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Pedagogic Democracy versus Pedagogic Supremacy: Migrant Academics’ Perspectives

This paper investigates the underexplored area of *othering* of migrant academics within their teaching context. Nine personal narratives of migrant academics’ teaching were analysed qualitatively for indications of pedagogical othering. Migrant academics indicated the need to align their own pedagogic values and practices with that of their host institutions they work in as they felt their own values and practices were considered less desirable. We argue, from a Gramsci’s hegemonic perspective that the pedagogic adaptation by migrant academics aimed at improving student learning is not problematic in itself, but more problematic is the inequality of opportunity for migrant academics to contribute to pedagogical decisions which can meaningfully influence the departmental culture. Lack of pedagogic democracy where the ‘home’ academic environment has a monopoly of knowledge and a hegemonic position regarding learning and teaching can compromise the student-learning experience by limiting articulation of alternative pedagogical perspectives by the migrant international academics.
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# Introduction

Internationalisation polices of higher education institutions (HEIs) have driven an increase in international migration among academics. These migrants are academics who have crossed national borders for long-term employment prospects because of various personal and professional motivations such as career advancement, research opportunities and the prospect of a better life (Mihut et al., 2017; Jepsen et al., 2014; Khattab and Fenton, 2016, Teichler, 2017). Often these migrant academics have teaching as an integral part of their academic responsibilities. Several migrant academics have reported experiencing feelings of being different and out of place in their academic teaching roles, often referred to as *othering* in sociological literature (Hosein et al. 2018; Ikpeze, 2015; Brooks, 2016; Sang et al., 2013). Whilst there is growing body of literature around the othering experienced by migrants when they move into new cultural contexts, there appears to be limited research on the othering experiences of migrant academics particularly in the context of their professional practice of teaching. When it does, the literature tends to focus on the language and communication aspects (see for example Collins, 2008; although there are exceptions such as Walker, 2015). This is perhaps because research has focused mainly on the social adaptation of the migrant academics within and outside of work with little emphasis on how migrant academics adapt to the differences in their professional practices, such as teaching (see for example Kim, 2009; Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2010; Uusimaki & Garvis, 2017). In this paper, we develop this particular thread of the discussion by elucidating the pedagogical *othering* trends in several migrant academics international teaching journeys, which we argue below, underscores the need to reinforce and maintain a pedagogically democratic culture within university departments.

## Pedagogical Othering: The Conceptual Frame

Our research uses the concept of cultural hegemony (from the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci,1971) as a starting point for exploring the concept of pedagogical othering. In brief, “[h]egemony allows the ideas and ideologies of the ruling stratum to become widely dispersed, and widely accepted, throughout society” (Hobden & Wyn Jones, 2017, p. 138). For a higher education institution (HEI) environment, the ruling stratum for pedagogical ideas and ideologies may include the likes of academic developers, directors of learning and teaching and quality assurance personnel. These are the personnel with HEIs who have the power to push for a unified pedagogical ideology to be accepted and adopted - such as through the instruments of learning and teaching strategies and quality assurance policies. However, the unified pedagogical ideology may be adopted at a meso level, such as at the department/ disciplinary level (*sensu* the academic tribes of Becher & Trowler, 2001; the signature pedagogies from Shulman, 2005) or at the macro level of the HEI (such as the problem-based learning approach adopted by Maastricht University). The key insight offered from adopting a Gramscian perspective is that it illustrates how dominant pedagogical ideas or ideologies can pervade an HEI environment and “become the ‘ruling ideas’ of the age” without being challenged or questioned. These dominant pedagogical ideas and beliefs can be viewed “as a form of power” (Heywood, 2013, p. 174) in which academic teachers’ substantive beliefs are changed through socialisation into the norms and values to more closely align with the dominant pedagogical group, that is, the ruling stratum (Ikenberry & Kupchan, 1990). It is this form of power that can lead to a monopolisation of intellectual and cultural pedagogical knowledge (Heywood, 2013, p. 174).

