INTERNATIONALISING EDUCATION RESEARCH CULTURES AND GRADUATE TRAINING

BAICE East of England Partnership

Reports of two Workshops:

Educational research: developing cross-cultural perspectives on theory, methodology and practice

Held at the Faculty of Education, Cambridge -18 May, 2009

and

Academic cultures - academic styles: exploring cross-cultural issues in postgraduate teaching and learning

Held at the Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia - 22 June 2009

Centre for **Education** and **International Development**

Acknowledgements

Contents

INTERNATIONALISING EDUCATION RESEARCH CULTURES AND GRADUATE TRAINING

BAICE East of England Partnership

Through funding from BAICE and the Centre for Commonwealth Education, Cambridge, two linked workshops were held in May and June 2009, with the aim of establishing an East of England partnership to bring together staff and graduate students working on educational or education-related research in the Centre for Commonwealth Education and the Centre for Education and International Development in the Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge and the Centre for Applied Research in Education (CARE)/School of Education and Lifelong Learning & School of Development Studies at the University of East Anglia. These two workshops provided an opportunity to reflect on the 'internationalisation of higher education' in terms of educational research in a cross-cultural context, as well as exploring issues around pedagogy and practice in education faculties.

Educational research: developing cross-cultural perspectives on theory, methodology and practice

Report on the first BAICE Workshop - 18 May 2009 - Organised by the Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge

This one-day workshop was attended by 34 participants (6 staff and 14 students from Cambridge and 6 staff and 11 students from UEA – see Appendix I for list of names). The workshop was planned and facilitated by a team led by Madeleine Arnot (Centre for Education and International Development) and the Centre for Commonwealth Education (CCE) consisting of Darleen Opfer and Ciaran Sugrue. Participation in the discussion groups was organised in advance of the event in order to ensure a mix of staff and students from Norwich and Cambridge in each group.

Each discussion group had its own rapporteurs. This report is based on notes taken by Antonina Tereschenko. We have decided to anonymise the group discussion

1

reports (apart from indicating the facilitators' names) as we were unable to check whether individuals wanted to be identified by name in a public report.

The programme consisted of two parts. The morning session included 4 brief talks based on published journal articles that were included in the conference pack. In the afternoon session, UEA and Cambridge delegates formed groups to discuss a range of pre-prepared questions.

Welcome address and introduction to the day by Professor Madeleine Arnot:
Madeleine Arnot particularly welcomed the delegates from UEA. and noted that the organisers had tried their best to set up a programme of two workshops to establish an East of England partnership on comparative/international education and to bring together students and staff to learn from each other. The two workshops (one in Cambridge and the other in UEA) came under the aegis of the British Association for International and Comparative Education's 2009 initiative on internationalising educational research and teaching. She emphasised a growing need for such workshops when increasing numbers of students studied away from their home countries but there was relatively little knowledge about experiences and approaches of the international community. Graduate courses become potentially rich sites for encounters between different research practices and ideas about teaching and learning can take place establishing an intercultural dialogue about the purposes and conduct of educational research.

 Aims:
1. The primary aim of this East of England partnership was to bring together staff and graduate students working on educational or education-related research in the Centre for International Development/Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge and the Centre for Applied Research in Education (CARE)/School of Education and Lifelong Learning at the University of East Anglia.

2. The second aim of the day was to learn from participants about the different ways in which teaching, learning and research were perceived and experienced. The presentations would explore diverse education research paradigms focusing on participants' experiences of the applicability and relevance of Western conceptual theory and methodology for conducting empirical research in international contexts, including ideas about research access, notions of trust, ethics, and

adapting research tools and approaches in settings outside the UK. The workshop aimed to explore:

- Theoretical/methodological frameworks (assumptions about the purposes/audiences of research, social facts and reform/ Western liberal traditions within academic, notions of balance/reflectivity, triangulations and collective knowledge)
- Educational research (assumptions about research practices – such as ethical procedures, communicative practices in interview contexts and research agendas)

3. The third aim on the day was for participants to get to know each other. The biographies of participants showed an exceptional range of nations, interests and research experiences. The hope of the organisers would be that useful networks and friendship would arise between students and staff.

Introductions:

Dr Darleen Opfer, Chair of the morning sessions introduced the morning speakers and suggested allocating 20 minutes for each talk followed by 10 minutes of general discussion, during which questions (or general points) would be taken from the audience.

Professor Christopher Colclough, Director of the Centre for Education and International Development, University of Cambridge - *Does International Education Help International Development?*

Summary:

This talk was based on the article Colclough, C. 2006. Does Education Abroad Help to Alleviate Poverty at Home? An Assessment. *The Pakistan Development Review* 44, no. 4 Part I: 439-454.

The talk focused on whether the increased availability of international higher education and flows of students worldwide (encouraged, for example, by globalisation, aggressive marketing by universities in the industrialised countries) could have a positive impact on poverty rates in the sending states. He pointed out that the Millennium Development Goals importantly included education amongst their objectives: ensuring universal primary education (UPE) and gender parity in

enrolments across all levels of education are key aspects of the global campaign to reduce poverty. The following reasons were given by the speaker:

- UPE has been accepted as a human right (since 1948 HR Acts);
- widely spread primary education is linked to better economic growth prospects; literacy and numeracy help the self-employed, including farmers, to increase their incomes;
- gender effects for households (i.e. better educated women have smaller and healthier families, better educated children);
- provision of education is an irreversible investment (i.e. once given cannot be taken away).

The question was raised as to whether the emphasis on basic education suggests that tertiary education has a lower priority. The answer was that while tertiary education mattered in terms of wage benefits for the graduates and in terms of the impact on poverty, its social returns were lower and the unit costs were 20 to 50 times as great as those at primary level, making it a high opportunity cost in the poor countries where not everyone could benefit from basic education. Therefore, public resources were particularly to be targeted at the base of the education system to ensure all children could find a place in school.

In circumstances where tertiary education had been unduly neglected, theory suggests that:

1. improving high-level skills in the population would help the poor indirectly via enhancing the prospects for economic growth and directly to the extent that they could become tertiary graduates;
2. as a shortage of graduates emerged, the private and social returns to higher education would rise; the rising private benefits from higher education could be expected to increase private expenditure on tertiary enrolments, and the rising social returns would generate the economic rationale for relocation of public funds towards the top of the education system.

In reality, simply providing more space for market provision was not pro-poor, and unless scholarships were provided, the recipients of the benefits of higher education would continue to be mainly the richer groups. Public funding of higher education had been reduced, and in many of the poorer countries, tertiary education was in a parlous state. In such circumstances, the speaker suggested that the growth of international education could be seen as a response to poverty.

The acceleration in student and knowledge flows internationally could be attributed to the phenomenon of globalisation, associated with economic integration, but also to economic polarisation across the world and gaps between living standards internationally. Although the fruits of science and technology research and development became globally integrated, their incidence was concentrated in the richer countries. The question asked was whether international education was part of the same processes of polarisation and whether it could be expected to be a source of change and reform.

The nature of student flows across the world has changed in relation to the provision of tertiary funding. The current trends were named as follows:

1. the decline of availability of publicly-provided student funding (students are increasingly self-financed rather than supported by northern aid or southern governments);
2. those migrating are increasingly the richer students (both from richer countries and richer families worldwide able to afford market fees).

The implications of the above for the levels of poverty in low-income countries depended on whether students returned to their home countries or not. In the case of students who subsequently return to work or for further study in their country, the impact for themselves and their society seemed highly positive (e.g. career opportunities, economic growth/competition/innovation, encourages multilateralism). These benefits could come at certain costs (albeit not significant compared to benefits), such as the relevance of Western education, problems of readjustment to a different lifestyle at home, and the effect on domestic universities - 'robbed of their best students'.

Historically, however, most students who had travelled to study abroad fell into the category of non-returnees. The following most obvious set of costs to their societies of origin included:
  • brain drain (less growth, leadership);
  • loss of historic public education subsidies received by the students concerned prior to their departure;
  • regressive transfers (poor communities become donors to the rich, providing the latter with new talent and skills);

- household social costs (high level of absenteeism, but mitigated to some extent by remittances).

The concluding part of the talk dealt with any prospects for change. The following new developments were highlighted: non-returnees comprising a diaspora, influencing domestic ideas and policy for large sending states such as India; circulating migration (as in case of Taiwanese 'shuttling' between US and Taiwan on a regular basis); and a new wave of returnees to China and Taiwan. However, such developments were interwoven with factors such as economic growth at home, intentions of students themselves, and the policies of the receiving states. The possible ways forward could be towards changes in funding policies (scholarships for the poor, taxation of the rich, compensation for historic and opportunity costs by aid, barriers to entry, and constraints on aggressive recruitment by Western institutions).

Discussion of Prof. Colclough's presentation:
A question was asked from the floor about any existing constraints on recruitment of students from the developing countries. Christopher Colclough noted that the answer to this question is not known. In general, it is difficult for the institutions/universities to make such decisions by themselves if only because they are in competition with each other. Possibly it should be thought through as a more centralized system/policy.

A point was made by a student about the fact that in Africa there is an increase in students going into higher education. Mobility of students within Africa (not just to the developed countries) is significant and an important phenomenon. South Africa receives a lot of students from the neighbouring countries because of the assumption that getting university education from there could open the doors to Europe. In Europe itself there is a change in immigration policies in terms of restricting inflow of immigrants which contradicts the policy of the universities aiming to attract more and more overseas students.

A questioner asked whether it was possible to redefine mobility in the context of slide 5 of the presentation. She expressed concern about the absence of women in statistics. What about expansionism? What about private education? Christopher Colclough noted that it was not very easy to set up private universities in Africa. Northern universities open up campuses in Africa further profiting from their fees.

A point was made based on a student's own research (which explores the history of universities and issues of mobility) that there had always been mobility in the past. This student came across various facts doing his own research of how European students were travelling to listen to professors in other countries, i.e. the British would travel to France, Polish to Florence, etc. So, he pointed out, this was not a very new idea. This mobility was born within the university culture itself.

Other issues raised were for example, as to why Latin America had not been covered in the talk. Christopher Colclough explained that Latin America is an unusual case in that it has very different historical roots. Linkages between North and South America are very different from those between Europe and post-colonial Africa.

Dr Ciaran Sugrue, Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge - *A Tale of Two Titles: 'From Heroes & Heroines to Hermaphrodites: Emancipation or Emasculation of School Leaders and Leadership?' Or Leadership: Culture, Conjuncture, Disjuncture?*

Summary
This talk was based on the article: Surgue, C. (forthcoming) From Heroes and Heroines to Hermaphrodites: Emasculation or Emancipation of School Leaders and Leadership? *School Leadership and Management* 29, no. 4.

The talk explored different notions, images of leadership in order to situate contemporary discourses on school leadership, critically interrogate prominent Western conceptions of leadership for their similarities and differences as a means of finding continuities as well as 'value added' over time.

In the discussion of the dominant hegemonic discourses of leadership the speaker touched on issues around its transformational (heroic) potential, and aspects of leader's identity (gender, colour, class, location, sexual orientation). Different models of leadership that were talked about included mythic, legendary heroes and heroines falling into the category 'out of ordinary' but in fact it was argued that those were ordinary people in many ways. Thus, there is a tension between a tendency to mythologise while at the same time seeking to humanize, to render ordinary into extra-ordinary individuals. The leading minds were defined after Gardner (1995) as:

- "simply relate the traditional story of his or her group as effectively as possible"; innovative:
- "takes latent story… and brings new attention or twist to that story"; visionary:
- "creates a new story … and achieves a measure of success in conveying this story effectively to others".

The speaker offered a number of examples of leading figures across the history and from different countries (failed/ successful/ female/ of colour etc.).

