrol in these institutions to acquire a Western education. The initial contact zones of ESL, EAP, and foundation studies programs are relatively recent pedagogic innovations designed to accommodate en-
counters between people with diverse historical trajectories, cultural identities, and linguistic repertoires in Western higher education institutions. Consequently, global education contact zones, says Bizzell (1994), are “not only what practitioners are teaching about, but what they are teaching in” (p. 166). These programs appear to be relatively standardised across Western nation states such as the United Kingdom, United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (Levin, 2001). Although academic preparation programs have been designed to improve articulation between overseas school systems and university disciplines (Humfrey, 1999), they appear to be based on notions of acculturation or syncretism—concepts of culture that have been challenged in recent years (see Appadurai, 1996; Castells, 1997; Clifford, 1997; Hall, 1996; Pratt, 2002; Shome & Hegde, 2002). Teachers employed in these programs appear to act as cultural informants socialising non-Western students into the norms or standards of Western scholarly conduct. For example, foundation and EAP programs across the Western higher education sector offer at the point of reception into university study a course in the English language, academic study skills, and cultural orientation. In addition, foundation programs provide prerequisite discipline-specific knowledge. Any difficulties that Asian international students may experience in the cultural contact zones are often explained by notions of culture shock, which place the burden of responsibility for adjustment on the individual student.4

More recently, however, teachers employed in the Australian higher education sector have been asked to internationalise curricula and pedagogy. The possibilities for designing pedagogic practices that take account of new theories of global cultural contact zones are thus emerging in the higher education sector. EAP, ESL, and foundation studies teachers are potentially at the forefront of this push to internationalise curricula and engage in modes of pedagogy responsive to the changing globalised and globalising zones of higher education.

Knight and de Wit (1995) provide a widely cited definition of internationalisation as “the complex of processes whose combined

---

4 A quick Yahoo Web search for the phrase culture shock elicited 663,000 sites. These sites were produced by universities, education departments, foreign affairs departments, travel agents, business organisations, private English language schools, expatriate teacher organisations, and international student groups. Many of these sites draw heavily on Oberg's (1960, cited in Bodyczott & Crew, 2001, p. 4) six negative characteristics of culture shock: strain or stress relating to psychological adaptation; a sense of loss or deprivation resulting from the removal of friends, status, role, and personal possessions; fear of rejection by or rejection of the new culture; confusion in role definition, expectations, feelings, and self-identity; unexpected anxiety, disgust, or indignation regarding cultural difference; and feelings of helplessness. Participants experiencing culture shock were found often to experience confusion, frustration, and depression.
effect, whether planned or not, is to enhance the international dimension of the experience of higher education in universities and similar educational institutions” (p. 16). This definition is frequently cited in policy documents in the Australian higher education sector. For example, the Australian Vice Chancellors’ Committee (1999, p. 21) suggests that Australian universities are internationalising curricula through the introduction of

- additional international content into courses
- comparative and cross-cultural approaches
- language and area studies
- interdisciplinary programs covering more than one country
- joint degree courses involving a professional course linked to an international studies/language course
- courses taught in part overseas or involving a study abroad component
- a placement in an overseas institution or a study abroad component
- courses using visiting academics from overseas

NEW MILLENNIUM CULTURAL CONSEQUENCES OF EDUCATIONAL GLOBALISATION

In broad terms, globalisation refers to the compression of space and time (Harvey, cited in Burawoy, 2000, p. 2) and thus the intensification of social and political relationships and heightened economic competition (Castells, 2000b). Distant localities are linked “in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (Giddens, 1990, p. 64). This connection of the local with the global has been made possible by “institutional, organizational and technological” capacities that enable social interactions “in real time or in chosen time, on a planetary scale” (Castells, 2000b, p. 101). Put simply, globalisation processes are “political, technological and cultural, as well as economic” (Giddens, 2000, p. 28). Political ideas, technological innovations, and economic models and influences, as well as cultural resources move rapidly, at times instantly, across the globe. Some theorists, however, have noted that globalisation processes are not necessarily new, but rather can be dated back several hundred years (Castells 2000a, 2000b; Giddens, 2000). However, new millennium globalisation processes are characterised by three unique and distinguishing features: the predominance of symbolic cultural flows as opposed to earlier material or political exchanges, the speed and volume of resources flowing across the globe, and the increasing importance of
global terms, or scales, of reference in imagining global-local connections (see Appadurai, 1996; Giddens, 2000; Spring, 2001; Tomlinson, 1999; Waters, 2001). At the same time, new millennium globalisation processes are experienced in complex, uneven, and varied ways by people across different spaces (Giddens, 2000, p. 22). Globalisation is not a consistent or uniform phenomenon.

Our primary concern here is with the cultural consequences of globalisation (Holton, 2000) as these are played out in the contact zones of Australian higher education. In particular, we are concerned with the ways these new cultural processes continually unsettle our assumptions about teachers, learners, and appropriate pedagogic strategies in EAP, ESL, and foundation studies courses. We use the term culture to refer to the symbolic resources (language, images, fashion codes, knowledge, political ideologies, and so forth) that are increasingly available in their rapid flow across territorial borders, as well as to the ways people individually and collectively experience and make sense or meaning of these cultural resources (see Singh, in press). Globalisation, say Shome and Hegde (2002),

produces a “dis-location” of culture, that is, it presents us with a “cognitive dilemma” because culture is no longer what it used to be or where we might expect it to be. It has become more abstract and imploded. . . . What looks the same may already be different and what is already different may still look the same. (p. 173)

The term global cultural flow is used to indicate the simultaneous fluid movement and changing meaning of ideas, as well as their location in, and passage through, specific historical, linguistic, and political contexts (Appadurai, 1996; Spring, 2001). Appadurai distinguishes between a number of flows or scapes along which cultural or symbolic resources move: (a) ethnoscapes, (b) mediascapes, (c) technoscapes, (d) financescapes, and (e) ideoscapes (p. 46). The suffix scape refers to the “fluid, irregular shapes of these landscapes” (Appadurai, p. 33). It also indicates that these landscapes are “deeply perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors: nation-states, multinationals, diasporic communities, as well as subnational groupings and movements” (Appadurai, p. 33). According to Appadurai, the global relationship within and between these different scapes or flows “is deeply disjunctive and profoundly unpredictable” (p. 35). The movement of cultural or symbolic resources does not simply follow the logic of economic incentives, nor is it simply constrained by national or supranational political constraints. Educational sites such as Western universities are intimately involved in, and contribute towards, these global scapes or flows (see Levin, 2001; Luke,
2001). For example, the business of exporting higher education to international students can be understood as contributing not just to the movement of people (ethnoscapes) desiring Western symbolic resources (mediascapes), but also to flows of capital (financescapes) and of ideologies (ideoscapes), mediated and accelerated by electronic technologies (technoscapes) with the various parties participating from motivations that reflect their perspectives and positioning in global flows. Disjunctural flows often produce discordant moments in their intersection, for example, liberal fashion tastes mushrooming in less liberal religious communities, and attendant moral issues.

