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'Education', as a field of study, is multidisciplinary. This volume contains educational research studies and perspectives from Australia and China. The topics addressed in this volume include: Languages education (the English language, indigenous Australian aboriginal languages & local languages of Sichuan China), early childhood education, arts and music education, cross-cultural issues in education, and higher education. As such, the volume intends to provide a forum for contemplation of and insights into current multidisciplinary educational research and research perspectives in Australia and China, particularly Sichuan Province. Therefore, the volume acts specifically as a forum for the dissemination of localised, yet rigorous, interesting, and noteworthy research which would have otherwise been denied to non-Chinese literate audiences.

Dissemination of research from international locations, or the need to do so, has been a politically popular catch-cry; many international conferences, symposia and refereed academic journals welcome submissions from various geographic locations for these research outlets to look more ‘international’. Nevertheless, a true and meaningful sharing of research from these different locations – research, especially, of academics who find expression in languages other than English challenging – has always been problematic. Whilst now is not the opportunity to discuss this aspect in detail, academics and academic institutions in English-speaking contexts bear a greater responsibility towards facilitating a more equitable distribution of such research.

This volume is the result of contributions from many individuals – individuals who mostly operated behind-the-scenes, but were crucial to the project. In a climate where research collaboration and student and staff exchanges are becoming priorities of universities in the Asia Pacific region, many chapters in this volume originated from an international research symposium organised by the Faculties of Education Deakin University, Australia and Sichuan Normal University, China. This symposium and the volume would not have been possible if not for the strong leadership of Professors Brenda Cherednichenko, Christine Ure and Badeng Nima.

Dr Tony Walker has been extremely instrumental in guiding and shaping the work of academic colleagues who found it difficult to disseminate what is uniquely theirs and were in a similar situation referred to earlier in this preface. I am sure these colleagues are deeply grateful to him. So are we.

Dr Laura Gurney, Mr Michael Knopp, Ms Anne Roubin, Dr Michiko Weinmann, Dr Ruth Arber, and Ms Ping Huang from the two Faculties also deserve a hearty mention. Additionally, we extend our gratitude for the support of Sense Publishers including Michel Lokhorst and Mrs Jolanda Karada.
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1. INTERNATIONALISATION OF AUSTRALIA–CHINA HIGHER EDUCATION IN TIMES OF GLOBALISATION

INTRODUCTION

A view of internationalization of higher education as merely a response to globalization fails to acknowledge that universities have been amongst the most international of institutions for a very long time (Teichler, 2004). Globalization has certainly impacted, in some shape or form, the activities of all educational institutions and educators, and of education researchers, and in the higher education sector in particular, with its core activities of teaching and research, internationalization and international education have been, for more than two decades, catchcries for a critical role for education in the new dynamics in global relations (Universities Australia, 2012) and practices (Jones & Killick, 2013). But, a careful distinction must be made between the phenomenon of globalization and the internationalization of higher education.

