

Chapter 1: The Journey

Phiona Stanley

As I write, in September 2019—in the first week of the new academic year—the UK international education sector is feeling “elated” at the prospect of being able to “compete effectively with other destinations” again. The UK government has bowed to industry pressure to reinstate post-study work rights—revoked in 2012—for international students graduating from British universities. Two of the UK’s main competitors in this market, Australia and Canada, already offer similar schemes. From 2020, international graduates will be able to work in the UK for two years after they finish their degrees, with no restrictions on the type of jobs they can apply for (PIE News, 2019). The students themselves are excited, too. The *Times of India* reports that some of the class-of-2019 graduating cohort—presumably due to start or continue their degree courses this week—are already deferring their studies so as to qualify (Canton, 2019).

Why does this matter? The right to live, learn, and work in the Anglophone “West” speaks to many students’ reasons for undertaking international education more broadly, an insight that can be gained through the British Council’s (2019) ‘Study UK’ advertising campaign. This sells the UK as a study destination as follows, with the captions pasted over stirring music and various aspirational scenes from British university life:

“Studying in the UK can open doors. World-ranked universities. World-class facilities. A very warm welcome awaits. A UK qualification opens doors. Discover culture. Discover travel. Discover you.”

These soundbites hint at the very real potential of intercultural learning to offer self-reflection (“discover you”) along with first-hand engagement with intercultural “otherness” (“Discover culture. Discover travel.”). These, we know, are part of what students want from intercultural educational experiences (e.g. Heng, 2017; Jackson, 2018). Additionally, of course, a very warm welcome and some swanky facilities may entice the undecided. This is the offering, and it seems to be selling well. In a year, from September 2018, the advertising campaign has “generated 22,000 direct leads” for British universities (British Council, 2019).

In Australia, meanwhile, the thirty-four-billion-dollar-a-year international education sector—the country’s largest export after primary industries—is reeling from a recent ABC News *Four Corners* documentary (2019), which investigated the undermining of academic standards by universities “waiving their own English entry standards in a bid to admit more high-paying international students” (Worthington, 2019). Staff and students interviewed for the program included Associate Professor Schroder-Turk from Murdoch University, who said, “Admitting students who don’t have the right prerequisites, or the correct language capabilities, is setting them up for failure. ... That’s not what education is about” (*Four Corners* 2019: 17:38). The ABC described the documentary—called *Cash Cows*—as investigating “how Australia’s higher education system is being undermined by a growing reliance on foreign fee-paying students ... academics and students are speaking out to reveal a picture of compromised academic standards” (*Four Corners* 2019).

Although universities advertise English-language entry standards (e.g. for many Master’s degrees at the University of Sydney, students are asked for IELTS 6.5; IELTS is the *International English Language Testing System*), some of the required levels are too low both for academic study and also for students to enjoy a connected social life and rich cultural experience. IELTS itself says, of “linguistically demanding academic courses” that IELTS 6.5 is insufficient and that even for “linguistically less demanding academic courses” 6.5 is only “probably acceptable” (IELTS, 2019, p.15). Given that many students study abroad thanks only to their parents’ hard-earned savings, this puts the students themselves under enormous pressure to succeed against odds that are stacked against them.

But even these standards are being subverted. For example, the University of Sydney's *Centre for English Teaching* offers a "Direct-Entry" course for students with IELTS scores from 5.0. For context, the IELTS promotional materials describe a band-5.0 user as a "modest user" of English, who: "[h]as partial command of the language, coping with overall meaning in most situations, though is likely to make many mistakes" (IELTS, 2019, p. 14). But from the Direct Entry course, students need only pass internal assessments for direct entry into degree courses. While some doubtless do fail, the pressure is likely on teachers and the college itself to pass them, as the Centre for English Teaching is branded by the same university, its unique selling point is its capacity to offer direct entry without further language testing, and international students pay substantial fees for their degree programs. Most universities have similar pathways providers with similarly conflicting interests.

Together, these news stories and the machinations behind them offer a microcosmic insight into the slick, joined-up operation of international education, in which myriad stakeholders with divergent interests jostle in a sector worth billions of what is very often individual families' hard-earned savings. Policy levers are pulled. Universities make money selling to those who may not be eligible for entry. Students may struggle to make friends, to understand their courses, and/or to represent themselves. And many people's jobs rely on the delicate balance staying the way it is. The Law of Inertia states that a body at rest will remain at rest, and international education, for all the mobility it entails, seems to be a body at rest.