By contrast, the term global culture is used to denote “the growing uniformity and homogenization of the world’s cultures” (Spring, 2001, p. 7). This global culture serves as a “magnet attracting people” to particular ideas “regarding economic opportunity and consumption” (Spring, p. 7). In addition, this dominant global culture is legitimated by recourse to notions of universal standards that often mask dominant-subaltern, ethnocentric bias (Cameron, 2002). For example, consumption of English language (preferably American or British) and Western knowledge goods are increasingly seen as an avenue for upward social mobility in the global economic marketplace, and particular models of English language curricula and pedagogy dominate the educational market (see Pennycook, 1999a, 1999b).

Given the powerfully disjunctive and irregular character of global cultural flows and scapes and the emergence of a dominant global culture, the debates surrounding the cultural consequences of globalisation are diverse and complex. These debates tend to reveal an unresolved argument between three basic positions, delineated by Holton (2000):

the homogenization thesis, in which globalization leads to cultural convergence; the polarization thesis, which posits cultural wars between Western globalization and its opponent; and finally, the hybridization . . . thesis, in which globalization encourages a blending of the diverse set of cultural repertoires made available through cross-border exchange. (p. 141)

The first hypothesis is that the worldwide spread of a neoliberal market economy and the global strategies of big business (including the increasing privatisation of education) are likely to homogenise or standardise local cultures. Consumer capitalism has been built on standardised brand imagery, and the “sale of dreams of affluence, personal success, and erotic gratification through advertising and the culture industry” (Holton, 2000, p. 142). This spread of a global consumer culture has been described as Westernisation, or more specifically Americanisation, Coca-Colonization, or McDonaldization (Holton; Porter & Vidovich, 2000). The term McWorld has been coined to describe the
standardisation or homogenisation of an American consumer culture—
a combination of fast food (McDonald’s), fast music (MTV), and fast
computers (Apple Mac)—that promises to tie people together “through
the soulless consumption of commodified cultural production” (Barber,
cited in Holton, p. 146). A crucial dimension of the homogenisation
thesis is the integration of elites with a Western education “in the
functioning of international organizations like the United Nations, the
World Bank, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural
Organization (UNESCO), as well as global corporations” (Holton, p.
143). In this sense, a global culture is developed not only via mass
marketing but through the interests and activities of a transnational
global elite (Castells, 1997; Holton; Luke, 2001). The homogenisation
thesis assumes a dynamic notion of cultural production and dissemina-
tion. At the same time, however, global cultural production and circula-
tion is in the hands of a transnational Western-educated elite. Educa-
tional sites may thus be complicit in the homogenising of different
cultures and also may play a significant role in providing dominant or
hegemonic visions of social order to a global elite.

The second hypothesis relating to the cultural consequences of
globalisation is that Western cultural homogenisation, neoliberal global
economic markets, and Western versions of modernity are likely to be
resisted and challenged by various social movements around the world.
Antiglobalisation movements are likely to be “multiple, highly diversi-
fied, following the contours of each culture, and of historical formations
of identity” (Castells, 1997, p. 2). They are likely to include proactive
movements, such as environmentalism and feminism, and reactive
movements, such as Islamic and Christian fundamentalisms. Reactive
fundamentalist movements operate through polarisation, constructing
powerful cultural dichotomies between their vision of social order and
the current vision of Western globalisation. In this perspective, Holton
(2000) points out, “the West is seen as the Other, as immoral and
pathologically individualistic” (p. 146). Appadurai (1996) argues that
“the central paradox of ethnic politics in today’s world is that the
primordia (whether of language or skin color or neighbourhood or
kinship) have become globalized. . . . Such primordia are often the
product of invented traditions . . . or retrospective affiliations” (p. 41).
These dichotomising and polarising tendencies are likely to produce a
clash of civilisations: Western, Islamic, and Confucian (Huntington,
1997). Teachers, at the front line of educational globalisation, may have
to negotiate conflicts between different cultural groups in the classroom
(Hafernik, Messerschmitt, & Vandrick, 2002) as well as take account of
different versions and histories of modernity in pedagogic engagements.

The third hypothesis relating to the consequences of cultural
globalisation is hybridisation, and the resultant production of new
education programs and pedagogic practices from a synthesis of diverse cultural forms (Castells, 1997). Hybridisation can be seen in the different types or versions of English that have emerged around the world. As Rushdie (1982) points out, English, “no longer an English language, grows from many roots; and those whom it once colonized are carving out large territories within the language for themselves” (p. 8). Hybrid practices are possible because the global culture of Western education is domesticated, indigenised, or transculturated to produce innovative patterns that sustain a sense of the local (see Canagarajah, 1999; Luke, 2001; Pratt, 2002; Shome & Hegde, 2002; Spring, 2001).

The major advance of the hybridisation thesis is that “cultures have become so intermixed that there is no longer any pure or authentic culture distinct from others” (Holton, 2000, p. 150). This intermixing of cultures does not simply produce a melting pot or unity of different cultural attributes or parts. Rather, what emerges is the opening of a third space “within which other elements encounter and transform each other” to produce new cultural forms and identities (Papastergiadis, 1997, p. 254). As tradition increasingly loses its hold, and daily life is reconstituted in terms of the dialectical interplay of the local and the global, individuals are increasingly expected and required to negotiate lifestyle choices among a diversity of options (Giddens, 2000). This undermines teachers’ ability to know or predict their “Other” students with any certainty through reproduced categories. Teachers at the front line of globalisation may have to take account of different versions of English, as well as new hybrid constructions of cultural identity, in day-to-day pedagogic encounters. Moreover, Asian international students, as informed consumers in the educational marketplace, are unlikely to take up Western knowledge uncritically and “buy into the ‘West is best’ model” (Luke, 2001, p. 41). Rather, classrooms are likely to be sites of struggle and challenges over the selection and enactment of curricula and teaching strategies.

The unresolved argument between these three theoretical positions highlights the complex and opposed potentials in any contact zone, where homogenisation, polarisation, or hybridity might result or be perceived, depending on the discourses, intentions, and actions of the individuals involved. The three positions also highlight the paradoxical processes of cultural globalisation. Different cultures are commodified as temporally and spatially distinct, leading to concerns about cultural and language extinction as well as to hopes for universal standards in educational rights. On the other hand, notions of cultural hybridity and flux are evoked, suggesting that it is no longer possible to talk about culture as unique and insular and as specialised meaning production by a group of people (Yon, 2000, p. 113). Thus, higher education teachers are expected to commodify versions of Western pedagogy, learning
styles, study skills, and academic English for consumption by EAP learners while invoking enabling notions of cultural hybridity and flux, with the added dimension of being respectful and valuing the cultural diversity students bring with them.