Internationalization has been a feature of higher education, at least in the West, since the inception of universities when medieval scholars and students moved between institutions and countries and shared Latin as a common language of learning and scholarship (Altbach, 2002). Movement of knowledge and innovative ideas across national boundaries has in fact been at the core of views of knowledge as universal, and international recognition and validation of research and of scholarship has, as Teichler (2004) points out, long been fundamental to another high profile value of contemporary higher education, quality. What is making contemporary higher education internationalization different is the impact of unprecedented global flows of the currencies of globalization – people, technology, knowledge, ideas, and values (Knight, 2015b) – that pay, increasingly, less heed to borders. As the global landscape changes and political, social and economic forces leave higher education with little choice but greater international involvement (Altbach & Knight, 2007), the actual practices that exemplify internationalization in higher education continue to evolve as universities face ground-shifting change, experiencing imperatives both internal and external to simultaneously shape and respond to rapidly emerging circumstances, to operate as both sites and instruments of change.
INTERNATIONALISATION & GLOBALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Universities occupy a strategic position in a global knowledge-based economy (Stiglitz, 2006) as generators and purveyors of the globally sought after commodities of ideas and education. Globalization is impacting on internationalization of higher education as teaching focuses increasingly on preparing graduates for a global employment marketplace (Jones & Killick, 2013) and research is expected to be responsive to market-driven external factors, and funding opportunities, rather than reflecting the priorities of the professional research community (Hall, 1996; Jarvis, 2000; Lyotard, 1985). Trade in the commodities of knowledge and education takes place against a powerful geo-political discourse that acknowledges a disparity between the economic prosperity and success of industrialised and highly educated Western nations and what Ferguson (2011) identifies as the aspirational rest. The quality and standard of education and educational institutions is seen as integral to the origin and continued development of Western living standards and quality of life, and because of this perception, a Western education has become synonymous with opportunities to achieve aspirations of prosperity (Gray, 2010), a prized globally traded commodity in high demand in the education market (Liyanage & Walker, 2014; Tilak, 2008). Historically, this has positioned Western universities as exporters of education, education materials, and research, and with an additional layer of regulation imposed by the gatekeeper to participation in Western education, the international medium of instruction and research, the English language.

The nature of internationalization, however – and in globalization terms, the balance of market power – continues to shift, and we now focus here more specifically on the Asian region to map out the international higher education relations between the two nations that have collaborated in production of this volume of education research, Australia and China. Despite new ideas such as borderless and transnational education, national borders retain their importance as universities respond to global forces and geo-political re-alignments constrained by local regulatory frameworks central to the critical features of higher education quality, course accreditation, and funding (Knight, 2015b). As Knight (2015b) stresses, the impact of globalization on the processes of internationalization differs from country to country “due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities” (p. 3). While international cooperation and collaboration between universities is foregrounded by national government policies (see, e.g., Australia in the Asian Century: White Paper, Australian Government, 2012), the internationalization initiative rests with individual institutions, and this volume of research from Chinese and Australian researchers is an example of the developing higher education relations between two countries.

AUSTRALIA & CHINA

From the Australian perspective, internationalization has progressed from an initial government funded aid-based model in the middle of last century, to a trade-based
export model of education as an important source of university revenue in the later decades of that century (Universities Australia, 2012). Currently international students constitute around 23% of students enrolled in Australian universities (Australian Government: Department of Education and Training, 2015), and China continues to provide by far the largest group of international students. Australian universities now consider themselves to be engaged in what is referred to as a third phase of internationalization in which the focus has moved from revenue to achievement of more deeply integrated interaction with the international higher education community and the global knowledge economy of both staff – through academic and research links – and students – through doctoral studies, expanded disciplinary engagement, and greater numbers of Australian students studying abroad: “Australian universities are now focused on quality, outcomes and meaningful collaboration and this will manifest in an increasing capacity for transnational education and greater emphasis on attracting international PhD students and research collaboration” (Universities Australia, 2012, p. 2). As a key provider of higher education in the Asia-Pacific region, the focus of this re-alignment of Australian higher education internationalization is directed at development of new and existing links with universities in the region. In many respects, this reflects a globalization discourse that positions the region as the new centre of global economic power (Ferguson, 2011) in an Asian century (Kohli, Sharma, & Sood, 2011). Australian government policy-makers have embraced this discourse, and the calls of stakeholders for development of collaborative research links (Australian Research Council, 2011), and made a commitment to support relationships with regional institutions to facilitate growth in the numbers of Australian students studying overseas in Asia for at least part of their degree program (Australian Government, 2012). Notwithstanding the intention to move beyond the aid or trade models, export of education to nations such as China remains a vital structural element of higher education in Australia (Marginson, 2015); the “vast” (Universities Australia, 2012, p. 5) opportunities identified by Australian universities are undeniably also about revenue generated through a market shortfall in availability of high-quality higher education in Asia, and continuing demand for English-medium courses (Marginson, 2015), that has seen outbound student numbers continue to rise sharply during the last decade. As Marginson (2015) points out, this is in many respects a precarious set of circumstances exposing the vulnerability of Australian universities to the implications, in globalization terms, of shifts in market conditions.