We should be discussing these issues, and there are plenty of conferences at which we might do so. But international education conferences are big, slick, industry affairs (e.g. the Australian International Education Conference (AIEC), British International Education Association (BIEA) and, the (US) Association of International Educators (still known by its former acronym NAFSA: *National Association of Foreign Student Advisers*). And although these organizations may *talk* about "an interconnected world characterized by peace, security, and well-being for all" (NAFSA, 2019), the programs and attendance of these conferences are dominated by the *business* of the industry: marketing, sales, risk management, quality frameworks, operations, and agents and pathways colleges as "strategic partners". Students are sometimes mentioned: there are presentations on 'student retention', for instance. But branding and operational excellence dominate, and although there are sometimes research-focused events tacked onto the conferences—for example, AIEC hosts a "Research Summit"—researchers must contend with an industry dominated by, well, the *industry* itself.

Where is the critique? Within this multi-billion pound/dollar industry upon which so many jobs rely, where is there space for questioning received wisdom? Where is there space to note that, in an advert only twenty-seven words long, the British Council (2019) twice peddles the enduring symbolic and cultural capital of Britishness, thus potentially perpetuating the colonization both of the consciousness and of cultural space? Where is there space for pushback against the discourses themselves, including the marketing-speak in which both international education *and international students themselves* are commoditized? Where is there space to problematize the profound power imbalances reified in the global marketplace of ideas if students are rendered voiceless by language policies that set them up to struggle? And where are the commentaries on the potential for epistemological, ontological, and axiological violence when students from myriad cultural backgrounds are subsumed into the (ideologically positioned) education systems of the Anglophone "West" in the name of cultural capital and symbolic cachet? None of this is in any way neutral.

This also extends, of course, beyond *international* education, to *intercultural* education more broadly: education of subcultural and subaltern minorities *within* a given society within educational establishments designed by and for those who experience some measure of cultural dominance in that society. This has the potential to be a robust and equitable exchange of ideas, just as international education has that potential, at least in

theory. More plausibly, though, it has the potential to be a colonization of minds, bodies, and tongues (e.g. Ngũgĩ, 2009), in a process through which those from the cultural margins may be trammelled in their ways of thinking, knowing, and being, resulting in censure and erasure. Cultural genocide, in other words.

But the colonization of the consciousness is not all push-driven. There is also the pull. Interculturally and internationally mobile students may buy into the idea of Centre-West logical rationalism and English as a *lingua franca*, and perhaps even that its associated places, people, and cultures are somehow ‘better’. This, of course, taps into larger global flows of economic, military, and cultural power. Another important question is therefore to ask: to what extent is it possible to use the master’s tools (e.g. academic texts like this one) to speak back to the master’s paradigm?

We rarely talk about these things in intercultural education, whether international education, Indigenous education, bilingual education, or any other sub-field. Instead, when we talk about diversity, we tend to focus on food and festivals: nice, safe, colourful topics. Show us your tropical dances and we’ll teach you our scientific rationalism. But we need to. We need to talk about what we think of as ‘normal’, laudable ways of thinking and being, and we need to talk about the power relations that let these norms go unchallenged. We need to talk about this and, more importantly, we need to listen to those on the margins: those not already subsumed into “the industry” of intercultural education. That’s what this book does.

Why this book?

This book proposes and showcases ways in which critical autoethnography can help a research area get beyond its existing paradigm by listening to subaltern voices in the field. The case study examined is intercultural education, but the book is a worked exemplar for *any* field that is stuck in its usual ways. The central thesis is that critical autoethnographic insights from emerging scholars have an enormous potential to shake things up.

In this book, a range of emerging scholars problematize taken-for-granted assumptions and norms in different areas of intercultural education, including language education, student and teacher mobility, Indigenous education, teacher identity, and student experience. This is timely—and vital—because intercultural education has become paradigm bound. While “the industry” pushes governments to pull levers to enable student recruitment—as in the British Council (2019) advertisement cited above—measures of ‘success’ remain numbers and profit rather than student wellbeing or learning. Students’ experiences are rarely considered beyond retention counts and failure rates. No one asks whether international contact produces intercultural competence—on either ‘side’, i.e. for domestic *or* international students—and whether the unfairly stacked power relations leave a bitter taste, perhaps resentments, all round. Few listen to the peripheral voices of students, emerging scholars, and those teaching in precarious, casualised jobs in the sector, under pressure from “the industry” to comply with policies of sometimes questionable ethical integrity. If they did, they might hear a different story: one that speaks back to the paradigm. Critical autoethnography thus lets some light in. This book presents emerging scholars’ accounts of intercultural learning in a very wide range of contexts. Their voices help move the debate along and, in so doing, the book as a whole is a worked example of how this research method can shift thinking in a field that has become stuck in its usual ways.

