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Abstract

This study explores Canada’s first private-public matriculation pathways partnership into higher education at the juncture of its ten-year anniversary. In 2006, Simon Fraser University (SFU), a mid-sized, public Canadian research university entered into partnership with Navitas, a private, for-profit, multinational education services provider. The partnership authorized the establishment of Fraser International College (FIC), on SFU’s main campus in Burnaby, British Columbia. Although the partnership was controversial, university administration justified the collaboration as providing enhanced recruitment of international students, financial gains through profit sharing and differential international student tuition fees, and enhanced academic and social supports for students. Unlike previous outsourcing to the private sector in Canadian higher education, the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership allowed for in-roads into core academic functions of the university. Since its inception, FIC/Navitas has extended its purview by claiming delivery of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) language instruction once located in SFU’s Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Theoretically, literature on globalization and internationalization of higher education as informed by neo-liberal ideology are employed and intersect with literature on the role of EAP. As university websites have come to have significant discursive influence and international reach, methodologically, this research combines qualitative case study with multimodal critical discourse analysis of SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership web pages. My primary findings reveal that the public and private partners share promotional discourses of marketization to their external market. However, there are some differences. The public partner, SFU, also relies on more traditional academic and social discourses of community, access, and inclusion when addressing local audiences while the private partner, FIC/Navitas, relies on the social and academic capital generated by the public
partner, SFU, for legitimacy and growth. I also found discourses present on SFU and FIC/Navitas websites point to contradictions with potential to impact both students and staff. Further findings indicate that the ongoing marginalization of EAP programs within the university provided an opening for FIC to grow its presence and profitability.
Lay Summary

This research was inspired by the questions and concerns expressed by some English language students in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program I teach in. The students were navigating their way through Canada’s first public-private matriculation partnership, between SFU, a public Canadian university, and Navitas, a private, for-profit multinational. My research came to delineate how the way we talk about policy and people -- in this case, internationalization in education and international students – has consequences for those involved. My findings show that while both partners promote their partnership in terms of economic and individual success, the public also draws on traditional academic and social discourses to promote themselves and the partnership to the local community. Finally, it connects Canadian internationalization of education policy to partnership marketization practice and potential experiences on the ground, particularly for those located in English for Academic Purposes Programs.
Preface

This dissertation is original, unpublished, independent work by the author, Beth Maschmann.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

‘Jane’, was a joy in the classroom. Extroverted and full of laughter, she brought energy to the group. She would often stay and chat after class. One day, she asked me if I knew of any opportunities for working, perhaps at the university or elsewhere, even if it was ‘under the table’. Her parents had worked to save for a certain amount of time of study abroad, and their calculation hadn’t included the terms of additional English study she was now facing. This eighteen-year-old, away from home for the first time and clearly very close to her parents, was spending her days at school, and her evenings alone in her homestay room studying for the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) test. The IELTS test is a high stakes English proficiency test used by many institutions and countries to screen applicants for migration, study, or work. As IELTS scores are an accepted entryway into Fraser International College (FIC), Simon Fraser University’s private matriculation pathways partner. Jane, like many others, was hoping to decrease her time in English language classes by achieving the required test score.

In fact, Jane hadn’t told her parents that she had to spend an extended time in English classes. She didn’t want to worry them and was sure she could find a way to work to support herself and make up the difference. By the end of her first term, Jane was increasingly fraught. While she was completing assignments, her former curiosity had been replaced with a preoccupation with tests and marks. The joy of new friendships and the excitement of first time travel could not compete with the stress of assuring her parents that everything was great while realizing that she probably wouldn’t be able to find work or even manage to work and study successfully.
The last day of term, I sat in a classroom with Jane. She was crying and explaining that she couldn’t afford to continue. She was going to ‘drop-out’ and intensively study for the IELTS in the hope that she could get into the partnering school before it became too much of a financial burden. She still hadn’t told her parents.

There were many emotions swirling around that conversation. Jane felt worried, anxious, and ashamed. She had internalized her experience as failure on her part and felt she had let her parents down. I listened, and in trying to console and problem solve with her, felt anger and frustration at a system that had led both of us to this moment. I worried about what would happen to her. As I sat with her, I thought of how I would feel if this were my daughter, studying abroad.

‘John’ came a year later. While I wasn’t as close to him as I had been to Jane, he reminded me of her. A ‘class clown’ with a quick smile, he infected the class with his energy and good humour. Like Jane, he was also on the FIC pathway and had been referred for further English language support. Initially believing it meant one to two terms of study, he set to work, ambitious and engaged in the classroom. At the end of term, he wrote his pathways placement test. When he walked into one of my classes the following term, I was sorry to see he hadn’t yet met the required English language proficiency. By this point, FIC pathways students were sharing their experiences, and some had openly discussed their frustrations in class. John was among the frustrated. As he sat across from me that term, I reflected on my own complicity and how to better support these students.
This research was inspired by my experience as an English as an Additional Language (EAL) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) instructor in Canadian public post-secondary through the recent advent and ongoing growth of ‘internationalization’ in education. Much of the critical research on internationalization in post-secondary institutions has shown that an emphasis on economy, the markets and marketization has come to dominate current practices. However, there has been limited research on how this approach is normalized at an institutional level, or the role of EAL/EAP in relation to ‘internationalization’ initiatives at the public post-secondary level. One example is the turn to profit driven internationalization intersecting with EAP programs and the move by some North American public universities to enter into partnership with private education providers. Technically, English for Academic Purposes (EAP), as a sub-category of English as an Additional Language (EAL) is used for English language programs offered in support of matriculating students or assisting students at the post-secondary level. However, some of the students initiating their journey through the FIC/Navitas pathway into SFU are at a level of basic English language proficiency, and would, terminology-wise, be categorized as pre-EAP and is indicative of some of the challenges occurring in teaching EAL/EAP in the context of neoliberalism.

In an effort to address gaps in the research, this study looks specifically to the initiation and evolution of a public-private matriculation partnership between Simon Fraser University (SFU), a mid-sized Canadian public research university, and Navitas, a private, for-profit, multinational education services provider. Although this partnership was the first of its kind in Canada, as in similar matriculation partnerships abroad, the private partner, Navitas, expanded from providing first-year credit courses at SFU to taking over segments of EAP programming from the host institution. This work will draw on case study and critical multimodal discourse
analysis to consider the SFU-Navitas partnership. And, as an under-investigated, yet central component of ‘internationalization’ in public Canadian universities, it will consider the role of EAP in relation to privatized and/or for-profit internationalization initiatives.

1.1 Personal Positioning

I began teaching EAP in Continuing Studies at SFU in 2001. At that time, recently returned from teaching and travelling abroad, I was thrilled to find teaching work in an established program within a public higher education institution. SFU had continued to promote their foundational image as progressive and accessible, both qualities which attracted me and were visible in programs run out of Continuing Studies (now life-long learning), from community outreach projects to gems such as the free “Philosopher’s Café” series. At the time of my hiring, the language program I was hired to teach in was unique in its articulation of a dialogic and critical approach to EAP instruction. I have since come to appreciate that these articulations are a continual work in progress, and increasingly challenging to apply in academic pathways. But even the notion of exploring teaching English in this new way was heady. It is through my time in this program that I first began to grapple with the complexities of power and reproduction of particular norms inherent in teaching English ‘language and culture’. It was here, too, located for the first time within a larger institution, that I became acutely aware of a hierarchy that marginalized EAL teachers and students. To address issues of disparity and contingency, the teachers in the program voted to unionize.

The joining of this union, and my continuing work as a shop steward within it, inspired me to start questioning more closely, first the nature, role, and extent of our program as cost-recovery in a public institution, and then, how our teachers and students were (and are) positioned within
this hierarchy of prestige and recognition in the university, and whether there was a relationship between the two. This further led to joining a peer professional development (PD) group.

Our PD group came to focus more deeply on aspects of critical pedagogy in EAL. I grew an awareness of issues of power and the many ways it operates and has operated in this field, particularly, around issues of identity and colonialism and more recently, around neo-liberalism and class. It was through the work of this group that I began to reflect on and adjust my practice. My classroom practice evolved as connections to notions of linguistic rights and diversity were made. Normalized practices of ‘English only!’ in my classroom were discarded, replaced with an effort to develop a multimodal and multilingual approach and utilize the diversity of languages in the classroom for peer teaching and new insights. Where possible, curriculum became student driven, and I applied new understandings of dialogic and critical pedagogy, which acknowledged how fraught English language teaching and classrooms could be.

These new classroom practices became essential as English language teaching, while still marginalized academically, became highly valued by the market. Tightly coupled to internationalization strategies and market rhetoric, top-down articulation processes and transferable pathways have become heavily regulated. Under current articulations of internationalization in Canadian public post-secondary, acceptance into a Canadian university equals both future personal success and potential citizenship. The high-stakes pressure to move out of the EAP classroom and into credit-bearing courses makes the current EAP classroom, already “a place of struggle” (Kubota, 1998), even more contentious. Drawing on critical pedagogy and student experience to inform my classroom practice opened-up places to disseminate some of the forces which bear so personally on our experiences in the classroom.
This research was inspired by a consciousness that complicity can be challenged and grounded in the understanding that we both, teachers and students, can work together to create our own spaces and places for advocacy. But I first had to access a more thorough understanding of how the current context came to be, a reflection of how I promote, negotiate, or manage it, and thoughtful reflection on ethical ways forward.

1.2 Context

SFU is a mid-sized, Canadian public research university located in Burnaby, British Columbia, with satellite campuses in Surrey and Vancouver. In 2006, SFU partnered with Navitas (then, IBT ltd.). Navitas markets to and recruits international students for their partnering institutions. Navitas claims to facilitate the international student experience through provision of a matriculation pathway into the partnering institution. At SFU, for example, Navitas operates Fraser International College (FIC) out of a pre-existing building on SFU’s Burnaby Campus. Initially, FIC matriculated students into second-year credit courses at SFU and offered no EAP courses. Students conditionally accepted to SFU but in need of EAP support continued to attend one of SFU’s in-house ESL programs, Preparation for Academic Studies (PAS), English for Academic Success (EAS), and English Bridge Program (EBP), run out of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS). Eventually, EBP, and later PAS and EAS either closed or functionally transitioned into the pathway through the program I teach in (ELC), or ‘Cornerstone’ at the private partner, FIC.

Currently, EAL students who have been conditionally accepted to FIC, but don’t meet their Cornerstone English language requirement, are directed to its partner EAP program which is the SFU English Language and Culture program (ELC). The ELC is currently SFU’s only
remaining in-house ESL program. While ELC students are not all FIC students, FIC-SFU pathway students have come to represent a significant proportion.

It is at this juncture, an EAP teacher in a program positioned as part of a public-private matriculation pathway, that I began to struggle with personal questions of integrity. My experience with this partnership has included students unclear about where they sit in the FIC pathway, confusion about progression, and worry about money and time. While some students make progress or manage to pay the additional fees required to meet English proficiency standards, I have had others in tears, angry, or asking about ways to earn money. I have heard students refer to FIC as “Forever in College” and SFU as “Stay Forever University”. I often feel equally confused, have few answers for students, and am directed to send students to administration when questions arise. I began to question what ‘internationalization’ meant to SFU through this particular partnership and the profits both SFU and FIC were realizing. As an English language teacher, I was troubled that decisions about EAL/EAP seemed to be increasingly driven by revenue generation aims for FIC and SFU. As SFU and FIC/Navitas celebrated a decade of partnership in 2016, I also wondered how this relationship, so controversial ten years earlier, was, apparently, being normalized, accepted, and publicly celebrated.

1.3 ACDE Accord on Internationalization

In 2014, the Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE) released an accord on the internationalization of education (ACDE, 2014). The accord, authored by Dr. Kris Magnusson, Dean of the Faculty of Education at SFU, identifies a number of potential benefits and risks of internationalization as it rolls out in post-secondary institutions. Reflective of the
critical research done in this area, the benefits of internationalization articulated in this accord include, but are not limited to, enriching educational experiences for all students, increased intercultural understanding and a realization of interdependence, partnerships based on reciprocity and social accountability, and the potential for system change. However, the accord also warns that internationalization motivated by profit may increase the risk of exploitative practices, systemic exclusion, personal and social disruption, and neo-colonization.

I found myself teaching on the front lines of a complex partnership rooted in government, business, and institutional discourses and an ideological shaping of post-secondary internationalization. The stories which introduced this research are a starting point, and the emotion attached to them may be reflective of the potential risks indicated by the ACDE. Certainly, Canadian institutions continue to increase international student tuition to address funding shortfalls, which may indicate a focus on recruiting wealthier students. At the same time, the blanket stereotype of the ‘rich international student’ needs to be questioned. Recently, the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) chairperson, Bilan Arte, reported that of the 80 schools the CFS runs campus food banks in, international students “are more likely than others to require help to have enough to eat” (MacLeod, 2016).

Again, I was left wondering how to support those students who were struggling to succeed in this new system, and what my position was in it. Further, how was the field I teach in being positioned or exploited in terms of access to university, particularly in a for-profit partnership? While I found that much critical research has been done on internationalization in post-secondary, I found very little on the unique role EAL programs play in relation to it, or on the framing and lived experiences of EAL students and teachers in the internationalizing
university. To understand, negotiate, and advocate for ethical practices in my field of work, it became important to clarify the current BC post-secondary context and the role of EAL.

1.4 Internationalization in the Post-Secondary B.C. Context

In Canada, education is a provincial responsibility with some support from the federal government through research funding and transfer payments. However, there has been a significant reduction in federal government funding, beginning in the 1990s with a change in the federal funding model and a shift to a neoliberal framing of education. At that time, the federal government instituted the Canadian Social Transfer (CST), an unconditional block payment to provinces intended for distribution amongst early childcare education, social services, and post-secondary education. In 1994, the BC government provided 74% of all funding to BC universities; by 2008, it was 58% (Fisher in Todd, 2017). In BC, the province experienced the largest decline in provincial funding to post-secondary education after the 2001 election of Gordon Campbell’s BC Liberal Party. In BC, as across Canada, institutional response has been to increasingly welcoming corporate partners and become increasingly dependent on international students as a revenue stream (CCPA, 2017).

The Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) home page boasts a 92% increase in international students from 2008 to 2015 (CBIE, 2017). In BC, public post-secondary institutions (as opposed to private post-secondary or K-12) experienced the largest growth in international students. Between 2008 and 2014, the number of international students attending public post-secondary increased by 85% (BCCAT, 2015, p. 15) with research universities and colleges growing at the highest rate with an increase of 90% in the same time period (BCCAT,
2015, p.16). The revenue international students generated for the province increased by 90% over the same period, from $712.9 million to $1,355 million (Kunin, 2017).

A dependence on international student tuition is referred to in the 2017/18 SFU Institutional Accountability Plan and Report (SFU IAPR). The report points to decreased government funding and a fixed number of funded domestic seats as resulting in a levelling off of domestic student enrollments and ongoing financial pressure. SFU notes that it has managed challenges through strategic cuts and increasing numbers of international students. For example, while the total undergraduate domestic student Full-Time Enrollment (FTE) had increased by 36.5% between 2001/02 to 2014/15, the number of undergraduate international students had risen by 426.0% in the same time period (SFU IAPR, 2015/16-2017/18, p. 4). Given the turn to dependence on international student tuition fees, the competition to attract international students is strong. International students are actively recruited by provincial post-secondary institutions through international fairs, websites, conferences, educational agents, and recently, through the kind of private-public partnerships SFU has established with Navitas. The typical Navitas model indicates that SFU also receives a percentage of student tuition from each FIC student, regardless of whether the students successfully matriculate into SFU or not.

The discourse of current public post-secondary institutions in BC both promotes and reflects this shift in perception from education as a public or social good, to a personal, economic one. In line with contemporary dominant neoliberal discourses, tuition increases and a turn to privatization in higher education is justified as a private and profitable investment. Neoliberal

1 Roslyn Kunin and Associates (RKA) was commissioned by the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (now Global Affairs) to assess the potential for economic gain rooted in international student numbers. RKA has continued to assess and report on the financial impact of international education in Canada
discourse is not only used to justify reduced public funding and increasing international student tuitions at provincial post-secondary institutions but is the dominant rationale in Canadian federal and provincial first-time internationalization strategies. The Federal internationalization strategy celebrates international students as contributing to the economy, and through immigration pathways, the labour market. It also notes that achieving the goal of a doubling of international students from 2012 to 2022 will require partnerships with the private sector (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2012). In BC, the BC International Education Strategy (BCIES, 2012) echoes the economic and human resource benefits touted in the federal strategy, emphasizing the financial boon to institutions, communities, and the province while identifying how these students can be drawn on to fill projected gaps in the labour market (BCIES, 2012). Federal and provincial financial projections have been realized; a focus on internationalization for economy in Canadian education has developed into a 11.4 billion dollar industry (Kunin, 2016). While BC colleges and universities have attracted international students for decades, these universities previously favoured graduate students. Today, it is largely undergraduate international students who are being sought. The Association of Colleges and Universities Canada (AUCC) report on internationalization reveals that 45% of universities cite undergraduate recruitment as their top priority, with 70% citing it in their top 5 goals (AUCC, 2014, p. 17). In BC, in 2014, undergraduate students constituted 74 per cent of international students (BCCAT, 2015, p. 18). The second highest rated priority of universities, as identified in the AUCC survey, is the pursuit of strategic partnerships (AUCC, 2014, p. 5).