Referring to teacher/school leadership, the speaker suggested schools' leaders fall in the category of ordinary and the question is whether this 'ordinary' for the researcher has the potential to be the celebrated, the authentic, the heroic.

Discussion of Dr Surgue's presentation:
A question was asked about why there were no pictures of Latin American leaders in the presentation. Ciaran Surgue explained he could not find any. People in the UK are largely unconscious of South America despite the globalization.

A question was asked about what kind of a leading mind a teacher should be – how innovative? Ciaran Surgue noted that literature on school leadership is confused about this. Distinctions are made between leader – manager and the discussion is about where to position teacher on this continuum.

A point was made by a student about the tendency in the 1960s to view a teacher as a leader in the community, and the question was asked about why it was not the case any longer. Ciaran Surgue suggested it had to do with the evolution of society. In the past teachers were the only, or the most educated people in the community, whereas now more people are educated and you get people much more educated than teachers living side by side. As society evolves the role of teachers changes and they get repositioned.

A follow-up point put forward by the same student (who had conducted her research in Kenya) was that teachers were still found to be the most educated in the community but were not considered leaders. Ciaran Surgue argued that attitudes towards authority had also changed. Teachers therefore need to earn and re-earn this respect.

A question was asked by the member of the Cambridge organising committee about whether the speaker came across any examples in the literature describing models of school leadership that were Non-Western.. Ciaran Surgue said he was himself in Egypt and was wondering about whether such examples could be found in the literature.

Finally, the speaker was asked about who controls the journals and who has power over which knowledge to disseminate. The same questioner also commented that we saw successful examples of educational practice but we had not learnt anything from them.

Dr Esther Priyadharshini, Centre for Applied Research, University of East Anglia - *Double-binds on "inter-national" researchers: A critical look at the discourse of internationalism*

Participants received a copy of Priyadharshini, E. 2003. Coming Unstuck: Thinking Otherwise about "Studying Up". *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 34, no. 4: 1-19., as background reading.

Summary:
The talk aimed to make the audience think about how the experience of doing research across contexts could change the figure of the international researcher and position her/him in particular ways. It was suggested that it was worth understanding an international researcher not only through their national identity but also as someone who worked across cultural, ethnic, or linguistic contexts. That approach would avoid stereotyping researchers and boxing them in with expectations about how they should be, what behaviour they should exhibit and what topics they ought to study and how.

Three examples were offered by the speaker to illustrate how one could get trapped through an essentialising and reductive discourse on 'international research/ers'.

The first example came from a paper by Bronwyn Williams in which the author reflected on his experience of teaching academic writing in a North American university and the ways the issues of power and dominant culture could influence understanding of stories told in a cross-cultural classroom. The striking part of Williams' example about how he was delighted by an essay of a Nigerian student

conveying parts of her exotic and authentic culture (which seemed to him much stronger and more valuable than an essay by an Egyptian student about his passion for jet skiing) lay in Williams' impulse to box or stereotype these students and to invoke in them a behaviour that confirmed to the dominant expectations.

The second example came from the speaker's own experience of supervising a doctoral student, who read extremely widely and as a result quoted in her thesis from sources ranging from medieval history to contemporary theories such as feminism and poststructuralism. This student was constantly questioned about why someone needed to quote from Australian post-structuralist writers for the purpose of researching/explaining the experiences of female academics in her own country. This example pointed to the fact that international researchers were often expected to conform to the expectations that s/he would be motivated in research by 'local' concerns and treat 'local' authors as more relevant.

The third example came from the speaker's own experience as an international researcher. While doing her doctoral research about the ways in which management education shaped the identities of the students, she was constantly asked why she chose to study a privileged group. She was also questioned about the suitability of Western theories for a developing country. This example further highlighted the problematic issues of power, identity and struggle faced by international researchers with respect to the dominant expectations about who to study, how to use theory, which methodology to choose, etc.

The speaker put forward a double-bind for the international researchers – on the one hand, the pressure to produce knowledge that confirms to the dominant conventions, and on the other hand, the pressure of a 'nativist' conceptualisation of knowledge that insists that locals must use local resources to exhibit their authenticity. One approach, the speaker suggested, erases difference (there is a universal way of doing research) and the other essentialises it (there are authentic ways of behaving in research situations), thereby creating restrictive positions for such researchers to occupy.

Discussion of Dr Priyadharshini's presentation:
A question was asked from the floor about how to address the fact that supervisors have certain stereotypes and expectations from students, who in turn are very diverse and come from various traditions. The speaker admitted she faced such

difficulties herself in a supervisor-student relationship, which should be more like relationships between colleagues or researchers exchanging views. She thought supervisors needed further education to supervise international students.

An example was given by a member of the audience about how she knew a Thai student who wanted to focus her research on Thailand and draw on academic knowledge available there. There was no problem in this case to conduct fieldwork there but local knowledge became a problem for her supervisor. So, the point was that we also deal with the power of knowledge and hierarchy. Esther Priyadharshini remarked that this was more usually discussed as a question of how and where knowledge was seen as being produced and consumed. This was also problem that called for a better education of supervisors of international students.

A comment was made from the floor about how far economic practices shaped the idea of research. The speaker agreed that there existed a link between who the sponsors are and what their expectations are. However, her point was that although research by international students is increasingly diverse, there is still an expectation that people from particular countries would tend to study particular topics.

A question was asked about how the student could educate a supervisor. Or whether well established institutional practices could be changed by students. The speaker suggested that institutions were not monolithic and that often one could find ways of educating and bringing about change. However, she cautioned that this was not to be understood as an additional burden on the student, leaving the institution without obligation.

An issue about ethics and ethical guidelines was raised in a context such as Tanzania, where the approved ethical procedures were not in fact applicable to context. Esther Priyadharshini said it would be easier to convince someone who had worked in international contexts about such ethical issues. She thought it was important to find a way to present it in such a way that would make sense to those on the boards of UK ethics committees. Again, she pointed out that it such boards were made up of a diverse group of people and that it was better to attempt to educate the board and make a good case for why you would need to do things differently.

Professor Madeleine Arnot, Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge - *Decentring hegemonic gender theory: the implications for educational research and teaching*

Summary:

This talk drew on the paper Fennell, S. and Arnot, M. 2008. Decentring hegemonic gender theory: the implications for educational research. *Compare* 38, no. 5: 525-538.

The talk drew on the personal journeys of the two authors, working in collaboration into a new way of thinking about the implications for the Northern (Western European/North American) gender theory of Southern gender theories – in this case from Africa and South Asia. The speaker started by highlighting the fact that knowledge gathered and reviewed in the field of gender studies had been disseminated globally but had paid relatively little regard to different contexts. There was also a relatively small chance one could come across any different (non-Western) perspective on the topic. The question posed was whether and how research and teaching about education could account for alternative forms of knowledge and ways of understanding without creating an artificial separation between the national and the international.

At present gender education was said to be linked to the elimination of poverty through economic growth, universal human rights, and other global equality agendas, which could provide an opportunity to bring together the diverse understandings of gender emerging across the globe, validate the work of academics outside Europe and North America. Despite that, it seemed that the gender scholarship had consequently been a one-way traffic (not influenced by insights from other traditions); innovative work by gender researchers outside the West had difficulty achieving international scholarly impact.

The speaker argued that national gender agendas in education could be seen both as a symbol of progress and a vehicle of contemporary neo-colonialism. The danger of uncritically importing neo-liberal models of individualism into the traditional context of developing countries could undermine women's position in those societies or even aggravate gender inequalities. In this respect, two intersecting dialectical conflicts were pointed out – that between education and development and between modern knowledge and indigenous knowledge. Under pressure to deliver certain targets,

national institutions of education could be in danger of losing the creative knowledge and imagination of indigenous cultures, whereas a more productive approach would be to generate a more history/culture specific conceptual and analytical framework.

The speaker outlined a diversity of feminist knowledge in terms of geographies as well as epistemologies challenging the universalising Western feminist agendas. The alternative Southern gender theories were presented by examining three main themes, identified as particularly useful for educational researchers.

1. The first theme named the 'othering of motherhood' focused on the deconstruction of universalisms within gender theory and its failure to even the hostility of Western feminism to motherhood which underprivileged African women's roles and identities.

2. The second theme focused on the *importance of relational worlds* especially considering the domestic sphere as an active site for very small acts of resistance. This alternative view represented the lives of women not as circumscribed between the private and the public but as developing a public role in the community that concurs rather than opposes their life within the family. In the context of the idea of relational worlds it was argued important to avoid models that followed single lines of causality, i.e. a woman's life was not about time mediated compartments of girl, sister, mother and grandmother, but might overlap and coexist.

3. The third theme - *individualism and the gendering of the body* - pointed to research from Africa and India which critiqued individualism and its focus on individual embodied selves. It was pointed out that it was highly problematic in African contexts to offer a gender analysis of bodies as sites of sex (necessarily linked to sexual acts), instead the focus should be on the relational world and relational acts in the context of which bodies could gain gender values. The understanding of the visual sense of the body was highlighted as different in Western social science in contrast to the emphasis on auditory senses (oral tradition of learning) in Africa.

The idea of *decentring hegemonic knowledge* forms was introduced as overturning it, and removing the geographical imperialism. This would not be easy and would have to start with intellectuals who often were not able to decentre or position themselves

or their established forms of epistemology. The talk introduced the concept of *nego-feminism* – a feminism of negotiation or the non-ego form of feminism, which could be recognition of the complexity of African countries: the African sense of identity is located within the communal rather than individual space.

It was argued by African researchers that there was a need to counter- hegemonic forms of knowledge. The research methodology which built on the 'indigenous' is not easy to implement. First, local knowledge system reveal the process-based learning that result from an individual's journey through different relationships and rites during the passage of life. It was agued that the replacement of this knowledge by externally imposed systems had eroded epistemic abilities within African academia, placing them in the position of subject rather than creator/maker of knowledge. Secondly, such (Western) approaches negated community/collective educational knowledge and community/relation integration through learning and marginalise the development of indigenous gender forms of education.

Bi-cultural research was identified as another site where the joint collaborative research could start through a learning period, where researchers read into the other's cultural context so that they could become 'fluent in each other's culture'. In conclusion, the above discussion could be lead to the construction of a new feminist research agenda around education that would reduce binaries, increases bi-cultural working, readdress the role of positionality.

Discussion of Prof. Arnot's presentation:
An issue was raised about the need to challenge the silence about Latin America. The question was how to overcome language barrier to include established South American universities with certain traditions. Madeleine Arnot said that Paulo Freire was the most successful example of South American knowledge travelling to the West. She said she knew from her own experience of working with Argentinean scholars that the conceptions of making change differ across different contexts: in Argentina popular movements are thought to create change and in the UK the teaching profession was used as agents of change.

A point was made by a student about the way gender relationships and feminism work in other parts of the world. An example of Zimbabwe was offered. He also mentioned a researcher educated in the West might have difficulties fitting into the context of developed local knowledges and can be perceived as 'outsider' because of

being away for too long. The speaker pointed out that due to high rates of divorce, addiction and teen pregnancy in the West, the developing world might think such problems were the result of liberation politics and feminism and ask whether it is appropriate to follow such movements themselves. The right to be educated could also lead to disfunctionality. For example, if girls are highly educated, the social effects will be negative if men are not re-educated to cope with educated women.

A point was made regarding language, translation and cultural (mis)understanding by a student who conducted her research in a third country (Mozambique). Drawing on her own experience, this student pointed out it was problematic to transport learnt knowledge and concepts to different contexts. In particular, when a woman was asked during an interview in Mozambique about her divorce, it seemed to the interviewer that violence was the biggest problem, whereas the respondent talked about her husband's lack of contribution to things such as clothing. When prompted about violence, she said she had beaten him up too when she had a chance. Madeleine Arnot responded by saying it was necessary to be open and move outside the established framework when researching in other contexts.