Thus, the ideas of dominant pedagogical group have an “overwhelming advantage over” those that challenge them; as a result of their pedagogical “cultural supremacy” (Heywood, 2013, p. 174). Therefore, the pedagogical othering may be reflective of an individual feeling that their pedagogical values are not in alignment with the widely accepted or dominant pedagogical cultural norms and beliefs within their HEI environment. The less visible forces at work, such as the HEI’s values, norms, beliefs, ideas and explanations of phenomena (the cultural and political practices) can both maintain and legitimise a *status quo* favourable to the dominant pedagogical group, such that the current academic teachers (i.e. the “native academics”), have become socialised into the dominant pedagogical ideology. Therefore, a migrant academic arriving to an HEI environment with a different ideology may be faced with pedagogical othering from these native academics and the policies and practices based in their host institutions.

This paper uses Gramsci’s theoretical frame as a way of contextualising and exploring pedagogical othering experiences of migrant academics who arrive into an HEI environment. It considers in particular, the pedagogical conflict they experience between their own pedagogical practices and the dominant pedagogical ideology of their host institution/departments, the implications this has for an inclusive approach to pedagogical development and the pedagogical enrichment within higher education institutions. However, even with this frame, it is important to acknowledge that there are likely to be HEI environments in which there are subversive native academic teachers who may not support the dominant pedagogical ideology, or HEIs where it is acceptable (and possibly encouraged) to have a number of competing or emerging ideologies.

# Methodology

To explore the nature of pedagogic othering, we conducted a documentary analysis of nine published autoethnographic accounts by migrant academics on their teaching journeys (see Hosein et al, 2018). The nine migrant academics were early to mid-career academics who had moved to their new country within the past ten years and were all connected to a UK teaching context. Seven of the academics moved to the UK, whilst two British academics moved out of the UK (see Table 1 for names of migrant academics and associated countries). The autoethnographic accounts took the form of critical reflections on the academics’ moving from one country context to another in search of different career prospects and varied in length from 4500 to 6500 words (see Table 3).

Autoethnography is a research and writing approach that ‘seeks to describe and systematically analyse (graphy) personal experience (auto) in order to understand cultural experience (ethno)’ (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011, p. 1). These accounts formed part of an edited book collection that focused on the challenges faced by and the adaptations undertaken by migrant academics to accommodate to their new teaching context. The autoethnographic accounts are therefore shaped or co-constructed with the editors’ aims (see Table 3 for editors’ instructions for the autoethnographic account), in the same way that interviewers shape the content and context in the production of talk (Heron, Kinchin, & Medland, 2018; Rapley, 2001).

Further, autoethnographic accounts unlike an interview, provides a window into the private world of the migrant academic (Méndez, 2013) as they reflect, explore and provide rich accounts on the teaching issues that were important to them over a longer period rather than being guided by pre-determined issues such as in a semi-structured interview. Therefore, there were no prescribed topics that migrant academics presented or discussed that influenced their teaching. However, there were common themes and overlaps in some of the accounts (see Table 2 for keywords of the authoethnographic accounts). These autoethnographic accounts are reconstructions of personal memories (which are sometimes supported by artefacts) that may evoke stronger or weaker emotions than were present at the time of occurrence (Chang, 2008). Even so, they provide information about the self and how the past is reconstructed and perceived by the migrant academic (Chang, 2008) within the ethical constraints of opening themselves to public scrutiny. Therefore, the autoethnographic accounts do not represent the totality of the migrant academics’ experience but rather represents an internally negotiated account that is acceptable to both their personal and (public) academic self.

*(Insert Tables 1-3 about here)*

## Analytical approach

A qualitative textual analysis approach was used to analyse the nine published autoethnographic accounts. We followed a thematic analytical approach proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). The second author read all nine autoethnographic accounts to familiarise himself with them. The other authors were already familiar with the autoethnographic accounts through their own reading as the editors of the books, and hence had read, provided feedback and edited all of the chapters over a period of two years. Next, a theoretical thematic analysis was used to identify any instances of pedagogical othering. A pedagogical othering experience was considered as one, where the migrant academic’s account suggested a feeling of discomfort, difference or lack a sense of belongingness (such as with an individual, a group of individuals or concept) in their working environment. The second author re-read all the chapters and extracted such instances of pedagogic othering. These pedagogical othering extracts were then inductively open-coded to determine semantic themes, that is, extracts with similar descriptive ideas. The extracts and open-codes were cross-checked and confirmed by the other authors to firstly, determine if there were any extracts that may have been missed based on their knowledge of the book and secondly, to reach agreement with the codes. Finally, a latent thematic analysis was used to theorise why these semantic themes were present.