The book asks: whose ways of being, and whose values, does intercultural education hold up as aspirational, or un/acceptable, and why? Whose ways of knowing are assumed to be better, more rigorous, and/or more ‘truthful’? What do teachers and students see as ‘normal’, and ‘valuable’, whether in terms of process or product? How does power operate? And, where we realise we don’t normally ask such things and we notice that these questions make us uncomfortable, the book asks what’s going on in the silent spaces where researchers

rarely tread. Because it is the difficult questions —and the conversations they spark— that this book is all about.

Ethnography's troubled history

But before we begin, it is necessary to problematize the research method itself, because qualitative inquiry, itself, is a *situated* practice. Ethnography in particular —within whose tradition sits autoethnography— is far from a neutral thing to be doing. Etymologically, *ethnography* is the writing (*grapho*, the ancient Greek verb *to write*) of people (*ethos*) (McCarty, 2015, p.29). But the putative neutrality of *writing about people* or *writing culture* conceals ethnography's troubled past. Like intercultural education, ethnography packs a hefty postcolonial punch.

Ethnography has its early roots in the descriptive accounts of 'missionaries, settlers, [and] colonial officials' (Pratt, 1986, p.27), and in common with missionaries' and colonizers' accounts, ethnography centred —and arguably still, now centres— the ““seeing man”...he whose imperial eyes passively look out and possess' (Pratt, 2008, p.9). That is to say, ethnography was borne of colonial subjectivity in which the Western gaze described, classified, judged, and reduced the exoticised Other. For this reason, Erickson (2018) revisits the usual denotative translation (of *ethos*, or *ethnoi*, as 'people'), instead proposing the more nuanced 'people who were not Greek', noting that '[t]he Greeks were more than a little xenophobic, so that *ethnoi* carries pejorative implications' (p.39). Given the way ethnography has historically been undertaken, this connotative translation makes more sense.

Leeds-Hurwitz (2013), sketches the early twentieth century anthropologists who travelled the world to research mainly so-called 'primitive' cultures in ways that they thought were objective. Such writing sought to hypothesize about and uncover the 'truth' of a given way of life, necessarily rooted in a positivist epistemological stance and a discourse that 'construe[d] the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest' (Bhabha, 1996, p.92). Within this paradigm, ethnography was a putative 'scientific' endeavour, a philosophy of science akin to 'social physics' that sought to uncover Humean causality and general laws of social processes (Erickson, 2018) within cultures conceived as 'fixed, unitary, and bounded' (McCarty, 2015, p.24). The cultures studied included the First Peoples of Canada's Baffin Island, the Trobriand Islanders of Papua New Guinea, and Samoans, choices that matter because all were non-Western cultures. Although anthropology came to refute the racism underlying early models of ethnography, shifting the focus to societies' internal coherence and coming to rely on the notion of cultural relativism (McCarty, 2015), ethnography remained part of the 'colonial discourse' and its 'apparatus of power' (Bhabha, 1996, p.92).

For some, this conceptualization has never gone away. This includes ethnography within the academy but also outside, such as in documentary filmmaking. In 2017, for instance, the (UK's) *Telegraph* newspaper ran a headline that reported: "British explorer Benedict Allen goes missing in jungle while searching for lost tribe" (Henderson, 2017). In contrast to the 'researched', the Yaifo people, the article depicted Allen as 'a very experienced explorer' whose 'daring expeditions' involved 'a hard hike up through rather treacherous terrain' (*ibid*). This discourse is lifted straight from colonial-era narratives in which 'British masculinity ...is constituted in the geography of adventure' (Phillips, 2013, p.55). In some ways, then, ethnography's past is still present. While Allen was making a BBC documentary, some researchers may still imagine that they are pinning down a 'neutral, tropeless discourse that would render other realities "exactly as they are", [and] not filtered through our own values and interpretive schema' (Pratt, 1986, p.27).