CHANGING LANDSCAPES

As nations such as China invest heavily in higher education and enter the market for international students, the so-called third phase of Australian higher education internationalisation is timely realization of the need to engage with Asian higher education on a more equal footing of mutual recognition, exchange and collaboration rather than a view of the West as the hegemonic producer, and the rest as grateful
consumers, of education and knowledge. These circumstances are as much as issue for internationalization of higher education in nations such as China as in the West as forces of globalization, most evident in the phenomenon of global university rankings schemes, threaten to overwhelm Chinese desires for self-determination (Turin, 2010) and impose Western models and quality frameworks on indigenous systems. Certainly, China seeks to emulate the prosperity of the West through both large-scale expansion of participation in education at all levels and the pursuit of quality (Altbach, 2010). In terms of scale alone, Chinese higher education dwarfs that of Australia, with the world’s largest number of enrolled students, and more scientific journals and funding for research than any country other than the USA (Postiglione, 2015). Expansion of education, including the flow and return of students to foreign universities, has resulted in a “broad intellectual renaissance” (Vogel, 2004, p. 48) that is reshaping the nation and positioning it as a world education power. In the special zone of Shanghai, for example, the general education system is already ranked among the world’s top five (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2010), and thanks to “a combination of significant infusions of funds to universities identified as top performers, mergers to create institutions with both high quality and economy of scale, and efforts to create an academic environment that rewards productivity” (Altbach, 2010, p. 4), several Chinese universities are regarded as among the world’s best (Postiglione, 2015). This impetus has produced some redress of the flow of Chinese students to universities in other countries; around 380,000 students from outside China were studying at Chinese higher education institutions in 2014 (Australian Government: Department of Education and Training, 2016). Following, perhaps, Western models, the first campus of a Chinese university outside China has been established in Thailand by Jinan University (Knight, 2015a, p. 2). Yet quality remains the critical factor for Chinese higher education, characterized as “big but not strong” (Min, 2015, p. 11), in its efforts to develop international standing and to compete in the globalized education market. It is revealing that more than half the foreign students studying at Chinese universities were enrolled in non-award courses, suggesting issues related to certification and recognition of study completed at Chinese universities. For the higher education sector as whole, quality improvements depend upon a complex suite of reforms or changes but ultimately are judged by teaching and research and it is here that the interests of Australia’s universities, engaged in a third phase of internationalism, and those of China’s universities can coincide productively for both, as they have in this volume.

Recent analysis by the International Association of Universities (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014) found the focus of priorities of internationalization processes in universities of the Asia-Pacific region to be research collaboration, followed closely staff mobility. Mobility of staff and of graduate students through international relationships can be one strategy to establish and develop research collaboration networks, and to simultaneously disrupt some of the methodological and topical constraints of local hierarchical networks that have been identified
INTERNATIONALISATION OF AUSTRALIA-CHINA HIGHER EDUCATION

(Altbach, 2010) as one of the impediments along the path to quality in Chinese higher education. For any contemporary university, internationalization and quality go hand in hand, in “an academic culture that is based on meritocratic values, free inquiry, and competition—combined with elements of collaboration and at least some mobility” (Altbach, 2010, p. 4). It is something of a conundrum that the capacity for mobility rests to a very significant degree upon quality and the competitiveness and processes of international publication, as an indicator of quality, are complicated for many Chinese academics and researchers by the use of English as the international language of research and scholarship. The challenge for many Chinese academics, researchers, and post-graduate students becomes access to opportunities to learn from participation in these processes, and the collaborative relationships that are a priority for Australian universities provide a productive avenue for nurturing of these aspects of quality development.