# Results

From the semantic thematic analysis, pedagogical othering was centred around three main themes: pedagogical approach, pedagogical expectations of behaviour and values, and pedagogical policies and procedures.

## Pedagogical Approach

In the pedagogical approach category, we are specifically referring to the migrant academics’ established approach to teaching (i.e. student-centred or teacher-centred such as explained by Trigwell and Prosser (2004) ) and whether the migrant academic felt there was an established approach in their host institutions. We were looking for instances where migrant academics because of difference in their own pedagogical approach and that of their host institution felt pedagogically othered and consequently felt the need to adapt or socialise to their institution’s pedagogical approach. For example, Anesa Hosein (from Trinidad and Tobago) notes how she was becoming socialised into the values and norms of her host institution which made her change her substantive pedagogical beliefs to an extent that she considered her previous pedagogical approach as “backward”:

Although, initially, I may have faced feelings of pedagogical disconnect, I was able to adapt and learn from my experiences – for example, working at LHU led to me using different teaching practices, such as becoming more student- centred […] (Anesa Hosein, 2018: 122).

I also found myself criticizing the systems of UWI and UG and thinking of them as ‘backwards’ in terms of pedagogy. I was thus becoming pedagogically assimilated into the HE system in the UK (Berry 1997); I was discarding the old and accepting the new and learning to play by the rules of the system and, through this, increasing my feelings of pedagogical relatedness (Anesa Hosein, 2018: 115).

Both Henry Kum (from Cameroon) and Anesa, also demonstrate how their mentors and the academic programmes for learning and teaching such as the postgraduate certificate in academic practice (PGCAP) were indoctrinating the dominant pedagogical ideology:

I was required to shift from content- based teaching to an interactive student- centred teaching and learning […]. The PGCAP course provided tasks, simulation exercises and strategies in interactive teaching and managing seminars, tutorials and lectures in line with the curriculum delivery model that operates at Liverpool Hope University. This changed my teaching approach to a much more hands-on and participatory teaching and learning approach […] (Henry Kum, 2018: 30-31).

Most of the migrant academics of non-UK origin previously had limited exposure to student-centred teaching approaches and found themselves feeling at a disadvantage within the UK Higher Education systems, for example, as Maja Jankowska (from Poland) explains:

Switching to the student-centred, market-driven, fast-paced and very diverse environment in the UK, where education is treated as a ‘commodity’ (Brown and Jones 2007), has required from me a great extent of learning, time, effort, flexibility and adaptability to my new role as a ‘foreign’ academic (Maja Jankowska, 2018:145).

Further, this quote from Maja (and echoed by Chloe Shu-Hua Yeh from Taiwan and Anesa Hosein) demonstrates that some migrant academics from non-UK countries noted the conflation between the marketization and commodification approach to higher education within the UK context juxtaposed with the need for student-centred approach to teaching. This dominant pedagogical culture focussing on a student-centred approach, therefore, was not only existent at an institutional level but it was an ethos that pervaded the UK nationally often driven by the increasing marketization of HE (Tomlinson, 2016).

Further, we observed curiously that the two Western migrant academics (Jennifer Chung from USA and Erik Blair from the UK) were less likely to conform to the pedagogical approaches in their new environments unlike Anesa, Henry and Maja. Jennifer who moved to the UK was almost subversive in not accepting the dominant pedagogical approach at her institution, for example:

I felt that the wider, holistic teaching of our subjects was compromised by these assessments and led to a teach-to-the test approach. A by-product of this was the amount of support with assessments we were expected to give the students. This contrasted heavily with my own ethos and philosophy of HE, influenced by the liberal arts tradition, which is to instil independence, self-reliance […] I resist the pressure to give extensive guidance to the students. […] Students informed me that some of their lecturers provided all the headings and subheadings needed for each essay. Still, I did not do this (Jennifer Chung 2018:54).