But it is impossible to objectively depict social 'reality'. The historical Redfield-Lewis case illustrates this point: two researchers set out, one in the 1920s and the other in the

1940s, to do fieldwork in/on the same Mexican village. But their accounts, seventeen years apart, came to the *opposite* conclusions. Assuming that the village of Tepoztlán had not changed beyond recognition between their visits, Erickson (2018, p.48) asks, ‘Do the perspective, politics, and ideology of the observer so powerfully influence what he or she notices and reflects on that it overdetermined the conclusions drawn?’ Well, yes.

We are, all of us, positioned within a specific paradigm. Just as a fish is unaware of water until it is lifted, flapping and gasping, onto dry land, it is difficult to perceive the arbitrary and constructed nature of the things we regard as right or normal. By way of illustration, Australian Robert Dessaix (1994, p.62), who was a rare, non-Soviet literature student at Moscow University in 1966, describes the nature of that paradigm, pointing out that the system there then was no more constructed or arbitrary than any other:

In 1966, Dostoevsky had only just been rehabilitated and for the first time since the early years of the Revolution it was possible to discuss Dostoevsky’s Christianity and novels like *The Devils* freely. I say ‘freely’, but I don’t mean by this that all was permitted. In our weekly tutorials with Mr Tiunkin, a frightened rabbit of a man, terrified the Australian in his class might suddenly come out with a heresy he’d then have to deal with, we’d begin with a short lecture[.]...Then the class would have what was called a debate. Tiunkin would announce a proposition (for example, ‘the figure of Raskolnikov [from *Crime and Punishment*] is anti-revolutionary’), appoint one student to defend it and one to oppose it, and then at the end of the tutorial he, Tiunkin, would tell us who was right and who was wrong and why. It was freedom of sorts. The class paper we had to write was less ‘free’: it had to be couched in strictly Marxist literary terms and the bibliography had to begin with the letter L for Lenin, then go onto M for Marx, E for Engels, and only then onto A, B, etc. No one minded or thought it odd. We were just giving unto Caesar. Much the same thing happens today in Australian tertiary institutions, after all, where, if not in the bibliography at least in the text, we find the obligatory mention of Kristeva, Said, Foucault, Lacan, Irigaray. We just have a wider range of orthodoxies struggling for dominance here—and the public’s indifference to all of them is not concealed, just ignored.

On autoethnography

This is why emerging scholars’ critical autoethnographies offer such valuable insights from the margins of intercultural education. In autoethnography, writers begin from their *own* experiences. Clearly, however, issues of paradigm boundedness and the slipperiness of ‘truth’ still emerge; the writers may be outside of the *normative* paradigm, but they are still (as we all are) paradigm bound. Ellis, Adams and Bochner (2011, p.3) write:

Autoethnographers ...recognize how what we understand and refer to as ‘truth’ changes as the genre of writing or representing experience changes. ...Moreover, we acknowledge the importance of contingency. We know that memory is fallible, that it is impossible to recall or report on events in language that exactly represents how those events were lived and felt; and we recognize that people who have experienced the ‘same’ event often tell different stories about what happened[.] ...For an autoethnographer, questions of reliability refer to the narrator’s credibility. Could the narrator have had the experiences described, given available ‘factual evidence’? Does the narrator believe that this is actually what happened to her or him? ...Closely related to reliability are issues of validity. For autoethnographers, validity means that a work seeks verisimilitude; it evokes in readers a feeling that the experience described is lifelike, believable, and possible ...[Citing Plummer] ‘What matters is the way in which the story enables the reader to enter the subjective world of the teller—to see the world from her or his point of view...’ ...An autoethnography can also be

judged in terms of whether it helps readers communicate with others different from themselves or offer a way to improve the lives of participants ...In particular, autoethnographers ask: 'How useful is the story?' and 'To what uses might the story be put?'

This is a process that makes very different assumptions about the nature of knowing and learning. It puts the researcher in a very different position, and it engages differently—much more tentatively and much less arrogantly—with the 'truth'. But is it enough? Is it *research*?