A concern was expressed by a member of the audience regarding how to address the expectations of the state which sends a student abroad and how research was seen by various countries. Within universities, too, it was pointed out that departments did not work to promote cross-departmental research. The speaker agreed there were often few links between departments as a result of funding structures.

Following lunch participants worked in 6 groups on 3 activities:

Activity 1 – Research Culture and Context

(a) Please introduce yourself and highlight the meaning for you personally of going abroad to study.
(b) What sort of issues were raised for you by the morning talks about the internationalisation of educational thinking?

Summary of main points (as they appeared on flip charts):

Group 1:

Activity (a)
- different level of education

- international development
- from Scotland coming to study in England → different experiences as an international student
- similarities and differences
- opportunities to apply what was learnt in another context
- counselling in the Middle East
- marrying different countries through research
- returning home after studies – culture influences / job opportunities
- education policy
- studies at Cambridge University thanks to a scholarship
- recognition of foreign degrees, "threat" of foreign degrees
- language issue when doing research abroad
- studying abroad is seen positively in Cyprus
- students return to Cyprus and work in recently founded universities
- development studies
- Denmark, Africa, Iceland, UK
- reputation of a university
- access
- Zambia → expanding perspectives and experiences
- role of researcher from the UK in an old colony

Activity (b) - Hegemonic discourses:
- different academic traditions
- literature of the elite
- truth
- location UK versus Universal
- indigenous knowledge: natural sciences vs social sciences

Group 2:
- language, cultural, religious issues (difference, misunderstanding)
- a new concept of qualitative methods
- benefit to research student's family, expand and enhance English and IT skills in the UK
- wish to become immersed in Arab academic culture
- wish to develop locally-informed studies/ teacher-training issues
- include access to local literature
- availability of courses

- urgency (i.e. shortage of teachers)
- expectation of authoritative knowledge (language education) on first arrival
- freedom of choice encountered in the UK
- interculturality (sustaining 2 identities)
- threads from the past re-emerge
- writing that reflects historical knowledge vs writing that addresses the specifics

Group 3:
- Language – no international educational thinking
- Development = Africa
- Think right and talk in English
- Historical perspective of concepts: globalisation; poverty
- Cultural explanations
- How do we view context?
- Complexity

Group 4:

Activity (b)
- Brain drain
- reasons for going home
- no jobs?
- economic development
- remittances
- UK university or international university located in the UK? UK has the resources and infrastructure.
- Meeting expectations of academic writing culture.
- "Think British, Do American"
- Missed opportunities – students with grants could not find supervisors.
- Open seminars, more flexibility across disciplines, across national boundaries.

Group 5:

Activity (a)
- opportunities and funding are limited at home
- life history – biography / career trajectory
- duration of degree programme → competition

- apprenticeship / expertise / status

Activity (b)

- interpretation / translation / meditation between 2 or more languages and cultures
- multiple audience – knowledge loss / gain
- research as intercultural conversation
- epistemic power / dominant discourse

Group 6:

Activity (a)

- two or more purposes and aims for multiple academic degrees
- the experience is gendered
- issues: "shit matters", matters of the heart, financial matters, political/organisational matters
- necessity / utility
- greener pastures

Activity 2 – Researching in your National Context

(a) What are the traditions of research in your country? What does it mean to do research in your country?

(b) Are the traditions in your country different from those identified in your courses, research training?

(c) What about your experience in the field? What sort of issues are raised in your national context about the purpose and approaches to research?

Group1:

Activities (a) and (b): National traditions of research / differences between those in your current courses:

- quality of education
- philosophy of education
- political targets through education
- different trends about how to work, how to study, how to construct knowledge, etc.
- sufficient information about how we're supposed to work? → student autonomy
- popular destinations for studying abroad

- distinction between qualitative and quantitative approaches → mixes methods as a new approach → difficulties for those coming from other backgrounds and used to another way of working
- pedagogical methods → difficulties for those coming from other backgrounds and used to another way of working
- mainly UK and US literature → language issues
- assumptions about different levels of education

Activity (c): Challenges of doing research in another cultural context:
- reluctance of participants to provide information
- access
- honesty
- legitimacy
- different "realities"
- security issues
- bias (gender, culture, race, etc)
- researcher's role in the group under study
- time restrictions
- personal interest and involvement in things that are not relevant to the study
- researcher's intervention
- ethical issues → approval / approach

Group 2:
- dominance of quantitative (expansion of student idea that quantitative 'easier')
- approach to arts education: technique → creativity
- what cultural ethics can be / should be taken on board as part of language education?
- cultural diversity within course materials
- reputation of speakers / of transmission of classic texts
- understandings of using 'expert' opinion
- authority of a text: deconstruction of knowledge; questioning authority – fear of (…? revolutionary)
- demographic pressure of children (assessment): produces competition, affects scale of research

Activity (c): Fieldwork experiences:

- consent: different conceptual bases on why we need concent
- responsibility
- construction of society vis-à-vis permissions
- power relations
- who is giving consent for whom?
- money/payment : how to reward / does one reward participation? who is benefiting? what kind of costs are incurred in specific contexts? the giving of time feeding participants
- researcher viewed as carrier of knowledge from and of outside world: valuing a stranger (in the UK not valued generally); attitude of learning from a stranger
- creating research relationships: contractual
- annonymising the subject vs honouring the subject

Group 3:
- practice of research
- international funding bodies impose a research agenda
- research for reporting rather than research for making change and action
- international collaboration: research for policy-making, academia, community

Group 4:
- Doing research in a small country where everyone knows you.
- No research culture? Theoretical research – quantitative (does not work in polygamous societies) or qualitative ("fear of data")
- How far our personal qualities fit with different methods?
- Perceptions from insider, outsider researcher and of insider who comes back as outsider.

Group 5:
- limited understandings of research traditions / expert v lay
- policy making
- ethics procedures / local knowledge

Group 6:
Activity (a):
- policy driven
- different expectations about research

Activity (b):

- appropriateness of the research tool: survey return rates, culture within culture, literacy rate /paper work, different languages
- disconnect between community expectations / and objectives of policy and research
- what languages do policy makers understand
- "nepotism": who you know, access to data, access to information, insider vs outsider

Activity 3 – Differing Research Traditions: making links

(a) To what extent are Eurocentric approaches to research are problematic in your national context?

(b) How do you bring this approach and your national knowledge and traditions together?

(c) What would you recommend in terms of developing a more international approach to teaching and research in education?

Group1:

Activity (c): Recommendations for internationalisation of research:

- introduce audience to the context of the culture that is being studied
- sufficient knowledge of a number of different traditions
- communication in order to learn about other people's experiences → involvement in international community organisations
- influences from other countries' educational systems
- how to maintain substantive data
- different understandings of concepts and terms

Group 2:

- exploring and contrasting models
- transplantation of models
- emotional empathy / platform
- induction phase / different stories and voices
- valuing the collective experience of international students: do you work with the system? should the institution accommodate more?
- what is the experience like for you in a diaspora situation?
- feedback from supervisor

Group 3:

Activity (c)

- cultural sensitivity
- pedagogical structure that recognises student knowledge and experiences
- translation of the world and words
- process empowered after PhD to support international research

Group 4:

- requirement to speak and write in 2 languages
- flexibility/collaboration across faculties and countries (in terms of supervising)
- offer European doctorate – relate to mobility and Bologna process
- twinning – 'sandwich' programmes in developing countries
- distance learning research programmes
- exchange programmes – lecturers from developing countries invited to teach here for a term
- writing culture is a barrier to internationalisation
- open lectures and seminars series such as history of education, philosophy (can provide inspiration for research ideas)

Group 5:

Who benefits from the research?

- We need to question our own assumptions
- Use courses participants as a resource → becoming a transcultural learner (both student and supervisor / educator)

Feedback from group activities and final discussion led by Professor Madeleine Arnot:

Madeleine Arnot announced 50 minutes for a feedback session from groups as well as for a general discussion around issues that had come up from the morning and afternoon topics. In the courses of the feedback session the workshop participants reported in particular on the following three questions in relation to the activity sheet:

Activity (1b): What sort of issues are raised for you by the morning talks about the internationalisation of educational thinking?

(2a/b) What are the traditions of research in your country? What does it mean to do research in your country? Are the traditions in your country different from those identified in your courses, research training?

Activity 2(c): What about your experience in the field? What sort of issues are raised in your national context about the purpose and approaches to research?

Activity (3c): What would you recommend in terms of developing a more international approach to teaching and research in education?

Discussion started with the issue of being an international student – what did it mean to study abroad?

The following issues were raised:

- There was a difficult scenario (and a challenge for developing a research course) when some students come from overseas to study in the UK and then conduct their fieldwork in a third country, researching a completely different culture, but using British degrees to get there. For example, among the workshop participants there was an Icelandic student studying in UEA who went to do fieldwork in Mozambique.

- People leave their home country to study abroad but then they have nothing to come back to in their own country because of unemployment. In such situations people who have higher degrees have to work as a cab driver or do not find any job at all. People end up as consultants and struggle to get at least one project to work on.

- A participant from Argentina revealed that in her country UK degrees are recognised unofficially but not officially by the Ministry of Education. It is recognised as a prestigious thing but at the end of the day it is just one's own personal investment and pride, but not an economic investment. Another participant suggested that even when jobs were available they did not pay enough to return the costs of the foreign education for self-funded students. A participant from Iceland, on the contrary, explained how getting a Master's degree from the UK offered her a head start since it was such a rare thing in her own country, opened up possibilities to conduct research in developing contexts funded by Iceland. In Ukraine, as a student said, as well as in the former USSR degrees are not recognised and treated as irrelevant knowledge sometimes by the political elites.

- There was a discussion on personal identities. A Chinese student talked about maintaining/ switching between the identities of a Chinese and a British. He resisted the notion of hyphenated or hybrid identity and preferred to retain 2 identities which he could shift to suit particular moment. He also said his stay in the UK completely changed him. For example, from the perspective of Chinese people he was completely Westernised, while when he talked to his British colleagues they were asking why he was still so Chinese. Asking himself whether he changed, he came to the conclusion that he felt more comfortable in a multicultural society. He thought it would not be easy for him to adapt to the local culture if he went to China again. The reason he came to the UK was to learn, but he felt his knowledge would be a bit useless back home. Another student from Mexico said his friends and family there always mocked his new British identity. Academically he felt in Mexico people simplified things at seminars he attended, whereas he started calling for more complexity, context, etc.

The next topic discussed focused on the traditions of research in different countries:
- A student said that Spanish was very eloquent. It is generally important to make a full description of something and then finish with the main idea instead of starting with the main argument like in English. One group had discussed how students on coming to Cambridge encountered the need to shift in their writing style. In their tradition they started with some knowledge and then concluded, whereas in Cambridge they were pushed to come to some sort of conclusion first and then had to debate it. Darleen Opfer summed up the discussion that was going on in her group about coming into a culture, getting something out of it and applying knowledge, particularly methodologies.
- The experience of an Australian student about fitting in into the research culture of the Education Faculty suggested that funding drove research heavily. It was noted that unlike 10 years ago, nowadays research in education was driven more and more by the funding bodies.
- A point was raised about the relationship between epistemology (qualitative/quantitative research) and writing. In Britain there was an assumption that research was more theoretical and qualitative, and that nobody outside was doing similar cutting-edge research. A speaker said everybody else was doing it but it was a matter of how it was presented.