The growth and dependence on international education as a major contributor to institutional, provincial, and federal coffers, particularly when targeting younger, undergraduate
students, suggests the ethical concerns of inclusion and exclusion, exploitation, and neo-colonial practices raised by the ACDE accord may be worth investigating through a real-world example, and regulatory oversight in international student recruitment may be partially to blame for this.

The next section will provide a short overview of the role of English language programs in public post-secondary to provide context for the case study.

1.4.1 Internationalization and English for Academic Purposes

EAL/EAP is one piece of the internationalizing university. Half of international students in BC are attending private ESL programs or colleges (Neatby & Yogesh, 2017). How English language support is approached and implemented has the potential to influence the experience of internationalization as one that encourages potential benefits rather than the risks identified previously. While not all international students are EAL/EAP students, the top ten source countries in BC (in 2015 and comprising more than three quarters of all international students) indicate that a large number may require English language support. In eight of the ten top source countries, English is not the primary, national nor official language. The remaining two countries which count English as a primary language or language of communication, include the United States, which, between 2010 and 2015, saw a 4% increase in students coming to BC, and India, which saw an increase of 277% in the same time-period (Kunin, 2017).

Western universities with English as a medium of instruction are privileged in influential university rankings. For example, the top 25 post-secondary institutions in the Times Higher Education Rankings for 2016-2017 are located in the United States or the UK, with the exception of one each in Canada, Switzerland and Singapore (Times Higher Education, 2016-2017). The noted language of communication and instruction at all top 25 institutions is English (EHT
Zurich encourages German for its undergraduate courses. Kachru (2003) has labelled countries such as the USA, UK, and Canada, where the native language is English, ‘inner circle countries’. The capitalization of status associated with attending inner circle Western institutions with English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) has warranted renewed critical attention to how English engages with and informs issues of inclusion, access, and exploitation (Altbach, 2007; Chowdhury & Phan, 2014; Kubota, 2009).

Prior to undertaking this research, I turned to a number of critical scholars who have worked to realize this sentiment through pedagogical applications and institutional advocacy (Benesch, 2001, 2013, 2017; Chun, 2009; Eaton, 2013; Kubota, 2009, 2016, 2017; Morgan, 2002; Winkle, 2014). However, if the role of EAL/EAP teachers and programs is simply revenue generation they risk being further marginalized and contingent in the neoliberal university, There is a significant risk of less teacher and program autonomy and more insecurity.

Against the detailing of the establishment of the SFU-Navitas partnership, this research will endeavour to tease out the narrative these institutions wish to communicate about themselves and their partnership through institutional and partner webpages. Neoliberal discourses have been identified in the marketization of language education and language teacher education as part of internationalization in higher education (Chowdhury & Phan, 2014; Chun, 2009; Kubota, 2011), but not in the context of the growing number of private-public matriculation pathways partnership. The role of English in the selling of internationalization and in privatized pathways into higher education will be explored in more detail in later chapters. The next section will provide a brief rationale for the inclusion of websites as units of analysis in understanding institutional and partnership visions of internationalization.
1.5 Internationalization, Marketization, and the Role of Institutional Websites

As noted, there is a push by different levels of government in Canada to grow international education as a market. All public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia are under pressure to compete. Institutions face the challenge of making themselves unique in a field where isomorphic, or shared, attributes (for example, sports teams, architecture, landscape) denote quality to potential students. Websites have become an essential site of marketing to international students. Websites employ language, visuals, multimedia texts, and interactive features to draw users in. The first point of entry is the university home page, and it is here we are first and most fully introduced to how the institution wishes to distinguish itself from others.

This work treats partner webpages as sites of “discourse” -- an integration of text, images, visuals, and multimedia which produce and reproduce ideas and identities in particular ways -- which are ideological, reflective of power relationships and have implications for social practice (Fairclough, 1992, 1995, 2014; Gee, 2004; Kress & van Leeuwen, 1996). Van Dijk (2008) writes that “symbolic elites” control the discourse which shapes, for example, unquestioned understandings of race or class. Universities, or the politicians, bureaucrats, scholars, and writers who contribute and/or acquiesce to the finished product of the website are part of this symbolic elite and shape public discourse. In a time of internationalization, where local, public educational institutions are increasingly turning to multinational, private, for-profit interests for support and partnership opportunities, the question of who, as van Dijk writes, “has access to the fundamental power resource of public discourse” (2008, p.31) or who controls production, becomes fundamental. As van Dijk continues, “Once you control part of the production of public discourse you also control part of its contents, and hence indirectly the public mind.” (2008, p.31)
As discourse is situated and should be analyzed in relation to the context it is located in, this work will draw on case study to describe the influence of global and national neoliberal positioning of education as a growing market and the provincial and institutional take-up. A case study of how the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership began and operates at the juncture of its ten-year anniversary is included to provide context and support website analysis. This research is not meant to assess, nor is capable of assessing the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership in terms of quantifiable success or failure. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) aids the researcher in establishing the relationship between discourse, power, and society. In this instance, case study deepens observation into how discourse is operationalized.

1.6 Research Questions

1. What multimodal discourses are evident on FIC/Navitas and SFU websites to explain and promote their public-private partnership?

2. How do the discourses on the FIC/Navitas and SFU sites differ and how are they similar?

3. What tensions, contradictions, and absences are evident in the ways that the partnership is articulated on the respective FIC/Navitas and SFU sites?

1.7 Significance of the Research

This research responds to Jones’ (2011) observation that there is little research on internationalization in Canadian universities, and no case studies. In the years since, a quantity and diversity of research has indeed been undertaken on internationalization in Canadian higher education. However, while there has been some case study, particularly at the graduate level, there is very little work on the development and role of private pathways providers into public
higher education in general. At the time of this research, I could source no case studies on specific private matriculation pathways into Canadian public universities or the accompanying shift of English language programs into the private partner. Specifically, it is hoped that this research will build on that which attends to the relationship between internationalization and privatization in Canadian public post-secondary, the intersection and impact on EAL/EAP programs as a generalizing example, and how institutional website discourses, essential in marketing to an international audience, normalize particular visions of people and purpose in relation to these concepts.

Cairns (2012) posits that while much of the current focus on higher education and public-private partnerships is on marketization, what is really happening is a covert form of privatization and a threat to democracy. Cairns believes that the focus should turn to a documenting of how these partnerships work across different relations of power. Robertson (2016) somewhat aligns with this view in noting that valuable work by, for example, Jessop et al. (2008) and Marginson (2013, 2014) has identified ideology in global education policy discourses while the work of Ball (2009, 2012) and Hogan et al. (2015) have made visible the networks of power driving particular conceptions and new manifestations of higher education. Robertson observes what is missing is an accounting of how higher education markets are made.

Robertson (2016) writes that there are moments when higher education markets are made when attention to the interplay of actors and processes at macro, meso, and micro levels allow insight into not only power and interest, but where space for challenge may exist. In this research, I will employ case study to examine the processes at play in the establishment and ongoing partnership between SFU and FIC/Navitas. One purpose of the case study is to build on what Cairns (2012), and Robertson call for in their respective ways: a revealing of the how --
how conditions in a particular time and place make possible the transformation and purpose of schools.

The impacts of ‘glocal’ influences and private-public university partnerships on conceptions and practices of education in relation to EAL programming and internationalization at the post-secondary level are surfaced as a generalizing example. Here, this research hopes to build on the work of Block and Cameron (2002), Block, Gray, and Holborow (2012), Chowdhury and Phan (2014), Chun (2012), Holborow (2015), and Kubota (2006, 2009, 2016) in identifying how the framing and operationalization of EAL and EAL programs extend or mediate neocolonialism and neoliberal discourses. Observing the choices made at departmental and institutional levels can add to the work called for by Marginson and Rhoades (2002) -- empirical evidence which reflects both how local institutions respond to the global and how they initiate and extend into it. Further, observation may support attention to the ethical, or moral responsibilities of universities and language professionals to the ‘glocal’ (Kubota, 2009) community, as opposed to institutional and regional economies. An understanding of how these pieces work together may address a lack of understanding of the experiences and emotions of the participants engaged in internationalization (Beck, 2014). In this context, this work responds to Hadley’s (2016) observation that the EAP academic community needs to conduct more research on the ethics of international student recruitment and partnerships.

Finally, there has been a call for more critical research on website discourses and higher education (Askehave, 2007; Ramasubramanian et al., 2002; Saichaie, 2010, 2011; Urciuoli, 2009). It is hoped that this research will add to the existing research and build upon it through an analysis of how website discourses and narratives in public higher education integrate, or differ,
with that of private, for-profit partners. The closing chapter will reflect on how website discourses are operationalized, and the cultural and material effects on those bound by them.

### 1.8 Thesis Outline

**Chapter 1** outlined the context, purpose, and significance of this research.

**Chapter 2** will look at the relevant literature and describe the conceptual frameworks. The critical literature on neoliberal globalization, internationalization in Canadian post-secondary as an example of neoliberal globalization, marketization and privatization as dominant forms of internationalization in public post-secondary, and the role of EAL in relationship to these forms of internationalization will be reviewed. Marginson and Rhoades’ Glonacal Agency Heuristic will be reviewed as a conceptual lens.

**Chapter 3** will introduce the methodological approach of case study and multimodal critical discourse analysis -- specifically, Luc Pauwels’ multimodal framework for analyzing websites.

**Chapter 4** will provide the in-depth “glonacal” context necessary to forefront the case study of the SFU-Navitas partnership.

**Chapter 5** provides an account of the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership and its evolution up to the juncture of its ten-year anniversary in 2016.

**Chapter 6** presents and analyzes partner web page data through multimodal critical discourse analysis in relation to the research questions.

**Chapter 7** concludes the study by answering the original research questions, reflecting on the applications and limitations of this research, and suggesting possibilities for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This literature review aims to establish the current context the public university is operating in. The concept of ‘neoliberalism’ as ideologically informing globalization and internationalization of education will be established. An overview of how neoliberalism presents, generally, in the field of education, allows for a reflection of how and where, specifically, the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership ideologically aligns, contests, or furthers its tenets. A review of the literature on internationalization in post-secondary as an example of neoliberal globalization, and the positioning of EAP in relation to post-secondary internationalization efforts follows. Finally, a review of the critical literature on Western university websites will be undertaken, which offers insight into the ways in which discourse engages with neoliberal operationalizations of education. The chapter closes with an introduction to Marginson and Rhoades’ (2002) ‘glonacal agency heuristic’. This heuristic allows for a lens through which to map the case study and website data and illuminate the interactions between discourse and power.

2.1 Neoliberal Globalization

An understanding of “globalization” in relation to this study requires an unpacking of the term. Marginson and Rhoades (2000) write that globalization simply refers to the development of increasingly integrated systems and relationships beyond the nation. They state that systems and relationships are “more than economic: they are also technological, cultural and political” (Marginson and Rhoades, 2000, p. 288). For Marginson and Rhoades, globalization ideally denotes a “focal point for theorizing and empirical study” (2000, p. 288). Tsui and Tollefson (2007) make the point that these integrated systems and relationships depend on both technology
and English. In consideration of Marginson and Rhoades’ view that globalization has always existed, I review how it is currently informed and theorized, and hope to add to the empirical research of how it plays out in one context through technology and English specifically. To do this, it is helpful to first understand the ‘glonacal’ context in which the case study sits. Critical scholars have collectively articulated a dominant ideological influence at play in contemporary globalization. The following section reviews descriptions of neoliberal globalization in education as a point of departure from which to situate this specific case study and website discourses.

Many have argued the dominant role neoliberal ideologies have played in current conceptions and practices of higher education (Altbach, 2009; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Marginson 2004, 2006; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009; Unterhalter & Carpentier, 2010). Harvey (2005, 2007) describes the shift to global neoliberal practices as a response to the global unemployment and inflation of the 1970s, and formalized, for example, in the politics and policies of Regan, in the US, and Thatcher, in the UK. In Canada, the Mulroney Conservatives aligned themselves with the free market rhetoric of this time, helping to usher in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with the US and Mexico by 1994. It is of interest to note that Canada’s retaining of its right to protect the sectors of education and health care was the subject of intense public debate at the time. Dale and Robertson (2002) conclude that although NAFTA didn’t affect the autonomy of Canadian public education, it allowed for inroads through questions of sovereignty (investor protections and dispute resolution) as institutions open-up to private investment. Robertson, Mundy, & Verger (2012) have noted that the take-up of neoliberal discourses have been so successful in relation to education policy that they have resulted in a transformation from a tension between the social, political, and economic rationales for education, to a dominance on education for economy, supported by private
interests. This movement has gained the nickname ‘GERM’ (Global Education Reform Movement) (Sahlberg, 2011). Today, there is critical consensus that transnational corporations are heavily invested in a neoliberal enactment of education, have leveraged a great deal of political power, and influence state policy to reflect their interests (Ball, 2012; Chomsky, 2017). In turn, they are the prime beneficiaries of the neoliberal turn in education (Unterhalter & Carpentier, 2010).

For my work, I will settle on a definition of globalization by Gibson-Graham (2006) utilized by Stromquist and Monkman (2014), which emphasizes an underlying ideology fixed on economy. It characterizes globalization as:

"a set of processes by which the world is rapidly being integrated into one economic space via increasing international trade, the internationalization of production and financial markets, the internationalization of a commodity culture promoted by increasingly networked global communications systems” (Stromquist & Monkman, 2014, p.17). This definition, with a reiteration of Tsui and Tollefson’s inclusion of English as an additional mediating force, provides a place from which to conceptualize neoliberal globalization in educational discourse and practice.

Hill and Kumar (2012) describe specific examples of neoliberal discourse and demands. They begin by differentiating liberalism from neoliberalism as the shift between a lessening of the state to a more determined involvement of state steering of its interests, particularly in the field of education and training. The role of education under neoliberalism, they argue, is to produce a compliant and skilled workforce for the economy. Hill and Kumar outline the theoretical demands neoliberalism has made nationally and internationally. Those most relevant to education and this study include:
Nationally:

- Reduction of state subsidization to public institutions and low public expenditures overall
- Market approach which includes private sector involvement in education
- Discourse of ‘opportunity’ in education through ‘choice’
- Institutionalization of corporate-managerialist models with focus on accountability, and performance
- Suppression of oppositional critical thought

Internationally:

- Free international trade
- Free competition in all economic sectors for companies of any nationality

Joel Spring (2015) writes more specifically about what he labels ‘educational globalization’, which includes:

- The influence of global discourse on local and national educational policymakers, administrators, and faculty
- Marketing of global higher education and educational services
- English as the global language of commerce and curricula

Building on Spring’s last point, Tsui and Tollefson (2014) show that the intersection of globalization and the dominance of English as the language of education and business raise real issues of access and equity. While their work is not grounded in access to English language programs in relation to international education and student mobility, their conclusion that language policies are central to educational access and inclusion are relevant to this study. They close with extending their argument to stating that having one language, even English, is not
enough, and equity in educational opportunity will depend on access to instruction in multiple languages, accompanied by inter-cultural understanding.

This description of global neoliberal practices in education are provided with the understanding that their current dominance is predicated on pre-existing and on-going, contestable narratives, shaped by specific contexts. However, taken as a whole, the practices listed above work to provide an overarching description of contemporary higher education from which to situate my specific case study.

My research, through a case study of one partnership, includes a desire to understand if neoliberal globalization as a dominant ideology has affected local conceptions and practices of higher education, and to what extent. More specifically, if it has been taken up, how has it been mediated by local and institutional “layers and conditions” (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002). The case study must first be understood in the context of the literature on internationalization in higher education.

2.2 Internationalization in Canadian Public Post-Secondary

Before turning to internationalization in higher education, it is necessary to further explore the relationship between “globalization” and “internationalization”. As noted, globalization has been characterized as both a neutral process and ideologically informed. Internationalization has been approached in much the same way. Knight’s 2004 definition, for example, has become a standard in much of the literature. She defines internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural and/or global dimension into the goals, functions (teaching/learning, research, services) and delivery of higher education.” (2004, p. 11). Knight has since reflected that although the definition still stands as non-prescriptive, it assumes
“traditional values” (2013, p. 85). By traditional values, Knight lists those associated with the academic or social benefits of internationalization such as collaboration, and mutually beneficial partnerships. Although Knight has developed a definition more inclusive of a diversity of models and providers, she maintains a neutrality. She emphasizes the suffix ‘-tion’ in internationalization. It is firmly a process located in specific contexts which can be negotiated with. While critical of the more predatory forms internationalization in higher education has taken, Knight argues that internationalization is not globalization, but is in relationship with it and contestable. For example, Knight notes (2006, 2013) that the number one risk identified by 70% of respondents from 95 countries to an International Association of Universities 2005 survey (2013, p. 88) is the commodification and commercialization of education programs. While she concedes this risk has indeed come to pass, she argues it continues to be contestable. She encourages institutions to reflect on how their activities shape the nature of academic, social and cultural purposes of education and to renew their commitment to discourse and practice which supports these. Both she and Altbach (2007) have called and continue to call for monitoring, debate, and regulatory systems which can hold multinational, for-profit providers accountable. I am hopeful that through case study and attention to a specific example of how internationalization may manifest, movement towards accountability, or at least a new way of talking about and assessing these partnerships can be achieved. It is not just “institutions” and “governments” which implement policies and realize particular ideological visions. Specific institutions, political parties, and individuals engage, legitimize, normalize, and promote a vision of internationalization. In identifying these players and processes more specifically, those who wish to challenge the realized risks of contemporary internationalization policies may have something more substantial to work with.
While Knight positions neoliberal globalization as an existing state to be negotiated with through local internationalization policies and strategies, Kumari Beck (2012) responds to Marginson and Rhoades’ (2000) call for a deeper theorizing of globalization. She argues that attention to a broad range of portrayals of globalization, inclusive of more sustainable and hopeful visions, provide a reference for local framings and interpretations of internationalization. Spring (2015) defines the globalization of education as the effects of economic global processes at local levels and also offers a diversity of alternative world models. He describes progressive, educational and indigenous models which all offer more inclusive approaches, involve teacher and student agency and autonomy, and protect local languages and cultures.