This is best addressed autoethnographically, through a story. I recently co-edited *Questions of Culture in Autoethnography* (Stanley & Vass, 2018) and an inductive reading of our long editorial discussions about papers we rejected suggest that there are at least three ways in which autoethnography can be done badly. Here, then, are three problem areas that Greg Vass and I identified in texts purporting to be autoethnography. From these can be gleaned a set of evaluation criteria for autoethnography (but see also Schroeder (2017) and Le Roux (2017) for more complete sets of evaluation criteria).

First, not all would-be autoethnographers can tell an engaging story in which they situate the self and the lived experience. The seeming freedom of 'writing from the heart' (Pelias, 2013) may appear as an opportunity to rant rather than to set a compelling scene and narrate action, and some of the writing submitted and ultimately rejected from the book read as angry online opinion pieces rather than as stories. This is simply not what autoethnography is. Related, another issue (and a different rejected submission) was writing that looked, on the surface, like autoethnography: full of punchy slogans about writing differently and vague statements about feelings. But this text was, at best, a form of writing-as-therapy. Now, although the political is never far from the autoethnographic and there are few things quite as theoretical as a good story, 'personal' writing does not mean simply grinding an axe of opinion. And nor does the vague writing of fleeting feelings and cribbed soundbites constitute autoethnography. As with any other ethnographic method, there is a need to ground interpretations and inductive theorising in meaningful, storied 'data', thickly described.

Second, any individual's so-called 'personal' narrative is necessarily situated, and it is the engagement with power relations that makes autoethnography "critical". (Indeed, the very notion of the 'individual' self is a situated, Western ontological position, which both enjoys rather too much normative power, and which is far from universal; Iosefo, 2018). This is particularly relevant in mobilities contexts, like intercultural education. As Sheller (2018, p.21) writes, of mobility justice more broadly, there is a need for "sustained attention to aspects of colonial history and an understanding of the historical formation of contemporary forms and patterns of global im/mobility". Thus, when one writes one's 'own' story, there is a need to draw on the surrounding context and literature and, when writing about interculturality in particular, postcolonial and intersectional power relations must be central. Critical autoethnography is thus a very different genre from autobiography, memoir, or creative non-fiction. However, some of the writing we reviewed for *Questions of Culture in Autoethnography* told 'personal' stories that were almost entirely decontextualized. Autoethnography is very much scholarship rather than personal writing. The difference from other forms of academic writing is only that individual experience is foregrounded, not that rigour does not matter.

The third and perhaps most contentious criterion is that autoethnography has an overt political agenda: it seeks to right ethical wrongs. This is what Ellis, Adams, and Bochner (2011) mean when they ask, 'How useful is the story?' and, 'To what uses might the story be put?' An autoethnography may be both compelling to read and well contextualised, but if it doesn't work towards making the world a better place, it is not autoethnography as such. This is of course immediately contentious, particularly in our politically polarised times. As I have written elsewhere, of activism:

[I]f we rely on an inductive construction —the assumption that *we know activism when we see it*— it is also necessary to trouble the “we” that is doing the perceiving. Does activism necessarily invoke a progressive politics, and, if so, how is this to be defined? Or is it still “activism” if it is the alt-right that perceives the objective as desirable social change? ... If any and all social-change goals are the legitimate target of “activism”, does the term retreat from usefulness, becoming a catch-all for any and all impassioned or vaguely ‘helpful’ activities –per the paradigm of the in-group itself– that can wrapped up in ‘activism’ to confer legitimacy? (Stanley, in press)

So it is with the political agenda of autoethnography, which is necessarily an activist, change-oriented methodology that seeks to problematize taken-for-granted canonical knowledges and empower other ways of knowing, being, and doing. But while the specific politics of these may be contested, this core political agenda is a pre-requisite: autoethnography is about new and useful ways of seeing and about seeing new and useful things.

This is why this book comprises critical autoethnographies written by emerging scholars. Situated just outside ‘the academy’, and outside of intercultural education as an industrial complex, they can perceive things differently; sometimes radically so. They problematize many of the comfortable certainties promulgated by the international education discourses described in the opening section. And all spin a compelling yarn about what it is like to live their own particular stories within the context of intercultural learning.