- Further discussion of qualitative and quantitative types of research. A student from China suggested the discussion in his country was about which type of research was more applicable. Traditionally, quantitative research in China was also more widespread because one supervisor could supervise 50 students, but now the culture was changing towards qualitative research with all the students recently coming back to China with their qualitative experiences from the UK and Australia. Demography was probably an interesting element of this since the use of quantitative research methods might have links to the scale of a national population. Qualitative research, on the other hand, was said to be a luxury type of research which required a great investment of time on the researcher.
- Another point raised was how much research in different countries was focused on policy. In Pakistan it was said to be linked to policy and policy questions were often more easily answered with quantitative data. A student from Africa pointed out that in the African context quantitative surveys could be misleading in the culture of shared households: not clear how to count family members.
- The discussion also focused on the notion of authority. Participants had reported that in China and Malaysia it was considered a good practice to review all the authoritative knowledge prior to moving to one's own. The authority and expertise were said to be embedded in such cultures, whereas in Britain that was not how one got to the point, opinion rather than authoritative text/author is offered first. So, the use of authoritative text differs, as well as how the history of knowledge is seen. In the UK critical deconstructive knowledge was preferred. Being in education arguably made it harder to refer to authoritative knowledge, and philosophical knowledge today. There was great pressure identify a practical/professional or policy problem and offering a solution.

The discussion focused on research experiences in the field:
- A student talked about the issue of ethics in Ghana, particularly about seeking access and consent. She said informal relations played a great role in negotiating access and worked better than a formal route, such as through the Ministry of Education. She also encountered a problem in signing consent forms and had to be more practical about whom to seek consent from – a parent or a school.

- A student from Africa raised an issue about the disconnection between the literature and social science research on mothering and motherhood. Literary work provided more important sources for literature review on this topic. When she went into the field her participants became her co-researchers. An opening question which was okay in the UK – tell me about your life –did not work in the Kenyan community. Alternative opening questions might be rejected in the UK as not appropriate methodologically.

- In China, it was pointed out, signing consent forms would trigger contractual relations. Often participants wondered why they needed to sign, they were afraid. The issue was whether contractual relations do not work in international contexts; the way gatekeepers are viewed in different ways in different countries because in some contexts they might have moral responsibility for children, whereas in the UK every child is seen as a property of parents responsible for their welfare, and thus researchers need to go individually. Also, coming on the contractual basis looks like one was making a career out of research, becoming a data grabber.

- A student pointed out that the researcher found it hard to go back to the communities to share findings in Africa and people seemed increasingly tired of research.

- A student from China talked about how she always rewarded her participants by bringing for example a basket of fruit to thank them for participation.

- The remuneration of participants were not generally discussed in the research courses. The other issue raised earlier was the kind of literature suitable for social research, whether literature and poetry were respectable references for social scientific research.

Discussion on what training courses could do to help/prepare students.

- The recommendation for universities/training courses that came up in one of the groups revolved around the need for universities to become more flexible and international, run exchange programmes, seminar series, cross-departmental supervisions etc.

- It was important to see how issues had already been addressed, what could change the culture of the institution, institutional and emotional experience of studying in another country, engaging and learning from each other could be taken further within each partner institution..

Filling in evaluation forms (see Summary of Evaluation attached below)

Closing remarks and introduction to the next workshop at UEA by Professor Madeleine Arnot.

BAICE Workshop 18 May 2009 – Cambridge University, Faculty of Education

Evaluation forms – **Summary**

Total forms returned – 32

Total students – 22	Total staff – 9
Cambridge - 12	Cambridge - 3
UEA – 10	UEA - 5
Both (PhD student and staff) – 1 (UEA)	Unspecified - 1

Areas of student research:
- Adult education and gender roles
- Development studies
- Gender equality
- Communication between children and parents in the era of HIV/AIDS
- Universities in Latin America
- Human resources management in HE
- Counseling
- Parental movement in preschool education
- Teacher development
- Sociology of education
- Art, culture and education
- Educational leadership
- Mathematics education
- School finance
- Teachers' reflective thinking
- Children's geographies

Feedback provided by students:

1. How far has the day fulfilled your expectations?

On all 23 forms students said this workshop met their expectation in various ways or exceeded them.

Positive aspects:
- thought-provoking;
- well-balanced in terms of discussion/presentation;
- very informative;
- great to meet researchers who are further along in their projects and find out how they have found solutions for issues that cross-cultural research presents us with;
- opened the door to discuss major issues about research within different contexts;
- enjoyed that professors and students were in groups collaborating;
- enjoyed learning about international/intercultural experiences different in purpose and structure than my own;
- it has been tremendously exciting to have so many international perspectives, and so many issues and problems raised – a dialogue at last;
- afternoon discussion was really intellectually stimulating;
- chance to talk to other people about the issues that we had never had a chance to talk about;
- just got back to the UK after a long period and it was very useful to come here and reflect on many relevant issues and get back to academia mode.

Negative aspects:
- too little time to discuss the major presentations
- surprise at feeling lack of accommodation on behalf of Faculty at Cambridge for international students and incorporation of their research background and experiences.

2. *What do you feel you are taking from the day?*

Sense of shared experience
- better understanding of myself as a researcher, how my experience resonates with that of others;
- a sense of solidarity, a greater understanding of international research issues;
- rich diverse cultural experience but also how much similarities were there;
- I am not alone in feeling there is a disconnect between the theory studies and realities of research in the field.

New knowledge

- what I've learned from others about more complex issues in educational research;
- increased complexity of perception of ethics/methods, views from beyond Europe;
- cultural diversity factor in research;
- ideas on internationalizing of HE;
- researchers' career choices;
- ethical concerns in research;
- an awareness of hegemony of the English language in academic discourses;
- gained some cultural knowledge;
- practical and theoretical considerations for undertaking my own fieldwork.

Rethinking own practices

- activity 2 and 3: rethinking of these areas within my country;
- awareness of my own lack of internationalization of my thinking and research;
- the complexity of the research process and all the issues to keep in mind whenever working on a research project;
- experiences from different researchers has inspired me and next time I research I will improve;
- revision on research in general, openness to research from different contexts and experiences.

Other

- that Shackleton and Geldof are Irish, and that the Irish are the funniest;
- confidence.

3. *What issues would you like to be discussed in the next workshop?*

Collaboration

- potential identification of peers for potential future collaboration;
- funding and collaboration on research projects;
- possibilities of collaboration in researching similar topics;
- international collaborative research;
- how to create more exchange within universities in order to bring students together, and students and staff, to exchange ideas.

Further focus on international research/students

- comparative advantages in HE;
- comparative research in education;
- more on overcoming difficulties in cross-cultural research;
- real case studies of international students;
- meaningful steps institutions can take to become more international and receptive to alternative epistemologies and ontologies as valid;
- issues about academic writing culture and flexibility to accommodate international students;
- how to challenge stereotypes, i.e. ways in which we, as educators, can be challenged to think outside the box and look at new perspectives or same issues under a new/different light.

Methodological issues

- Western and non-Western methodologies and their relevance;
- validity and being inside/outside;
- research ethics → the ethics of researching and being foreign 'to the culture you are researching';
- cross-cultural methods in the field, ethics;
- how to get literature on such undocumented research experiences;
- how to deal with ethical issues arising from the fact that you're studying a culture with different values and morals than your own;

Other substantive issues

- research models in different countries;
- Western and non-Western knowledge and its use in research;
- more about policies that impact practice;
- What happens when local knowledge becomes known to outsiders? Does it change? Become non-local? Knowledge and research as abstraction.
- types of research done at Cambridge and UEA on, in and from Africa;
- transfer of capital from one setting to another – is it as straightforward as it seems?
- international research economics → who pays who has money determines the field of the literature;
- identities, different ways of being and knowing yourself and your discipline;
- whose benefit in internalization – for the student or the institution;
- European politics on HE "European Doctorate Degree".

Practical issues

- discuss each presentation in groups to crystallize thinking on that topic;
- interaction with more people.

Feedback provided by staff:

1. How far has the day fulfilled your expectations?

Positive aspects

- good variety of presentations at the start;
- excellent lunch and venue;
- afternoon discussions exceeded expectation, wasn't expecting it to be so thought-provoking;
- the mix of 2 universities has been extremely good with a lot of exchange of ideas and feelings and shared set of issues;
- a comfortable exchange of views without any sense of hierarchy (faculty/student);
- very positive experience – I don't know what the expectations were, they may well have been exceeded;
- rather better than expected.

Needs improvement

- more direct connections between workshops/groups and issues raised;
- need more interaction with the other groups (perhaps several different group combinations next time);
- feedback session – too much towards personal anecdotes.

2. What do you feel you are taking from the day?

- thoughts about creating knowledge through processes that are 'fair' and not unequal;
- how to be a better learner in the supervisor-supervisee relationships, i.e. mutually educative;
- ideas of areas to strengthen in my own work and researcher relationships;
- highly informative perspectives, experiences and opinions from the research students;
- more aware of issues/sensitivities while not necessarily being any more certain of how to deal with them;

- made good contacts;
- different perspectives on intentional education.

3. *What issues would you like to be discussed in the next workshop?*
- more on how to educate staff in the UK about being sensitive to international student needs;
- ways of negotiating more supportive teaching and assessment environments for non-UK students;
- how to change ethos of the international student experience as practiced by universities (i.e. beyond published guidelines);
- issues of pedagogy of educational research with international students + language and concepts;
- academic culture and institutional change – how to change hegemonic practices alongside supporting students in participating in these practices?
- changing/amending processes of research from epistemic knowledge to writing practices to ethics procedures;
- more discussion would be good on, for example, What do we mean by indigenous knowledge? Are we questioning notions of/cultures of truth and legitimacy?
- colonialism and politics in local context – you can't discuss international education without these;
- I think – take an overarching theme – Developing my 'Doctoral voice' – ideal with several aspects of that in a multidimensional manner.

Academic cultures - academic styles: exploring cross-cultural issues in postgraduate teaching and learning

Report on the second BAICE Workshop – 22 June 2009 – Organised by the Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia

This one-day workshop focused on the theme *Academic cultures - academic styles: exploring cross-cultural issues in postgraduate teaching and learning* and was attended by 34 participants (3 staff and 14 students from Cambridge and 6 staff and 11 students from UEA – see Appendix 1 for list of names). The workshop was planned and facilitated by a team from CARE/UEA consisting of: Juancho Barron-Pasteur, Oscar Holguin-Rodriguez, Kathleen Lane, Yann Lebeau, Anna Magyar, Esther Priyadharshini and Anna Robinson-Pant. The UEA team also acted as facilitators for the groups (which were allocated randomly through a 'lottery' on arrival, to ensure a mix of staff and students from Norwich and Cambridge in each group). Rapporteurs in the plenary sessions included: Oscar Holguin-Rodriguez, Alan Pagden, Oley Dibba-Wadda, Hong Bui, Jennifer von Reis Saari, Thelma Mort, Sheila Aikman, Rosemary Deaney, Fibian Kavulani Lukalo, Lee Nordstrum, Georgie Hett.

This report is based on notes taken by the organising team, as well as Georgie Hett and Leticia Goodchild. We have decided to anonymise the group discussion reports (apart from indicating the facilitators' names) as we were unable to check whether individuals wanted to be identified by name in a public report.

Kathleen Lane and Yann Lebeau, University of East Anglia - *Interrogating assumptions in research methods courses for international students*

This short discussion of how assumptions can turn into obstacles in the teaching of research methods courses to international students in Education aimed to share some reflections triggered by our experience of teaching research modules to diverse groups of home and international PG students (MA in education, MA in Education and Development Studies, etc).