A MEANINGFUL INTERACTION

International collaboration across distinct academic, research and education cultures demands commitment from both parties. Authentic internationalization demands more than the adoption of Western epistemologies and practices by higher education in other parts of the world. Imperatives to embed intercultural knowledge understanding and attitudes in the coursework of higher education programs for student learning must be applied more deeply to academic and research cultures of higher education. The risk for higher education is that internationalization simply as globalization threatens cultural heritages, language diversity, variety of academic cultures and structures, not to mention quality (Teichler, 2004). Internationalization is an opportunity for creative and reflective disruption of paradigms, of “being confronted with different theories, methodologies and field knowledge in order to reflect and relativise one’s own past conceptual frameworks, to broaden one’s horizon, to think comparatively and eventually to develop more complex perspectives” (Teichler, 2004, p. 11). That English remains the medium in this volume of research does not indicate capitulation to Western practices and priorities. Rather, it has in this case provided opportunities for researchers and practitioners to focus on quality and to work with and learn from colleagues whose methods, interests and conventions exhibit characteristics distinct from their own, and for readers to become familiar with the priorities and approaches of researchers in education in a region of China with its own distinct identity.
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2. CHALLENGES FOR DEVELOPING EAP PRACTICE IN ANGLOPHONE CONTEXTS

EAP AND ENGLISH IN HIGHER EDUCATION

English for academic purposes (EAP), the academically-focused branch of English for specific purposes (Johns & Dudley-Evans, 1991), aims to facilitate learners’ participation in the English language academic community (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Prosser, 1994). The EAP sector has expanded rapidly in recent years (Liyanage & Walker, 2014b) and now plays a significant role within Anglophone and non-Anglophone higher education contexts (Ashraf, Hakim, & Zulfiqar, 2014; Basturkmen, 2012; Kafle, 2014). Global trends which associate English and the West with educational prestige (Kubota & Lehner, 2004), assigning them a “perceived superiority” (Liyanage & Walker, 2014b, p. 165) over other languages and educational paradigms, have led considerable numbers of students to undertake English-medium higher education (Brown, 2014; Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2013; Kim, Tatar, & Choi, 2014). These developments have cemented the international status of the language, which has also has become the global medium for academic communication and a lingua franca in general (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Jenkins, 2011; Seidlhofer, 2005). Increased student mobility and preferences for English-medium education have been of particular economic significance to Britain, Australasia and North America, referred to as the BANA nations, which have experienced a boost in overseas enrolments (Andrade, 2006; Saw, Abbott, Donaghey, & McDonald, 2013; Terraschke & Wahid, 2011). Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom are amongst the countries with the highest proportion of international tertiary enrolments globally (OECD, 2014), and the United States and Canada also host a significant number of overseas students (Choudaha & Chang, 2012; Siddiq, Nethercote, Lye, & Baroni, 2012).

While the BANA nations continue to be popular destinations, they are not the only providers of English-medium instruction (EMI) tertiary education. EMI policies are on the rise in non-Anglophone higher education contexts (Dearden, 2014; Hu & McKay, 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2014). Policy efforts to internationalise and expand higher education via EMI have been implemented at governmental and international levels (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2011) – examples include the Bologna Process in Europe (Smit & Dafouz, 2012) and the promulgation of EMI as a key approach to improving tertiary education by the Chinese Ministry of Education (Lei & Hu, 2014). Institutions have also responded with ground level policies to
implement EMI, typically in response to the desire to rise in university ranking systems (Kirkpatrick, 2014), compete with other institutions (Brown, 2014), and attract domestic and international students (Dearden, 2014; Pan, 2007). As a result, English is now used around the world in higher education by students and educators, many of whom are non-native speakers of the language.