Navigating the book

This book is organised into three sections: *engaging with the western ‘academy’*, *lingua-cultural learning*, and *intercultural learning in the world*. Section One begins with Michelle Bishop’s provocative and powerful chapter, written from her Indigenous Australian standpoint, in which she traces the contested values, ways of being, and ways of knowing that are part of what Indigenous students (indeed, any non-Western students) encounter in Western education. She traces the study of Psychology, in particular, to its sordid roots in eugenics, noting her own sense of devastation as she reads depictions of Indigenous people as inferior, backward, child-like, and primitive. How can she respond to any of this? She reads about decolonising methodologies that reclaim and foreground Indigenous epistemologies and writes, for a university assignment, an Indigenous autoethnography. Decentering the self, she offers an account of ‘flipping the gaze’ by questioning the privilege typically awarded to Western research methods.

In Chapter 4, Michelle passes the baton to Isma Eriyanti, who writes movingly about her experiences as another non-Western student —she is Indonesian— encountering the Western academy. Focusing primarily on private as well as university life, she describes her fears, homesickness, and struggles as an international student in the Anglophone ‘West’. Her difficulties are not least linguistic — even though she has a ‘good’ IELTS score of 7.0— and she shares her anxieties but also the strategies she found to support herself as she made friends and made a success of her time overseas. The theme of the Western academy continues in Chapter 5, where Maddy Manchi writes an ingenious microcosmic critique of postcolonial power —including xenophobia and racism—through her own experiences as ‘a marriage migrant and a ‘global’ scholar’. Undertaking her PhD at a very prestigious Indian university, she moves to New Zealand and is dismayed to find herself ‘chipped away into silent invisibility’. Gradually, she takes on the Western academy, cold-calling scholars until she is hired, piecemeal and casualised, as a postdoctoral research assistant. But the xenophobia and racism remain, and on the 15th of March 2019, she watches in horror as a white supremacist murders fifty-one people at two Christchurch mosques. Reeling, she writes that the attack is the ‘physical manifestation of all the xenophobia and racism that people of colour have known about and felt viscerally, silently, for years ...I feel no need to lift the rug

anymore, to examine all that has been swept under it. It has been pulled from beneath our feet, forcing us to get our hands, feet and bodies dirty'. The national conversation and reflection about racism in New Zealand that follows the attack, she provocatively concludes, is a conversation we need to have in the Western academy, too.

Interleaved, in Chapters 3 and 6, are conversations about process and method: the issues, tensions, and possibilities of writing critical autoethnographies like these. In Chapter 3, Michelle Bishop sits down with Dakota Jericho Smith, an Indigenous undergraduate student, to discuss the intricacies and potentialities that arise for each of them as they write Indigenous autoethnographies but also as they sit as Indigenous students in university classrooms. In Chapter 6, Maddy Madhavi and Elham Zakeri pick up the conversational thread, in a discussion of vulnerability and memory in writing their own intercultural autoethnographies that span India, Iran, Turkey, New Zealand, and Australia.

Section Two, on *lingua-cultural learning*, is bookended by chapters 7 and 12, in which Anqi Li and Jinyang Zhan, respectively, write about their own, different experiences as Chinese international students in Australia. In Chapter 7, Anqi focuses on her own learning of (and at times passion for) learning English in China, where she engages with US popular culture and feels excited to go to university in Sydney to undertake a Master's degree. But, heart-wrenchingly, when she arrives she describes the lingua-social isolation she feels as one of the 'Asian students' in class:

[W]e sat apart and were quiet while they talked... We watched. They judged. And we judged, too, but probably they didn't know that. They talked. And we were silent. The only communication I had with an Australian woman classmate in that class was when she picked up my dropped pen lid. The whole process lasted for only 20 seconds, without any eye contact. I felt very upset: I'd thought that I could develop friendship, or at least that I might discuss about the class topic with her. But there seemed a mountain between us, which let me feel separated from their world. In that class, I gave up speaking with anyone, feeling upset and under pressure to keep up.

This thread is picked up in Chapter 12, by Jinyang, who describes the Chinese-language landscape around her university campus in Australia and the efforts she has made to escape from this first-language 'bubble', in an effort to have a more authentically Australian (or 'international'?) experience. Their two stories resonate, reverberate, and at times contrast, although these two young Chinese women writers have never met. Both are legitimate users of English although both grapple with their identities in being this, and both find ways of negotiating their alienation in a setting that is, by turns, as 'Chinese' as it is 'Australian'.