The starting point of all this is the set of difficulties which lecturers in Education (and to a large extent in the social sciences generally) are facing when leading research methods modules with international students. Because they are postgraduate

students and sometimes research students, we tend to assume a common understanding of issues related to individuality, preconceptions and conceptualisation, critical thinking, ethical issues, etc. It is often on these assumptions that our discussion of qualitative and quantitative approaches,of fieldwork and of interpretative frameworks are based.

We organised our discussion around two problematic areas in assumptions and misunderstandings. One dealing with the issue of Authority (of the textbooks, of the teacher, of the method) [introduced by Kathleen], and one looking at the problem of context-related assumptions about knowledge and research practice [Yann].

Kathleen spoke about the issue of authority: *how critical can one be in the face of the "authority" of the text, the course or the tutor?* The main focus of her talk was on the treatment of textual sources. In many countries and settings, students of all ages are given a text and are expected to read it. But the "learning" of it might not include asking questions, in the sense of a challenge, of it. This may be bound in part with the assumption and expectation that authoritative knowledge resides in the teacher or tutor.

Numerous understandings are encompassed by the term "critical reading" and the "critiquing" of a text. Among the workshop participants, several different synonyms were given for the word *critiquing*, which is indicative of the nuances of meaning hedged around the word, as well as the variety of our own backgrounds, our attitudes and cultural suppositions and the epistemologies in which we engage. On a related matter, to ask some students to describe or report something "in your own words" is laden with meanings reflecting experience and cultural contexts.

In short, it is important to acknowledge and fully participate in the idea that all of us have our own language, culture, history, as well as individual personality and outlook. Some people, especially those introduced into new environments, may find it impossible, as much in terms of self-confidence as in cultural attitudes of respect, to criticise a textual source.

Yann's discussion of *regional epistemologies and of ethics and methodological integrity* was motivated by some key assumptions and misunderstandings experienced and observed in the UK in research methods teaching applied to developing contexts:

1. We teach data collection techniques as if they were universal while our model of fieldwork processes in developing countries is based on the classic anthropological discourse of the cultural encounter: our assumptions about these processes are culturally biased : status of the in the society, rights of individuals etc.

2. And while we tend to decontextualise the discussion of ethics requirements and techniques of data collection (see textbooks), we emphasise strongly the importance of contexts in the analysis (grounded approaches, institutional case studies, etc). As a result students tend to dissociate the "methodology" from the "analysis" in their own research and writing.

3. We also tend to consider the research process as being negotiated and defined by research participants when the study is carried out, but how is this possible and how is it happening in cultures around the world?

The research encounter as we call it tends to assume a situation of role playing between willing participants. This conception is not transferable in many socio-cultural contexts where roles (including positions and hierarchies in educational institutions) are distributed differently. We know it and research in developing countries is today promoting more collaborative processes to better address these issues. But   this is hardly encouraged among international students   who are sent home to carry their research as if they were European anthropologists of the early 20th century.

V Darleen Opfer, University of Cambridge - *Can We Ever Go Home Again?*

In this talk, Darleen presented three contradictions in internationalising our research methods programmes at the University of Cambridge that she had been struggling with:

1. The academy's tend toward homogenization and its implications for 'internationalizing'

Difference is the price of admission to many graduate programmes today – international students and researchers are valued by universities because of the financial and prestige advantages they bring. And yet, universities are all about masking difference – through the 'canon' of knowledge they transmit, the

uniformity of their assessment practices, and the adoption of a 'correct way' to conduct research. How do I encourage methodological, cultural difference within a context where the goals are uniformity?

2. *The practice of internationalizing and the placement of the burden of 'internationalizing'.*

The work of post colonial researcher methodologists such as Linda T. Smith, Julia Alvarez and Sandy Grande have brought to our attention the burden of research on participants. While as researchers we may recognize, discuss and problematize this methodological burden, as teachers in internationalized programs, we haven't yet begun to deal with the idea that internationalizing our programmes creates a similar pedagogical burden. In order for me to be a more international teacher, I must get to know my students. I need to see them as individuals and not cultural categories or stereotypes, but in trying to get to know them as individuals, I am placing a further burden on them to self-disclose; to give me their history. To not make this request will make me a less able to help them, to do so places a burden on them, and if I share my history in order to right that imbalance, am I imposing then imposing my story and my history on them?

3. *The place of international students and researchers at the 'nexus of the global-local struggles'*

We talk about researching the 'other' and the difficulties in doing that. I believe we may be creating researcher 'others' in our international programs. By going abroad and learning abroad, you naturally become an 'other' even when you return home. This creates two problems. First, as an insider, you have important sensitivity to offer, and yet you are also more vulnerable than an outsider researcher. You are vulnerable to the pressure from the outside world that your work conforms to outside research standards and describes the 'home' reality in terms of its relationship to the outside. But you also will be pressured from the inside to portray reality or maybe to protect reality from others.

Second, Stacy (1991) has argued that feminist ethnographers 'are apt to suffer the delusion of alliance more than the delusion of separateness, and to suffer" from that delusion. Thus that betweeness – not being an insider and yet not being an outsider may create a 'delusion of alliance' for our students when they return home. Given these contradictions of internationalized research methods programs and the tensions they create for the researchers that emerge from

them I ask - Can they really ever go 'home' again? And what is our responsibility to help them do so?

Group activity/discussion:

The aim of the first group activity was to discuss the issues emerging from the two presentations in relation to three perspectives: disciplinary, geographical and professional perspectives. Each group member was asked to introduce themselves from these three perspectives first:

- Disciplinary refers to where you locate yourself intellectually and your academic field (e.g. development studies, anthropology, economics, education, health etc.)
- Geographical refers to the diversity of cultural, social, and physical environments in which research is carried out, including consideration of regional/national epistemologies.
- Professional refers to where you come from in terms of career/institutional context, as well as where you are going! (e.g. Ministry of Education, school teacher, NGO worker etc)

The group then focused on issues arising directly from the presentations, noting down points on post-it notes. As the basis for the reporting back, the post-it notes were sorted into three categories (according to the three perspectives) and rapporteurs from each group presented on these. The following accounts were written by the group facilitators, with additional input from some of the rapporteurs.

Group 1 (Facilitator: Esther Priyadharshini)

The group decided to discuss issues arising directly from the talks in the morning rather than restrict the flow of conversation to the themes of 'geography', 'discipline' and 'profession'. This emerged after we introduced ourselves – we were from Palestine, Ghana, India, and two from Kenya, making up one academic member of staff from UEA and 4 research students from Cambridge, all researching a very wide range of topics and areas.

Insider-outsider theme:

One of the first issues that came up for discussion was the idea of being an 'insider-outsider' while doing research. Interestingly, the group felt that identities change and how we described ourselves changed with changes in location/audience. In the 'field'

we were usually identified as an insider but with some outsider characteristics/privileges. This placed us in an ambivalent position regarding our own identity.

A further complication arose when we discussed that some of us may not feel a full sense of belonging to a community/nation even when we have never left the boundaries of the nation – due to colonial inheritances, linguistic and religious differences (from the dominant group) and most of all, educational experiences. So this then raised the issue of whether ALL education is a process that moves us away from earlier identities? And is this necessarily bad? Evolution of identity therefore can be a 'normal' process of life even if one is not an international researcher with a hybrid identity.

One member of the group felt that hybrid identities whether we liked it or not, was where we were at and another recalled an earlier discussion in the Cambridge workshop when a student claimed a double identity for himself rather than a hybrid state of 'in-betweenness'.

One member said that reaching this state of understanding the privilege of being 'internal' and 'external' to several cultures was a powerful 'product' because it makes the process and products of research better – more coherent and contextual.
One member also said that it was important to bear in mind one's stage in the lifecycle of being a researcher/academic. This changes how one feels about one's identity too! And perhaps we need to also consider where we would be in 8 or 10 years' time.

Homogeneity and diversity in university practices
The group also discussed issues of 'contradiction' that Darleen's session had raised – about universities desiring diversity while pushing for homogeneity at the same time. Several members of the group asked if this contradiction was a bad thing? Perhaps this points to the opportunities for universities to change?

Power dynamics & ethics in research:
There was a strong feeling that the researcher was not always the most powerful one in a research encounter. This was a changing dynamic between and even within a research encounter with one person. It was felt that this was a major issue that is not

often highlighted in standard research procedures and ethics textbooks. This needed to be corrected to improve the experience of the researcher in the field.

Research methods and authority:
Following from some of the issues raised by Yann and Kathleen in their session, it was felt that currently certain research methods textbooks and authors had canonical status which was not deserved. The group felt that we find it easy to talk about children in developing contexts being taught not to question the teacher or the texts, but we do the same with these research methods text books which are often decontexualised pieces. The group suggested that perhaps one of the outcomes of these workshops would be to begin to write an alternative research methods text that can challenge the cannon. This could focus more on problematising practices than prescribing dos and don'ts.

Following on from this, the group felt that reading lists of such methods courses need to be revised to reflect the diversity and range of peoples' experiences and projects. It was also felt that we need to think of authority not only of the texts (many cultures prescribe authority to the oral rather than the textual) but also of practices and processes.

Following on from this, the question was raised about whether methods courses can be more interactional than prescriptive or lecture led? The presentations raised the importance of integrating the technical and philosophical aspects of doing research – for instance to what extent can research methods courses be tailored to be based on argument and challenging the content (of cannons)?

We need more international staff to be recruited to allow for better diversity of perspectives and methods.

In terms of expectations, it was felt that students, supervisors and programmes/institutions, all had different expectations, so some chance to overview and listen to each others' priorities was important.

Group 2 (Facilitator: Juancho Barron-Pastor):
The group focus mainly in Kathleen's concerns about the diversity of contexts as a departing point to what Darleen presented as efforts for homogenisation, but due to authority issues as Yann had sketched. Collective discussion derived into criticising if

higher education in UK is really promoting 'democratic values', and some examples about how inflexible and 'complete' can be UK Higher Education, particularly Cambridge University, in adapting its academic style to 'overseas' potential contributions. Also it was underlined by a participant the necessity of admitting that we are all part of 'hybrid research cultures' instead of parties meeting in an illusionary border.

Geographical Issues

Six persons in the group representing six countries: Argentina, Mexico, South Africa, Ukraine, United States, and Zimbabwe. Discussion from a geographical perspective highlighted the lack of a strong academic tradition for African countries, the difficulties to combine the academic writing style from the very strong and prolific Latin American critical theories. Translation problems were also mentioned by all members of the group. The reflection flowed into 'following the text' or 'following the critiques' dilemmas and inferred a possible connection with cultural styles of authority.

Professional issues

This perspective gave a lot to discuss. Participants debated how questionable is the assumption that getting a PhD degree in UK opens up possibilities for a job in countries of birth. The spirit of this part of the conversation was synthesised by a participant who said "No way to come back, we are already contaminated". Questioning the assumptions didn't follow arguments around economic or political crises but around the questionable assumption of being becoming experts, as maybe we are all loosing authority to critique national issues due to the distance generated by the nature of our academic programmes. Participants accentuated many aspects to demonstrate how they feel as outsiders both in UK and in their countries of birth.

Disciplinary issues

Not too much was said from participants' disciplinary backgrounds. But it could be inferred that students' environments from each country are very different. It was underlined the willingness of international students to participate in the 'research culture' of the UK, but a problem they face is the institutional, staff and students' questionable belief of UK's environment for study being the best.

Group 3 (Facilitator: Anna Robinson-Pant):

We began by introducing ourselves from the three different perspectives and noted how selective we had been in constructing our life stories for this activity – also that it

made a difference whether you were second or third to speak. This related to Darleen's point in her presentation about students being asked to 'give their stories' and how far this was 'burdening' students. We felt we had still had much control over what we chose to share with the group and the identities we created for ourselves.