In contrast, Erik Blair (who moved to Trinidad and Tobago) saw the adaptation of teaching as not something which changed his academic teaching practice, but something which helped him to contextualise his practice. He viewed this as something that helped him to enhance his teaching practice in his new context of Trinidad and Tobago but did not change him:

Getting to know, and becoming involved in, the customs, ways and manners of the people of Trinidad and Tobago meant that I became enculturated. This process did not lead to me becoming a different type of academic, nor did it lead to fundamental changes in how I conceptualized teaching and learning, but I was able to fine-tune my practice so that it became more relevant to my new teaching environment (Erik Blair, 2018:18).

Erik appeared to negotiate and adapt his teaching approach within the context of Trinidad and Tobago without expressing any feelings of self-doubt based on his pedagogical approach. Perhaps, in Trinidad and Tobago there were no pervasive dominant pedagogical ideology that made him question his choices but instead probably had an HEI environment that was more accepting of competing pedagogical ideologies.

It begs the questions, why Erik and Jennifer had different experiences to Henry and Anesa. It is possible that both Erik and Jennifer had faith in their pedagogical approaches because they both came from systems where they were immersed in dominant pedagogical ideologies that endorsed the notion of the Western supremacy of their education (Altbach, 1989). In contrast, Henry, Maja and Anesa expressed self-doubt in their pedagogical capabilities and questioned the appropriateness of their pedagogical belief and values rather than that of their host institutions. For example, Henry notes:

Even the mobile expert becomes a novice, a learner caught betwixt and between two cultures, where previously acquired knowledge becomes almost irrelevant and which places the new arrival in a position of self-doubt that poses as a main challenge in the new environment... my previous professional identity became redundant. I doubted if I knew the subject matter; I doubted if I could teach what I knew to the students and I doubted my position in the new system (Henry Kum, 2018:32).

## Pedagogical Expectations of Behaviour and Values

Interactions with students in a migrant academic’s host institution, is another theme that was predominant in our data which demonstrates the notion of pedagogical othering and hegemony. This theme is based on how migrant academics experienced a disconnect between their pedagogical expectations of the behaviours and values in their interactions with their students within their home and host countries/institutions. For example, Chloe Shu-Hua Yeh (from Taiwan) expressed this in the comparison she makes between the respect she received and gave to her teachers in her Taiwanese culture to that in the British HE institutions, for example:

[…] whether I was respected ‘enough’ by my students. For example, sometimes I received emails from students without any subject, without appropriate title and without any customary acknowledgements such as ‘thank you’. I felt surprised and puzzled when I received such emails, since in my culture, not addressing a teacher by title or name or indicating ‘thank you’ at the end of an email requesting for help from students to a lecturer is considered impolite and inappropriate (Chloe Shu-Hua Yeh, 2018:77).

Chloe’s account demonstrates that the pedagogical othering experiences can also be created or exacerbated by students’ behaviour, expectations and demands rather than by the dominant pedagogical approach. In this case, Chloe felt pedagogically other as she was in an HEI environment which used the common UK pedagogical device of informal communication to reduce the power distance between student and teacher (Hofstede, 1986, 2011). Similarly, Erik (Blair) also experienced pedagogical othering because of the increased power distance between students and teachers in his context of Trinidad and Tobago:

I was not used to being addressed in this way and found it somewhat uncomfortable, but when I asked students to call me ‘Erik’, the best I could get was ‘Dr Erik’. I had felt that using first names would create an interactive atmosphere but, on reflection, I realized that I was actually making my students feel uncomfortable and creating a barrier to communication (Erik Blair 2018: 18).

However, a reduction in power distance did not translate into meaningful relationships between the teachers and students. For example, Thushari Welikala noted that in her Sri Lankan context (and echoed by Chloe in her Taiwanese context):

Similarly, students in Sri Lankan culture remain lifelong students of their teachers. In that sense, the discourse of ‘studentship’ ‘learning’ and ‘teaching’ are culturally embedded in our lifeworlds, whereas (as I perceive) the businesslike, distant relationship between teachers and students I encounter in the UK seemed simple and straightforward (Thushari Welikala 2018: 64).