**CULTURAL GLOBALISATION AND PEDAGOGIC DILEMMAS**

One particularly significant set of moral dilemmas that EAP, ESL, and foundation program teachers have to negotiate concerns their professional ethic of cultural respect and the acculturating imperative of the linguistic-cultural orientation to Western higher education. Most teachers are wary of the charge of doing symbolic violence to students' cultural heritage through curricula and pedagogy that may be construed as neocolonial or neoimperial (Bourdieu, 1992). On the other hand, teachers are expected to inculcate Western academic habits and dispositions and thus reproduce Western cultural traditions and norms of academic-scholarly conduct. In those situations where idealised versions of the Western student are promoted in opposition to reified notions of the Asian learner (often linked to Confucian values; for example, Ballard & Clanchy, 1997), the moral dilemmas and conflicts confronting teachers in everyday pedagogic interactions are likely to intensify (Doherty, 2001). Buzzelli and Johnston (2002) define morality as “that set of a person’s beliefs and understandings which are evaluative in nature: that is, which distinguish ... consciously or unconsciously, between what is right and wrong, good and bad” (p. 3). They understand a moral dilemma to be “a dilemma in which the options involve consequences that are both good and bad” (p. 3). Hafernik et al. (2002) suggest that ESL teachers often have to deal with relativist notions of ethical practice, given the diverse cultural backgrounds of the students present in any one classroom. We suggest that the effects of globalisation make even these predictable cultural attributes uncertain and slippery. In this era of globalisation, ESL teachers have to negotiate the ethical and moral dilemmas produced between notions of professional care, curricular charter, and conditions of globalisation, even as these notions and conditions are rapidly changing.

How do EAP and foundation program teachers negotiate and manage these contradictory and ambivalent pedagogic dilemmas in the cultural

---

5 "Ambivalence refers to affective states in which intrinsically contradictory or mutually exclusive desires or ideas are each invested with intense emotional energy. Although one cannot have both simultaneously, one cannot abandon either of them" (Flax, cited in Ang, 1996, p. 44).
contact zones of higher education institutions? One group of researchers suggest that teachers as moral agents often develop patterns or strategies for managing or coping with these moral dilemmas so that they can get on with their day-to-day pedagogic work. Sometimes these patterns or strategies of management are “consciously chosen, deliberate efforts to put social and educational values into practice” (Berlak & Berlak, 1981, pp. 108–109). At other times, teachers’ strategies for managing moral dilemmas may be more implicit, the product of “sheer habit” or “formed by cultural and social experiences and forces,” or internal needs and desires (Berlak & Berlak, pp. 108–109). In these cases, teachers may not have examined why they choose particular pedagogic strategies or patterns of classroom interaction (Berlak & Berlak). In addition, institutional settings may similarly regulate patterns of resolution by their corporate culture and practices, by their resourcing, and by the degrees of freedom available to teachers with which to enact the curriculum.

This article draws on data from interviews that elicited teachers’ reflections and elaborations on their videotaped classroom practices to profile the nature of the dilemmas encountered in preparatory or foundation programs offered by Australian universities to international students. We also examine how teachers’ theories of culture and academic learning may construct varied responses to these dilemmas. We paint detailed portraits of pedagogic practice for three teachers from their interview accounts to demonstrate a wide range of strategies and of patterns of management and describe in brief how the other six teachers observed and interviewed were positioned in relation to these patterns. Our purpose is to demonstrate the variation in responses possible for teachers to manage the dilemmas embedded in these ambivalent educational sites. We also aim to show how the different responses may constitute different understandings of culture and cultural identity, with possible consequences for the paths taken by international students into mainstream university programs. Finally, we offer teachers additional discursive resources for thinking about the moral dilemmas of pedagogic work in these globalised and globalising spaces.

Although we have endeavoured to capture the complexity of teachers’ work in these cultural contact zones, our analyses are necessarily limited by the amount of time we could spend in each classroom, as well as the nature and length of the interviews. Both of us are members or insiders of the EAP, ESL, and foundation studies professional communities in our various roles as teacher educators and teachers, and one of us has been an ESL student. However, we are not members of the particular university departments and classrooms captured in the study reported in this article. Consequently, we are also outsiders to this community. Although both insiders and outsiders, we can only reflect the world of
the teachers who participated in this study “in fragments of broken mirrors”: there will inevitably be “missing bits” in these “slices” of pedagogic practice (Rushdie, 1983, p. 73). Our objective, then, is not to construct rigid, fixed, or static constructions and proclaim that this is the way that these teachers always engage in pedagogic work. Rather, we want to use these portraits to think critically about the ways different ideas of culture may be strategically deployed to manage moral and cognitive dilemmas and to design pedagogic strategies. Our objective is to explicitly link the micropractices of pedagogic work and pedagogic dilemmas in contact zones with the macroprocesses of cultural globalisation. In doing so, we want to take teachers out of their classrooms and show how their day-to-day work contributes to the push-pull-mix processes of globalisation. Critical engagement with these issues is important for all teachers employed on the front line of educational globalisation.

AN EMPIRICAL CASE STUDY: PEDAGOGIC DILEMMAS IN THE GLOBAL UNIVERSITY CONTACT ZONE

The analyses reported in this article draw predominantly on data collected from semistructured interviews (see the Appendix) with nine teachers, as well as the program outlines and marketing materials produced by the case study institution. Interview data have been edited to ensure that meanings conveyed in oral interview accounts are represented accurately in the written form. These data were part of a larger study that included student interviews, curriculum materials, brochures, and audio- or videorecordings of classroom lessons. Four teachers were videotaped teaching in the intensive EAP programs, and five teachers were videotaped teaching in foundation programs that provide alternative university entrance. Four or five classroom lessons were videotaped for each teacher. The teachers were interviewed in two stages and asked first to respond to a set of general questions about curriculum and pedagogy and second to reflect on and articulate their rationale for particular teaching activities or practices observed and videotaped in their own classes. A stimulated recall method (Keith, 1988) was used in the second stage of interviews, in which teachers viewed a selected episode of one of their videotaped classes before being asked to elaborate on the design and enactment of specific pedagogic strategies. Stimulated recall interviews using videotaped lessons as the stimulus have been used in studies of teachers’ knowledge and decision making (e.g., McMeniman, Cumming, Wilson, Stevenson, & Sim, 2000). The choice allows some access to the empirically invisible complexity of teachers’ decision making in action and in context, and grounds
accounts of pedagogy in concrete circumstances, thus avoiding generalised, decontextualised accounts. In this study, particular episodes were selected because they foregrounded issues of cultural difference in the choice of instructional material or provoked observable discomfort or resistance among the students or because the teacher’s choice of pedagogic strategy was marked in some way and distinct from that of the other teachers.

The teachers were invited to participate in the study by program administrators and were selected on the basis of their teaching experience in the field and their willingness to participate in the research process. Only two of the teachers interviewed for the study held continuing or tenured employment positions in the case study institution. The remaining seven teachers worked on consecutive casual (i.e., temporary) employment contracts. This meant that these teachers were only paid for contact teaching hours and not for lesson preparation or meetings and consultations with colleagues. Wages for casual teaching work in EAP and foundation programs are not high. Consequently, many of the teachers held several casual employment contracts across a number of institutions.