Reflective of theory, internationalization in Canadian higher education has taken on both standardized and unique forms, which will be detailed and analyzed in more depth in following chapters. However, a concerted push by Canadian federal and BC provincial government international strategies have resulted in a significant shift away from the more humanitarian and service articulations of international engagement to a market expression. Specifically, both have called for a doubling of full-fee paying international students. Both strategies highlight the benefits to economy and the future labour market. The focus on marketization as internationalization is reflected in institutional priorities. The 2014 AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges Canada) survey revealed that 95% of Canadian universities identify internationalization as a priority, with 82% placing it in the top 5. Further, 70% of institutions had undergraduate student recruitment as a priority of internationalization, with 45% of institutions claiming it was their first.

While Canadian universities have been attracting international students in line with the numbers required by federal and provincial internationalization strategies, success is not always
translated in the experiences of those in the institution. A study of SFU and its Faculty of Education (Beck, Ilieva, Waterstone, Hill, Sai, & Zhang, 2011) reflects some of the concerns expressed by the ACDE and Knight,

Beck et. al. drew on a metaphor of “harmful emissions” to characterize 3 unsustainable practices of internationalization. The first identified a lack of awareness as to what “internationalization” meant. While there was a shared belief that internationalization is ‘good’, many in the study had trouble defining what it meant in the context of the institution. As a result, the principles of internationalization and institutional policy were unclear to many, as were the needs of international and exchange students. Secondly, a coupling of internationalization with economic motives was identified as problematic. Those troubled by the commercial aspects, reported, for example:

[we are an] increasingly commodified, corporatized university … marketing ourselves to most often more vulnerable populations, families and students in developing nations and calling it internationalization … [this seems] parasitic” [Interview, Faculty 2] (Beck.et al., 2011, p.23)

And:

To me, "internationalization of education" means the globalization of a publicly funded educational institution (SFU "Thinking of the World" recent branding campaign). It also means "a substantial source of revenue" for our increasingly privatized university system. [Survey, Student] (Beck.et al., 2011, p.23)
Finally, in addition to ambiguity and commercialization, the survey revealed a feeling that there was a “containment of difference” as evidenced by a focus on North American content, and the marginalizing of international student knowledge and an emphasis on monolingualism and monoculturalism:

“We know best . . . get on board. You know nothing . . . get on board. Colonialization continues . . . get below board. We couldn't deal [with] our diversity . . . but can deal with the world's. ... get on board or stay overboard.” [Interview, Faculty 2] (Beck.et al., 2011, p.27)

Those identified as English as an Additional Language students faced additional stigmatization: One student reported that her friend from China “was humiliated by her TA where the TA actually told her her English is horrible in front of the whole class” (p. 2 St. Int. 2). (Beck.et al., 2011, p.28)

Issues of inclusion and exclusion are reflected in a 2014 Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) student survey. While most international students reported satisfaction with their experience abroad, students and the CBIE recognize integration as a primary challenge. For example, students from diverse national contexts learning from each other is often cited as a benefit of studying abroad, yet 56% of students reported having no Canadian students as friends (p. 38).

Issues of inclusion and exclusion outside of higher education may sit in relation to for-profit internationalization strategies as well. Writing from the University of British Columbia, Kubota (2016) has acknowledged the complexity -- and complicity -- of international education in reinforcing not only racial and ethnic inequality, but geographical and socioeconomic inequity as well. The current model of international education targets families in designated countries
who may be able to afford an international education, marginalizing many from what rankings and discourse frame and manifest as a key to success.

My research explores how framing and operationalization of ‘internationalization’ through one private-public pathways partnership mitigates or exacerbates the key tensions identified in this section. English language programs are a substantial piece of articulated pathways into higher education in BC and a key component of the SFU-FIC matriculation pathway. The following section will review the relevant literature on EAL/EAP in post-secondary education and its shifting position in relationship to internationalization efforts. My research hopes to present a mapping of the growth of private for-profit EAP initiatives in the internationalizing university and their normalization through hegemonic neoliberal discourses.

2.3 English and EAP in the Internationalizing University

Jones (2008) notes that the university as a predominant unit of analysis in globalization and internationalization of higher education studies is fitting and reflective of the many changes in relationship between global, national, local and institutional layers. However, he also draws on Kerr’s concept of the “multiversity” (2001) to underscore the absence of what he labels the “understructure” in internationalization of education research. If we conceive of the university as a loose collection of independent academic units with autonomous orientations to global, national, and local dimensions, we can better understand the experiences of students and faculty within these units and their facilitation or resistance to larger institutional policies. This concept will be further explored in Chapter 3 in connection with Marginson and Rhoades’ glonacal agency heuristic. It is introduced here to contextualize EAL programs as a piece of the understructure in the internationalizing university.
Many critical scholars have noted that integral to status and the internationalization of higher education is the role of English. The commercialization of higher education has been coupled with the commodification of English (Altbach, 2013; Kubota, 2016; Robertson & Kedzierski, 2016) and the selling of English has been referred to as both a product and a promoter of neo-liberalism (Phan, 2014) and Westernization and colonialism (Altbach, 2012). Phan Le Ha references Canagarajah (2005); Pennycook (1998, 2001), and Phillipson (1992, 2009) in noting that within the internationalization process, “there are concerns regarding the unequal ownership of English and the reproduction of colonial dichotomies between the Self (the coloniser) and the Other (the colonised)” (Phan, 2013, p.7). “Othering” as a process takes place when we essentialize, for example, cultures, ethnicity, and nationality in relation to “Self”. In addition, there continues to be a call to include how the construct of race is implicated and understood in the process of marginalization and inferiorization that is characteristic of othering in the university and EAP classroom (Kubota 2001, 2004, 2006, 2015; Lee 2008, 2015; Rich & Troudi, 2006). This research looks to glonacal discourses, including those of the institutional partners, to understand how international EAL/EAP students are framed or “othered” in relation to an institutional “self” as manifested through website discourse and institutional practices.

2.3.1 EAP: Shifting Purpose, Shifting Place

The demands of the new knowledge economy pressure students to seek degrees from institutions recognized internationally through controversial global university rankings. The majority of Times Higher Education top ranked universities are located in the West and list English as a medium of instruction. As will be illustrated in more detail in the following chapter, Canadian federal and provincial governments have developed branding and policies which
capitalize on the privileged standing and status of their public education institutions. In higher education, Canadian federal and provincial (BC) internationalization strategies prioritize the recruitment of international students, many of who are required to utilize English language supports and/or programs.

Hadley (2015) offers some applicable insight in his book on EAP programs in the neoliberal university, which looks at universities in the UK, US, and Japan. Hadley characterizes higher education institutions as belonging to four types. The “Dreamweaver” and the “Ivory Tower” are traditionally associated with Western cultural humanism as opposed to the “Sausage Factory” and “the Mass Provider,” which are vocational in nature. These institutions are further distinguished by their expression of either neoliberal or Keynesian values. SFU seems to fit Hadley’s definition of “the Dreamweaver”. This is an institution with brand recognition but is not included in the top-tier higher education institutions (HEIs) which constitute the “Ivory Tower”. Hadley writes:

“Many of these HEIs have adopted neoliberal values, but publicly, they maintain a narrative which highlights their history, character, social status, and contributions to society. Privately, the agendas of outside stakeholders tied to corporate interests are discreetly addressed, but are repackaged to fit within the mythos of the HEI. The dynamics related to the curriculum and faculty often share similarities with Mass Providers, since newer neoliberal policies are placed on top of older educational traditions which, as seen earlier in this chapter, result in conflict and contradictory practices.” (Hadley, 2015, p.36).

He notes that the EAP programs in these institutions (dreamweavers), once located within academic departments, are increasingly rare. The Ivory Tower, on the other hand, while still
operating within contradictory discourses, may have the brand and resources to, in this case, appear or operate in a less visibly predatory manner. This is exemplified by the comments of James Ridge, a principal of Vantage College at UBC. Admitting its first students in 2014, Vantage College was conceived as an in-house pathways model for international students which stood in opposition to privatized, and/or off-campus models.

“The private sector models try to use cheaper options, which are often sessional instructors, but our faculty will be tenure track people who are superstar teachers. …Part of the calculus in keeping it in house is that our brand is powerful and well-recognized and we want to keep it that way.” (McClure, 2013)

Discourse surrounding the Vantage College pathway, similar to many pathway models, celebrates the cultural and linguistic diversity of its students. However, Vantage also recognizes concerns of access. For example, the Vantage College website points out that 7% of their student tuition funds scholarships for about 60 students in an effort to encourage socio-economic diversity (UBC, Vantage College, 2017).

Hadley’s description of the “Sausage Factory” appears to partially apply to the role of for-profit pathway matriculation providers. In these institutions, the teachers and curriculum are highly controlled and entrance is dependent primarily on the ability to pay. These are organizations which manifest neoliberalism through the buzzwords of “efficiency”, “predictablilty”, or “standardization”, “calcuability”, or the ability to measure success, and ‘control’ or centralization of power to ensure conformity. These principles are also listed by Hadley as borrowed form Ritzer’s Theory of McDonaldization, or mass production – newly touted as necessary in the current climate, but also for meeting the challenge of a sharp increase
in international students needing to be processed (Hadley, 2015). As public universities are still reliant on their social and cultural capital (Marginson, 2012), shifting English language programs in higher education to for-profit making partnerships may be more seemly when run at arms-length.

This characterization mirrors much of what Winkle (2014) reported in his work on faculty experiences in the United States with for-profit matriculation programs. Faculty in the United States reported frustration with an “implementation from above” approach -- frustration that the existing program wasn’t invited to develop a matriculation program itself and opinion that arriving students didn’t have realistic expectations about their matriculation into the host university. The cost of tuition was a subject of concern for instructors as was the absence of remediation for students unable to complete the pathway. Marginalization continued to be experienced by English language teachers in the matriculation partner, and by association for the for-credit instructors. One benefit emphasized by faculty and staff, which highlights the challenge of openly addressing the frustrations, was that the growth of these programs created more full-time work and opportunity.

This section reviewed what has been documented in the literature in relation to EAP as a piece of internationalization in, primarily, Western post-secondary. Apart from the ‘ivory towers’, many higher education institutions are choosing to move existing in-house EAP support and bridging to private, for-profit partners. The next section will explore what has been documented in relation to student experience and program realities.
2.3.2 Remediation, Realities, Response

In Western higher education, a remedial approach to English language proficiency is typically taken (Kanno and Varghese, 2010). A remedial approach, which isolates and marginalizes students, has been identified as problematic (Benesch, 1988) and knowingly (Blumenthal, 2002) meeting the needs of the institution over the students (Solida, 2002). A study involving domestic EAL students by Kanno and Varghese (2010) support these findings, reporting that the remedial approach is experienced as punitive and costly. Students voiced that access to “reliable and relevant” information in regards to how to move into and through post-secondary was missing, as was a lack of financial aid.

Normalized discourse may not only other international EAL/EAP students, but may work to have them unconsciously assume responsibility for structural failures beyond their control. If we turn to Foucault and his notion of the “entrepreneurial self”, we can understand how the self - both students, and implicated stakeholders such as teachers, and administrative staff -- can be corporatized along with the university. Flores (2013) quotes Foucault:

The idea of a privatization of insurance mechanisms, and the idea at any rate that it is up to the individual [to protect himself against risk] through all the reserves he has at his disposal, either simply as an individual, or through mutual benefit organizations and suchlike, is the objective you can see at work in the neo-liberal policies. (Foucault, p.145, in Flores, 2013, p. 503)

In addition to the noted existence of marginalization and othering, my research questions partially interrogate whether the discourse and operationalization of the private-public pathways partnership exacerbates or mediates risks to international EAP students, as raised by the ACDE.
Over a seven-year period, Hadley (2016) interviewed respondents (numerous EAP graduate and undergraduate students, senior administrators, EAP administrators, academics and EAP teachers and professionals) from three countries (Japan, UK, USA) in eighteen universities. Referencing existing research and substantiating it with interview data, Hadley identifies some challenges in contemporary university EAP programs. The first is the slow level of progress made by English language learners who begin with a low-level of English language proficiency. Issues of non-participation in the EAL classroom (stories of sleeping or disengaged students), socio-cultural enclaves which rebuke the idea of an intercultural campus, and troubling reports of EAP students experiencing psychological distress and/or exhibiting anti-social behaviour are evident in literature and anecdote. In the kind of public-private partnership I am researching, quantitative data which would confirm or challenge Hadley’s findings is difficult to access or ascertain if it has even been initiated. Hadley concludes:

After the initial economic contribution has been made, the lack of a positive, engaging dynamic among many of these learners makes them increasingly problematic to a neoliberal HEI, especially if their social problems are interpreted as resistance to the overall picture that managers have for the institution. (Hadley, 2015, p.113)

In the face of these challenges, Hadley writes, institutional response takes the form of non-action, justified through ascribing responsibility to students and the choices they make.Aligned with the neoliberal narrative of choice, students are assigned full responsibility for their inclusion or exclusion through their ‘choice’ to engage or disengage, which may further the othering that takes place. He writes that the minority of international students seen as successfully participating are highlighted and discursively framed as “persevering, self-directed, and low-maintenance” (Hadley, 2015, p. 129).
The next section turns to a reflection on emotion in the EAP classroom as a legitimate response to current framings and realities of the EAP program in the internationalizing university.

2.3.3 Emotion and EAP Programs

While the role of emotion is not central to this research, it is fundamental to its inspiration and experience. For this reason, a short exploration of the emerging work attending to this topic is worthy of mention. Writing from the field of EAP at City University New York (CUNY), Sarah Benesch’s work on emotion in critical English language teaching (2012) and emotional labour (2017) holds particular relevance. Rather than chastise the emotional, Benesch positions it as a social construct and draws on feminism and cultural theory to both validate and interrogate the role of emotion for critical praxis and political action.

Benesch builds on the critical work of Bonny Norton. Norton connected the feelings of the women in her study (2000), to identity, language learning and power. She concluded that anxiety in the EAL classroom is not innate but socially constructed by the lived experience of language learners. Their motivation to speak English for example, was mediated by their individual investments associated with previous experience or future desires. Benesch further centres emotion in her work and takes a cultural politics approach to them. Benesch’s discussion of the work of feminist and critical race scholars Sara Ahmed and Sianne Ngai in relation to the field of English language teaching offers insight into how to talk about how discourse and its operationalization affects individuals and their relationships on the ground.

Both Ahmed and Ngai understand emotions to be, at least in part, socially constructed. Ahmed’s notion of “sticky objects” (2004) is highlighted by Benesch. Ahmed is less interested in what emotions are, as she is in what they do. A sticky object can be a thing or an idea invested
and layered with affect. It is an understanding that there are values and power attached to those objects which ‘stick’, although the emotions they engender are fluid, moving between bodies in action and reaction. Benesch found Ahmed’s notion easily applicable to praxis in the EAP classroom. For Benesch, the sticky objects under investigation were dictionaries and cell phones. She investigated both student and teacher emotions around their use and concluded that the positive or negative associations could be mined for pedagogical implications and understanding. Benesch illustrates how open engagement with students in the classroom about phone use or dictionaries and the emotions attached to them, for example, allows for a stepping outside of the teacher-student binary and related assumptions.

In my experience, the work of Benesch and Ahmed provides a structure to understand how discourse insinuates itself into our emotional lives. Benesch offers Ahmed’s view that our emotions may be dependent on previous constructions and are not necessarily our own. In the case of institutional discourses of internationalization and EAP/matriculation pathways, what does the data tell us about what we are supposed to feel or will feel? What happens if the manufacturing of our feelings doesn’t match the reality? How can dissonance be engaged with for critical praxis and political action?

Benesch’s discussion of the work of Sianne Ngai is also helpful for reflection. Ngai’s work (2005) on ‘ugly emotions’ (envy and irritation, for example, as opposed to the grandiosity of anger) is also intended to lead to critical praxis. For example, Ngai examines the role of envy in art as an allegory for resignation and pessimism in relation to political action. Like Ahmed, Ngai holds that rather than suppress emotion, the ability to understand and engage with it can lead to enrichment. For both Ahmed and Ngai, the gift of emotion lies in the understanding of how it is constructed and the relationships it defines. Attention to emotion can act as a guide
through, for example, discursive framing that benefits a few to the exclusion of others. Ngai notes the pressure to ‘brush away’ what is viewed as negative emotion which serves to block agency. Once the feelings are identified and understood, discussions, action and coalition building can begin.

Viewing matriculation pathways at SFU as a ‘sticky object’ and attending to the emotions attached to it helps to make sense of both my own heightened emotional reaction as an ‘agent’ within the confines of the partnership and the expressions of some students, and in combination with the results of this research, helps to illuminate a potential direction for future action and reflection.

