Editorial

A central focus which emerges from this first open issue of 2018 is the way in which subjects are positioned through the use of language, and languages, within 'pedagogic discourse' (after Bernstein, 2000). Whether it be the students positioned as consumers in today's UK universities (Collins), international students travelling from across Asia to a Taiwanese university to study in English (Lin); schools and colleges ranging from Catalonia to Canada who support migrant children and students learning the language(s) of the host country (Mady; Petreñas, Lapresta & Huguet) or a conversation between two researchers engaging one postgraduate student recently arrived at a European university, and remotely relayed between their various offices (Amadasi & Holliday), what most of these papers demonstrate is that 'pedagogic subjects' – pupils, learners and students - can no longer be viewed as 'cultural dopes' within diverse global educational systems; rather they can engage agentively with the ideologies (e.g. Collins) and resources of these systems to advance their own needs (e.g. Mady) and negotiate their own positions (e.g. Lin). Furthermore, this negotiation often entails a manipulation of the many languages which subjects have at their disposal: not only the often multiple languages with which many immigrants are endowed, arriving expectantly at the borders either for study or for longer term sojourn, but also those with which they engage as they navigate their way into a foreign 'culture'. Several of the contributors to this issue (e.g. Collins; Lin; Petreñas et al.) also demonstrate once more that it is simply not possible to attribute decontextualized, supposedly universal, attributes to learners derived from their first language, ethnicity or religion, but rather that attributes are adopted by learners - often knowingly – which are specific to, and contingent upon, the educational and social contexts within which they find themselves. Nevertheless, pedagogic discourse is inevitably intertwined with the discursive constitution of political systems and nation states, however 'imagined' these may be (Anderson, 1983). And so we round off the papers in this issue with Xiaoping Wu's welcome analysis of 'stance' in news reports published in the press of the different state actors in the Sino-Japanese territorial dispute, which affords us considerable insight into just how the – often adversarial - political ideologies of these 'imagined communities' are created.

In a foretaste of the special issue (18.5) which we have lined up for you later in this volume, Haynes Collins opens this our second issue by reporting on an ethnographic investigation of the widespread and institutionalised use of the terms 'intercultural' and 'interculturality' within HE to convey essentialised meanings within the ethos of an increasingly neoliberal view of education, one which in the UK is increasingly driven by an ethos of marketisation and

commodification. Despite the best endeavours of our members, there remains a proliferation of precisely these uses and applications of intercultural education in higher education which IALIC was set up specifically to challenge and to resist. For Collins, this recontextualization of the intercultural, which he dubs 'interculturality from above', represents the ideological positioning of education within the neoliberal phase of capitalism which so many of us either inhabit, or have to engage with. However, contra this bleak and rather dystopian vision, Collins also uncovers through his enquiry locations of criticality and optimism which arise from the agency of his participants, who display a capacity to act independently and autonomously in relation to the dominant discourse of the institutions which they inhabit. Thus, his students also critiqued the dichotomisation, essentialism and stereotyping which they found in the British academy and display the potential to navigate the complexities of the discourses which they encountered in a creative and potentially transformative fashion – a position which Collins calls 'interculturality from below'. Collins's paper therefore renews the clarion call for members of our association to reclaim the term 'intercultural' and re-situate it within a discourse which allows 'the concept of the intercultural to help establish a greater moral, ethical and reflexive framework'.