The eight classes taught by the nine observed teachers ranged from 12 to 26 students, with the vast majority from Southeast Asia (Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, East Timor, Indonesia) and East Asia (Hong Kong, Taiwan) and the occasional student from the Pacific Islands, Papua New Guinea, Colombia, Mozambique, and Sweden. Students were aged between 18 and 44 years, with all groups displaying a wide spread of ages. Of the nine teachers observed, only two did not have postgraduate professional qualifications beyond their initial teaching qualification. All nine had substantial cross-sectoral teaching experience, ranging from 7 to 28 years. Five of the teachers had also taught overseas.

Across the data set, seven of the nine teachers expressed caution about what topics pertaining to sensitive or controversial issues were introduced into the classroom and how these topics were discussed or negotiated. Two of the teachers did not touch on the use of controversial topics, beyond recounting how they employ examples of biased statistics in the hope of provoking discussion. One of these teachers talked about

---

6 The observed classes were coded and cross-checked by two research assistants, first by phase of lesson following Lemke’s (1990) activity types. These specialised interational practices include triadic dialogue, teacher-student debate, student questioning, teacher monologue, external text dialogue, teacher-student duologue, seatwork, group work, board work, true dialogue, cross discussion, media presentation, teacher summary, and testing. Markers for changes between specialised interational practices were noted. The topics covered in terms of the content of the lesson were coded. Markers for shifts in topics were noted. Interactive trouble such as student disruptions, failures to respond to teacher question, and challenges to both the specialised interational practices (regulative order) and the topics (instructional order) were coded at the level of the exchange and pedagogic move.

TESOL QUARTERLY
using “my country” topics as a strategy for encouraging student discussion and avoiding cultural offence. The other teacher talked about “choosing topics that are nonemotive,” but this was in regard to the sensibilities of scholarship students in the company of wealthier, self-funded students. Elsewhere, the same teacher spoke about how her students “often get horrified” in class discussions of newspaper accounts of their home country. Two of the nine teachers talked explicitly about employing teaching strategies to protect or assuage student sensibilities. One suggested that she mitigated her taste for “fun” in the classroom in the face of student discomfort. Another claimed, “I try to be aware of some of the things that make them feel uncomfortable. . . . If you have any sensitivity towards the students you do have to try and balance it out a bit.” Four of the teachers suggested that students needed to be explicitly taught via the use of texts that might be considered sensitive or controversial in their home nations. Moreover, they argued that pedagogic models were selected with the explicit intent of eliciting student discussion, debate, and articulation of individual opinions, behaviours associated with pedagogy in the Western university. For example, one teacher spoke of introducing “outlandish ideas to try and stimulate them into talking,” and another considered that “you can be understanding but you can’t be too soft, because that won’t help them.”

PORTraits OF PEDAGOGIC PRACTICE IN GLOBAL CONTACT ZONES

We constructed portraits of pedagogic practice (Lightfoot, 1983) from the interview accounts of three teachers, focusing on the issue of topic selection. Data extracts from each teacher’s interview that address pedagogic dilemmas of managing cultural sensibilities in the classroom are analysed to derive themes and contradictions with which to characterise each teacher’s position and professional responses. The three pedagogic positions were selected to offer a range of strategies: the first teacher’s studied avoidance of any hint of cultural offence, the second teacher’s attempts to find some compromise solution to cultural tensions, the third teacher’s challenge to cultural sensibilities. In constructing these portraits of pedagogic practice, our data analyses focus on the following key analytic questions:

- What moral dilemmas do the teachers recount? How do they attempt to manage these dilemmas in the globalised pedagogic contact zones of higher education institutions?
- Does the management of these dilemmas lead to pedagogic contradictions?
• What attributes of professional conduct are associated with handling such dilemmas and contradictions?

• What theories of globalisation, cultural identity, and academic preparation inform these accounts?

Of the three teachers profiled in detail in this paper, Teacher A had postgraduate qualifications and taught in a preparatory program for prospective master of business administration students. He described learners' English language proficiency as less than the required entrance levels of IELTS 6 or 6.5. The observed lessons covered essay structure and preparing and presenting oral presentations. Teacher B had a master's in education qualification and 7 years of experience teaching in school and tertiary settings in Australia. She described her observed class in the EAP program as of “intermediate” proficiency. The observed set of lessons focussed on the structure and delivery of seminar presentations, culminating in assessable student seminars, and some work on expressing cause-effect and generalisations. Teacher C had postgraduate qualifications and extensive experience teaching in tertiary settings in many different countries. She was one of the few teachers employed permanently. Her observed EAP class had 15 students, aged between 19 and 44 years, whose proficiency level was approximately an average of 5.5 on the IELTS scale. The EAP program prepared students for university in Australia and “to meet entrance requirements” by in-house assessments. The observed lessons dealt with style and structure in written assignments.

Although the classes taught by these three teachers varied somewhat, the moral issues that they had to manage were similar. All of these teachers talked about having to manage cultural sensitivities while ensuring that students met the English language proficiency and academic skills requirements for entry into mainstream university courses.

Pedagogic Strategy 1: Studied Avoidance of Controversial Topics

In response to a research question about Asian culture and learning styles, Teacher A suggested that there is an “Asian-type” student who has been socialised in a culture of “deference and reverence to . . . older people.” This, however, does not imply for him that Asian students are “quiet, passive learners.” Rather, what is significant is that they lack experience in Western-style genres and thus do not have the skills to complete a literature review, academic essay, or reflective journal. Moreover, he suggested that Asian-type students find it difficult to understand assignment questions because of a “lack of acute understanding of the task words—describe, explain, compare, contrast.” Through-
out the interview, Teacher A evoked his professional knowledge or expertise in linguistics to explain or account for the design and enactment of classroom lessons. In the selection of data that follows, the interviewer asks Teacher A about his marked choice of the “cats and dogs” topic for an observed group discussion exercise wherein students were to collaboratively plan the structure for a compare-contrast expository text.

R: Now the choice of topic for the task you set up was to compare cats and dogs. . . . Do you want to talk about your reasons for choosing that topic?

Teacher A: Well, with Thai students it’s okay because they don’t dislike dogs. With Chinese I run into problems because a lot of them think that a dog is a dirty animal. It’s not something that you have around the house, such as we have in Australia. But cats and dogs, I think, are probably simplistic which is why I choose them. They’re easy to understand. Almost everybody knows what a cat and a dog is. When we do compare and contrast essays I don’t want to encumber the exercise by dealing with intellectual ideas that are not understood. So I take really simple ideas but I keep on trying to reinforce that academic assignments are on topics a lot more complex than cats and dogs but the same thing applies. . . . So once we have a good foundation of comparing any two simplistic things then we can get into the heavier material with greater number of paragraphs and more complex compound sentences but the structure is still the same.

(Two turns omitted.)

R: What other potential topics do you see as sensitive for this group?

Teacher A: Oh, well, I actually looked at it the other way. I tried to think of things that wouldn’t be sensitive . . . . things that are universal. If I don’t use cats and dogs I also use rainbows. . . . Because I try my best to keep any kind of politically sensitive material out of the class. I just pick things that I’m happy with, and that are common things so we don’t stumble over what do we mean by rainbow.

R: So with this last semester with the events of New York [September 11, 2001], has that been discussed in the classes at all?