The question of legitimacy as a user of English is then picked up, in Chapter 8, by Hyejeong Ahn, who writes about her negotiated identity as a Korean-born, Australian-citizen scholar in Singapore. She navigates questions like the contentious "Where are you (really) from?" and paints a picture of lingua-cultural identity that is, above all, hyphenated and negotiated. The complexity continues in Chapters 9 and 11, where Davina Delesclefs and Alana Bryant, respectively, write searingly honest, insightful accounts of their own early experiences of teaching English in Switzerland, Italy, and Cambodia. Davina problematizes many language schools' 'English-only' policies and the attitudes of her colleagues, some of whom are monolingual users of English, afraid, perhaps, to let go of some of their classroom power. Alana approaches the question of teacher power differently, considering the teaching body: the norms and expectations of so-called backpacker 'teachers' in Southeast Asia and beyond. These chapters are again interleaved, in Chapter 10, by a 'conversation', in which Hyejeong and Davina problematize their experiences of insecurities, imposter syndrome, and what they term 'native-speakeritis' in their work in English language teaching.

Section Three then moves out of the academy and language classrooms and into intercultural learning in the wider world. In Chapter 13, Tara McGuinness writes evocatively

about critical race theory and, in particular, whiteness and migration in the context of Brazil. Writing about visiting her husband's family farm in Minas Gerais, she questions the ongoing privileging of whiteness and, citing Sara Ahmed, discusses bodies in or out of place and the ongoing unmarkedness of her own whiteness. From race the discussion then moves on to religion, and in Chapter 14, Martha Gibson considers her own intercultural learning about and from Abrahamic religions, her work among Muslims predominantly in Yemen but also Afghanistan and Bangladesh, and her interest in the sociology of Jewishness in New York City and other settings, such as Spain. Despite her deep interest in Abrahamic religious and cultural practices, she writes that she is yet to find a 'god-shaped void in her life. Nevertheless, she engages with and learns from religious cultures around her, writing about the tensions and assumptions that result.

In Chapter 15, Matthew Crompton engages critically with the extreme mobilities of long-term, location-independent 'nomadic' lifestyles associated with but distinct from backpacker tourism. He writes of his own alienation growing up in monocultural, small-town Ohio, USA and his sense of release and relief among a transnational community in Guatemala, at first, and then in India, South Korea, and Colombia, among other places. The theme of imaginaries of place continues in Chapter 16, in which Elham Zakeri writes about growing up in Iran and the way social imaginaries there constructed her homeland as 'periphery' and the foreign as 'centre'. 'As Iranians, we looked up to foreigners,' she writes, describing her own leaving of Iran first for Turkey and Georgia, and then, eventually, to Spain and Australia, where she experienced the thrill 'not wearing a headscarf and feeling the wind dancing in my hair'. But her Iranian-ness still haunts her, and she struggles with social imaginaries of Iran *outside* the country, feigning that she is French to a class of Chinese students. Her chapter speaks deeply to the tensions and negotiations between appropriated and attributed identities. These themes continue in Chapter 17 and 18, in which Ingrid (Ying) Wang and Gesthimani Moysidou, respectively, each grapple with complex questions of national identity and identification. Ingrid (Ying), a Chinese-born, New Zealand-resident art therapist, writes about her own attempts to 'de-Chinese' and then 're-Chinese' herself through her remarkable art and poetry but also through re-naming, re-imagining, and re-working her own narrative. Gesthimani, meanwhile, is 'half-Greek, half-German, and full-foreigner': a multilingual, bicultural, pan-European 'international student', undertaking her first master's degree as a Greek citizen in Germany during the global financial crisis (in which she is pushed to explain and represent Greek perspectives to Germans, and vice versa), and then as a Greek-German 'full-foreigner' undertaking a PhD in Scotland. There, at last, she comes to a sense of home and selfhood that are congruent with her friends and her surroundings: in cosmopolitan Edinburgh, she finally feels 'at home' among other othernesses, seeking out familiarity in cultural difference. Together, then, this section speaks to the complexities and possibilities for intercultural learning in the wider world but also the difficulties and tensions in maintaining and re-negotiating our own identities as we navigate lingua-cultural difference.

Chapter 19 concludes the book, revisiting the overarching themes of postcolonial power and intercultural learning in the western academy, in language education, and in the wider world. Echoing the process sections –the conversation chapters– this last chapter is presented as a conversation, in which the substantive but also the methodological issues are teased out between the editor and some of the chapter contributors.