Although entry level requirements typically govern student enrolment in EMI programs in both Anglophone and non-Anglophone contexts (Kirkpatrick, 2014; Terraschke & Wahid, 2011), widespread concerns regarding the language skills of students for whom English is an additional language (EAL) have been raised by researchers, institutions and the wider public (Andrade, 2006; Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2015; Fenton-Smith, Humphreys, Walkinshaw, Michael, & Lobo, 2015). Language difficulties are not by any means unique to EAL students, as the development of academic language proficiency is recognised to also involve prolonged dedication on behalf of native speakers (Taylor & Geranpayeh, 2011). Nonetheless, within Anglophone contexts, particular efforts to facilitate EAL students’ successful participation in higher education have been made. These include reports from government and regulatory bodies acknowledging the need to address language issues and standards (Brown, 2010; Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, 2009; Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education, 2012), as well as institutional responses in the form of assessment and diagnostic tools, and EAP programs (Fenton-Smith et al., 2015; Harris, 2013; von Randow, 2010). Contemporarily, EAP is offered in the BANA nations in pre-sessional and degree-integrated forms within universities and language teaching institutions, and may be either general or discipline-specific (Jarvis & Stakounis, 2010; Lobo & Gurney, 2014; Terraschke & Wahid, 2011).

PROBLEMATISING EAP PRACTICE WITHIN AN INTERNATIONALISED SECTOR

EAP courses focus on developing students’ cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). CALP encapsulates the various aspects of academic discourse (Cummins, 2008) which, in Anglophone contexts particularly, is shaped in accordance with the norms of academic communities operating in the West (Phan, 2011). Culturally specific content, including conventions concerning the formation and structure of arguments and text types, relevance and clarity of information presented, and concepts such as plagiarism and critical thinking (Fox, 1994; Lan, 2015; Phan, 2011; Thompson, 2002) are typically built into EAP courses, which subsequently present “Western ways of learning and … organising and generating knowledge” as neutral (Liyanage & Walker, 2014b, p. 2). This is symptomatic of wider trends affecting English language instruction and testing, which remain largely deferential toward native speaker models (Sewell, 2013). As Jenkins (2012) posits, despite the increasingly widespread use of English globally, “the prevailing orientation in English language teaching and testing, and ELT materials remains undoubtedly
towards *English as a native language*, with correctness and appropriateness still widely driven by *native speakers’* use regardless of learners’ current or potential communication contexts” (p. 487). Subsequently, learners who transfer from other language communities into English must deal with sociocultural as well as lexical aspects of language use, and may resist new and unfamiliar expectations regarding speaking and writing (Fox, 1994; Zappa-Hollman, 2007).

However, due to increased student mobility, widespread implementation of EMI and the lingua franca status of the language, it is unlikely that students will use English, academically and professionally, only in Anglophone contexts. Many students return home to work following completion of their studies (Gu & Schweisfurth, 2015; Hu, 2007; Xu, 2009), while others may opt to move between countries and regions for undergraduate and postgraduate education (Lan, 2015; Liyanage, Diaz, & Gurney, 2016). For the large numbers of international students who plan to transition between academic and professional communities, many of their future interactions in English are likely to be undertaken with non-native speakers (Nickerson, 2015). Students may also treat overseas education as an opportunity to develop an “international identity” and to become “mobile and comfortable in a range of environments” (Pyvis & Chapman, 2007, p. 241), premised on their varied educational and cultural experiences.

In light of these points, and considering that English tends to be used “more as a language of communicational necessity than as a symbol of cultural identity” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 539) by EAL speakers, restricting EAP instruction to native speaker models and subjugating students’ prior knowledge and skills are therefore counterproductive to the goal of facilitating their development as flexible and international communicators. As Phan (2011) argues, students’ existing knowledge and practices

… need to be recognised and acknowledged as … enriching their English writing rather than ‘polluting’ it. Importantly, students themselves need to … be encouraged to make full use of their prior knowledge and ways of doing in performing in English, given the internationalising status of the English language itself. (p. 38)

In order to prevent EAP and higher education in Anglophone contexts from functioning as an avenue for disseminating Western values, and becoming “another instance of Western colonialism and imperialism” (Singh, 2009, p. 199), the appropriacy of adhering to traditional instructional aims is increasingly subject to scrutiny. Responsively, debates have begun to arise which concern the growth of different academic *Englishes* (Canagarajah, 2006) and their accommodation within EAP classrooms and academic environments generally (Flowerdew, 2008). Traditional privileging of an idealised Western paradigm over a more pluralised approach, acknowledging the heterogeneity and global nature of academic communication, has become an issue of importance within the sector (Canagarajah, 2014). Proponents of a flexible approach to EAP instruction argue that the promotion
of accommodative pedagogies, which entail “a reassessment of what constitutes English-language proficiency” on behalf of teachers (Liyanage & Walker, 2014a, p. 9), may be of benefit for the development of EAP in alignment with processes of internationalisation and globalisation in tertiary education and beyond (Jenkins, 2011).