The issue of 'being critical' was a focus of our discussion - particularly the idea that it is not so 'black and white' (i.e. being critical or not), and is an issue for everyone (i.e. not just international students, but UK undergraduates too, as Kathleen had pointed out). We explored some assumptions that are not necessarily questioned in our UEA/Cambridge contexts, for instance, with regard to the assumed superiority of qualitative over quantitative research methodologies in CARE. We also talked about how within some disciplines, some ideas/writers are often not critiqued but taken as a generally accepted starting point – 'in the area of children's geographies, if you use Foucault, no-one challenges you!'

Participants shared their experiences of having arrived for a doctorate in the UK – one student had been sent a reading list beforehand when they had no access to the Internet in their country. However when studying here, it was exciting to be able to get the book written by the professor whose work you were hearing about firsthand. Power issues were also noted - differences in how far some students felt they had a space to voice their own experiences and to 'speak back' to the supervisor. International students were often talked of as 'cash cows' – a term used particularly by students from US and Canada in Cambridge. We debated whether the business model of higher education with regard to international students could have positive aspects as well as negative, since the universities have to ensure courses are of high quality and relevant to their consumers' needs.

We ended up talking about the implications of internationalisation for curriculum and pedagogy (including whether 'local' students would feel there was too much focus on the international). Someone felt that there were not enough books from developing country contexts and that many lecturers did not have the developing country experience needed either. This related to the three dimensions we had started with in regard to professional identities and geographical context: 'some teachers have the feeling that we're doing research in the UK'.

Group 4 (Facilitator: Anna Magyar):
Keywords: outsider-insider; authority; identity; ethics

All members of the group resonated with the 'outsider-insider' theme. Two members had been in the UK for some time and had found going back home that they had become 'outsiders'. This was not a comfortable experience and they were still grappling with it, and with the perceptions and expectations from family/colleagues. Being an outsider was 'psychologically exhausting' according to one person.

There was appreciation for the opportunity to share background and 'who we are'. One participant misses this aspect of South Africa where there is more of a differentiated/situated discourse... people are more careful/mindful about making assumptions. What came out of the round of introductions around the themes of professional, disciplinary and geographical was that the stories of who we are are complex, multiple/overlapping roles/selves/positions (eg outsider-insider). How do we represent that?

We discussed the extent to which the knowledge base students encountered in the UK was shared. The social science canon in Spain in the 80s was being subjected to critique and analysis in a similar way to here with much overlap in the canon so this made Oscar less of a disciplinary outsider. In Malaysian universities most of the lecturers are from the US and UK so the academic culture in the UK was not new for some Malaysian students.

We discussed authority and how that is played out at different levels, for example, the hierarchy of institutional authority. Lecturers from Cambridge University for example are somehow vested with more authority than other universities.

A student described how the universalist approach to ethics imposed on her by her institution was not fit for purpose in her research in Tanzania.

Another participant suggested the metaphor of the bottle to represent the diversity of students who enter the academy and then having to pass through the bottle neck of UK assessment processes.

Group 5 (Facilitator: Kathleen Lane):
The group did not keep strictly to the designated activity but the issues discussed among us overlapped with what had been expected.

Insider / outsider perspective as raised in Darleen's presentation:

- discussion opened with one person saying: had not initially realised the implications of this in terms of "where I am"
- can we sign-post the implications of "where we are" for each other, say at the beginning of a programme or the start of an academic year?
- can we understand our world view better
- perhaps do a questionnaire on what is knowledge, views on research
- a questionnaire might not be the most suitable instrument – maybe something else would capture information on our individual world views in a better way
- as she said, Darleen had no answers re insider/outsider, but perhaps we can tap into underlying values in order to help understand each person's perspectives
- and, wondered another group member, how would that help the international research student understand returning to their own culture?
- try to investigate / make explicit the worldview and value systems as a way of finding answers to the contradictions

Role of supervisor:
- should the supervisor tell the student where to carry out data-collection?
- international students, according to this group member, face the challenge of not understanding language and life here in the UK
- geographical problem with MA/MSc international students
- the research student finding him/herself "inbetween", as Darleen spoke about
- should the School leave an option for students to do either a Masters dissertation or another unit/options
- is the supervisor responsible for "training" the Masters student?
- "convenience" issues for data-collection
- a Masters is less than one year
- data-collection in one 's home country might be inconvenient and there could be other resource issues
- as a result, some students use Skype, online surveys, etc.
- this is probably acceptable on grounds of convenience
- but it does not equal getting the best data
- a face-to-face interview is very different from a survey

General issues
- what is the focus of the research? How does that fit into the person's own aspirations?

- how does it contribute to the student's professional / personal development?
- most universities in one participant's home country do not offer research methodology courses
- so it was an automatic choice for this individual to come to the UK
- what does that mean, asked another participant, for you returning to your country as a researcher
- another participant: we want to change [the whole educational system in] my home country
- little by little, each of us will return to my country
- collectively we will make the changes we want
- another participant: would these changes be accepted in terms of wider cultural values? Would you be at odds with your own culture?
- response: not sure
- on returning to your country, you are in a good position to do research in your own methodology
- what then about the issue of "authority" in your own country?
- it is important to go by the authority of the text to certain points
- a recommended methodology: but your context says it is not going to work
- the researcher back in his/her own country must make a decision
- this raises issues of empowerment

Group 6 (Facilitator: Yann Lebeau):

Session started with individual presentations, where participants tried to relate their current status and focus to their past trajectory. Easy for some who have got a straightforward trajectory within a discipline, more complex for others, crossing disciplines and institutions.

This led to a discussion of *disciplinary cultures and identities.* Someone pointed out that the two members of staff in the group were locating themselves in reference to their disciplines (sociology). This drives their career, their publication plans and their conception of educational research. She felt that these are "dinosaurs' profiles compared to the post modern transdisciplinary trajectories of the PhD students. Most of them have already experienced different language, disciplinary and institutional contexts.

A discussion of the importance of discipline followed. Not so much an issue in Education where disciplinary perceptive are not valorised (particularly in UEA), while

Development Studies maintain strong disciplinary perspectives on development issues (and are able to encourage students to be multi-disciplinary). This can be complex for international students who come from traditions where disciplines remain more strictly defined.

A discussion of institutional cultures in relation to attracting international students and supervising them followed. The issue of the money raised through international students was raised, as sometimes responsible for dubious orientation of students and their lack of research background in the area they have been accepted in .

Geographical perspectives

A discussion of research cultures and critical perspectives led to a critique of the cultural assumption that some international students are less critical than others. Forms and experiences of being critical were found to differ from one context to another. A certain way of engaging with texts an ides that dominates in Europe tends to be presented as universal. The questions of whether or not research traditions and schools of thought can develop in developing countries was raised. This reveals another form of authority of the North over the South, as very few developing countries have the means and the critical mass to develop their own research traditions and methodologies. Research traditions tend to be filtered and abandoned when students come to the UK and have to conform to specific modes of assessment, etc. Also, these regional epistemologies are not valorised in most schools of education in the UK which have not developed area studies. Research cultures, scientific authority and dominant paradigm tend to reflect the wealth of countries and institutions.

Professional

Some students reported the power conferred by a PhD from the UK in their own country. A discussion followed about the issue of going back home and being in between two academic cultures. Questions were asked about the freedom of pursuing certain types of research in the home country after years of developing such research expertise in the UK as part of a PhD. Overall, it was considered that the more fluid and transdiciplinary identity of contemporary PhD students could facilitate the adaptation to contrasting professional environments.

Anna Robinson-Pant and Scholastica Mokake, University of East Anglia - *International research students and their supervisors: transformation for whom?* **Introduced by Anna Magyar**

This session was based on a film currently being made by research students and Anna Magyar and Anna Robinson-Pant about the experiences of doctoral supervision and conducting research as part of a UK doctoral course. The film is being developed as a result of focus group discussions conducted with first year PhD students from across UEA and is structured around some of the themes that emerged in these discussions, including:

- First days (adapting to a UK university)
- What do you expect from your supervisor?
- What do you think your supervisor expects from you?
- Finding ways of working together.
- Differences in academic and research cultures
- Researching and communicating across cultures, disciplines and methodologies
- How do you know you are doing OK?
- Researching and writing in a second language
- Being a PhD student at UEA: advice and reflections

Anna M. and Anna RP briefly introduced the theoretical underpinnings of the research project on which the film was based (particularly concepts and approaches from the field of academic literacies and contrastive rhetoric – see Appendix 3 and articles included in the conference pack). Scholastica gave an insight into her own involvement in the film as a doctoral student discussing the issues she had faced, particularly in terms of ethics procedures, when conducting fieldwork in Tanzania.

Afternoon group activities:

Each group focused their discussion of the issues arising in the video in relation to each of the following three perspectives:

- Research student perspective
- Staff perspective
- Institutional perspective

The aim was also to draw out the implications of the film for these three 'agents'.

Group 1 (Facilitator: Esther Priyadharshini):

The group consisted of one each from Ukraine, Finland, India, Iceland and Kenya, making up 4 research students (3 Cambridge, 1 UEA) and one academic member of staff. As a result of this composition, we tended to talk more about issues from the student perspective but generally found that student, staff and institutional perspectives were all tied together in practice, anyway.

Supervisor-supervisee relationship

The film had captured much of what students experienced but some wondered if students could ever really be candid on camera, for a variety of reasons. Some students felt that it felt very alien to them that no one asked about their family, even as a matter of courtesy. They felt that this was a huge part of their life that simply dropped out of their lives. This separation of private (family life) and public (student life) was tough to adjust to.

Some felt that while their supervisors didn't need to be their friend, (some actually preferred a degree of tension in the relationship), some degree of familiarity with their home lives (even a degree of humanity) would be a good thing. But all agreed that this may be a cultural divide that would be hard to bridge.

Some researchers felt frustrated by their supervisors not giving them the sort of in-depth feedback they would have liked on their work. Most often their work was returned with just language and typos being corrected. Others felt that perhaps their work was fine, and that was the reason for little feedback?!

One of the students was particularly frustrated by her supervisor's constant need for references to every detail that related to her own community/nation. For example, when she made a statement about the geographical position of her country in relation to Europe, she was asked to cite a reference – is this really necessary?

Esther mentioned that she often resented writing as if writing to an 'idiot' when she was asked to make things explicit but found that as an academic, she was often passing on the same advice to her students as she thought this made their writing less open to criticism and this was a way of reducing the risk for the student.

Taught or compulsory element of research degrees:

One of the first questions that was raised was about the increasing 'taught' or 'compulsory' component for doctoral students – how much 'teaching' is required at this stage? Has this become so imbalanced that it is restricting people's freedom to read and explore their field and other related fields? Whose responsibility is it to choose which seminars and topics to attend? In general, it was felt that the compulsory elements were generally not useful to students and that it felt like they were more for the bureaucratic/institutional requirements. Esther mentioned that often ESRC requirements determined which elements might be compulsory or not and that this was something that even many supervisors or universities felt unhappy about.

Many of the researchers in the group felt that what was covered in the 'taught' elements often bore no relation to their topic or even how their supervisor approached their work. The disjunct between the two made little sense to researchers experiencing both perspectives. Invariably the taught elements began to emerge as hoops to jump through rather than anything relevant towards their Ph.D.

Bureaucracy:
One of the students raised the burden of bureaucracy, especially on foreign students who found themselves caught between, say, faculty, college, and board of studies. When they each had different deadlines for various papers to be filed, this made life much harder for students who may have to wait ages before being reassured.

It was mentioned that it seemed that universities sometimes functioned as if they were geared for an 'ideal' student in their minds - young, male and white. Mature students, those with families. or part timers found the going much harder and often university facilities like libraries or technicians were not available when they needed them most.