Thus, it appeared the pervading dominant pedagogical ideology that determines the nature of student-tutor relationship is often embedded into the societal cultures (Hofstede, 2011) and influenced the pedagogical discomfort and disconnect experienced by the migrant academics.

## Pedagogical Policies and Procedures

Migrant academics felt pedagogically othered by having to grapple with an established culture of the pedagogical policies and procedure within their HEI environment that was in opposition to their pedagogical values and beliefs. For example, Judith Enriquez-Gibson (from the Philippines) notes:

Coming from a poverty-stricken country in the East, the value of education is more than a right but a gift. … It is not the same here in the UK. It does not seem to be anyway. What matters is more about the numbers or data that could be tracked and recorded in management and information systems. The measure that has to be satisfied relates to meeting retention and degree classification targets. It matters less what knowledge and understanding numbers or marks represent (Judith Enriquez-Gibson 2018:131-132).

In this example, the level of metrics and monitoring required in the UK HEI environments were interfering on how migrant academics valued their students, something which Anesa Hosein also notes in her teaching journey when she moved from the Caribbean to the UK echoing the stifling of her academic autonomy as experienced by Judith Enriquez-Gibson above :

The system of creating and redeveloping modules constrained my sense of pedagogical autonomy as it was confined to the validation processes […] These scrutiny procedures impinged, I felt, on valuing my professional judgement and academic authority (Anesa Hosein 2018:115).

Further, the pedagogical idea of metrics and monitoring were juxtaposed with policies and procedures that promoted research metrics but were detrimental to pedagogical cultures. For example, Tanya Hathaway who moved from a teaching intensive institution in the UK to a research-intensive institution in Australia, was affected by the discourse around the need to concentrate on research outputs at the cost of teaching quality:

I became a subject of competing discourses about teaching and research, experiencing the intersections and tensions it caused among colleagues and the impact on teaching practices (Harman 1989) [...] Yet, here, as an international academic, I was expected to strictly adhere to the normative logics and practices of the department (Saltmarsh and Swirski 2010) […] I had encountered the view that students’ learning was detached from the discovery learning and research practised by scholars, despite inhabiting the same conceptual space (Boyer 1990). As before, instead of adopting the norms of practice, I digressed and continued putting as much effort into teaching as I always had […] (Tanya Hathway 2018:95-98).

Of course, the idea about metrics, monitoring and tension between research and teaching were not issues that affected migrant academics solely. Native academics mainly from Western countries, have also lamented about how their pedagogical values and beliefs are compromised by the fixation on metrics, monitoring of students and the overemphasis on research as opposed to teaching (Hosein, 2017; Katz, 2015; Tomlinson, 2013). Therefore, both the migrant and native academics in this particular instance were expected to accede to the dominant pedagogical ideology of complying with monitoring and metric demands whilst demoting the importance of teaching.

# Pedagogical Democracy and Pedagogical Supremacy: A Discussion

In this section, we take a latent thematic analysis approach to theorise the underlying ideologies and conceptualisations that explains the semantic thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The semantic thematic analysis revealed that the extent of pedagogic *othering* was dependent on the migrant academic’s previous teaching approach (teacher/student centred) and geopolitical associations. Some of the migrant academics experienced pedagogical supremacy wherein the ‘native’ HEI environment (the institution/department) had a pervading pedagogical approach that to some extent dictated how learning and teaching should occur. Academics moving from non-Western countries (often developing countries with colonial pasts) to the English Western world experienced a more pronounced pedagogic *othering* in that they expressed that their pedagogical values were perceived by themselves as being less desirable as they did not conform to the expectations of their host HEIs.

Therefore, translating Gramsci’s perspective into a pedagogical context, the ideas of the dominant pedagogical group have influenced the regulative and instructional discourse (Bernstein, 2000; Kinchin et al., 2016) of the HEI pedagogical cultural network at the institutional or departmental level. This notion is evident in Henry’s, Jennifer’s and Anesa’s reflections, which go beyond mere statements of difference and incompatibility of pedagogical approaches but rather feeling the that the power at play requires them to comply in order to exist in an environment that is not accepting and resists the contradictory approaches to pedagogical practice. Hence, the pedagogical cultural network can be viewed as ‘closed,’ if it equates to sustaining cultural pedagogical supremacy over the way on how teaching should occur. On the contrary, a pedagogical cultural network that is ‘open,’ would be one which is premised on the ideal of inclusive democratic deliberation, whereby institutional mechanisms facilitate the bottom-up creation of pedagogical values, rather than the top-down imposition of these from dominant pedagogical groups.