References

Bhabha, H. (1996). The other question: Difference, discrimination, and the discourse of colonialism. In H. Baker Jr., M. Diawara, & R. Lindeborg (Eds.), *Black British*

- cultural studies: A reader* (pp. 87-106). Chicago, USA: The University of Chicago Press.
- British Council (2019). *Study UK: "Discover you" campaign*. British Council. Accessed from: <https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/what-we-do/study-uk-campaign>
- Canton, N. (2019, 16 Sep). Extend 2-year post-study visa to all international students in UK: Indians. *Times of India*. Accessed from: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/uk/indian-students-campaign-for-two-year-psw-visa-to-be-extended-to-current-intake/articleshow/71141096.cms>
- Dessaix, R. (1994). *A mother's disgrace*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 12(1): Art 10.
- Erickson, F. (2018). A history of qualitative inquiry in social and educational research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (fifth edition), pp.36-65. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
- Four Corners (2019, May 6). Cash Cows: Australian universities making billions out of international students. *ABC News In-depth* [Video file]. Accessed from: <https://youtu.be/Sm6lWJc8KmE>
- Gopaul, B. (2011): Distinction in doctoral education: Using Bourdieu's tools to assess the socialization of doctoral students. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 44(1): 10-21.
- Henderson, B. (2017, 15 November). British explorer Benedict Allen 'goes missing in jungle' while searching for lost tribe. *The Telegraph* (UK). Accessed 23 September 2019 from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/11/14/british-explorer-benedict-allen-goes-missing-papua-new-guinea/>
- Heng, T. T. (2017). Voices of Chinese international students in USA colleges: 'I want to tell them that'. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(5): 833-850.
- IELTS (2019). Guide For education institutions, governments, professional bodies and commercial organisations. Accessed from: <https://www.ielts.org/-/media/publications/guide-for-institutions/ielts-guide-for-institutions-uk.ashx?la=en>.
- Iosefo, F. (2018). Scene, seen, unseen. In P. Stanley & G. Vass (Eds.) *Questions of culture in autoethnography* (pp.69-79). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, J. (2018). *Interculturality in International Education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Le Roux, C. S. (2017). Exploring rigor in autoethnographic research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 20(2): 195-207.
- Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2013). Writing the intellectual history of intercultural communication. In T. K. Nakayama & R. T. Halaulani (Eds.), *Handbook of critical intercultural communication* (pp.21-33). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McCarty, T. L. (2015). Ethnography in educational linguistics. In M. Bigelow & J. Enns-Kananen (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of educational linguistics* (pp.23-37). New York: Routledge.
- NAFSA (2019). *NAFSA Programs and Events* [website]. Accessed from: <https://www.nafsa.org/programs-and-events>
- Ngũgĩ, wa Thiong'o (2009). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- Pelias, R. J. (2013). Writing autoethnography: The personal, poetic, and performative as compositional strategies. In S. Holman-Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.). *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp.384-405). Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press.
- Phillips, R. (2013). *Mapping Men and Empire: Geographies of Adventure*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

- PIE [Professionals in International Education] News (2019, Sep 10). Two-year work rights for international students in UK reinstated for 2020/21. *The PIE News*. Accessed from: <https://thepienews.com/news/two-year-work-rights-for-international-students-in-uk-reinstated-for-202021/>
- Pratt, M. L. (1986). Fieldwork in common places. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.) *Writing Culture* (pp.27-50). Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Pratt, M. L. (2008). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Schroeder, R. (2017). Evaluative criteria for autoethnographic research: Who's to judge? In A.M. Deitering, R. Schroeder, & R. Stoddart (Eds.) *The self as subject: Autoethnographic research into identity, culture, and academic librarianship* (pp. 315-346). Chicago: ACRL Publications.
- Sheller, M. (2018). *Mobility justice: The politics of movement in an age of extremes*. London: Verso.
- Stanley, P. (In press). Problematizing "activism": Volunteer tourism in Central America, homophobia, (de)colonization, and the short-handled hoe. Special Issue of *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* on Activism, edited by Jonathan Wyatt, to be published in 2020.
- Stanley, P., & Vass, G. (2018). (Eds). *Questions of culture in autoethnography*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- Worthington, E. (2019, 6 May). Universities ignoring own English standards to admit more high-paying international students. *ABC News* (Australia). <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-05-06/universities-lowering-english-standards/11063626>