The previous sections have explored the positioning of EAP programs in the context of neoliberal expressions of internationalization in Western public post-secondary. The choice to move in-house EAP programs to external, private, for-profit providers has been shown to have implications for inclusion, exclusion, equity, access, and emotional health. The next section reviews the literature on how post-secondary institutions are normalizing and advancing an ideological framing of education and paves the way for a collection of specific case study data.

2.4 Branding and Marketing the Internationalizing University

Fairclough (1993) noted that in the 1970s, universities moved from an informational tone in their promotional materials to one increasingly borrowed from genre-specific marketing. Current promotional materials often contain the language of business, such as ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘enterprise’ and contain personal testimonials (Teo, 2007). The language the university uses to sell itself is not neutral and reflects real changes in policy and practice (Leslie & Slaughter, 1997). One example of this is how the global competition to recruit international students paying
differential fees (detailed in later chapters) has intensified promotional, over information-driven, institutional websites.

. Marginson (2004) details the turn in Australia from a nation positioning its higher education system as part of a wider equality building project to one that undermines the goal in its current marketized form. Much as has unfolded in Canada, a system of chronic defunding, a framing of education as an individual benefit, and increasing attention to the profits to be made by full-fee paying international students, the university has morphed into a product – a positional good in a positional market, where some win and some must lose. Competition and subjective rankings drive value as opposed to, for example, quality of teaching, programs, access, or equity.

Marginson (2007, 2010) identified market-like competition as one outcome of neoliberalism’s ideological effect on higher education. As a competitive good in an isomorphic field, universities are faced with the challenge of differentiating themselves from each other (Becher & Trowler, 2001) resulting in an intense focus on brand development. As Stack (2016) notes, a steadily increasing amount of many university budgets is being spent on marketization, and marketing is using increasingly sophisticated methods. One of these methods is the institutional website (Anctil, 2008; Sachaie, 2011; Taylor & Morphew, 2010). More than simply moving from informational to market discourses, university websites now employ text and visuals to impart an institutional -- and highly affective and conceptual -- set of values. Ng (2014) notes these are ideological in nature. For example, neoliberal nods to flexibility and empowerment (Ng, 2014) are representative of the values of managerialism and consumer capitalism (Zhang & O’Halloran, 2013).
Lemke (2001) reflects that the neoliberal subject embodies their investment. Many may become invested in branding because it is difficult to question or expose its contradictions. Seen in this light, branding becomes a political act (Aspara, Aula, Tienari, and Tikkanen, 2015).

The following section will review the literature on how university websites reflect mirroring visions of education and where and how branding works to differentiate.

2.4.1 Website Discourses in Higher Education

Ramasubramanian, Gyure and Mursi (2001) show in their study that prospective students form strong impressions about universities based on web site visuals and that commonly (and internally) held beliefs about what makes a quality institution (tradition, historical buildings, quads, athletics) is what students respond positively to. Building on this, Sachaie and Morphew (2014) note that university websites will often be the first and only institutional impression students have of a school’s mission and even the purpose of higher education. Utilizing Labree’s competing goals framework (1997), Sachaie and Morphew find that the dominant purpose of higher education as communicated through university websites is for the private good of social mobility as opposed to public goods of democratic equality or social efficiency. Rhoades’ (2016) analysis of four university websites supports these findings, observing that the goals of the university and the students are self-referential. A focus on individual benefit in a competitive marketplace mimics prevailing neoliberal discourse. The universities under review also position themselves in terms of rankings. The concrete location or community the institution occupied was sold as tourism as opposed to any references of cultural or community engagement. Finally, the marketing strategy the universities employed was, as described in the literature review, typical of a competitive market good, selling lifestyle over substance. Rhoades adds that the
lifestyle approach is an exclusive one, targeting a particular class of students willing and able to pay for what is being sold as a costly but valuable individual benefit. Kubota (2016) echoes these observations in her study of university websites selling study abroad. She describes a neoliberal imaginary rooted in linguistic, cultural, personal and career benefits.

Hartley and Morphew (2008), Saichaie and Morphew (2014), and Rhoades (2016) all note an overwhelming similarity in the marketing of higher education discourse on institutional websites. As noted earlier, website discourses, text and visuals have the power to normalize and solidify framings of reality that privilege some to the exclusion of others. Harklau (2000) reminds us that this happens without awareness of those being caught up in the framing.

The research shows a consistency of message in higher education websites and the influence texts and visuals have on viewers of higher education websites, particularly in strengthening the images and values which underpin neoliberalism. Kress (2006) reminds us that though some of the current discourses of neoliberal globalization are uniform, they continue to be negotiated in the local and can present differently everywhere. Ramasubramanian, Gyure and Mursi (2001) tell us that students are looking to websites to differentiate between institutions and the shared messaging, achieved through branding.

The next section presents Marginson and Rhoades’ 2002 ‘glonacal agency heuristic’. The heuristic will be utilized to map case study and website data in an effort to surface one instance of how a Canadian public university replicates or contests hegemonic discourses of neoliberalism in education through partnership with a multinational, for-profit, provider.
2.5 Simon and Rhoades’ Glonacal Agency Heuristic

In ‘Beyond National States, Markets, and Systems of Higher Education: A Glonacal Agency Heuristic’, Marginson and Rhoades (2002) make the argument that much of the current research on globalization in higher education identifies what is happening in regards to the marketization of higher education, but not how. They claim we are distracted by liberal theory and neo-liberal policies into a focus on the relationships and balance of power between institutions and states, states and markets, or the outcomes of these relationships. They advocate a more nuanced understanding of how all three interact with agents, agencies and processes at levels from the individual to the international. The heuristic they propose takes into account the complex interplay of agency and agencies at global, national, and local levels, and therefore supports the complexities of looking at a partnership rooted in both the local and global spheres.

The glonacal heuristic is represented by a hexagon which privileges neither the global, national, or the local agencies or human agency, but rather allows the researcher to foreground any one of the three levels. The lines connecting the six ‘agencies’ are joined around and through the hexagon, representing a myriad of connection, all marked by reciprocity. These lines of influence are described in terms of their strength, or the degree of influence or resources they contain. To round out their model, Marginson and Rhoades note that attention must be paid to the layers and conditions, or the structures and circumstances which shape the lines and force of interactions. Finally, they offer a notion of spheres, meant to evoke an imagining of the space taken up by agencies and agency, which allows for an envisioning of geographical and functional encroachment.

Marginson and Rhoades give a number of examples to illustrate the efficacy of their model. Of particular relevance to this study is a focus “beyond and beneath national institutions
and systems of higher education” (2002, p. 301). As institutions compete to attract international students, Marginson and Rhoades encourage researchers to pay attention to institutional policy and practice as well as to that of the units and individuals within them. In this study, the institution is foregrounded: not a generalized institution, but one which can be observed as a space of autonomy, mediating equally unique state policies and practices, and influenced by, and even influencing global policy and practice. The notion of reciprocity in this research allows for an analysis of the lines of strength between the global and the local as they exist in private and public forms.

As mentioned in the literature review, Jones (2008) extends the glonacal agency heuristic to include an analysis of how the authority of what he terms the “superstructure, institution, and understructure (individual academic units)” orients itself to the local, national and global layers proposed by Marginson and Rhoades. An example would be extending an understanding of the SFU-Navitas partnership in this research as influenced by local layers and conditions, to understanding how the partnership shifts the orientation of the understructure, represented by, in this case, in-house EAP programs.

Marginson and Rhoades glonacal agency heuristic, supplemented by Jones’ global higher education matrix, provides a practical approach to understanding this single case study data which traverses the many points of contact and influence referred to as local, national, and global agencies and agency, and of identifying how, at a local level, these flows are assisted, resisted, and otherwise mediated. A mapping of the case study data is undertaken as an instantiation of how university webpages act as sites of ideologically influential discourse with real world implications.
This section reviewed literature which establishes the current framing and processes of internationalization in higher education as primarily motivated by profit at global, national, and local levels. The positioning of education as a commodity in the global market place as reflected in internationalization strategies, policy and trade is supported by discursive framings which emphasize competition between nations, institutions, and individuals. A global, market approach to education has encouraged the growth of new, for-profit, trans-, and multinational initiatives. This research concerns itself with the rise of privatized, for-profit, pathways into local, publicly-funded institutions. In particular, it seeks to understand if current discourses and their operationalization manifest potential ‘risks’ or ‘benefits’ as, for example, articulated by the ACDE. My experience and the literature indicate that the intersection of EAP in a post-secondary context with ‘internationalization’ is a particularly critical ‘sphere’ from which to assess issues of inclusion, exclusion, access and equity. My interest is in beginning with reflection on my own place and practice within it, how and where the local post-secondary institutions negotiate, normalize and/or further neoliberal discourse and practice, and where agency is available. In this research project, documenting and analyzing partnership website discourses is one place to begin. The next section will review the methodology employed to set out how SFU-FIC/Navitas position themselves and their partnership in the context of wider neoliberal discourses of marketization in higher education.
Chapter 3: Methodology

In this section I will detail the methodology to be employed to answer my research questions. Specifically, how can multimodal critical discourse analysis of partner web pages help illuminate how SFU and Navitas/FIC conceptualize internationalization and their public-private partnership, and how can a single case study of the partnership provide context and evidence of how the partnership is operationalized.

3.1 Qualitative Traditions

This research draws on two strands of qualitative research: case study and critical discourse analysis.

A qualitative approach to understanding the SFU-Navitas/FIC partnership is appropriate as it lends itself to meaning-making -- an approach that seeks to understand how people interpret the phenomena (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Cresswell (2013) includes and builds on the interpretive nature of qualitative research by noting that “it begins with assumptions and use of interpretive or theoretical frameworks to study the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (italics mine) (p. 44). Qualitative research can be approached informally and can identify patterns and themes as they emerge (Cresswell, 1998); but, ultimately, rigour is dependent on substantial attention to context and significance.

As this research seeks to understand the public-private partnership in relation to EAL/EAP and the benefits and risks associated with internationalization in Canadian higher education, and seeks to map the global influences, it is significant that qualitative research is considered transformative by some, by “making the world visible” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011, p. 3).
Characterized as a methodology that has had to fight to establish itself against positivist traditions in research, Denzin and Lincoln refer to the work of Torrance when stating “The heart of the matter turns on issues surrounding the politics and ethics of evidence and the value of qualitative work in addressing matters of equity and social justice” (2011, p.1). Further, they define the current historical period of qualitative research as one that must both “confront the backlash associated with the evidence based social movement” and become, in the social sciences and the humanities, “sites for critical conversations about democracy, race, gender, class, nation-states, globalization, freedom and community.” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2006, p. 3)

Referring specifically to a defining of qualitative research in education, Wright (2006) argues for overlapping moments, in response to Denzin and Lincoln’s mapping of identifiable periods. For example, the most recent being ‘Postmodern/Poststructuralist’ and the current as ‘Postexperimental’. Wright emphasizes that regardless of how we define it, qualitative work may be more likely to be delegitimized in the current period which sanctions positivist methods. In this light, qualitative work must be prepared for contestation. And, in a time many have come to paint as ‘post-truth’, his assertion that research in the current climate is a political act is strengthened. Working from an understanding that research, qualitative, or quantitative, is political, it is up to the researcher to be explicit in their positioning.

The next sections delineate case study and multimodal critical discourse analysis as the most appropriate methods for answering the research questions.
3.1.1 Case Study

This research design will incorporate a single case study to investigate the decision by one public university in Canada to partner with a private pathways matriculation provider, and how this decision has evolved at the juncture of its ten-year anniversary. Case study data will inform and substantiate a reading and analysis of website data. Yin (1994) states case study is appropriate for answering the questions of “how” and “why” and investigating a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context. This could also be considered what Stake (1994) calls an instrumental case study in that through detailed examination, insight into larger issues can emerge and contribute to the development of new theory. Drawing on case study method allows a close examination of the data within a specific context, here, to give a more nuanced understanding of what internationalization, through discourses of private partnership, looks like in practice.

Case study is a useful method to analyze the complexities at play in the operationalization of policy in higher education. Coryell, Durodoye, Redmon, Wright, Pate & Nguyen (2012) employ case study to review four examples of internationalization in higher education and make a compelling argument that internationalization requires an understanding of institutional context. Larsen (2015) draws on case study to illustrate the complexities of an initiative between a Canadian university and a Tanzanian non-profit to reveal dissonance between official discourse and on the ground reality. Two case studies which have also employed Marginson and Rhoades Glonacal heuristic to great effect are Fiocco’s (2005) dissertation on Australia’s turn to pathway programs in higher education and Liu and Metcalfe’s (2015) work on the internationalization of one Chinese higher education institution and how local layers and conditions contributed to “reception or resistance”. Finally, Jennifer E. Haan (2009) used historical case study to detail the
evolution of ESL programs at Purdue University to understand the complex external and internal factors contributing to its present form. These examples point to the ability of a case study approach to manage and surface the complexities involved in understanding the intersection of internationalization, privatization and ESL/EAL at one higher education institution.

3.1.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

This section provides an overview of the literature on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), or Critical Discourse Studies (CDS), Multimodal Critical Discourse Studies (MCDS) and their relevance to this research.

Acknowledged as growing and evolving out of a constellation of scholars including Teun van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Gunther Kress, Theo van Leeuwen and Ruth Wodak in the early 1990s (Machin & Mayr, 2012; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). CDS continues to be recognized as both diverse and sharing points of consensus across the spectrum (Wodak & Meyer, 2015). Generally, CDS positions discourse as sitting in relationship with power in specific social contexts.

Hall (1996) drew on Foucault to summarize one approach to the notion of discourse as ways of talking, thinking, or representing subjects or topics in ways which affect practice and in relation to the circulation and contestation of power.

Fairclough and Wodak’s specification of discourse reflects this idea neatly in their often referred to specification of discourse (1997) as both socially constitutive and conditioned. Dominant discourses are understood to serve and maintain a particular status quo. van Dijk (2008) writes that discourse has the power to manipulate, so attention must be paid to how elites, or those who have the power to shape public discourse, manipulate it to legitimize
understandings of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ that may lead to social inequality or injustice. Critical discourse approaches are rooted in the belief that discourse is not neutral but should be understood in relationship to its social context. Investigating discourse within the context of the articulated norms and values of a society aids in identifying how particular discourses either align with (or challenge) maintaining an unjust status quo.

Fairclough notes the emancipatory potential of CDS. He notes that critical discourse approaches which engage with rigorous methodological tools to analyze semiotic data (written, spoken and visual) expose the ways in which interests and ideology are obfuscated and come to be understood as common sense (Fairclough, 1995). CDS both seeks to make more explicit the links between language, power and ideology and to work as an agent of social change (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). A documenting of these links may present inconsistencies, which is where possibility can be found (Fairclough, 2003).

Most recently, Fairclough (2013) argues for not just a critique of structures, but a critique of strategies, which a case study approach in this research intends to make visible. In keeping with his further advocacy of a shift to positive critique, this research will acknowledge structural constraints on institutions but also intend to identify spheres of transformation and possibility in the closing chapter.

3.1.2.1 Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis

In the third edition of their comprehensive overview of critical discourse analysis/studies, Wodak and Meyer (2016) make an explicit change in both title and terms of reference from critical discourse analysis (CDA) to critical discourse studies (CDS), from naming their work “Methods for critical discourse analysis” to “Methods of critical discourse studies” (italics mine).
Teun van Dijk speaks to this switch by arguing that CDA is not a method, but a way of thinking which employs a diversity of approaches rooted in discipline and methods determined by the context of the research:

“Hence, I recommend to use the term Critical Discourse Studies for the theories, methods, analyses, applications and other practices of critical discourse analysts, and to forget about the confusing term ‘CDA’.” (van Dijk in Wodak and Meyer, 2016, p. 3)

Emphatically not restricted to any one discipline, evolutions and offshoots of CDS have flourished as have new communicative technologies. Fairclough (1995) and Kress and van Leeuwen (1996, 2001), for example, were early critical discourse analysts to develop tools to analyze visual communication in ways that had previously been applied to primarily linguistic texts and are credited with coining the term ‘multimodal analysis’. While media and cultural studies have a history of investigating reaction to text and image based on personal and cultural contexts, the addition of tools for critical discourse analysis are perceived as adding depth to explaining ‘how’ specific reactions are manipulated (Machin & Mayr, 2015).

Although there is a diversity of approaches, CDS shares many of the methodological tools found in qualitative research (Fairclough, 2001; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Recently, CDA has been more extensively applied to multimodal texts, with Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) and Machin (2007) providing useful tools and examples. I will draw on a multiplicity of tools to employ Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis (MCDA) when examining partner webpages. MCDA allows for the particular analysis required by the linguistic, but also visual, auditory, diversionary and transient nature of web pages. Conceptually, I draw on the work of Fairclough (1995, 1989), Janks (2006) and van Dijk (2008) as an entry point into the notion of language and power, and the social semiotic approach of Kress and van Leeuwen (1996), van
Leeuwen (2007) and Machin & Mayr (2012), which extends a critical textual analysis with a more extensive semiotic one to develop and deepen. Finally, I look to the contributions of critical multimodal approaches evolving out of communications and media studies, emphasizing a methodological approach developed by visual sociologist and communications scientist, Luc Pauwels. Conceptually, these shared approaches lend themselves to surfacing visible, and invisible, discourses linked to relationships of power and privilege.