If Collins's study is situated within the ethos of commodification and marketisation within the UK, where the epithet 'intercultural' is often used interchangeably (and uncritically) with the term 'international', Lin's study is located within a university in Taiwan where the internationalisation of higher education is taking place no less 'aggressively' across Asia; not least this entails the proliferation of instruction delivered through the medium of English (EMI). Lin reports on a comparison of Taiwanese students' communicative behaviours within the EMI class when set over against their peers from other Asian countries. While these pages are becoming increasingly resistant to research design which features national cultures operating as a categorical *a priori*, in this paper the participants to a certain degree themselves make the category of culture relevant to the research findings. In this respect, participants' sense of cultural identity was constructed within their own discourse as fluid and shifting rather than being static and unchanging in relation to their ethnic or national origins. Once again, differential views of linguistic identity emerged from this study despite the common 'non-native-English-speaking' status of both groups, with the Taiwanese students being co-constructed by both groups as non-English speakers (even in their 'home country') and international students being co-constructed as English speakers. In the end, Lin finds that although the classroom interaction of the two groups differed at the beginning of the period of

engagement, by the end of the investigation each group had adjusted towards their peers' behaviour. The Taiwanese spoke more and become more relaxed in class to be more like their other Asian counterparts, and the other Asian students became more reflective and discerning in their participation to become more like their Taiwanese counterparts. These insights support the notion that participation in talk is – like the cultural and linguistic identities of the students in these cohorts –achieved in relation to highly contextualised and local circumstances and cannot be addressed as an inherent or universal attribute of the profiles of the subjects concerned.

Pedagogical and social context is also a key factor in Mady's study, which compares the achievement in both English and French of three different groups of learners attending a French immersion class: Canadian-born Anglophone students born in Canada, the multilingual offspring of voluntary immigrants who were born in Canada, and multilingual immigrants. Mady employs a plurilingual theoretical framework that considers the participants' achievements in the range of languages at their disposal as potential resources for language learning. Drawing on Ogbu's cultural-ecological theory (e.g. 1995), the study considers the role of the receiving country's education system and community agencies in the capacity of voluntary immigrants to invest in learning the language(s) of the host country. In the event, the newly arrived immigrant group outperformed both Canadian-born groups on some components of both the English and French assessment. A measure of this success may be attributable to the greater positivity that this group felt about education in general and the official policy towards bilingualism, despite some aspects of discrimination which they might encounter in other areas. Thus, in some ways similar to the preceding papers in this issue, Mady's recently arrived immigrant language learners are shown to exercise a degree of agency over the pedagogical and social circumstances which they inhabit that leads in very specific ways to their investment in, and strategic manipulation of, the resources at their disposal.

Our next paper continues the rich stream of intercultural research which we have been bringing to you from the culturally complex, plurilingual region of Catalonia (c.f. Madariaga, Huguet, Janés, 2016; Lapresta-Rey, Huguet, Fernández-Costales, 2017), a region which has featured prominently in the international news in 2017. Adopting a theoretical approach which combines symbolic interactionism with sociocultural theory, Petreñas et al. focus upon the relationship between language, social interaction and the identity of a group of young Romanian immigrants, who attend secondary school in Lleida. While – in contrast to some of the more ethnographically inclined studies in this issue - Petreñas et al. employ a semi-

structured interview for their research, they remain explicitly aware of the power differentials constructed between the interviewer and the interviewee in this form of dialogic encounter. The study reports that as the young immigrants engage with a new cultural context, their interactions with significant others also change, leading them to develop hybrid identities. In this respect, their new sense of self is strongly related to those with whom they interact and, by implication, what language they choose to speak in this plurilingual society. A corollary of this is that these immigrants report gradually relinquishing the use of their first language, even when talking at home with other family members. In this respect, their gradually increased use of the languages of the host society – Spanish and Catalan - contributes to their sense of belonging to their new locale and to their sense of melding with the new cultural groups amongst whom they find themselves living.