Teacher A: No. No. I can hear myself saying once in a while when we come to topic X that we’re not looking at this from the political viewpoint. We’re looking at it from a language viewpoint. . . . In terms of the New York event—no it never quite came up as such. And, in fact, I do have an Arabic man in that class. No, I just stay away. . . . I don’t think it’s necessary to bring it in for what I’m doing. . . . Not that it shouldn’t be spoken about or should be avoided, but in the material that I’m going over with them it’s not appropriate. It’s not necessary. . . . I guess I also don’t want to make any of the students feel responsible for their government’s action. . . . Why make them feel uncomfortable by bringing up topics that really aren’t germane to linguistics? They might be central to marketing or other subjects, but not linguistics.
Teacher A offers the most extreme account of a pedagogic position among the nine teachers, where potentially sensitive or controversial topics are consciously averted in the interests of protecting perceived cultural sensibilities. Teacher A’s pointed avoidance of substantive controversy in the classroom sits uncomfortably with his account of the importance of eliciting student discussion in foundation programs:

R: And your reasoning behind obliging them to ask... a number of questions through the presentation?

Teacher A: Well, because I feel that here at the university when they take part in group activities it’s something that a lot of them don’t want to do. . . . And I’m being really onerous on them by insisting that they participate because part of the whole tutorial thing is allowing someone to understand what you’re thinking about. . . . So I try to suggest to them that this involvement, the give and the take, the turn taking is part of what we do. And I think part of our educational process is more argumentative, in the true sense of argument not tantrum. . . . It’s more argumentative than a lot of other cultures, where they accept someone’s discretion and that’s it. Whereas, here, we go for the chink in the armour and we say, “Well, now wait a minute, mate. What about that time? Why didn’t it work then?” . . . And that’s argumentative: the pros and cons. I try not to change them as people but I try to expose them to the fact that our situations are going to be a little different.

For Teacher A, cultural sensitivities are to be respected by including only topics that are (a) “simplistic” and not “encumbered” with complex “intellectual ideas” and (b) likely to have “universal” appeal to the diverse cohort of students. He also justifies this topic choice by his reluctance to engender unnecessary student emotion as well as to run the risk of forcing students to wear collective versions of their culture or history. Teacher A also suggests that the subject of linguistics, unlike other subjects such as marketing, can be demarcated by strong boundaries that exclude potentially controversial or sensitive topics. This choice of topics, however, may not generate student discussion and participation in lessons. Consequently, Teacher A stages pedagogic exercises to encourage students to learn how to act as Western students in tutorial or seminar sessions. He provides two explanations for taking up this pedagogic position. First, he suggests that Asian international students need to develop communicative skills in the argumentative style of Western academic work. Second, he proposes that talk makes visible student thinking processes and therefore is a crucial teacher evaluative resource. Such staged exercises in “doing seminar presentations,” however, do not engage students in the substantive content of the seminar presentation. The teaching of form is given more importance than engagement with content (see Doherty & Singh, 2002).
Of particular interest is an important disclaimer, or rider, that Teacher A places on his pedagogic position: “I try not to change them as people but I try to expose them to the fact that our situations are going to be a little different.” Through this construction of the teaching-learning process, Teacher A attempts to distance himself from a potential charge of constituting neocolonial pedagogic relations by forcibly socialising students into new pedagogic identities, that is, of producing some cultural homogenisation. His pedagogic position is substantiated through recourse to a pedagogy of choice, that is, offering students alternative knowledge or models. This careful distinction is present in other teachers’ talk and perhaps is their way of dealing with the difficult moral ground they are on—where the provision of Western knowledge and English language instruction is always fraught with a potential charge of neocolonialism.

Pedagogic Strategy 2: Compromising or Compromised Pedagogy

In contrast to Teacher A’s careful attempts to avoid cultural controversy while imparting the linguistic skills and techniques of English communicative competence, Teacher B offered a different account of how cultural frames can intersect and work together in these contact zone pedagogic spaces. In this extract, Teacher B starts to talk about her misgivings and dilemmas over the content and structure of the EAP curricula. Specifically, her concerns are about the lack of an international focus in the EAP program and therefore her own inability to meet the educational needs of the diverse student cohort. This extract was generated in response to an interview question about how the teacher’s knowledge of the students’ background informs her planning.

Teacher B: I think we don’t internationalise the curriculum. . . . We tend—I’m saying “we,” I should say “I,” but it seems to me that a lot of us are doing the same thing. I suppose I shouldn’t make assumptions about that. But because the course is so prescribed and when you talk to a lot . . . of the other teachers we seem to do a lot of the same things. . . . The students come here and it’s kind of like we impose all of the teaching methodology that we have. . . . If you give these students [Asian international students] too many choices they’re like, “You’re the teacher. You do it.” . . . I think there are benefits from collaborative learning . . . but these guys are not convinced of them. So what’s the point of shoving something down their neck if they are not convinced it’s going to work anyway? So I try not to give them as many choices as I would a class of Australian students. . . . They [Asian international students] are used to sitting in a classroom—and this is a generalisation—sitting in a classroom,
taking notes, and then learning those notes, and then regurgitating them for
an exam. So they’ll often even articulate that they think it’s not fair that they
come over here and they’re expected to learn a lot in a really short period of
time. They are expected to learn about critical thinking and evaluation and
all the things that we put value into. Often this knowledge is completely alien
to these students. They’re like, “Why are we doing this?” . . . And I think that
. . . if a teacher has any sensitivity towards the students, then he/she should try
and balance the program out a bit. We should not just impose our Western,
Australian methodology on them. Although I think I probably do it more
than I think I do. . . . But I try to be aware of some of the things that might make
them feel uncomfortable. . . . I think I’m more directive with these
students, more input, more speaking and whatever else I do, than I do with
Australian students when I teach them. . . . I hope I’m not being condescend-
ing or patronising. I think I’m doing it because sometimes when the students
get out of their comfort zone they can’t or . . . they don’t operate to the best
of their abilities.

According to Teacher B, the EAP curriculum is about Western
learning strategies and demeanours, a set of practices she described as
“completely alien” to the students. Moreover, the EAP curriculum is
characterised as an “imposing” pedagogy, taking the students “out of
their comfort zone.” Teacher B expresses a degree of discomfort with the
imposition of a prescribed curriculum and teaching methods and sees it
as incongruent with the policy discourse of internationalisation. At the
same time, Teacher B does not cast herself as having any control over the
curriculum, with which she seems to have some issues. Her account poses
this quandary, which she then partially resolves with reference to the
pedagogical compromises she makes to accommodate the students,
suggesting a reflexive, mutual negotiation and compromise in how these
classes are conducted.

In the following extract, Teacher B elaborates on her concept of
internationalising the curriculum as a hybridising exercise in mutual
enrichment:

R: So then what exactly would you mean by internationalising in relation to
what you have just said? . . . As opposed to assimilation.