A multimodal critical discourse approach to understanding the matriculation partnership between a private multinational and a public university is ideal for a number of reasons. The public research university, dependent on public funding, can serve to reflect the ideals, or values, of the society it is dependent on. A comparison of what the university homepage, for example, reveals about itself in comparison with the home page of the private partner may surface similar or conflicting visions, or a mix of both. It is hoped that situating multimodal critical discourse analysis within the context of a case study will help to fortify analysis of how partner website discourses may position individuals and the concept of internationalization in ways which contribute to the risks and/or benefits as outlined previously.

3.1.2.2 Critiques

While CDS might often be used to disrupt dominant ideologies or harmful practices, the term does not necessarily dictate the holding of one ideological perspective. Some critiques of CDS hold that the term “critical” might simply mean “attacking ideas, attitudes and values we do not agree with” (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 208). I employ the term ‘critical’ to include reflexivity and forthrightness from the researcher. Van Dijk (1993) cautions, however, that this forthrightness, or an explicit self-positioning of the researcher, not simply serves analyst ends, or
self-validation. To address these critiques of subjective condemnation, and/or self-serving validation, I endeavor to substantiate, through the literature, case study, and multimodal critical discourse analysis the existence of potentially harmful practices in the manifestation of this partnership as identified against, for example expressed institutional and societal ideals of access and equity in education and the ACDE Accord on the Internationalization of Education.

In relation to my specific research and the utilization of web pages as a data source, concerns regarding who the producers and audience are may be the most challenging. Websites can be complex and contradictory, and Pauwels notes the difficulty in identifying sole producers and calls into question the ethics of identifying users, even if that information is readily available (2005). It is hoped that an awareness of this, a rigorous methodology, situated in case study and strong empirical evidence, as well as explicit researcher positioning will serve to address these critiques.

3.1.3 Multimodal Analysis

Van Leeuwen notes that although the term “multimodality” is increasingly employed as a general descriptive, it can also specify a ‘particular set of theoretical concepts and analytical practices’ inspired by linguistics but currently incorporating work on visual communication from diverse disciplines (van Leeuwen, 2011). While discourse has never explicitly been confined to only its linguistic components, in the current context of ‘globalization’ the visual is garnering increased attention. van Leeuwen (2008, p. 132) speaks of a “blurring of lines between visuals and writing” and Thurlow and Aiello (2007, p. 308) refer to a semioscape; ‘a globalizing circulation of symbols, sign systems and meaning-making practices’. Ailleo and Pauwels (2014)
articulate the ability of producers to communicate globally to a diverse audience as a crucial. When communicating to diverse, global audiences, the visual takes on increased importance. In addition to an increasing dependence on images and other non-linguistic semiotic devices to mediate or even replace linguistic text, there are new forms of dissemination and production, notably screens and digital methods (Kress, 2009). This development makes critical approaches to discourse analysis more urgent. van Leeuwen notes that the change in semiotic practice is driven by the fact that “it is increasingly global corporations and semiotic technologies, rather than national institutions which regulate semiotic production and consumption” (van Leeuwen in Wodak, 2009). This matters, Cope and Kalantziz (2000) reinforce, because discourses represent interests. In this study, then, web page analysis will help us understand not only what the discourse centres, but also that which it ignores, and ultimately whose interests are being served and legitimized by current discourses of internationalization in higher education.

3.1.3.1 A Multimodal Framework for Analyzing Websites

As this research involves organization(s) communicating and marketing to an international audience, I will draw on a multimodal framework for analyzing websites as cultural expressions as developed by Luc Pauwels (2012), who, through this framework, has sought to provide an integrated tool which is:

relevant for researching cultural differences between countries or ethnicities but equally suited to track differences and specificities in organizational cultures (departmental or professional cultures) or small groups from a diachronic (longitudinal) or synchronous (comparative) perspective…and is focused on taking into account the medium specific
modes and sub-modes, their multimodal interplay and their origin and purpose. (Pauwels, 2012, p. 248)

Luc Pauwels’ multimodal model for analysis will be employed to mine institutional websites for cultural data. Website analysis can be problematic in that, in its infancy, research is still trying to understand the connections between ‘on-line’ worlds with ‘off-line lives’, and they are often transitory, changing rapidly, and tools for analysis are still in development. Pauwels positions websites as:

an eclectic, multidimensional and integrated search for explicit and implicit statements on cultural issues, such as values, norms and opinions regarding gender, class, race, religion, the state, etc., as they are intentionally or unintentionally expressed and materialized in the many features of this highly hybrid medium. (Pauwels, 2005, p. 609)

I appreciate Pauwels’ framework as one that is not meant to be “predetermined, predictive, or normative” but is “explorative, descriptive, and interpretive” (2005, p. 251). It is hoped that through utilizing Paulwels’ framework, both the explicit and implicit values informing a primary manifestation of internationalization at SFU will be determined.

Stack (2016) enlisted Pauwels’ framework to surface how complex processes of globalization, marketization of education, and practices of mediatization – particularly how universities in the current competitive market brand themselves – could be clearly situated in relation to each other. Stack’s analysis of university websites using Luc Pauwel’s model, alongside data which included documents and interviews, concretely surfaced the ways in which rankings and ranking organizations manipulate a particular conception of higher education.
Luc Pauwels (2012) notes that early website analysis tended to focus on the effectiveness of communication rather than its effects and refers to models developed by Hall (1966, 1976) and Hofstede (1980, 2001) as formative. Criticism of these models revolve around their tendency to be somewhat simplistic (data collection) and/or reductionist, such as Hofstede’s positioning of dimensions of culture (individualism/collectivism, for example). Websites, like individuals, are complex and can understandably hold apparently opposing worldviews. In fact, it is in noting these contradictions that we both identify aspects of interest and opportunity, and legitimate our research by resolutely not predetermining a blanket perspective.

This research intends to provide a ‘snapshot’ in time, of partnership web pages at their ten-year anniversary, and to elicit their statements regarding internationalization in a Canadian public post-secondary institution. Pauwels, by his own standard, offers an approach that is not deterministic, but an “explorative, descriptive, and interpretive approach” and is intended to identify how the intentional or unintentional, yet, paradigmatic choices of website building communicate particular ‘cultural statements’ (Pauwels, 2012, p. 251).

My study draws on Pauwels’ Multimodal framework as one way to document a critical shift in the mission of the Canadian university through “decoding/disclosing the cultural information that resides in both the form and the content (and the content of the form cf. Hayden White, 1987)” (Pauwels, 2012, p.248) of the web pages of a specific, but in many ways increasingly typical, public-private matriculation university partnership.

Luc Pauwels’ multimodal framework for analyzing websites allows for a rigorous exploration of how the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership is discursively constructed, the identification of which can open space for reflection and dialogue, particularly in relation to explicit risks and benefits of internationalization as articulated by the ACDE.
3.2 The Present Study

My research hopes to describe and situate the partnership between SFU and FIC/Navitas through case study and multimodal critical discourse analysis. My overarching questions are restated below.

1. What multimodal discourses are evident on FIC/Navitas and SFU websites to explain and promote their public-private partnership?

2. How do the discourses on the FIC/Navitas and SFU sites differ and how are they similar?

3. What tensions, contradictions, and absences are evident in the ways that the partnership is articulated on the respective FIC/Navitas and SFU sites?

3.2.1 Luc Pauwels’ Multimodal Framework

The research design follows Luc Pauwels’ multimodal framework for analyzing websites as social and cultural data sources (2012, p. 252). He specifically proposes six phases, described below, which move from documentation and measurement to interpretation of the data. Multimodal discourse analysis requires an integration of concepts from diverse disciplines. Where appropriate, I will reference concepts from linguistics (Janks, 2006) and semiotics (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006; Machin & Mayr, 2012) which will be drawn upon to flesh out the analysis.

3.2.2 Data Collection and Selection

The following section describes data collection and selection through the application of Luc Pauwels’ framework.

I chose to only document and analyze easily and publicly available data -- in this case, institutional web pages. I decided to analyze the SFU and FIC homepages and their relevant links at the juncture of the ten-year anniversary of the partnership (2016). I chose to focus on the
homepages as they are not ‘cherry-picked’ for a particular slant but might reflect the complexity of organizations with intricate and diverse agendas and orientations. The literature supports the home page as a place to start to get at a more holistic ideological positioning of what SFU and FIC are communicating about who they are. From these pages I linked to information about admission and progress through the pathways, including references to English language requirements and supports, the about pages, and, finally, letters from the institutions in celebration of the partnership at its ten-year anniversary.

The following steps were taken in accordance with Pauwels’ framework.

**Step 1: Preservation of first impressions and reactions**

It was through my first foray into the SFU and FIC web pages that I determined the order of presentation. As will be described in chapter 6, after a first ‘googling’ of SFU, I began data collection in earnest from the SFU home page. Through a focus on admissions and international students, I was linked to the FIC Home Page. Organizing data around three sites of comparison “home pages”, “about” and “partnership anniversary”, continued to make sense in the context of understanding this partnership.

**Step 2: Inventory of salient features and topics**

As I recorded my first impressions of the website data, I was both struck and intimidated by the amount of data available. I began placing data within a rubric I created based on the work of Machin and Mayr (2012) (who primarily draw on Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006). With the intention of being as thorough as possible I also adopted the invaluable rubrics utilized by Saichaie (2011) in his work on college and university websites. In Saichaie’s work, Janks (2005) served as a guiding framework for a textual analysis, to attend to, interpret, and confirm initial perceptions of multimodal elements. Sachaie also developed his own rubric based on the 2006
work of Kress and van Leeuwen, which I employed as final check for visual texts. Finally, I
turned to the work of Adami’s (2014) social semiotic framework for website interactivity. This
allowed me to account for the interplay and effects of navigable content markers, or what Adami
refers to as “sites/signs”. The rubrics I employed for documentation and note-taking can be
found in the Appendix.

**Step 3: In-depth analysis of content and stylistic features**

It is in this phase that the information located in individual modes, as well as their inter-play, is
attended to. At this stage, I sat with completed rubrics and accompanying websites to register
overall patterns in content and features.

**Step 4: Embedded point(s) of view or voice and implied audience(s) and purposes**

This phase seeks to analyze not just ‘what’ is being communicated, but by who and to whom in
terms of primary and secondary audiences. Here, I was looking at not only what is explicitly, but
implicitly, communicated to surface, even when contradictions exist, whose interests are most
being served.

**Step 5: Analysis of dynamic information organization and spatial priming strategies**

In this phase, I sought to analyze the organization of the webpage. This purpose is to identify
how a viewer might be directed or primed to follow certain information or links, or even be
distracted or deterred from viewing others. Attention to not only what the visitor is allowed to
do, but what they are not allowed to do, is also attended to. Here, I was seeking indication of
direction, misdirection, absence, and references or links which would surface networks of power.

**Step 6: Contextual analysis, provenance and inference**

This phase brings together the identification of significant cultural indicators and the cultural
actors they serve or represent, and an exploration of the complicated links to authorship and
intention. This section of Pauwels’ Multimodal Framework for analyzing websites will be attended to through the concluding chapter of this research.

3.2.3 Limitations of data

Documents providing details of the partnership which might shed some light on issues raised in the literature review were difficult to access or ascertain the existence of, even with the aid of research librarian-supported searches. Interviews with stakeholders in the partnership would add considerable weight to the findings and will be recommended in support of further research.

Ascertaining single authorship of websites is impossible, and they are often the result of a collective effort. A rich theoretical base and case study is intended to support the data and conclusions of a multimodal analysis.
Chapter 4: A Glonacal Context

Before turning to a detailed accounting of the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership and analysis of the SFU and FIC web pages, it is helpful to understand the ‘glonacal’ context in which privatized, for-profit, educational pathway partnerships began to appear and grow. The intention of this chapter is to seek and establish patterns of policy and discourse which can be used to legitimize or trouble the case study and website analysis. It also serves as a reminder that ‘internationalization’ in higher education as market driven is the result of a complex interplay of world bodies, governments, and private interests in contestation, and is contestable.

4.1 Global Context

Post WWII, the aspirational notion of education as a societal good was articulated in Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. One way this was nominally taken up, in Canada, for example, was through what has been labelled the ‘massification’ of public post-secondary. The opening of SFU in BC and York University in Ontario in the post-war period, are two examples of what was intended to reflect a more socially-inclusive higher education system. While the values of access and inclusion were named as driving forces, the pragmatic need for educated workers in a growing post-war economy has also been identified (Johnston, 2005; Kerr, 1982). This growth in education to meet economic needs can be seen as a precursor to the take-up of the university itself as an exploitable resource, and what Marginson, in his preface to ‘The Dream is Over’ (2016), writes is a turn away from progressive ideals to an (globally influential and reflective) individualist American public, higher education system which has moved away from serving the notion of public good.
The moving of education to the markets are due to networks and organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). These organizations have been employing rhetoric which advances the international commodification of education, including advocating for privatized forms and partnerships. Increasingly, the opening-up of public education to private, multi-national, for-profit interests is being entrenched through the rules and regulations of global trade agreements. In Canada, for example, faculty associations and student unions have allied themselves with international education union movements that raise serious concerns and questions about privatization of public education and increased international corporate rights through quietly negotiated agreements, centering around the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) (CAUT, 2003), the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) (CAUT, 2013), the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) (CAUT, 2016), and, most recently, the Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA) (CAUT, 2016).

The following section will provide a short overview of how global discourses of marketization of education were taken up and enacted by the federal Conservative government of Stephen Harper (2006-2015) and continues under the Liberal Party leadership of Justin Trudeau.

4.2 Canadian Context

While Canadian public post-secondary institutions can be flexible in how they negotiate federal and provincial education strategies, they still sit in relationship with global, federal, and provincial discourses of education. How global framings of education as commodity have been negotiated by the federal and provincial government(s) provide insight into what pressures bear on public post-secondary institutions in their own negotiations.
Ken Steele writes that in 1950s/60s Canada, post-secondary education grew to accommodate the middle class, with college campuses and new universities opening across the country, and “In Canada, at least, public tertiary education was increasingly being seen as a fundamental human right and an essential component of a functioning democracy, much like elementary and secondary education had been previously” (Steele, 2010, p.27)

Post-secondary education in Canada is a provincial responsibility. While the federal government transfers block payments in support of education, the provincial governments determine priority social spending. However, as neoliberal thought began gaining traction, and funding of large-scale projects like universities became more contentious, both levels of government began looking for ways to subsidize the cost of post-secondary education. Inflated international student tuition fees became a lucrative option and both levels of government began developing international education strategies. As education is a provincial responsibility, and there is no ‘Ministry of Education’ at the Federal level, international education strategies were placed under, and immediately defined by, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAIT).

Under Stephen Harper, DFAIT created an advisory panel to review international education in Canada. This working group, made up of a mix of university Presidents, administrators and the President of Rio Tinto Alcan were tasked with “maximizing economic opportunities” for Canada in the field of international education. The panel reported to the Minister of International Trade and Finance, which released a final report in August, 2012, entitled “International Education-A Key Driver of Canada’s Future Prosperity”. This federally articulated envisioning of ‘international education’ both extended and centred the federal government in the international education agenda. It also explicitly conflated international education with immigration and labour policy in a chapter called ‘a pipeline to the Canadian labour market’ (italics mine) (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2012).
Affairs and International Trade, 2012). Of the 14 recommendations, most relevant to the research undertaken here is the doubling of the number of international students (with no recommendations of how these numbers or the institutions they study at, are to be supported), place DFAIT in the centre of defining national aspects of international education and while claiming CIER will provide advice to industry, on the provincial level it will be shown that ‘industry’ is being paid to provide advice to ‘education’.

As will be evidenced in the BC International Education Strategy (BCIES) and provincial institutional accountability reports, the province of BC and its public post-secondary institutions are aligned in targeting specific students from specific countries which have invested in education and/or English language training for its citizens and have a large pool of young, mobile, potential labour. The discourse of immigration pathways through Canadian post-secondary is replete with adjectives like ‘high-quality’ to describe potential candidates. As current immigration minister John McCallum stated in June, 2016, “I have not had one person disagree with me when I say that international students are a very fertile recruiting stream for us” (Dharssi, 2016).

The recommendations of the Federal advisory panel were taken up, and in the relatively decentralized context of Canadian higher education, the federal government released a centralizing policy on international education: Canada’s International Education Strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity (CIES) (DFAIT, 2014) through the then-Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, under the Conservative government of Stephen Harper. With a primary goal of more than doubling the number of overseas students in the country by 2022 to 450,000, the strategy notes that “much of the demand for international education will come from developing and emerging economies” (DFAIT, 2014, p.10)
The Liberal Government of Justin Trudeau continues to build on the strategy through the launching of EduCanada in February 2016. EduCanada is a national branding strategy replete with a recognizable logo and tagline: “A World of Possibilities”. The EduCanada Brand and website is designed to bring together the disparate initiatives by individual provinces and universities. Promotional materials are intended to unify messaging and are designed to support the work of the Council of Ministers of Education who work in collaboration with the provinces and territories (Smith, 2016).