Some Ph.D students were asked to keep log-books that really seemed not well thought through. One student had filled in her entire log book in a few weeks while others paid no attention to it.

Group 2 (Facilitator: Juancho Barron-Pastor):
The group highlighted from the video session the difficulties to adapt what 'ethical issues' mean for UK's higher education, and hence the difficulties to apply some compulsory but very contested issues such as the 'signed consent'. Also, the videos

provided useful insights for staff participants to walk in the shoes of students and vice versa. Non-student participants showed surprise about some students' statements about the expressed expectations for supervisions such as accessibility as there are multiple time constraints for staff.

Student's perspective

From the perspective of students, it was stressed the process of isolation that international students live. Also, student participants mentioned that supervisors are often the 'human face' of a culture and that they sometimes seemed to expect someone to introduce them into the English culture and city activities. This lead the conversation into friendship and its limitations as it is a spontaneous emotion that cannot be impose by institutional means. It was also underlined that students have different times to settle down and that often they are not aware by themselves about the process they are living. I had the impression that non-student participants were maybe performing defensive attitudes when speaking from student's perspective.

Staff's perspective

It was recognised the admirable labour of supervisors to deal with different accents and cultures. Also, it was mentioned that it seems that they are very aware and sometimes much stressed of their ignorance about international students' cultures. However, it was highlighted how diffuse are the roles for supervision beyond 'pure-work' and that it seems to be a tendency to underestimate students' experience and previous knowledge, as they show ignorance for certain authors that are 'basic'. It was reflected that some efforts could be done help supervisors to demonstrate that they are prepared and improving their abilities to work with persons from other cultures, as they represent a personal connection from the institution. However, it was much emphasised that staff have tremendous time constraints and heavy workload.

Institutional perspective

From this perspective it was highlighted some difficulties due to resources' limitations. Also it was mentioned that it would be recommendable to show more flexible guidelines, such as times for settling-down, to shift and complement programmes, or changing supervisor. On the other hand, it was difficult to stress how to improve the writing material. In the case of Cambridge students, they suggested to have an induction week as UEA has.

Group 3 (Facilitator: Anna Robinson-Pant):

We began by talking about the student's perspective on supervision, particularly in relation to competing agendas and commitments (professional, personal). A student who was very anxious to finish the PhD quickly related how she had been advised to 'slow down' rather than attempt to 'write it as it comes' (an approach which had worked well for her in professional contexts). We discussed the struggle faced by many of us in 'writing academic, not policy' (where the style of academic writing was perceived as 'too prescriptive, having to dilute information') – some of us seeing this as an apprenticeship or 'being initiated into a cult and then examined by the cult'. There seemed to be tensions between the students' idea of 'getting the thesis done' (particularly if they had left children behind with extended family) and the supervisor's idea of 'the pace of a PhD' (being intended to be at least three years in length).

This led to discussion about the envisaged and actual relationship between supervisor and student (prompted by reflections about Sharifa's statement on the film that the supervisor should be available and accessible whenever she needed him). The notion of 'total accessibility' was related to the notion of buying a course and an educational experience: trying to establish, how much can I ask of him/her? A supervisor likened the relationship to that of a mother – that the student often 'wants 'love', 100% accessibility, openness, support and knowledge' – and in return, the supervisor may not even be thanked or acknowledged in the thesis ('invisible support'). We talked about how far it was regarded as a one way relationship by the student: the supervisor being expected to understand and engage with the students' personal as well as academic issues, whereas the student had little interest/knowledge of the supervisor as a person with family issues too. The formality of the supervision relationship was problematic for some students – 'making it difficult to open up and express myself'. The question of where to draw the boundaries between personal and professional led to discussion about how far the supervisor could be regarded as a 'friend'. A supervisor related how difficult it could then be to become critical and ask the student to rewrite a chapter/thesis – the ideal relationship was one of 'tough love'. Some students noted the importance of 'critical friendship groups' (often from the same cultural background) as complementing the support from supervisors.

On the institutional level, we noted the issues around matching student to supervisor and the ideal situation when the supervisor is researching on the same subject as the student. There were differences between UEA and Cambridge in how far supervisors

were free to take only students within their specialist areas (UEA supervisors being under more pressure to take students from outside their area). The question of time constraints on supervisors (regarding accessibility to research students) was also considered more as an institutional issue at UEA – since the university code of practice has attempted to define minimum expectations around supervision meetings. We also discussed how far university ethical procedures could be negotiated rather than be assumed as uniform (as discussed by Scholastica in the film).

Group 4 (Facilitator: Anna Magyar):

Key words: language; knowledge

One participant was surprised that the students were not more critical of their supervision experience. Anna explained that in the original interviews there had been more overt criticism. There were several possible reasons why the DVD did not capture this. By the time students were filmed they were into their second year and so felt more comfortable/had found ways of working with their supervisor. Students were probably reluctant to give critical 'soundbites' to the camera but also some of the critical undertones were perhaps lost through editing.

In response to the comments on the DVD about wanting feedback on content rather than language, we discussed the admission criteria for international post graduate research students in the UK. Angela mentioned a friend of hers who felt the university had led her to believe that her English was good enough to study for a Phd only to find that this was not the case. She felt the institution should not have let her in and this was linked to international students being 'cash cows' for HE in the UK. Many universities use IELTS scores as a measure of language proficiency but this is a crude tool which does not reflect how someone will cope with the reading and writing demands of a post graduate degree. The need for language training was discussed and the role of the supervisor. Should the supervisor help the student with their language? One participant argued that surely it was not possible to mark a paper just for content, that structure and style could not be separated when assessing a piece of work. It was then clarified that the comment was contextual to the writing of a thesis which happens over a period of three years. The supervisor is not commenting on a final draft or assessing the student's work at that point but simply commenting on texts in which students are beginning to tease out the questions and boundaries of their research. So what is the role of the supervisor with regards to a student's English proficiency? The point was made that proof reading is

a very time consuming process. Who should be responsible for that? There was also the divide between the supervisor and the expectations of the external examiner who might not be understanding of scholars writing in a second language and expect 'native speaker' English.

In relation to Schola's comment in the DVD, we discussed the status of indigenous knowledge and experience and that 'it isn't knowledge unless it is written down'. Angela described the dilemma for her of coming to the UK because 'we'll get left behind if we don't do this', the excitement of encountering and engaging with the knowledge of the 'North' but then feeling that somehow in embracing this body of knowledge and neglecting 'indigenous knowledge she was 'selling out'. The feeling that southern scholars were somehow 'not good enough' was discussed as well as the fact that supervisors reinforce this by questioning southern scholars students refer to in their work. If they are not known, then somehow their academic credibility is questioned. References from home context are not seen as equally valid. The post graduate research student is forced to refer to the Northern canon of knowledge, thereby 'selling out'. The only alternative is for African scholars to turn inwards. This dominance of knowledge from the North creates more of a divide.

Two ways forward were discussed: north-south collaborations across universities, but with the caution that 'collaboration' can mean different things and may not necessarily shift the balance of power. Also, Yann's project of creating a database of African scholarship in the social sciences was mentioned as a good effort to shift the locus of authority and challenge the existing northern dominated canon of knowledge.

Group 5 (Facilitator: Kathleen Lane):
- how honest would I be talking about my supervisor?
- is it realistic to expect a student can be fully candid
- the supervisor who says, "I suggest…" rather than "I want you to do…"
- level of professional support: what does it mean in terms of the supervision
- do you leave the room motivated / in despair after the supervision
- wanting motivation: being understood, sharing issues and interests; being stretched
- the art of being a supervisor
- does a supervisor approach a student as empty or full; what kind of listening skills do supervisors have

- if you are in a very small department, an "anonymous" questionnaire still means that you will be identified
- the "humphing" supervisor who does not say anything concrete
- emphasis in UK on "self-learning"
- there's a different recipe for each supervisor/student relationship
- what type of students have problems with their supervisors

- from the outset, you should lay out your expectations as a student

- expectations of learning – a dialogue / a contract between supervisor and student
- will the supervisor help the student according to his/her learning method?
- does supervisor have knowledge of learning styles – and the willingness to adapt to them?

- both freedom and form exist in the supervisory relationship / structure which allow room for conversation and critique
- do you include the social dimension within that?
- the student-teacher relationship is like a marriage – hell or heaven
- it is not a tick-the-boxes relationship; there should be room for creativity and differentiation
- also the student and supervisor need to bring up new issues

- do not forget that a power relationship can exist
    - e.g., your supervisor is someone who will provide a reference for you
    - closed rooms
- human, emotional aspects to the relationship, so the culture of how you talk, the gestures you use can affect this
- inherent to motivation is the ability to draw out and have interests that are similar
- and the student has the responsibility to bring up issues
- postgraduates should be motivated for doing a postgraduate degree
- yes, but there can be hard times, too (the supervisor has a large impact on how these moments are handled and worked through)

- the supervisors mediate between the foreign student and the institution, often between foreign and home students, too

- the staff perspective: the film only showed one side; it would be interesting to hear what the supervisors felt of their students and learn their perspectives
- also the supervisors' expectations
- students absorb expectations about how to do work, conform to what is to be done
- supervisors don't share! We must share but they don't

- framework of supervisions that speak to institution's structures, but within that, there is room for movement ➔ conversation and critique

- all three perspectives – research student; supervisor; institution – should overlap
- they are linked

- the letter of the law versus the spirit of the law vis-à-vis supervisory relationships
- how supervision is carried out varies widely (and wildly)

Group 6 (facilitated by Yann Lebeau):

Discussion of specific institutional frameworks of staff-student relations in the supervisory process.

In Cambridge, international students are given a handbook so they know what to expect. The frequency of supervisory meeting is strictly scheduled. In UEA and Cambridge, the process can be too bureaucratic with the annual reviews, etc, while needs for supervision are necessarily diverse.

Models of supervision vary from institution to institution, but also between departments within one university. In the hard sciences, model of departmental supervision: no exclusive relation between a student and a staff. In the social sciences (including EDU), supervisory teams of two academics, where one is the

primary supervisor. Some schools in UEA offer different types of combination, including joint supervision.

International experiences were discussed through examples from various countries (France, Spain) where students seem to attach more importance to the choice of their supervisor.

What to expect from a supervisor?
The comment of one student in the film about the importance of having a supervisor with a reputation in the field was discussed and experiences were shared.

The group agreed that a distinction must be made between having an expertise in the field and being famous. The reputation did not seem to be too much of a concern. It was suggested that it is more important in countries where the supervisor has more impact on post doc placements and job opportunities etc. The expertise however, was seen as largely advantageous: to orientate the early stages (access to the literature, etc) and to create an intellectual bond between the student and the supervisor. Staff perspective: Staff try as much as possible to supervise in their field as this is also enriching their own knowledge, but are under pressure to accept all sorts of demands when schools are short of supervisors.

Supervising international students:
Language is often a big issue: how to express complex ideas in a second language. Also a source of frustration for staff. Discussion of the situation in Cambridge and UEA re English language requirements: same problem = many students accepted with limited English language proficiency. Would be great for international students to have a second supervisor with the same mother tongue and or to be allowed to write the thesis in a different language. OK but the English language dominates the academic life and the publication market, so it is good to be fluent. Discussion of European doctorate: spending time in other European countries and having one member of the jury from a different European country: common in Spain, where having a larger jury was seen as positive in terms of networking.