Pedagogical democracy would equate to an *ideal* that places normative emphasis on affording academics equal and inclusive opportunities to guide the evolution of their pedagogical cultural networks. Hence a pedagogical cultural network would be “'democratically affirmed” (Sclove, 1995, p. 87), when the background conditions for egalitarian empowered participation is present for all members of a pedagogical cultural network; thus, facilitating cultural pedagogical pluralism. Hosein and Rao (2018) provide a range of practical options to enable this pluralism including mentoring and open forums. Providing the conditions for inclusive deliberation of pedagogical practices would be a key way of upholding broader democratic ideals, namely offering members of a community the opportunity to shape their community, which in turn respects the moral autonomy and dignity of all individuals (Sclove, 1995). This approach helps overcome cultural hegemony, as “even if consensus remains elusive, only when all parties feel respected by a process are they in turn warranted in honouring it and its outcomes-even particular outcomes they disfavour” (Sclove, 1995, p. 160). Fair and inclusive pedagogical deliberation thus equates to a movement of understanding academics’ pedagogical philosophies, which may not mean merely accepting or rejecting them, but exposing them to fair, critical and constructive scrutiny within the pedagogical cultural network; such a climate of critical scrutiny being “democratically essential” to the network (Sclove, 1995, p 178).

Whether the conclusion of Marxian insights in this area, namely that cultural hegemony results in a ‘false consciousness,’ whereby individuals do not know what they *really* want, only what society conditions them into thinking they want, is debatable in the migrant academic context. Migrant academics would arguably be well aware of the *difference* between their own pedagogical philosophies and approaches to those of the host pedagogical network, due to their encounter with a myriad of acculturation experiences including cultural shock (Kolapo, 2009; Mason and Rawlings-Sanaei, 2014; Hutchison, 2016; Yudkevich *et al.*, 2017; Hosein *et al.*, 2018), as well as their negotiation of third spaces (Hsieh, 2012; Hutchison, 2016; Ikpeze, 2015). In this sense, migrant academics may well be acutely aware of their pedagogical approaches being othered and whilst they may struggle with the differences, may feel because of the power of cultural hegemony, as we see in the case of Anesa and Henry, the need to substantially change their pedagogical beliefs in order to assimilate as closely to their HEI environment’s pedagogical values (Ikenberry & Kupchan, 1990). Yet, when considering how to change an education ethos, a parallel can be drawn with Mason’s (2008) insights regarding complexity theory and education. The argument here is that as educational networks are extremely complex, to change their current direction, which could be sustained by a closed network, requires interventions at all levels of the system (Mason, 2008). For instance, applying Gramsci’s (1971) ideas, then the migrant academics pedagogical ideas need to engage in a battle (exemplified by Jennifer’s approach) with those of the pedagogical dominant class in order to mitigate the latter’s cultural hegemony, which is distributed via the mass media, higher education agencies, government policies and higher education personnel. Hence facilitating the intervention and critical examination of ideas within a network, both those of the dominant pedagogical group and the migrant academics, could be achieved by the promotion and operation of an ‘open’ democratically affirmed pedagogical cultural network. However, whether such a system could ever be truly ‘open’ will depend on the power dynamics and the vested interests of groups, but an approach that recognises that there are unconscious biasness to particular pedagogical ideologies can help work towards alleviating the power play of cultural hegemony.