Greater centralization aligns with the push by some for profit pathway providers to best position Canada as a brand, which includes addressing the problem of locally determined (provincial) education mandates. Tina Bax, founder and president of Culture Works, a private EAP pathways partner to a number of Canadian post-secondary institutions, states:

But until we can figure out how to deal with the fragmentation caused by education being a provincial mandate, we’re going to struggle to compete with countries that have national education marketing strategies, no matter what our logo looks like. (Smith, para. 13, 2016)

This is a refrain also voiced by corporate policy advisors in connection to privatized in-roads into public post-secondary via pathways. The feature article in the January 2016 edition of The PIE (Professionals in International Education) Newsletter – an international go-to network and information source for those involved in profit focused international education – is entitled “Canadian pathway growth faces capacity, fragmentation challenges”. Based on research by the Illuminate Consulting Group (IGC)², the article states “nearly two thirds of students completing

² IGC defines itself as “an international science, research, and academic strategy consulting firm advising the leadership of teaching and research institutions, foundations, governments, and public agencies on public policy, institutional development, and competition issues.” They have most recently presented in Australia on “Rankings Optimisation for Young Universities” and gave a number of presentations at the 2016 CBIE conference, including topics such as key markets, and venture capital and
pathways (in Canada) were enrolled from university-operated EAP programmes. “*However* (italics mine) pathway provision lags behind more mature markets in competitor countries” (Smith, 2015, para. 2). The article details that the pathway model in Canada is “fragmented, a result of having a provincial education system” (Smith, 2015, para. 2) The article concludes with IGC ‘prompting Canadian post-secondary institutions to consider whether their institutions could ‘benefit from public-private partnerships’ to streamline pathways (Smith, 2015, para. 14).

Issues of access and inclusion are not restricted to schooling. In addition to the rise of privatized pathways into post-secondary public education is the further promise of Canadian citizenship on the other side. As promised in the lead-up to the recent election, the Liberal party is counting 50% of international student time towards the physical residency requirement through Bill C-6. Randall Martin, executive director of the British Columbia Council for International Education (BCCIE), stated “Canada must compete with other countries for the same pool of skilled international students, and creating clear transitions from studying to working, permanent residency and citizenship will help our case.” (Marsh, 2016, para. 7)

The EduCanada home page refers to the possibility of immigration on its homepage and provides a link to Canadian Immigration (CIC). Early policy, which advertised immigrant pathways to international students was effective in increasing the number of international students but was short on follow through. Changes to policy by the Harper Conservatives in 2015 made it even more difficult for international students to actually apply for Permanent Resident status. Currently, Government web pages identify different streams of immigration international students may wish to pursue, with ‘Express Entry’ identified as the most relevant for global competition (with a panel including senior administrators from Culture Works and ELS Language Centres (Private National and Multinational providers) and Vantage College, UBC and Camosun College.
international students. Express Entry simply places international students in a pool alongside skilled immigrants with years of work experience and, often, advanced degrees. Statistics show that even with the support of settlement agencies, qualified immigrants face challenges finding work in their field or making comparable wages to Canadian-born workers. Universities have had to take on the role of immigrant and settlement advisors to international students being sold a pathway that has the possibility of leading to immigration. And in fact, a survey by the Canadian Bureau for International Education shows that over half of international students do want to stay and are applying for permanent residency (CBIE World of Learning, 2015).

The take up of education as commodity has been profitable, but it is not without a cost. In the rush to capitalize on profit, significant structural supports for international students, including EAP, have been identified as lacking. Further, without community and institutional support for all students, staff and faculty, and without an authentic engagement with the potential benefits of internationalization, tensions will arise. If internationalization is experienced as primarily about profit, and profit-motivated education is experienced as ‘common sense’, then the conversation may become about the number of international students, as opposed to the lack of structural support for all. Ken Steele notes:

Growing international student recruitment has created real financial and social benefits for Canada’s institutions, but has also contributed to new strains on student support services, amplified faculty complaints about student academic preparedness, and perhaps set the stage for incidents of racial tension and conflict on campuses and in surrounding communities; (Top Ten). (Steele, 2010, p. 29)
While international student marketing and counselling opportunities have blossomed as band-aids to structural support and more altruistic motives, Phan Le Ha notes that “internationalization is not rolling out in universities (through domestic students, staff, and faculty) because it’s been defined as moneyed interests – for many a sense of alienation and marginalization.” (Phan, 2014)

4.2.1 The Canadian Context: Section Summary

This section detailed the centralization of international education as both a federal interest and market good, and the support of the private sector in further centralizing education to make it more structurally compliant with marketing processes. It noted that the federal promotion of international education includes opportunities for work and immigration. This chapter concluded with the determination that federal international education strategy and branding has contributed to an economic boon for some, as defined by the overall numbers. In relation to discourse, ‘possibility’ and ‘opportunity’ surfaced as key nouns on government websites, while ‘pathways’ and a centralizing of authority to facilitate the marketing of international education were of central concern to private interests. This section concluded with the recognition that while internationalization has been lauded as a financial boon, institutions are lacking significant structural support. Internationalization experienced as for-profit is manifesting substantial challenges for individuals experiencing it at an institutional level.

4.3 British Columbia: The Provincial Context

Over a one-week period in 2008, then-Liberal Premier Gordon Campbell announced that five postsecondary institutions in BC, formerly labelled ‘college-universities’, would change their status to ‘university’. The government explained the change in status as based in
recommendations made in the *Campus 2020* report on postsecondary education authored by Geoff Plant in 2007. While officially designated “special purpose teaching universities” would continue to offer skills training and trades, Kwantlen University president Skip Triplett, noted that “85% of students at Kwantlen were enrolled in degree programs or programs that track directly to degrees” (Charbonneau, 2008). This facilitation of prestige and potential transferability into British Columbia’s research universities, namely UBC, SFU and UVIC, helped the ‘new’ universities address funding cuts that had been announced just prior to the status change announcement. President of University College of the Fraser Valley H. A. “Skip” Bassford, noted “the change will make fundraising much more effective and will improve efforts to recruit international students” (Charbonneau, 2008). A simultaneous and ongoing effort by the British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfers (BCCAT) has led to a robust ‘transfer system’ involving all public post-secondary institutions, and more recently, private ones. The eleven public universities currently named by BCAAT as part of the transfer system are matched equally by eleven private post-secondary institutions. Building on this development has been the initiative taken by some universities to create not just potential transferability, but articulated or matriculated pathways. As will be detailed in a following section, one example of this would be the partnerships Simon Fraser University has in place with Douglas College (a local public college) and Fraser International College (FIC-established by Navitas, as noted, a private, for-profit, multinational education services provider).

---

3 Just previous to the announcement of change in status, the BC Liberal government announced that universities would see their operating budget cut by 2.6% the following year (University Affairs, 2008).
In 2011, amidst this rapid rise in pathways and accredited for-profit post-secondary institutions, the BC Liberal Party, then led by Premier Christy Clark, released its ‘BC International Education Strategy’ (BCIES). The language of the strategy reflects the economic emphasis of the global and federal positioning of international education as an untapped market. It stresses both the money available for local communities and retention of international students to fill projected labour gaps. It also references the role of the private sector in informing, realizing and managing international education policy moving forward.

4.3.1 BC International Education Strategy

The British Columbia International Education Strategy (BCIES) was enthusiastically presented as a gift to the economy. When introducing the BCIES at Thompson Rivers University (TRU), Premier Christy Clark spoke in explicitly economic terms. As international students milled around her, she enthused that “They pumped 88 million into the local Kamloops economy” and “They pump 1.25 billion dollars into our national economic sector” (italics mine) (Kam News, 2011). Similarly, the document itself, while containing a nod to domestic students travelling abroad and a stronger international outlook, overwhelmingly accentuates economic gain with an overwhelming number of graphs and charts.

The BCIES is offered as the answer to ‘emerging labour market challenges’ and of ‘significant shortages of skilled workers in certain fields’ (BCIES, p. 10). And much like the federal advisory, the BCIES asserts that ‘it is about bringing key students to key parts of the province where there is a need for their skills’ (BCIES, p. 14, italics mine). In addition, Premier Clark, in her introduction to the strategy at TRU, notes that government will be ‘partnering with industry to make sure that demands in key sectors are met,’ (Kam News, 2011). In a time when all
levels of schooling are struggling with reduced budgets and increasing costs, private industry is promised 6 million dollars to help them tell government ‘who they are going to need educated’ (Kam News, 2011). Target countries are then listed, assessed, for example, on the typical field of study of students compared to the labour needs of B.C. International education then, can lead to immigration, for certain students, from certain countries, pursuing certain fields of education.

Of note is how both the provincial and federal policy documents present international education as the solution to a certain type of problem (economic), as articulated by and to serve specific interests (industry), and in this case, the pressure which is then exerted on education institutions to fall in line. For example, there has been a 20% drop in real per student operating grants since 2001 (FPSE, 2016 p. 2). At the same time, a policy is introduced meant to address the funding gap, and, in fact, we can see that the policy pressure to increase the number of international students attending BC schools has been successful.

Roslyn Kunin and Associates 2015 report for DFAIT which updates earlier numbers and projections speak of economic success for the post-secondary sector. Kunin reported that between 2009/2010 and 2013/2014, the growth rate of international students studying in BC was ‘most significant at the post-secondary sector’ (Kunin, 2015, p. 3). Her report states that the share of international students in the province “increased from approximately 40% of the total number of international students in the province to almost 50% of the total student body” (Kunin, 2015, p. 3). Further, from 2009/10 – 2013/14, the number of international students in public post-secondary increased, on average, by 9.1% per year. During the same period, domestic students decreased by an average of 1.1% per year. (p. 5). In total, 114,600 international students contributed 2.6 billion dollars to the provincial economy in the 2013/2014 academic year. ( p. 1)
While policy that places pressure on public post-secondary institutions to rapidly increase the numbers of international students and funnel them into funded departments and immigration pathways have been realized, those very few aspects of the BCIES that speak to the needs of teachers and students have received no policy support. The BCIES delineates 3 goals, supported by 9 ‘actions’. Only action ‘9’ speaks to the pressure that will be put on institutions (or by extension, the people and communities they are composed of):

9. Ensure educational institutions and their communities have the capacity to accommodate increasing numbers of international students….the province will accomplish this by: sharing capacity ‘best practices across the sector’ and ‘pursuing private, public, and not-for-profit partnerships to meet capacity needs. (BCIES, 2012, p. 26)

In the absence of any state support, the message of action 9 is clear: the institution is responsible for ‘best practices’ and seeking partnerships outside of the public realm to meet ‘capacity needs’.

In the absence of provincial support for the international numbers being demanded, public post-secondary institutions have had to make decisions about how those numbers will both be achieved and managed. Looking to Australia as a country that, so far, has had success attracting large numbers of international students, often through private pathway matriculation partnership agreements, some Canadian and British Columbian post-secondary institutions have followed suit. The following section will provide an overview of the current landscape in Canada, in relation to private-public pathway provider partnerships, all of which are dependent on English as an Additional Language or English for Academic Purposes Programs for profit.
4.3.2 The BC Context: Section Summary

This section documented how the creation and rise of domestic pathway models in private and public language and post-secondary institutions shifted competition between all institutions to types of institutions. Pathways also created an opportunity for increased marketing to international students who could be offered a potential path into a top-ranking research university. The BC Liberals under Christy Clark further capitalized on the economic gains to be made by articulating internationalization strategy in education as part and parcel of their ‘BC Jobs Plan’. As in the federal document, attention was explicitly directed towards economic opportunity with little regard or support for the personal and social costs. Also missing was the potential financial cost of mediating the effects of a primarily profit-motivated endeavour on educational communities. Also like federal discourses, provincial discourses position international students as ‘other’ with repeated reference to what ‘they’ can do for ‘us’, and little in the way of guarantees the other way around. The next section will provide a contextual overview of the growth of private-public pathway partnerships to situate the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership.

4.4 Public-private post-secondary matriculation pathway partnerships for international students

Carter A. Winkle is one of a few who have researched in some depth the intersection of privatization/corporatization of the university, English language programs and for-profit partnerships. In his book “University Partnerships with the Corporate Sector: Faculty experiences with for-profit matriculation pathway programs,” Winkle notes that while the outsourcing and privatizing of areas of the university that don’t meet core academic mandates has been somewhat normalized (cleaning, cafeteria and security staff, for example), and the increasingly contingent
nature of faculty is a current reality, there has been very little attention paid to the outsourcing of whole programs and/or departments. Already marginalized in academia, EAL programs have been routinely qualified as in support of the academic mission of the university, and it is these programs that have been the first to be coopted by private partners. In the recent past, EAL (or IEP) programs in Canadian public-post secondary would often be run out of Faculties of Arts and/or Social Sciences. It was recognized that while there was a fee, the primary goal was to provide a ‘bridge’ for EAL students to transition into for-credit classes in the university. It is also true that there would be ‘cost-recovery’ programs run out of Continuing Studies departments, which would be depended on to generate profit, taken-up by Continuing Studies or the larger university. Often both types of programs would exist simultaneously, and both would be accountable to the public institution. The institution would also be directly accountable to the students in its programs. However, with the current emphasis on international student recruitment as a funding mechanism, and the English language as holding a privileged place as an academic *lingua franca*, private educational providers are capitalizing on an opportunity for mass profit. Once marginalized, yet often quite autonomous in Canadian public-post secondary, EAL and EAP programs have become the subject of review and reform.

In contextualising pathway partnerships, it is essential to review the implications of their foundational rooting in traditionally in-house ESL/EAL programs and the links between power, privilege and the role of English as a global language (Pennycook, 1994, 1998; Widin, 2010).

English has often been marketed as one of the most appealing elements and a must tick of the internationalization of education that would earn a nation’s competitive advantage and modernisation as well as bring about good jobs, status, knowledge and access (Airey, 2011; Low & Hashim, 2012; Marimuthu, 2008 in Chowdhury & Phan, 2014, p. 8).
While much current research is documenting how these tendencies are being negotiated and challenged (Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999, 2005; Pennycook, 2008), ‘inner-circle’ English speaking post-secondary institutions in partnership with profit-based private providers have the potential to encourage and accommodate these problematic tendencies. For example, in an ambiguous response to a question regarding the success of Navitas, Tony Cullen, the Executive General Manager – Marketing and Sales, University Programs at Navitas responded “Yes, more than 20 years of delivering education for kids to get them from where they are in their own country into a university and the success of that.” (Baker, 2016, para.6)

While the phrasing is somewhat unclear, it reads as removing ‘kids’ from their ‘own country’ into a university in another country, at the “mainstream” university, as successful. The implication being that attending university close to home is somehow unsuccessful. Further:

TC: I think what we’re going to find is there will always be that need for the pathway because of the education systems that a lot these kids come out of. I think what we will see is it will become very much multi-module. But I think the value of having an education from an English speaking country, certainly with the focus on employability and employment – and with the skills shortages in the labour markets across a whole lot of different markets – means that appetite for international education is not going to diminish. (Baker, 2016, para. 13)

The internationalization of higher education has taken an economic turn. In Canada, as elsewhere, research universities are increasingly positioned, and position themselves, as in competition with each other, and other national economies for a global market share of
international students. In this world, education as commodity is solidified and must be marketed, and language skills are part of the product. In Canada, both the federal government, and some provincial governments (in this research, British Columbia) have called for a dramatic increase in international students over a relatively short time. Many public research universities simply did, and still do not have the marketing/agent apparatus in place to meet the turn-around time. Following isomorphic tendencies, Canadian universities began to follow the lead -- established by Australia and taken-up by the United Kingdom -- of turning to privatized pathway partnerships which offered extensive and established marketing and international recruitment networks, per student payment, and a steady stream of university-ready, international undergrads. For their part, private for-profit educational providers, already established and generating profit in Australia and England, were eyeing Canada and the United States as the next frontier.

The next section provides an overview of the dominant private, for-profit matriculation providers in Canadian public higher education and explores the establishment of both a symbiotic relationship, as well as a dependent one.

4.4.1 Canadian Pathway Partnership Providers: Study Group International, Culture Works and Navitas

While the number and diversity of pathways into Canadian public post-secondary continues to grow, the prominent players in the Canadian educational services pathways-partnership matriculation market include Culture Works, Study Group International and Navitas. SFU was the first research university in Canada to enter into a matriculation partnership with a private, for-profit provider (Navitas). Since then, there have been a number of these types of partnerships in both the US and Canada, with the US still seen as the primary growth market. As
noted previously, the initial draw is the marketing, and networking apparatus these partnerships offer. The above-named groups advertise not only recruitment services, but also EAL programs which offer provisional acceptance into the host institution and/or a pathway into the same private college’s for-credit first year classes in a supported environment. Successful students then transfer into the public host institution for their second year. In sum, the private partner offers marketing, recruitment, language, acculturation and academic support, as well as a percentage of tuition fees and a guaranteed and ready international student body paying full international student tuition (which has no cap, as opposed to domestic student tuition) once they enter the host institution. The private partner gets the name brand of their partnering public institution as well as access to use of public facilities on campus.

In Canada, Study Group International (SGI), a former Australian company now wholly owned by private Providence Equity in the United States, has partnered with Royal Roads. SGI provides English language and for credit courses enabling a pathway into partner universities. The SGI homepage refers to the placement of a number of their partner universities in league tables and rankings and notes the ranked livability of cities and states in the USA and Canada: “A university education from the USA or Canada is recognized as being among the best in the world, providing exciting career and lifestyle prospects for international students” (StudyWorks, 2017).