One of the ways in which Collins proposes that the current malaise affecting interculturality in HE can be superseded is through attending to the notion of 'cultural threads', a concept first set out in these pages by Adrian Holliday two years ago (2016), and then reprised last year in Amadasi's investigation of the experiences of postgraduate students in a university in Europe (Amadasi and Holliday, 2017). Following on with this enquiry in the present issue, Amadasi and Holliday present the second instalment of their 2017 study. Previously they reported on how stories about culture and cultural identity can be multiple and competing depending on how people position themselves in interaction, sometimes creating essentialist 'blocks' and at other times drawing non-essentialist 'threads' in interviews with two of the students. Here, they select just one interview from those available in the larger study to report on the intercultural experiences that one postgraduate student found significant during the first weeks in their new country. This enables the authors to explore how narratives that are constructed and shared in the interaction that takes place in the interview. In this part of the study, they focus on how the students and the two researchers involved position themselves in the interviews through their negotiation of personal narratives. The paper explores how the participants in become interpersonally connected in their search for intercultural 'threads'; and they analyse the interplay between personal and grand narratives to consider how they can be used to reproduce both dominant essentialist and alternative non-essentialist discourses of culture.

The papers in this second issue so far give accounts of the lived experience of interculturality, and communication between cultures. However, the ways in which cultural beliefs and attitudes are represented, and arguably constituted, not only construct the attitudes, beliefs and values of those who identify with one 'culture' rather than another, but also lead to material

effects. Nowhere is this more true than in the discourse of international relations, and with respect to the ways in which the territorial ownership of a geographical region is constituted within the public sphere – conveyed principally by a plethora of news outlets which circulate both terrestrially and on the web. In our concluding paper, Xiaoping Wu considers the shifts which take place in the way the attitudes towards a group of disputed islands in the East China Sea – dubbed the 'Diaoyu Islands' or the 'Senkaku Islands' depending on one's point of view – are constructed when international news reports are translated into a Chinese newspaper. This case study uses 'frame analysis' to illustrate the ways in which the stance of the news texts varies between the source and translation. Through this analysis, Wu concludes that news translation has shifted away from the traditional concept of equivalence between source and target text to one in which different types of framing strategies bring about variations in stance as news reports are translated from one language into another.

Those of you alert to the turning of the seasons will detect that this issue is appearing in your pigeon holes rather earlier than usual this year. This is because in this volume, LAIC is expanding from four to six issues a year. This is a testimony to the engagement of members of the Association and the creativity of readers of this journal. As before, we will feature alternate open issues and special issues, each issue now being collated every 2 months. If any of you are still wanting to catch up on some of the papers presented at our Barcelona conference, these were published in the first issue of this volume (18.1), which came out in February. Coming up in June is a highly topical special issue on *Language, Mobility and Work* (18.3), guest edited by Melissa Moyer. And the final special issue of the year will pick up on Collins's theme of neoliberalism in higher education in a special issue dedicated to this theme guest-edited by John Gray, John O'Regan and Catherine Wallace, entitled *Education and the Intercultural Politics of Global Neoliberalism* (18.5). We are grateful to our publishers Taylor and Francis, and especially to our Managing Editor Lucy Sheach, for affording us this opportunity for.

Next, Prue Holmes will update us on events in the Association in her annual dispatch to us from the Chair. And to round off this issue, we feature three reviews, brought to you by Sarah Treloar, Chengli Zuo & Liping Weng, and Adriana Diaz. As ever, we salute our reviewers for keeping us up to date on what is current in the field.

References

Amadasi, S., & Holliday, A. R. (2017). Block and thread intercultural narratives and positioning: Conversations with newly arrived postgraduate students. *Language & Intercultural Communication*, 17 (3), 254-269.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Holliday, A. (2016). Difference and awareness in cultural travel: Negotiating blocks and threads. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16 (2), 318–331.

Lapresta-Rey, Cecilio, Huguet, Ángel, Fernández-Costales, Alberto (2017) Language attitudes, family language and generational cohort in Catalonia: new contributions from a multivariate analysis. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 17 (2), 135-149.

Madariaga José-María, Ángel Huguet, Judit Janés (2016). Language attitudes in Catalan multilingual classrooms: educational implications. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 16 (2), pp. 216-234.

Ogbu, J. (1985). Cultural-ecological influences on minority education. *Language Arts*, 62(8), 860–869.