Teacher B: So what about then . . . using some of the learning styles that they
have. Like, instead of rejecting rote learning as being something that’s not
valuable why not somehow incorporate aspects of everything. All the different
learning styles. Like, you think about it if the Chinese, for example, who tend
to value rote learning being able to regurgitate thousands and thousands and
thousands of facts. I always sort of think we kind of poo-poo that here but you
look at their culture. Their culture has been around for how long? That’s got
to have worked for them in whatever way it worked. So how can we say that
that is not of equal value to ours? So then how do we incorporate those
aspects of their culture together and make something? I don’t know.
R: So that's what you mean by internationalising?

Teacher B: I don't know. Internationalising is really a difficult concept to pin down I think but it's, I think it's like making knowledge and education accessible to everybody without having to change everything about themselves. Like becoming little Australians or new Australians to be successful here, isn't it?

This vision of some optimal cultural hybridity is denied, however, by the institutional setting that fails to embrace internationalisation of the curriculum and pedagogy:

Teacher B: What is my role? I guess my role is to show them what they need to know to assimilate. I don't limit what I say or change the process because the end result is that they will go into university courses which have not been internationalised.

On the matter of culturally sensitive topics, Teacher B is less ambivalent, less accommodating, and more confrontational than her position on internationalisation may suggest, though it marries with her more robust construction of culture. Put simply, she takes up an acculturating or cultural homogenisation pedagogical stance, suggesting the importance of providing students with the resources needed to succeed in the mainstream Western university context:

Teacher B: If there was something in the content that was really vilifying a religious group or a cultural group then, I probably, I don't know if I'd no, I'd actually no, I don't think I would cut it out because you know, you think about university here. We listen to a lot of opposing views, don't we? We may not agree with them but part of our culture here is that you listen and then you evaluate. You don't attack before you have listened. So if there was something like that maybe I would play it but then we'd talk about it later. Yeah. So, no there's not really anything.

Teacher B's pedagogical strategies are informed by a robust, generative notion of cultural processes. She talks about the self-governing community of common practice among the EAP teachers that does not overtly challenge or contest the prescribed curriculum and pedagogic structures. She also acknowledges that students do exercise some control over the curricular content through their resistance and complaints. She talks about a distinction between the beginning and later parts of the course, in terms of accommodating cultural differences. The implication is that as the course progresses, less allowance is made for students to adhere to different teacher-student models and that they are shaped towards the normative Western model by the end of the program, which could be interpreted as a homogenisation process. Although she can articulate a vision of what internationalisation might entail, she finds her
conditions of employment and the institutional setting justify an acculturating or cultural homogenisation pedagogical stance that prepares students for, by her account, a starker, more biased reality.

**Pedagogical Strategy 3: Deliberate Provocation to Generate Classroom Discussion**

Teacher A and Teacher B consider the cultural sensibilities of their students and design their pedagogy around these to varying degrees; Teacher C, in contrast, is quite uncompromising in her pedagogical strategy. Teacher C expressed no reservations about the strongly framed curriculum or pedagogy of the EAP or foundation programs. Rather she suggested that the explicit objective of the courses was to “acclimatising” students to the cultures of learning in Australian universities. This means that students need to become familiar with both the content and styles of teacher-student relations in Australian universities.

R: Do you think in terms of an Asian culture?

Teacher C: I think you would get a very different answer had you talked to me when I was teaching, say in Bangladesh or in Saudi Arabia or in Nigeria, which are the three Muslim areas I have lived in where I was, I'm sure, careful to some extent, of what I said so as not to offend people. But here, not that I’m trying to offend people, but I feel we are acclimatising these students to being in Australia. And rather than not say something because I might offend them, I will say something and then say that I realise that some people may not see this in exactly the same way because they might be Muslim or blah, blah, blah but that’s the way it is in Australia. And I feel that that’s important that we don’t avoid these things because if I were in their country I would be doing that. But here I don’t. And I feel we’re training them. You know most of them are going to be here for another 2, 3 years and I think part of what we’re doing is getting them used to the Australian scene. If there’s somebody in the class who I know might be offended, I would say, “I know that you think differently about this.” Or, “I don’t want to offend you by saying this, but . . .” So I’ll let them know that I’m aware of it but I don’t tread around and think I’m in an Asian culture. I’m not. I’m in an Australian culture. In Bangladesh that’s very different. I am in their country and I am doing things their way.

Teacher C's pedagogical position of cultural homogenisation is crystal clear and unequivocal. The students have travelled to Australia to acquire an Australian qualification. Thus, there will be no or few changes made to the curriculum or teaching strategies. Rather, it is the student’s task to adapt or “acclimatising” to the knowledge in the curriculum packages and in the classroom lessons. By her account, Teacher C acts in what she perceives to be students’ long-term interests, and her abrupt
staging strategy aims to bring these students into what she constructs as the Australian model of teacher-student relationship as quickly as possible, in contrast to the gradual staging of Teacher B or pluralist respect of Teacher A. Teacher C alluded to the importance of ensuring that international students acquire the same knowledge as their Australian counterparts. There will be no “dumbing down” or “watering down” of the knowledge for this cohort of students.

COMPARING AND CONTRASTING STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING PEDAGOGIC DILEMMAS

Where the institution’s entrance pathways and the curricula construct the preparatory phase as a simple, benign exercise in cultural briefing, these three teachers’ accounts suggest that the undercurrents of cultural sensibilities make this a more fraught and hazardous process than it is acknowledged to be by the institution and that teachers have to steer their own courses in the absence of such institutional insight. Under their conditions of casual contracts, prescribed curricula, and numerous contact hours, these teachers are negotiating a difficult space between their professional ethic of cultural respect and the acculturating imperative of the curricular design. The tension between these two imperatives is managed in different ways by the individual teachers in the space of freedom offered by the classroom, though their accounts suggest that this is an ongoing and escalating struggle for them. To suggest that there is a simple one-size-fits-all way to resolve these tensions would be to deny the complexity of any university as an institution and its disciplinary cultures, the shifting nature of markets in international education, the relative status of the EAP or preparatory teacher, and the relative customer power of the international student body as Australian universities become more reliant on their income. In the following commentary, we dissect each of the teachers’ patterns of resolution to the dilemmas they encounter, to acknowledge and open the debate about how teachers can work in this ambivalent and shifting moral space. This debate is necessary given the accelerating pace and disjunctural nature of global cultural flows, that is, flows of ideas, images, people, and finances. The cultural politics of globalised education will become increasingly uncertain, complicated, and problematic.

Teacher A has chosen what we would call an effaced pedagogy and carefully sanitised the curriculum, stripping it of intellectual engagement, so that the linguistic aspects of the target genre can be foregrounded and performed in a template fashion. The degree to which he reportedly avoids what he considers potential controversy begs the question of whether assumptions on what constitutes the controversial are ever
tested. In other words, Teacher A’s imaginary constructions of controversial, as well as culturally sensitive or respectful topics, constitute what counts as curricular content in the pedagogic contact zone of the foundation business communications course (see Appadurai, 1996). For this teacher the globalised pedagogic contact zone is a minefield of cultural sensitivities, from which it is his professional duty to protect the students. In teaching students about this contact zone, Teacher A constructs cultures and cultural identities as discrete, internally coherent, stable, yet fragile. Alert to possibilities of cultural homogenisation, he offers the international students a syncretic, relativist choice between cultural frames as a way of managing the dilemma inherent in the “conversion kit” curriculum.