Culture Works, a Canadian pathways provider, works in much the same way and has partnered with King’s College, Brescia College, Carleton University, Western University, Durham College and the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT). Carleton University notably partnered with Culture Works after its Senate had recommended not partnering with SFU and UofM’s for-profit education provider, Navitas. One criticism of these partnerships, and of which
Carleton is a case in point, refers to the closure of in-house ESL programs taught by affiliated and unionized staff being replaced by a provider which relies on outsourcing and non-unionized instructional staff. Nineteen unionized jobs were lost when the in-house English language program at Carleton was closed. A second wide-spread criticism is that across the board, these pathway partnerships are negotiated behind closed doors. In 2012, CUASA delivered a letter to Carleton’s board of governors condemning the lack of “transparency and disregard for academic freedom” (CAUT, 2012). The terms of the agreement between Carleton and Culture Works were confidential. Faculty expressed concern over the incentive to compromise academic integrity when a for-profit motive is present. On August 11th, 2016, Carleton academic staff unanimously passed a motion of no-confidence in its Board of Governors, specifically tied to concerns which limit decision-making power and restrict communication, particularly in regard to partnerships with the private sector. (CAUT, 2016).

While Navitas was unsuccessful in their approach to the University of Windsor, Dalhousie University and Carleton University, it was able to achieve pathway partnerships with two Canadian Universities. Navitas opened Fraser International College at Simon Fraser University in 2006, and the International College of Manitoba (ICM) at the University of Manitoba (U of M) in 2008. While the relationship between Navitas and SFU will be explored in more detail, a few words on the establishment of the Navitas-University of Manitoba partnership may serve to further exemplify concerns with lack of transparency in public-private partnerships. As reported by the Canadian Association of University Teacher’s (CAUT):

Reportedly a five-year contract, the secret brokering of the deal with no notice to the university senate, board of governors, or faculty association, became the cause of heated debate in senate meetings following the posted announcement of the contract on the Navitas
website.

Last November’s senate meeting held another shock for faculty when it was announced that what had originally been thought to be a five-year contract with Navitas, is in fact a 10-year contract expiring in 2018. (CAUT, 2016)

Actually, the U of M Senate had to file a Freedom of Information (FOI) request to get information about the deal that senior administration refused to share. What they did receive had financial information redacted. Ken Steele notes as well “Of even greater concern than the current arrangements to deliver foundational programs, faculty associations claim that the Navitas business plan includes eventually delivering full degree programs in partnership with universities (uCu, 2010, in Steele, 2010)”. Initial protests by faculty and student groups at both SFU and UofM along with a high-profile CBC report examining potential recruiter fraud tied to Navitas (Larsen, 2012) may partially explain the reluctance of other Canadian universities to partner with Navitas. Another outcome may have been the pressure put on the government of Manitoba to propose and recently pass ‘Bill 44’ or the International Education Act, put in place to protect international students from predatory practices. Manitoba appears to be the lone province to advance this type of legislation. On a federal level, changes to the international student program are in place to specifically protect the fraud or misuse of the program, not students.

The next chapter will describe Navitas as an organization in more detail before moving to a history and description of the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership.
Chapter 5: The SFU - Navitas/FIC Partnership

This section will begin with a brief description of Navitas and SFU as individual entities and continue with a documenting of the establishment and history of the SFU-FIC partnership, culminating in its ten-year anniversary.

5.1 NAVITAS

Navitas, formerly IBT (Institute of Business Technology), a publicly traded, multinational, for-profit, Australian education business, is one of a few private multinational education businesses which have come to dominate the international education market. Navitas positions itself as a solution to challenges they (Navitas) assert are facing public universities in the global movement to “internationalize”. In a 2004 article entitled “IBT Education Group goes public – is student support the next frontier for commercial intervention in higher education?” IBT claims to “provide solutions to widely perceived tensions between international students and universities – specifically university concerns about student language and academic ability on entry, and international student concerns about university support arrangements” (Observatory, 2004). Today, the Navitas homepage leads with the statement:

Navitas accelerates the internationalization of university campuses providing greater opportunity and access to high-quality learning experiences and bringing global perspectives to the university curriculum. (Navitas, 2017)

Navitas (credited with being one of the first to establish these kinds of pathways programs) follows a standard pathways model. On the ground, Navitas offers a private pathway
into “Western” public post-secondary for “international” students and money for under-funded public institutions. In fact, Navitas’ corporate strategy has identified the conditions for their success as dependent on ‘the lack of tertiary infrastructure in source countries’ and the ‘real reduction of government funding (increasing reliance of universities on full-fee paying international students)’ (UCU, 2008). Students are typically recruited overseas although domestic recruitment is now established at Navitas colleges in Australia, where 25% of pathways students are domestic (Baker, 2016). The meta message for students is that by attending Navitas you have bought matriculation into the partnering public institution. Indeed, this may be the case, if you are successful. The Navitas website states:

Our story is best told through our learners. It is their adventure... a student, who through Navitas finds it within to navigate a path to success, overcoming challenges and achieving their goals of further study, of progression in their chosen career, or expanding into new fields.” (italics mine) (Navitas, 2017)

While each Navitas college partnership is somewhat unique, the specifics of each are not publicly available. Navitas colleges follow the standardized pathways model as outlined previously; in return for a brand name and access to public facilities on campus, Navitas will recruit and provide both EAL support and/or first-year credit classes. Those students who

________________________

4 The current partnership page of the Navitas website lists partnerships with 9 universities in Australia, 10 universities in the UK, 5 in the US, 1 in New Zealand, and 2 in Canada -- University of Manitoba, along with Simon Fraser University.
succeed are rewarded with matriculation into the partner institution, which will then receive 100% of inflated international student tuition (as noted, in addition to a percentage of the tuition FIC receives).

In a statement to the Globe and Mail, Nancy Johnston, then executive director of student affairs at SFU, summed up the relationship with Navitas in the following way:

They take in students who are not otherwise qualified, including in speaking English, [and] they give them a university transitional year, … The goal is to get them up to our admission standards. If they spend a year at FIC, and have success there, they will be on a path to SFU. We're in business with them, because they have a good quality product. It's a win, win, win, and along the way we make some money. (italics mine) (Gallagher, 2010)

As a for-profit enterprise, Navitas is first and foremost responsible to its shareholders, and they “have made some money along the way”. In its FY16 results, the Navitas group reported that revenue exceeded $1b the previous year and a rise in net profits of $90m after tax – a growth of 25% (Marsh, 2016b). Chief executive officer of Navitas, Rod Jones, stated that next year looks equally promising, saying “Demand for international education continues to grow. Regulatory environments in the US and Canada remain supportive, Australia is undergoing further positive reform and the UK continues to be restrictive” (italics mine) (Letts, 2016).

Navitas sources 63 per cent of its earnings in Australia and 10 per cent in the US, while the UK and Canada, with 9 per cent and 8 per cent are its other significant markets (Letts, 2016). Relevant to this research is noting that the English language and professional courses division of Navitas is identified as successfully offsetting the “decline of the universities division” (Custer, 2015).
5.1.1 The Navitas Brand

Australian education services multinational IBT received shareholder approval to change its name to ‘Navitas’ in November of 2007. ‘IBT’ was said to be too generic a name to offer legal protection, but the focus for the change was on a rebranding. A professional agency was brought in to realize an envisioning of Navitas like the company ‘Virgin’ -- recognized internationally on its own merits (Baker, 2016). In a 2016 interview, Tony Cullen reflects that over time, Navitas came to understand that it was not their brand attracting students, but that of their public partner. In reference to its evolving brand, Cullen stated:

I guess over time what we have learnt is the importance – particularly in the university division – that the students aren’t buying Navitas, they are actually buying the university partner, and so we’ve taken MIBT and turned it into Deakin College, we’re doing the same with QIBT it is becoming Griffith College, so it is getting much closer aligned with the university and the university brand. (Baker, 2016)

The ‘brand’ built up by the public university is essential to the selling of the pathway into it by the private, for-profit provider. The university becomes dependent on the revenue generated by the private partner and lines become blurred. This blurring of lines can become problematic as severing ties or a taking up of criticism against the private partner may no longer be in the institution’s best interest.

While Navitas partnerships may financially profit, concerns over partnerships have been raised. Unions and staff in partnership with Navitas complain that aggressive, profit-driven
marketing result in students with a lower level of English language proficiency who are required to spend additional time and money on the pathway. Additionally, a loss of union recognition as sessionals are transferred out of the university and into teaching positions at the partnering college, result in a two-tier workforce on the university campuses.

In 2013, the Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency (Australia) sought feedback from the higher education sector on the future direction of its regulatory processes and Regulatory Risk Framework. In response, Navitas noted that “the risk framework applied by TESQA must include Risk indicators that actually reflect demonstratable risks to students or pose financial risk to the provider” (TEQSA, 2013). In regards to specific risks, two are notable in their relation to student and faculty concerns: attrition and completion rates. Navitas notes that due to a diversity of existing and emerging models of delivery, there should be new methodology for determining completion and attrition rates. TESQA lists academic staff on casual contracts or sessional contracts as a risk factor. Navitas disagrees with this characterization and argues that while its pathway colleges have a largely casual teaching workforce, there is little risk as they are able to “match teaching capacity to demand and ‘cherry-pick’ only the best and most engaging academics to teach in a Navitas college (TEQSA, 2013).

5.1.2 Navitas: Section Summary

In summary, Navitas claims to recruit, support, and transition underqualified students into partner universities. Data which delineates the number of students entering into initial agreements with Navitas colleges, the number which matriculate into the partner university, and the number who successfully graduate from the partnering institution in the context of the larger
numbers are unavailable on the FIC or Navitas websites. However, the partner university typically licenses their name and logo to Navitas for marketing purposes and grants Navitas educational space on campus as well as access to campus facilities. In return, the host institution receives a percentage of each pathways student’s tuition, and then full international student tuition if the pathway is successfully completed. Key criticisms of Navitas partnerships are that they provide scaffolded access, including English language support, to students who can afford it, a lack of transparency and accountability, and increased contingency for teaching staff. Meanwhile, Navitas recognizes that it is dependent on the partner university for the social and cultural capital associated with their brand.

5.2 SFU

SFU became the first university in Canada to enter into partnership with a private provider offering a matriculated pathway. SFU was attractive to Navitas – it has a strong brand and ranks high in comprehensive university categories. In addition, in the current marketing of universities, place and lifestyle are emphasized. Navitas marketers are able to advertise Vancouver, Canada, and the possibility of work and immigration.

SFU, itself, has built up a brand that hooks into notions of integrity, equity, and serving the greater community. The ‘radical campus’, or ‘Berkeley North’ built in 1965 during the post-war boom may not have been exactly that, but it did begin with alternative, less centralized models of decision-making and an intention towards inclusiveness and transparency. Built to meet the growing demands of an expanding middle class, SFU was to be reflective of a growing belief in education as an accessible right for all. Much of SFU’s current branding and social media presence still pays service to the idea of far-reaching ‘engagement’. In a time of
internationalization, the SFU logo reads ‘engaging the world’, but its larger mission statement includes “engaging students, engaging research, engaging communities”.

Moving into the 1970s and 1980s, SFU faced the same hardships in the form of funding cuts that universities across Canada were facing. And, like other universities across Canada, SFU began to look to the private sector for support.

5.3 The SFU-FIC/Navitas Partnership

The following section outlines the establishment and development of the SFU - FIC/Navitas partnership.

5.3.1 Beginnings

In 2005, Navitas (then IBT), looking to expand into North America, approached SFU. At the time, SFU was looking to increase international students and diversify its international student population. When interviewed, SFU’s Vice-President, Students and International, Nello Angerilli, explained that developing its own agent network to increase international students was time-consuming and uncertain, and that IBT had proven itself as a successful option (Buenaventura, 2007).

In March 2006, the SFU Board of Governors approved an affiliation agreement with Australia’s IBT (Navitas). FIC opened on September 11th, 2006. The opening was controversial with the Simon Fraser Student Society (SFSS), Teaching Support Staff Union (TSSU-representing TAs, TMs, Sessionals, and Language instructors), the SFU Faculty Association (SFUFA), and SFU international student group (ISG) all publicly voicing their concerns or opposition to the deal. Through collected interviews, Buenaventura notes that the SFSS raised
concerns about the shift SFU was taking in terms of democratic control in relation to the partnership. Noting that the SFU Board of Governors has representatives from staff, faculty, administration, the province and the student body, the SFSS felt the ‘Academic Advisory Committee’ for FIC was underrepresented with only 3 representatives from FIC and 3 (appointed) from SFU. The SFSS raised concerns that the Committee might be motivated by profit over what might be best for instructors and students. The TSSU noted that FIC instructors are contingent and unrepresented, and felt the agreement would contribute to the casualization of academic labour. SFUFA took issue with the speed to which administration was seeking to make a decision, as well as having questions and concerns about increased workload and the effect on pathways and relationships already in place with local public colleges. Finally, the SFU international student group raised concerns about the framing of international students as ‘cash cows’ and were skeptical that the Navitas partnership could be the single solution to support they had long been advocating for (Buenaventura, 2007).

Collectively, these groups were able to pressure administration into two open forums, held on January 31st and February 23rd, 2006.

At one open forum, senior administrators listed retention and international student diversity as factors contributing to their decision to pursue partnership with Navitas (IBT), but as one report noted:

The primary reason cited by both Waterhouse and Angerilli for looking into increasing the number of international students on campus was to further diversify the population of SFU students and give students exposure to a variety of different cultures. By the end of the meeting it had been boiled down to finances.
Thirty per cent of the tuition fees collected by FIC would be redirected to SFU, and it is expected that cumulative net income for this venture would be approximately $1 million after two years and grow to $10 million after five years. Current tuition fee revenue at SFU garnered from international students is $22 million in 2005/2006, accounting for 23 per cent of the total undergraduate tuition fee revenue. (McCuaig, 2006)

The debate moved to votes in both the SFU Senate, and finally a closed-door session through the Board of Governors. Buenaventura quotes an anonymous student interviewee:

For those who attended that Senate meeting... It was a very intense debate... But, the university [administration] was able to intimidate some faculty members by threatening [them] that if IBT [did] not pass then revenue was going to be lost. So, once their employer begins to make those kinds of threats, I just can’t see how IBT would have failed because the consequence to the faculty members was you either go with IBT and maintain the funding levels that you have now and possibly increase it or you go against IBT you can be sure that your budgets will be cut. ...So, as much as some [faculty members] opposed the agreement in principle, the practical reality [is that] they didn’t want to see their budgets cut. I think that was really the key argument that swayed the vote. (Buenaventura, 2007)

The final Board of Governors vote passed and a five-year affiliation with Fraser International College/IBT was agreed upon.
5.3.2 The 2010 Review

In 2010, a required review of FIC took place. The partnership was assessed successful by SFU President Andrew Petter and, on October 4th, a media release announced the renewal of the partnership. Then-VP Academic, Jon Driver, rationalized SFU’s decision by stating:

basically, it is just like any other college and from my perspective the students are paying essentially what they would pay anywhere to do a pre-university program, but they’re getting a better experience because they have access to a whole lot of university resources and the courses they are taking are specifically designed so that they’ll be able to transfer into an SFU program (Proctor, 2010)

However, a Globe & Mail article published a few days later on October 15th raised serious concerns, particularly regarding questionable Navitas agent practices and promises (Gallagher, 2010). Although the partnership was renewed, the external review committee (ERC) noted issues regarding diversity and translation of information for potential students. They concluded their report with the following reference to ongoing review:

The ERC also believes that it is prudent and useful to conduct reviews such as the present one on an ongoing, cyclical basis, every five years in accordance with the SFU departmental self-study policies and procedures already in place. (SFU, 2010, p.30)

If there has been a five-year review, or any further public reviews, a search of SFU’s website does not make it available, nor clear whether this recommendation is being followed up on.
5.3.3 The 2011 EAL Supports Review

In the fall of 2010, SFU Vice President Academic Jonathan Driver initiated a review of EAL supports and services. Noting at the time that an estimated 50% of domestic and international students could be categorized as EAL, the report was meant to identify and address significant gaps in support for these students. The final report (SFU, 2011) noted that pre-admission support had been addressed through the program I teach in, the English Language and Culture Program (ELC) run out of Continuing Studies (now Lifelong Learning), and The English Bridge Program (EBP), the Preparation in Academic Skills in English (PAS) and the Academic English Skills (AES) run out of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. The final report noted that EBP had been recently closed as more international students were being directly admitted to SFU and that FASS was no longer able to afford to run the programs out of their faculty. PAS and AES were to run “in collaboration” with FIC. These programs have since disappeared and/or moved into ELC (for students who have an IELTS score of “4” or less) which then pathways students into FIC’s EAP “Cornerstone” program (which acts as a ‘bridge’ into FICs for credit first year offerings). Documents illuminating any formal agreement, notification, discussion, or vote of how these programs were closed, or regarding FIC’s take-up of them, are unavailable.

The English language market is essential to Navitas’ growth, as recently reported:

“The company’s professional and English programmes, which also include higher education and vocational qualifications, saw a 17% increase in EBITDA resulting in a total of AUS$29.5m.” (Marsh, 2015)
5.3.4 Celebrating a decade of partnership: 2016

Ten years later, there are questions which are difficult to determine the answer to, including whether the college has reached or surpassed optimum enrollment. According to the numbers, Fraser International College has 500 more students than initially proposed, and it is unclear who is included in these numbers.