Nonetheless, despite widespread support for these goals based in consideration of students’ communicational needs, several impediments operate within higher education in English-speaking countries and complicate change in EAP practice. These include the lack of teacher education and training options available for EAP instructors, employment affordances and restrictions, issues of status and collaboration between staff within institutions, and the expectations of academic staff concerning students’ use of academic language. These issues are discussed in the ensuing sections.

CHALLENGES TO DEVELOPING EAP PRACTICE

Overall, very few EAP-specific teacher education and training opportunities are available to practitioners prior to commencing their work (Hamp-Lyons, 2011). As Hamp-Lyons (2011) argues, despite considerable growth in EAP over the past few decades, the persistent lack of professional education and training opportunities has remained a “cause for concern” (p. 100). Whilst TESOL pre-service teacher education and training courses are accessible throughout the BANA nations, these courses prepare teachers broadly to work as teachers of general English (Liyanage, Walker, & Singh, 2014). However, given that teaching any branch of English for specific purposes, including EAP, necessitates its own pedagogical approach (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998; Rajabi, Kiany, & Maftoon, 2012) as well as an expanded knowledge base, preparation for teachers to work in EAP is a critical but unaddressed issue. EAP teachers are resultantly obliged to replace education and training opportunities with processes of experimentation and translation of theory into practice (Ghanbari & Rasekh, 2012), supplemented by in-service professional development where possible.

To further complicate negotiation of practice, many EAP practitioners enjoy little employment security and inhabit peripheral roles within institutions (Evans & Green, 2007; Fenton-Smith & Gurney, 2015; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002). Notwithstanding relatively recent efforts to embed credit-bearing EAP courses within degree programs (see, for example, Lobo & Gurney, 2014), widespread implementation of EAP courses as non-credit-bearing still prevails. This assigns EAP little apparent academic importance and reinforces the perceived remedial status with which it has dealt for some time (Evans & Green, 2007; Hyland, 2006). As Allison (1992) argued over twenty years ago, positioning language courses as remedial stigmatises the students who undertake them, lowers students’ motivation, and contributes to dismissive views concerning teachers’ expertise and the importance of their roles. More recently, Hyland (2006) echoed these sentiments that EAP is
“generally regarded as a hand-maiden to those ‘proper’ disciplines which are more
directly engaged in the serious business of constructing knowledge or discovering
truth” (p. 34). As a result, the expertise of language specialists is not typically
recognised by academics working in other disciplines, compromising collaboration
and communication within institutions (Fenton-Smith & Gurney, 2015; Lee, 1997).

Collaboration and communication between EAP teachers and discipline
academics open up yet further complications for developing EAP practice. Even if
EAP teachers were afforded greater employment security and more opportunities for
education and training, and were equipped with the necessary skill set to negotiate
academic communication more pluralistically with learners, they would nonetheless
be caught in the dilemma of reconciling best EAP practice with the expectations of
academics working in undergraduate and postgraduate higher education programs.
Proponents of a pragmatic approach to teaching EAP (Allison, 1996) have long
argued that some degree of conformity with the expectations of the academy is a
necessary part of EAP instruction. The pragmatic approach, which has been subject
to criticism for endorsing “power relations in academia and in society” (Benesch,
1993, p. 711), is a “skills-based, instrumental approach that attempts to make
students aware of the dominant conventions … and then successfully appropriate
these same conventions” (Harwood & Hadley, 2004, p. 356). In practice, most EAP
courses orient around these goals (Helmer, 2013), in order to ensure that students are
prepared for the demands of higher education. This is a practical move, as research
suggests that discipline academics working in Anglophone contexts have long
expressed dissatisfaction with EAL students’ work and non-native features in their
writing (Casanave & Hubbard, 1992), to the extent that EAL students’ work tends to
be marked at a lower level than that of native speakers (O’Hagan & Wigglesworth,
2015). Other research suggests that perceptions of EAL students as less competent
may prevail within institutions, and that faculty may hold them to a different
standard from native speaking students (Barron, Gourlay, & Gannon-Leary, 2010;