Teacher B has chosen what we would call a face-saving pedagogy to manage the moral quandary arising from the perceived collision of culturally inscribed teaching-learning models. The international student is constructed as a passive, reproductive, dependent learner, who avoids interaction and requires more overt instruction. On the other hand, Teacher B talks about student protest and resistance, where ironically students assert their right to be relatively passive. Thus, two polarised learner-teacher models are evident in Teacher B’s account—one is the Australian-Western model of an interactive teacher-learner relationship, the other is a passive student-directive teacher model attributed to the students. She portrays these two models as operating in conflict, with some pedagogical negotiation between them, for example, her accommodation of students’ preferences by fulfilling their expectations of teacherly conduct. She uses the term “assimilate” without any qualification, but by her account, washes her hands of any attendant moral stain associated with it. The blame lies with the unforgiving institutional setting that constrains her pedagogical possibilities of doing transcultural or hybridising work in globalised contact zones.

Teacher B’s account presents internal inconsistencies and dilemmas. As a teacher, she is not in control of the curriculum, its pacing, or the policy environment, and by her account, neither she nor her students are entirely comfortable with the values and intentions inscribed in the curriculum. Elsewhere in her interview, she depicts herself as distanced from any decision-making power: “I’m no one in this.” She thus constructs herself as a passive subject of institutional power relations, rather than as an active agent responsible for choosing curricular content and pedagogic strategies. Her account of the process students undergo in this program is presented as the imposition of another homogenising cultural frame and of resulting student resistance. Cultures in this teacher’s account operate in conflict where they coexist and exert pressure on each other—a more robust, dynamic, overlapping, and interactive construction of culture than the discrete fragility expressed
by Teacher A. She invokes the term “internationalisation” as an alternative to cultural imposition and by implication is imagining a possibility of mutual accommodation and of reconciling multiple frames to coexist and enrich each other. Her articulated position on internationalisation thus sits more comfortably with a hybridising rather than a homogenising notion of pedagogic work in globalised contact zones or spaces. She does not, however, view the considerable adjustments she reports making to accommodate student preferences as internationalisation bestowed by the institution.

Teacher C has chosen a pointed, *in-your-face* pedagogy to deal with the moral dilemmas associated with teaching in the global university contact zone. For Teacher C, culture is local and situated, that is, place dictates the appropriate cultural script. Her heightened sense of culture as located, rigidly bound social practice means that her professional judgements on what to include or exclude change according to where she is teaching. Offence is to be avoided when elsewhere, but is pointedly not to be avoided in the Australian-based preparatory course: “That’s important that we don’t avoid these things.” Any sense of dilemma is unapologetically resolved by this device. She uses the term “acclimatise” to refer to this notion of situational adaptation, which distances her from the assimilation discourse Teacher B slipped into. The contradiction inherent in this pedagogic strategy is the fact that this well-travelled teacher can retain such an unproblematically homogeneous, located notion of culture, despite her extensive experience in, and contribution to, the globalised-globalising educational circuits and flows that are increasingly blurring or breaching such spatial boundaries. This professional sense of context sensitivity will produce very different educational outcomes in different locations.

Our analyses depict three positions on a continuum: effaced avoidance at one extreme; pointed, in-your-face confrontation at the other extreme; and a middle-ground, saving face position for both teacher and students. We do not mean to imply that each teacher stuck rigidly to one pedagogic approach. Indeed, our analyses of the videotaped lessons of each teacher showed movement across the range of pedagogic strategies we described. In general, our analyses concur with observations made by Luke (2002, p. 52), who suggested that many EAP teachers remain “dedicated and committed educators” with “political commitments” and concern for the communities within which they work. In these new globalised and globalising times, EAP teachers’ political commitments are often “expressed as a need to be ‘culturally sensitive,’ ‘culturally appropriate,’ to avoid either the aculturalism of technocratic education or the cultural imperialism of Western education” (Luke, p. 52). We observed that although most teachers expressed a need to be culturally sensitive or culturally appropriate, the pedagogic strategies articulated in
their talk and enacted in classroom practices ranged from acultural technocratic, to bald cultural assimilationist, to more tempered compromising approaches.

DISCUSSION

Teachers in these preparatory courses constitute the front line in educational contact zones, and they confront risks and moral dilemmas on behalf of their institutions and end users. They have to live through the awkward moments of discomfort, offence, or distrust with students when sensitive topics are broached, and sensitivities are breached. The teachers’ professional discourses for making sense in these matters, as sampled above, construct culture in different ways—as the stable, reproductive “primordial” ethnic category (Appadurai, 1996); as discreetly located social practices; or as established bodies of social practice on collision courses. Significantly, none of the teachers engaged with issues or discourses of globalisation, hybridity, or cosmopolitan identities premised on some global cultural form. Their commonsensical constructions and received wisdom about mutually exclusive cultures, and, in particular, cultural learning styles, which inform the design of these preparatory curricula, have in effect created the ambivalent spaces and moral dilemmas for them.

Indeed, a number of researchers have argued that the received view of culture dominates practitioner work in the TESOL field (see Atkinson 1999a, 1999b; Pennycook 1995, 1999b; Holliday, 2001). For example, Atkinson (1999b, p. 625) argues that although culture is “implicitly and explicitly” involved in every aspect of TESOL practice, this ubiquity fosters an unexamined, taken-for-granted, or commonsense construction of the term. Culture or cultures are typically defined in the received view as “geographically (and quite often nationally) distinct entities, as relatively unchanging and homogeneous, and as all-encompassing systems of rules or norms that substantially determine personal behaviour” (Atkinson, 1999b, p. 626). This version of culture, we suggest, cannot adequately serve a profession whose work is so intimately involved in the cultural intersections of the global contact zone.

We offered a different, relational construction of culture as resources and imagination produced, negotiated, and appropriated through contact with difference. Higher education was explored as a contact zone where cultural identities struggle over their representation in a process of mutual entanglement. Thus, the design of preparatory curriculum for this contact zone demonstrates not only how the Western institution understands and represents its international student body, but also how the institution imagines and projects its own identity even as its constitu-
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ency is changing. We outlined the debate surrounding cultural processes under conditions of globalisation, in particular, the distinction between competing predictions of inevitable homogenisation, polarisation, and hybridity. Rather than subscribe to a particular position, we suggest that the TESOL profession treat these as competing potentials that could eventuate in the microsetting of the preparatory classroom.

To assist in this rethinking of cultural processes and potentials, Appadurai (1996) suggests that we avoid the noun culture as too problematic now, with its inherent logic of entities that can be held apart. He suggests that we retain its adjectival form, cultural, which he suggests is more relevant and useful to characterise the flow of deterritorialised resources available to people with which to imagine and assemble their identities amidst alternatives. In this light, to construct the international student’s country of residence and Australia as mutually exclusive cultures isolated from each other is to overlook the landscapes or cultural flows they share under current conditions of globalisation (ethnoscapes, technoscapes, financescapes, mediascapes, and ideoscapes) and to deny the contact zone both teachers and students occupy. To deliver programs that construct idealised narratives of a pure Western academic tradition is to erase considerations of changing circumstances, politics, and economies in Australian universities and also to deny the substantial international student body any transformative power. Curricula that promote such an idealised narrative effectively construct a textual truth that elides the complexities and shifting parameters of the Western global university. To move professional debate and practices beyond the sticky moral dimensions discussed here, disciplinary notions of cultural difference need to be revisited and renovated to reflect the impact of globalisation in the trajectories of the university, the teachers, and the students.