## Achieving pedagogical democracy

Pedagogical democracy could be achieved by enabling a plurality of pedagogical ideas to be discussed and given a fair hearing in both the informal and decision-making agora’s of universities (e.g. faculty learning and teaching related meetings), and also the higher education system more broadly (e.g. at Advance HE (UK) workshops/ conferences). In this case, the question is not about successfully integrating “subordinate classes” into the “value system” (Heywood, 2013, p. 175), being Gramsci’s purpose, but rather integrating the pedagogical philosophies of migrant academics into the pedagogical cultural networks of their institutions. Therefore this ‘open’ pedagogical cultural network could be posited as subscribing to pedagogical democracy. Thushari’s remark on her teaching philosophy aptly sums-up our notion of pedagogical democracy, which we thus transpose from the classroom to the departmental setting:

I am also conscious not to impose my cultural ways of knowing on my students. Rather, I create spaces in which all participants can engage in learning from each other (Thushari Welikala 2018:69-70).

# Conclusion

This paper examined the pedagogical othering of migrant academics using their published autoethnographic accounts. Some of the migrant academics indicated that they felt they had to change pedagogical ideologies to fit with the dominant pedagogical ideology of their HEI environment and through this process made them feel that their previous pedagogical ideologies were inferior. We, therefore, theorise that the migrant academics were experiencing an HEI environment of pedagogical supremacy. In these pedagogical supremacy environments, the international transferable pedagogical knowledge of the migrant academics are lost. However, HEI environments should be striving towards an environment of pedagogical democracy where appropriate aspects of these transferable pedagogical knowledge could be incorporating to create and evolve new pedagogical knowledge.

Our research predominantly had an exchange of migrant academics between non-Western and Western countries and those from post-colonial countries which have may have pushed to the fore the idea of pedagogical supremacy. Future lines of research examining whether the idea of pedagogical supremacy exists between pedagogical cultures that are equivalent, such as between Western countries or between Eastern countries or between post-colonial countries could be pursued.
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author | Origin | International Experience | Context |
| Erik Blair | UK | Trinidad & Tobago | English Western to English Non-Western |
| Jennifer Chung | USA | UK | English Western to English Western |
| Judith Enriquez-Gibson | Philippines | UK | Non-English, Non-Western to English Western |
| Tanya Hathaway | UK | Australia | English Western to English Western |
| Anesa Hosein | Trinidad & Tobago | Guyana, UK | English Non-Western to English Western |
| Maja Jankowska | Poland | UK | Non-English Western to English Western |
| Henry Kum | Cameroon | UK | Non-English, Non-Western to English Western |
| Thushari Welikala | Sri Lanka | UK | Non-English, Non-Western to English Western |
| Chloe Shu-Hua Yeh | Taiwan | UK | Non-English, Non-Western to English Western |

Table 2: Keywords to describe the authoethnographic account

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Author | Themes/ Keywords | Number of words (excluding references) |
| Erik Blair | Context, reflection, involvement, rehearsal, consideration, deliberation, culture, assumptions, scholarship of teaching and learning | 4579 |
| Jennifer Chung | Liberal arts, higher education, tertiary education, university, post-1992 | 5398 |
| Judith Enriquez-Gibson | Academic mobility, non-EU/UK migrant academic, decoloniality, otherness, whiteness, ‘other thinking’ | 6231 |
| Tanya Hathaway | Narrative, academic identity, transition, scholarship, critical pedagogy | 6080 |
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| Henry Kum | Identities, threat theory, liminality, transitions, migration | 6554 |
| Thushari Welikala | Migrant academics, cultural-professional interfaces, identification, heterocultural fluency, global universities, gender | 4490 |
| Chloe Shu-Hua Yeh | Collectivism, individualism, Confucianism, teacher-student dynamic, professional identity, social adjustment | 6081 |

Table 3: Editors’ instructions provided to the authors for their auto-ethnographic account

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Chapters have to be written as a personal narrative which charts your personal learning and teaching journeys as you transcend national boundaries as a migrant academic. In writing the narrative please ensure you capture:  * The disconnects/ disruptions/challenges to your thinking about teaching when comparing the educational/cultural systems you have been a part of previously and the one you are currently in. * The strategies and strengths you have developed to adapt and adjust to these challenges. * The impact that these adjustments and adaptations have had on your teaching and your academic identity and mobility.  1. Make sure that via your personal narrative you offer an implicit comparison between the various educational systems you have been exposed to. 2. The personal narrative should be supported/informed by literature in the field. 3. The conclusion makes recommendation for learning and teaching and for practice, including something which might be of value for other migrant academics. |