Summary of comments posted :
- Research student perspective: Students should "own their work" as opposed to too much reliance on the supervisor

- Expertise of the supervisor is crucial: making sure we are in the right direction in terms of the theme, the research literature, etc.
- How to find the right balance between a supervisor with real expertise in the filed and one that provide a good support.
- Staff perspective: PhD supervision is equally important for staff (promotion, etc). It is also their interest to show that they are attracting research students in their own area of expertise.
- Institutional perspective: Whenever possible, Institutions should encourage interdisciplinary supervision through supervision teams made of people from different schools or departments. Joint supervision with someone from outside the university should not be a problem.
- The expectations of students should be paid more attention in order to provide satisfactory support.

Final plenary session: Introduced by Anna Robinson-Pant and Madeleine Arnot - *Looking Forward: discussion on the future development of this partnership and ways of taking forward/documenting ideas from the two workshops*

Anna explained that the aim of the workshops was to start initial conversations between our two institutions as the basis for possible future collaboration. She invited people to offer ideas on:
- How do we encourage future partnership between UEA and CEID?
- What suggestions for future collaborative activities, publications?
- What issues emerged from the two workshops which the institutions might like to explore further/address?

The following suggestions were made:
- The institutions need to take up some of the issues that had arisen about the need for more appropriate language support.
- We could publish a series of working papers that workshop participants could contribute to/work on in small groups – e.g. on research ethics, language issues in research.
- Our discussions should be made available to other institutions working on internationalisation issues – this could be done through posting on the BAICE website.
- Put together a reading list on articles/papers related to internationalising themes. It was mentioned that some of the research is being documented on

a website established by the ESRC seminar series on 'Rethinking the needs of international students: critical perspectives on the internationalisation of UK higher education'.

- It would be interesting to do some comparative work between countries and for researchers here to work together on this (e.g. extending some of the comparative analysis about doing research in different countries that was started in the groups)

- Hold a seminar on 'Africa' looking at research methodologies and experiences in that context, prioritising indigenous knowledges

- May be useful to disseminate ideas from these two workshops to other faculty members who were unable to attend, or to those in other disciplines.

The next stage of the process will be to take forward these ideas at the final team meeting and to establish working groups for some of the above projects. A writing workshop is planned for January 2010 for participants to begin working collaboratively on papers reflecting on the issues discussed at the day conferences in UEA and Cambridge.

The workshop finished at 4pm and comments from participants on the evaluation sheets suggested that everyone had enjoyed the opportunity to share ideas about our teaching/learning approaches and doctoral research in the two different institutions:

- *It has allowed me as an international student to have a forum to express some of the very pressing concerns I have had*

- *Very fulfilling. Discussion of lots of pedagogical and theoretical issues of international dimension*

- *Great day and discussions. Some presentations put more questions than gave answers – which is very good*

- *It raised questions about the implications of doing research within a different context. It was good and created an environment for sharing ideas and experiences*

- *An opportunity to express and listen to other international students about our experiences and challenges.*

- *I am taking home a deeper connection with students from other developing countries, a strong sense of identification and a renewed sense of*

commitment to working towards improving the education of developing countries.

Appendix 1: List of participants attending Cambridge and UEA Workshops

UEA Staff:

Sheila Aikman

Kathleen Lane

Yann Lebeau

Anna Magyar

Esther Priyadharshini

Anna Robinson-Pant

UEA Students:

Azhar Adnan

Juan Carlos Barron-Pastor (Uses Juancho as first name)

Hong Bui

Oley Dibba-Wadda

Marta Einarsdottir

Leticia Goodchild

Georgie Hett

Justin Hett

Oscar Holguin-Rodriguez

Scholastica Mokake

Alan Pagden

Cambridge Staff:

Madeleine Arnot

Chris Colclough (Cambridge Workshop only)

Rosemary Deaney (Cambridge Workshop only)

Susan Kiragu

Darleen Opfer

Dave Peddar (UEA Workshop only)

Ciaran Sugrue (Cambridge Workshop only)

Cambridge Students:

Manzoorul Abedin

Foivi Antoniou

Olena Fimyar

Yongcan Liu (Cambridge Workshop only)

Fibian Kavulani Lukalo

Rabea Malik (Cambridge Workshop only

Thelma Mort

Siza Mtimbiri

Lee Nordstrum

Georgina Y. Oduro

Jennifer von Reis Saari

Kylie Stevenson

Rabab Tamish

Antonina Tereshchenko (Cambridge Workshop only)

Appendix 2: Programmes

<div style="background-color:#cfffff;">

Internationalising Educational Research Cultures and Graduate Training

BAICE East of England Partnership
with support from Centre for Commonwealth Education and Centre for Education and International Development

Cambridge University Workshop – 18th May 2009

</div>

Time	Activity	Room
10.00	Registration and coffee	GS5
10.20	Introduction to the Day – Madeleine Arnot and Anna Robinson-Pant Morning to be chaired by Dr Darleen Opfer	
10.30	**Speaker 1 – Professor Chris Colclough**	
11.00	**Speaker 2 – Dr Ciaran Sugrue**	
11.30	**Speaker 3 – Dr Esther Priyadharshini**	
12.00	**Speaker 4 – Professor Madeleine Arnot**	
12.30	Lunch	GS1
13.30	Afternoon to be chaired by Dr Ciaran Sugrue **Activity 1 – *Research Culture and Context*** (break into groups – see attached list)	GS5
14.00	**Activity 2 – *Researching in your National Context*** (break into groups – see attached list)	
14.30	**Activity 3 – *Differing Research Traditions: making links***	
15.00	Tea and Plenary	
16.00	Workshop concludes	

Time	Activity	Room
10.00	Arrival of Cambridge team: tea/coffee and lottery to decide groups	School of Education and Lifelong Learning Foyer
10.30	***Welcome and overview*** of workshop (including links between the two workshops, aims etc): Anna Robinson-Pant and Madeleine Arnot,	EDU Room 01.21
10.40	Presentation by Dr Kathleen Lane and Dr Yann Lebeau on ***Interrogating assumptions in research methods courses for international students.***. This presentation is based on examples of working with PG students (primarily in Development and in Education) and looks at the assumptions of staff and students about field research approaches, critical enquiry and issues of authority.	EDU Room 01.21
11.00	Questions/comments about the presentation (Facilitator: Dr Anna Magyar)	EDU Room 01.21
11.10	Presentation by Dr Darleen Opfer on ***Can we ever go home again?***	EDU Room 01.21
11.30	Questions/comments about the presentation (Facilitator: Dr Yann Lebeau)	EDU Room 01.21
11.40	Group activity in 6 groups (see attached sheet for details)	Various Rooms
12.30	Reporting back from the small groups to plenary (Facilitator: Juancho Barron-Pastor)	EDU Room 01.21
13.00	Lunch (& lottery to decide next groups)	EDU Room 01.01
14.00	Dr Anna Magyar, Dr Anna Robinson- Pant and Scholastica Mokake on ***International research students and their supervisors: transformation for whom?*** This session will be based on a film being made with international PhD students at UEA where they talk about their expectations of a supervisor & supervisors' expectations of them, how they found ways of working with their supervisor, conducting research in different cultural contexts and reading and writing across cultures.	EDU Room 01.21
14.30	Group discussion of issues raised by the film in relation to some of the above themes (see attached sheet for details)	Various Rooms

15.15	Tea and report back from groups to plenary (Facilitator: Dr Kathleen Lane)	EDU Room 01.21
15.45	*Looking Forward*: discussion on future development of this partnership and ways of taking forward/documenting ideas from the two workshops (Facilitator: Dr Anna Robinson-Pant)	EDU Room 01.21
16.00	Close	

Appendix 3: *Handout for session on International research students and their supervisors: transformation for whom?* **at UEA Workshop - Presented by Anna Magyar, Scholastica Mokake and Anna Robinson-Pant**

Institutional processes of assessment and accreditation of doctoral students revolve around the production of a single extended text – the thesis – in the context of a three year research process. International postgraduate research students – who constitute 40% of those undertaking advanced research programmes in the UK (Global Opportunities for UK Higher Education, accessed 2009) – are often seen as problematic, requiring more time from the supervisor and in need of substantial language support in order to enable them to meet the demands of thesis writing. Through adopting an academic literacies approach, we hope to challenge these deficit discourses with a more complex exploration of the processes and practices within which doctoral students research and write.

An academic literacies approach to academic writing emerged in response to deficit discourses in Higher Education as a result of widening participation and the increase in international students (Lea and Street 2006, 1999, 1998; Lillis and Scott 2007;). As practitioners and writing developers, we have seen evidence of this deficit discourse, with supervisors sending students to 'sort out' or 'improve' their English, and the effects this negative feedback can have on student confidence and ownership of the research process. Academic literacies conceptualises writing as social practice and is interested in exploring how practices shift and change in different contexts and over time, what it means to participate in them and how 'identity and identification are bound up with rhetorical and communicative practices'(Lillis and Scott 2007:9). Academic literacies research has developed primarily in the UK, US and Australia and has therefore focused on English academic writing. For perspectives on academic writing across cultures, we look to the field of contrastive rhetoric.

Contrastive rhetoric research has explored differences in textual organisation and rhetorical strategies as well as patterns of preference at linguistic level. In relation to international PGRs writing in the UK, the a significant finding is that what constitutes 'good' and 'clear' academic writing is by no means universal but is culturally constructed (e.g. Duszak 1997; Cmerjkova 1997), influenced by both the disciplinary discourse community and the wider discourse communities within which texts are written and read (Gobeliowski and Liddicoat 2002). The development of the concept

of 'contrastive rhetoric' into 'critical contrastive rhetoric' (Kubota 2004) and 'intercultural rhetoric' (Connor 2004) signals a shift away from purely textual analysis to draw on both post colonial discourses and ethnographic approaches 'that examine language in interactions' and take account of a more complex and dynamic notion of 'culture' (ibid).

The treatment of language/writing as solely or primarily linguistic leads to linguistic and textual solutions which try to 'fix' the problem and which ignore other dimensions of academic writing equally important in the writing process. Furthermore, this 'fix it' approach is predicated on a 'universalist' notion of good writing. This led us to explore the multiple and diverse cultures within which students and supervisors were reading and writing texts and how the process of writing and conducting research are bound up with academic institutional procedures and practices in complex ways. For example, doctoral students are expected to adopt different research procedures and practices, even when conducting field research in their 'home' contexts.

In our interviews with international students we explored their perspectives and experiences of doing research the 'UK way', the process of writing the thesis, their perception and understanding of the conventions and assessment criteria, and the interplay between their writing and supervision, including their expectations of the supervisor and what they thought supervisors expected of them. In exploring what the process around the production of the thesis means to doctoral students, we look at what their perspectives can reveal to us about the dominant - and often unquestioned – academic practices at UEA. What insights can be drawn about how those practices might be transformed to the benefit of students, supervisors and the wider academic community?

References:

Connor, U. (2004). Intercultural rhetoric: beyond texts, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3, 291-304**.**

Duszak, A Cross-cultural academic communication: a discourse-community view in Duszak, A(Ed) *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse;* Mouton de Gruyter; Berlin 1997

Gobeliowski, Z and Liddicoat, A (2002) The interaction of discipline and culture in academic writing; *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 25, 2: 59-71

Global Opportunities for UK Higher Education: International Unit http://www.international.ac.uk/statistics/international_student_recruitment.cfm

Lea, M.R., & Street, B.V. (2006). The 'Academic Literacies' Model: theory and applications', *Theory and Practice*, 45 (4), 368-377

Lea, M.R., & Street, B.V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: an academic literacies approach, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 23(2), 157-172.

Lea, M.R., & Street, B.V. (1999). Writing as academic literacies: understanding textual practices in higher education, in C. N. Candlin and K. Hyland, *Writing, texts, processes and practices*. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.

Lillis and Scott (2007) Defining academic literacies research: issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy in *Journal of Applied Linguistics* Vol 4.1