The danger of the theoretical concept of globalisation, however, is that it presents as a monolithic fait accompli beyond the agency or purview of any individual or organisation, which makes it possible to overlook one’s own professional contributions to, and involvement in, its progress. Appadurai’s disaggregation of the scapes helps to disassemble and analyse constituent global flows, so we can understand where, how, or what we are contributing. Shome and Hegde (2002) remind us that globalisation is a “process and a phenomenon . . . that has to be actively implemented, reproduced, serviced and financed . . . and relies for its functioning on several overlapping structures and relations, from the local, to the national, to the global” (p. 217). The EAP and foundation teacher is not “no one in this,” to borrow Teacher B’s phrase, but rather a very necessary part of the global machinery, lubricating the local points of contact.

There have been moves in the TESOL profession to unsettle the
commonsensical construction of culture by disputing the characterisation of certain cultural types. In particular, the construction of an Asian learner archetype has been challenged (Benesch, 2001; Biggs, 1997; Chalmers & Volet, 1997). Some theorists have explored the relations between dominant and Other groups. Spack (1997) warns about the limitations of any essentialising cultural labels and the need “to examine our own identities” (p. 773). Kubota (1999, 2001) deconstructs the powerful script of East-West dichotomy as a colonial discourse that perpetuates vested interests. Nichols (2003) explores the tension between opportunistically positive and negative constructions of the international student in Australian universities. These writers provoke reflection on who is invoking culture on whose behalf and to what end. There have also been suggestions on how to design a new, more democratic cultural politics in transcultural pedagogies (Giroux, 1992; Canagarajah, 1997; Badley, 2000; Holliday, 2001).

However, the critical pedagogy frequently framed as the solution (Benesch, 2001; Kubota, 1999) still casts the teacher as some transcendent agent outside the cultural influences of the pedagogical contact zone, who can orchestrate the encounter and protect students from the imagined deleterious effects of cultural contact. But are these strategies somewhat paternalistic in the way they construct the teacher as protector of the Other’s cultural identity? Do they in fact work to “fix the Other” in a form of indulgent, protective Orientalism (Pennycook, 1999a, p. 17)?

We suggest that TESOL professionals need to renovate the “discoursal baggage” (Holliday, 2001, p. 124) they bring to their pedagogic practice and to embrace new constructions that unsettle previous assumptions. Moreover, we propose that globalisation theory offers a new vocabulary for an emerging and pressing reality that cannot be ignored. EAP, ESL, and foundation studies practitioners need to engage with new theories of culture and cultural processes of globalisation and write themselves into these scripts as both active agents and subjects of the transculturation effect as much as the students sharing the contact zone (see also Zamel, 1997). Polarised cultural caricatures of a pure West and an unsullied East are no longer tenable as heuristic devices in this discourse, and cultural intersection, appropriation, and hybridity may not be such a morally repugnant outcome (Ang, 2001). Students seeking the cultural capital of global cultural forms and practices are not victims to be protected, but rather are proactive agents purposefully and advantageously imagining and positioning themselves in global flows, just as teachers and higher education institutions are also engaging in the global exchange of ideas and finance to their advantage. The English language and the textual practices of business and higher education no longer belong to an exclusive Western “Us,” but are tools and practices engaged with and shaped by a global Us. Undoubtedly, some are more advantaged than
others in these global flows, but any tactic of protective cocooning of the
Other, as demonstrated by Teacher A’s effaced pedagogy, needs to be
questioned.

Though reluctant to suggest some solution in these postmethod times
(Canagarajah, 2002), we suggest that curricula in the contact zone can
exploit and explore the many points of intersection or confluence and
legitimise hybridised identities in a facing-up pedagogy. This pedagogy
would recognise that English and the circuits of Western higher educa-
tion are also part of Asian students’ worlds and need not be packaged
with some localised orthodoxy. On the particular matter of resourcing
the EAP classroom, English language publications produced in non-
Western settings offer a legitimate source of texts for the contact zone
classroom. International issues framed through multiple perspectives
and diverse textual constructions, not just domestic versions thereof, can
serve to stimulate the communicative environment sought for language
learning. Such texts would work to decentre the teacher’s traditional
authority as cultural informant and the usual construction of interna-
tional student as naïve inductee. With access to the Internet, teachers
need not restrict themselves to commodified resources with their atten-
dant risk of patronising ideologies drawn from developmental dis-
courses. Such decentring of textual authority would be preferred to
goading students through in-your-face pedagogy, which risks repelling
them into polarised positions.

In addition, the growing policy discourse of internationalisation may
give TESOL professionals a valuable window of opportunity to turn
informer and take the role of provocateurs within their institutions. By
reflecting on how they themselves have been affected by the contact
zone, TESOL professionals have much to share with the Western global
university as such institutions face up to their new demographic constitu-
tion.

This rosy agenda does not eliminate all moral dimensions. Globalisation
is understood to have multiple competing potentials, including cultural
homogenisation or reactive polarisation as well as generative hybridisation.
EAP and foundation studies programs can still work to pull students into
homogenising scripts, or repel them into antagonistic opposition, and as
teachers we won’t necessarily be in control of the fluid and fluctuating
events that contribute to such outcomes. As Cameron and Block (2002)
note, “Where there is risk there is opportunity. Individuals are not the
dupes of overpowering social structures and events, but active, reflective
agents in the ongoing construction of social reality” (p. 4). If we can
embrace and value expressions of hybridity—the sharing of cultural
resources in indigenised-localised form—as valid and valued expressions
of cultural identity for current times, then we may be able to steer some
middle path between McWorld and a clash of civilisations.
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**APPENDIX**

**Teacher Interview Questions**

**First Stage: Generic Questions**

1. How do you find out about the educational-language needs of your student clientele? How does this inform your planning?

2. What are the most common learning strategies used by your students? Do you notice any significant changes in the way the students are learning during the course? What do you see as your role in this process? (Examples?)

3. What do you want your students to be able to do by the end of the course? How do you teach this? (What do you see as your role?) Is this familiar to/different from what they are used to?
4. There are now a variety of Englishes (Australian, British, American, Singaporean, Indian, etc.). Do you work with these different types of English in your lessons? (If yes, how?)

5. Do you think in terms of an “Asian” culture? How does this affect your interactions with students?

6. What do you think students want from their educational experience here in Australia?

7. Do you think students experience any tensions between their own culture and what they experience here? How do you manage these tensions?

Second Stage: Stimulated Recall of Videotaped Teaching Practice

1. We’re interested in what was going on there and what were your intentions.

2. Would you like to talk about why you chose that as an activity and what you hoped the students would get out of it?