These practices and perceptions serve to maintain boundaries between students,
subsequently excluding and marginalising the knowledge traditions brought by EAL
students in favour of those of the Anglophone West (Singh, 2009). Nonetheless, from
the perspective of EAP practitioners, understanding expectations for students’ work
at university is fraught with ambiguities and inconsistencies, which may also derive
in part from more serious problems with assessment practices in higher education
such as inconsistency in marking and unclear criteria (O’Donovan, Price, & Rust,
2004; O’Hagan & Wigglesworth, 2015). Lamentably, as language development is
not typically prioritised within students’ degree programs, and discipline academics
are generally ill-equipped to deal with such issues (Barron et al., 2010), Lack of
communication between EAP teachers and academics working in other disciplines
will only serve to cement existing problems.

A reconfiguration of institutional priorities to more critically consider the ways in
which English is used internationally and within institutions represents a necessary
step towards reconciling these issues. Factors such as teaching resources, the use of English within classrooms, and expectations regarding students’ use of English for classroom interactions and assessment purposes should be carefully considered in the interest of establishing coordinated and clearly communicated norms throughout institutions. In terms of EAP teacher practice, while issues of their employment, status, roles and responsibilities problematise the potential for EAP teachers to develop their practice in collaboration with discipline academics, processes of reflection on their own practice are also arguably limited in their potential to develop practice-based objectives congruent with students’ needs. In order to collaborate and communicate effectively with discipline academics and refine their practice in line with students’ communicational needs, and in light of the internationalising status of English, it is of critical importance that EAP teachers are able to negotiate professional identities outside the role of a support service and that they are able to access resources for training, education and professional development. Education and professional development for these teachers should be embedded within calls for rejection of the idealised native-speaker model, accompanied by consideration of students’ ways of constructing and communicating knowledge (Singh, 2009), in order to erode the expectation that EAP instructors must adhere to a singular model of academic English and open up the possibility for a greater, recognised plurality of students’ cultural identities and the uses of English internationally.

CONCLUSION

Within Anglophone tertiary environments, students’ success as academic communicators has traditionally been established vis-à-vis their ability to adapt to and apply Western conventions. However, as English has become a lingua franca and global medium for academic communication (Flowerdew, 2008), new modes of communicating in English are emerging which diverge somewhat from native-speaker models (Jenkins, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2011, 2014). Contemporarily, difficulties characterise the intersection of traditional EAP instructional objectives and the uses of English in the internationalised higher education sector. These issues create dilemmas for EAP teacher practice, particularly in Anglophone contexts. However, the resolution of these issues is complicated by the lack of education and training opportunities for practitioners, the perceived remedial status of EAP which persists in many institutions, barriers to communication and collaboration between EAP teachers and discipline academics, and unclear and inconsistent expectations for students’ work at university.

These issues will not be simple to resolve in the short term, as they involve the collaboration of multiple groups of actors. Nonetheless, as the internationalisation of higher education shows no signs of abating, institutional responses to these issues will be necessary to ensure ongoing viability of higher education programs offered in Anglophone contexts, the adaptability of institutions in the sector and accommodation of students’ needs.
CHALLENGES FOR DEVELOPING EAP PRACTICE IN ANGLOPHONE CONTEXTS

NOTE

As mentioned previously, EAP is also offered outside the BANA nations (see for example Atai & Dashtestani, 2013; Brown & Adamson, 2012; Li, 2013; Martínez, 2011). However, as this chapter focuses on EAP in Anglophone contexts, these programs will not be discussed here.
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