In addition, publicly accessible SFU budget reports obfuscate the real financial numbers that FIC is bringing in. When looking at highlights from the most recent SFU budget, the amount documented from FIC is included in a line entitled “Donations, non-government grants and contracts”. While it is unclear just how much comes from FIC, discrepancies between forecasted and actual amounts (surplus are attributed to increased royalties from FIC in the budget (SFU, IAPR, 2016/2017).

The relationship between government policy pressure and institutional decision making is clear when looking at institutional accountability reports. Funding cuts, redirected funding, and tied funding exert pressure on institutions to behave in particular ways. In alignment with provincial and federal strategy, SFU’s 2015/16 – 2017/18 Institutional Accountability Plan and Report to the provincial government provides information on enrollment which speaks to dependence on international student tuition, tied funding, and connections to immigration and labour policy. *(Institutional Accountability Plan and Report, 2015/16 – 2017/18, p.33).*

FIC/Navitas Pathway Numbers

It is unclear how many students actually commit financially to the FIC pathway, but never transition into SFU. Which public or private schools these students go to if they fall off the path into SFU, and what their relationship is to agents or FIC, or the number of students who
return home is publicly unavailable and although students may return to FIC, it is uncertain how many actually do.

There is indication that Navitas acknowledges its difficulties with retention. When asked a question regarding what Navitas can put into practice ‘at the coalface’ (the student end), Tony Cullen of Navitas replies that they are looking at being more engaged with the students and focusing on understanding and improving retention. However, at SFU in particular, it appears there may be little space to accommodate all students on the FIC Pathway into SFU; for the first time the spring term is now closed to international students as the cap for the year was filled in August. (Xu, 2017). Alternatively, if space is held for FIC students, what are the implications for international students applying outside of the FIC pathway?

The next section will turn to websites to assess how SFU and FIC/Navitas communicate their partnership publicly and how discourses align with or differ from case study data.
Chapter 6: Website Data

This chapter will critically analyze SFU and FIC/Navitas web pages with the intention of answering the research questions:

1. What multimodal discourses are evident on FIC/Navitas and SFU websites to explain and promote their public-private partnership?

2. How do the discourses on the FIC/Navitas and SFU sites differ and how are they similar?

3. What tensions, contradictions, and absences are evident in the ways that the partnership is articulated on the respective FIC/Navitas and SFU sites?

The web pages to be analyzed include:

- SFU and FIC home pages
- SFU and FIC ‘about’ pages (as linked to from the FIC website)
- Links to letters in celebration of partnership

The web pages were chosen based on their relevance to the research questions. The dates they were captured reflect a time of institutional recognition by SFU and Navitas of their decade partnership anniversary. The following section will organize the data around the three research questions.

6.1 Explanation and Promotion of Partnership

The following section will refer to first, the SFU, and then, the FIC, websites to understand how the partnership is explained and promoted.

6.1.1 SFU

The dominant images and language on the SFU home page target the local community (SFU and Burnaby) with an invitation to participate in free academic offerings. To the side, a list
of clickable links detail current SFU news and accomplishments, including a link to SFU President Petter’s blog celebrating the anniversary of the FIC partnership. There are no other links nor references to the partnership. As an instructor at SFU, and a regular user of the site, I note that the only time I have seen mention of FIC on the home page is around the time of the anniversary.

It takes three ‘clicks’ (admissions, undergraduate admissions, international students) to arrive at admissions information for international students. Listed in the left side task bar, detailing admission requirements, is a link to ‘English Language Requirements’ and ‘Partnerships’. A click on ‘partnerships’ reveals two types of partnerships on offer.

The first partnership programs named are Douglas and Langara, both public colleges in Vancouver, BC. These partnerships are given prominence through their placement at the top and larger font. The language used to describe these partnerships is authoritative and certain. The use of the modal ‘will’ leaves no room for doubt. The choice of the words ‘freely’ and ‘easily’ to describe movement between the partner institutions, and the reference to completion all indicate a transparent and definite outcome.

In smaller font, named below the public partnerships, is the private-public FIC-SFU partnership. The offering of these partnerships on the same page and beginning with the same phrase “Our partnership with…” indicates a cohesion of purpose and outcome. However, the degree of certainty as indicated by modal and word choice shifts considerably. The “will allow” of the Langara/Douglas partnership is replaced in the FIC blurb by “offers”. Further, the audience is addressed as ‘you’ in the Langara/Douglas partnership, whereas in the FIC partnership there is an indication of othering through the switch from “you” to “international
students”. Finally, the initial FIC partnership sentence ends with the euphemistic “a unique pathway opportunity to an undergraduate degree.” (italics mine).

6.1.2 Fraser International College

At first glance, an emphasis on the SFU partnership, and an implication of untroubled access to SFU, dominates the FIC homepage:

The FIC homepage is layered with replication of branded colours found on the SFU website. The layout of images also replicates the SFU homepage of one large rectangular image sitting atop three smaller ones. The dominant image is of a smiling, young, white woman wearing SFU colors against the backdrop of iconic SFU architecture. The woman is staring confidently out of the picture, and the image is taken close enough that we feel some connection. The viewer is not left to observe a passive participant in a frame, but to respond to a personal invitation. Above the image are the FIC and SFU branding, which are given equal space and placed next to each other, indicative of an equal partnership.

To the right of the student is a box of accompanying text. At the top of the box, in large font, is the unambiguous declaration: “Your pathway to Simon Fraser University”. However, as in the SFU websites, the active subject is missing. The ownership inferred by a fuller statement such as “FIC is your pathway to Simon Fraser University” or, even, “we are your pathway to Simon Fraser University” is replaced with a focus on you or your. Placed underneath this leading statement, in smaller, more personalized handwriting font, but still reinforcing the rhetoric of individual choice, is the statement, “I’m interested in studying…” Again, there is the focus on the individual. The use of ‘I’, here, emphasizes ultimate responsibility lay with the student, while the use of the verb ‘interested in’ infers possibility rather than certainty. Links to further define
the first stage inform the viewer that UTP Stage 1 is designed to prepare for university level courses in the undergraduate fields on offer and prepare for UTP Stage 2, which is the university level, for-credit courses. The ‘normal duration’ (italics mine) is determined as ‘2 terms’. How normal has been arrived at isn’t detailed, nor is what happens if a student doesn’t make it in the ‘normal’ duration.

The ambiguity of the language is overshadowed by the strong graphic pathway, and the bottom three images, taken as a whole, cement an impression of FIC and SFU as one entity. The image farthest to the left, where the eye first lands, is labelled ‘Simon Fraser University’. The central image is a generic photo of Vancouver, the longshot of clear ocean and sky, neutral. The final shot, of ‘FIC’ is represented by a group of joyful students. These students are effectively made a generic collective through similarity in appearance, but also in pose. Their stories, their reasons for attending FIC, anything which might have us see them as individuals, is obscured. A click on the third image reveals, as illustrated below, the explicit statement that FIC is a direct pathway to Simon Fraser University, and is reaffirmed again by SFU through linking to a video, repeated declaration, and a letter of welcome from the President of SFU, Andrew Petter.

The personal and welcoming tone of this SFU letter, on the FIC website, is quite different from the reference to FIC on the SFU website which indicated that FIC is simply another college: an additional choice in pathways. The SFU partnership page offered information, devoid of image, or, by extension, emotion. However, on the FIC linked page, a smiling President Petter welcomes potential FIC students and begins with promotional discourses touting place (Vancouver) and ranking. He further legitimizes the partnership by speaking to how SFU faculty and student excellence is “enhanced” by the partnership with FIC. Finally, President Petter writes that access to the SFU campus and facilities will “ease the transition to FIC and SFU”,
implying a seamless transition from one college into the next. An undertone of personal
challenge/responsibility follow the letter of welcome through a SFU promotional video entitled
“Are you SFU?”, the graphics possibly affirming the movement from a variety of locations, into
the centre.

6.1.3 Preliminary Summary: Explanation and Promotion of Partnership

The home pages and links described provide insight into how SFU and FIC promote their
partnership. The partnership is less visible, and the pathway more negligible on the SFU website.
However, the FIC website enlists SFU branding and works with SFU to present a solid, fluid,
pathway. Promotional discourses of place, ranking, and individual success dominate the FIC
website and are taken up by SFU in ways that are absent on SFU’s own institutional website.
Identifiable steps and timed level completion estimates on the FIC website add weight to implied
student success and matriculation.

The multimodal text in this section and the next cannot be isolated as either ‘promotion’
or ‘explanation’. However, for organizational purposes, this section focused on how the
partnership is promoted, primarily to students and their families. The next section will focus
primarily on how the partnership is explained to additional audiences, such as the local SFU and
geographical communities, as well as any government, or private financial stakeholders. Text
celebrating the SFU-FIC/Navitas ten-year anniversary, as linked to through institutional
websites, provide the most explicit rationale for the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership.
6.2 Celebrating the SFU-FIC/Navitas Partnership

6.2.1 SFU: President Petter’s Perspective

As mentioned previously, to the right side of the April 2016 SFU home page, there is a link to a letter in celebration of the SFU-FIC partnership, authored by SFU President Petter. A click takes the user to a regular feature, “Petter’s Perspective”. The letter (see Appendix 4 for text) begins with a repetition of the title, namely that SFU and FIC are celebrating a decade of ‘engaging the world’ together. ‘SFU’, ‘FIC’, ‘the College’, ‘Navitas’, and ‘the program’ provide lexical cohesion, but also are used repeatedly in place of personal pronouns which might indicate personal responsibility.

The letter continues with a sequencing of information detailing how FIC has been successful. It begins with noting the diversity of students: “2600 students from 60 countries” and a successful “95 per cent retention rate at SFU” (italics mine). While there are four links within the letter (to FIC, ‘Canada’s first pathway program’, the SFU International Engagement Strategy, and the QS World Rankings 2015), there are no links to information which might detail what percent of students come from which countries, FIC’s retention rate, how many students successfully navigate the FIC pathway into SFU, or in which FIC program those that do matriculate, begin their journey. Further, the link ‘Canada’s first pathway program’ leads to no information about the history, reviews, or establishment of this partnership, but rather a community news page also celebrating the ten-year anniversary. The link to the QS World Rankings page results in a “Page not Found (404 error)”. 
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The letter continues to quantify FIC’s success through, in order, the receiving of “high levels of personal support” and “help adjusting to living and learning in a new country and culture”. Both sentences obscure the agent through passive constructions.

FIC is then given credit for increasing international student enrollment and for SFU achieving second place ranking by the QS World University Rankings in international diversity, which infers it could only have been achieved this way. The letter concludes with a final indicator of ‘program’ success being the high participation rate of FIC students in ‘experiential learning opportunities’ at SFU. It is unclear whether ‘program’ refers to FIC alone or is a euphemism for ‘pathway’. There are no links which might clarify what is meant by ‘the program’, and there are no links to where these conclusions were sourced from. Without quantifiable data, the holding up of representative success stories runs the risk of discounting and shaming the experiences of those who don’t, or can’t, align with this narrative of success.

International students are presented as passive beneficiaries of supportive institutions, as opposed to people, or even classes of people. Interestingly, the implicit emphasis on personal responsibility to succeed found in text on previous partnership web pages shifts here. This is institutional success, not student success. An explicit example of how students are held fully responsible for their own success can be found in the second link available “Canada’s first pathway program”. As noted earlier, this link takes the visitor to an SFU community news page also celebrating the partnership. This page allows for interaction and comments, with an invitation to log in.

The next section will analyze the Navitas letter in comparison with SFU’s / President Petter’s. The letter of celebration was found on the Navitas website, as opposed to the FIC website. See Appendix 5 for full text.
6.2.2 Navitas letter of celebration

Of immediate note is that there is no explicit letter celebrating the SFU-FIC ten-year anniversary on the FIC home page. This may be explained by the placing of a celebratory letter as a promotional piece on the Navitas site. The following data description and analysis is conducted in comparison to the letter on the SFU home page. Both letters begin with a defining of the partners involved. SFU begins with noting: “Simon Fraser University and Fraser International College (FIC) celebrate a decade of engaging the world together as partners.” Navitas begins with: “Fraser International College (FIC), a collaboration between Navitas, a global higher education partnering organization, and Simon Fraser University (SFU).…”

Navitas defines FIC as collaboratory -- an outcome of the Navitas partnership with SFU. SFU doesn’t mention the Navitas partnership until the second paragraph of the letter and employs the euphemistic ‘provide opportunities’ to international students in its description of purpose. As opposed to the use of the noun ‘collaboration’ by Navitas, SFU employs the verb ‘join’ to describe the partnership.

Both letters emphasize particular words and follow a remarkably similar format. The word ‘success’ and its variations (successful, succeed) are used six times in the Navitas letter and three times in the SFU letter. Both letters follow the same topical outline. If outlined, the topical format for both begins as follows:

- Celebration and defining of ‘partnership’
- Growth of program from 85 students to 2600/from 60 countries
- Success defined as 95% retention rate at SFU

Although the following points are presented slightly differently, and in a different order, they continue to echo each other:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFU Letter (President Petter)</th>
<th>Navitas Letter (Unattributed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Small classrooms, student-focused</td>
<td>• Integrated and structured “Pathway” composed of intensive English language instruction, academic, study skills, high levels of social and academic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recruitment &amp; diversity</td>
<td>• Quote from Jon Driver (SFU VP Academic) re: growth of recruitment &amp; diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FIC student success engaging at SFU</td>
<td>• Quote from Christa Ovenell (FIC Director and Principal) re: FIC student success engaging at SFU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sole mention of English support sitting with the private partner is worth noting, as is the reliance on quotes by Navitas to perhaps add legitimacy. The similarities between the two letters make the differences more explicit.

Both President Petter’s letter and Jon Driver’s (SFU) quote point to less commercial benefits of internationalization. President Petter writes of:

- (FIC) students (=international students) “enrich[ing] our classrooms and encourage[ing] domestic students to think globally even while they are at home on campus” (President Petter)
- Diversify[ing] our undergraduate student body... build connections to many countries, ...increase opportunities for international exchanges of students and researchers (Jon Driver)

While it is not clear why these benefits could not occur without Navitas, they are acknowledged as laudable outcomes outside of profit and rankings.
The Navitas page (letter plus ‘fast facts’) emphasize more commercial aspects of internationalization (also drawn from Jon Driver’s quote).

- Enrollment, recruitment, and increased access are repeated words and notions on the Navitas page. Navitas, in a clear promotional piece, closes the letter with a blurb ‘About Fraser International College and Navitas’. It ends with “The Navitas and SFU collaboration supports the University’s internationalization goals resulting in a stronger, more diverse international student population; improved academic outcomes; increased global profile for the institution; and sustainable revenue streams for reinvestment in key areas of the university. (Italics mine)

- Repeated reference to ‘academics’ and ‘rigour’ are also present on the Navitas homepage.

Both the SFU and Navitas pages in celebration of partnership share some visual similarities and differences as well. President Petter’s post closes with a head on visual of an assortment of students, staff, and faculty from FIC in a formal group shot, although all are cheering exuberantly. The Navitas page leads with a more generic group shot that could be any group of students. We are looking down on these students, and they are looking up at us, also with hands of celebration in the air. SFU and diversity is represented by a student wearing an SFU sweatshirt and an ethnically mixed group. In both visuals, the majority are young, and all are able-bodied, well-dressed, and attractive individuals.

Whereas the SFU page had some navigable items (the four links), the Navitas page only has the standard task-bar links, including promotional links to the ‘newsroom’. President Petter’s blog also has links to Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, and email. The Navitas page has no social media links. Neither page has options for dialogue nor response on the site.
6.2.3 Preliminary Summary: How SFU and FIC explain and promote their partnership

The fact of the partnership on the SFU website, only mentioned at all due to the anniversary, is unclear. As to be expected, the FIC home page makes the partnership explicit, and the pathway from one into the other facile. Positioning the SFU logo next to the FIC logo on the top of each page works to reinforce branding and implies a shared standard. As noted earlier in this work, the quantitative data required to substantiate these claims is unavailable as are minutes or on-going partnership assessments from FIC or SFU. The images and text work together to present a joyful journey.

The SFU partnerships page sends a somewhat mixed message. The layout and repetition indicate a similarity in the process and outcome of all partnerships. However, the smaller font of the FIC partnership indicates a ‘lesser’ option. That this one is directed to international students in particular is notable and deflects the reader from the fact that international students also might choose to pathway through Langara or Douglas into SFU. The careful wording regarding the certainty of outcome through the FIC pathway is one that both absolves the university of direct liability and places the onus of outcome on the students, themselves.

Navigation and interactivity on all pages (the SFU Home Page, Admissions Page, and Partnership Page) was highly controlled. Links targeted specific audiences and move the viewer through. Links to English language support either moved the viewer to requirements with no further links or to the FIC partnership.
6.3 “About Us”: How SFU and FIC/Navitas discourses align and differ

The following section concentrates on the “about us” pages to elicit how partner discourses align and differ. The “about us” pages for both FIC and SFU are linked through the FIC website. A closing summary will synthesize data described on the institutional “home pages” with the “about us” pages to further corroborate findings.

6.3.1 SFU ‘About Us’

Above the fold, we see the FIC and SFU logos, equally sized, side by side in the top left corner. The page is dominated by a rotation of images which reflect the promotional language of current university marketing. The screen shot captures a landmark aerial shot of SFU Burnaby, surrounded by green trees, blue sky, and the city below. The caption below refers to the facilities and varsity teams. The images rotate fairly quickly, which only allow for a reading of the headings and snippets of text which extol rankings and facilities.

In addition to a focus on the more recreational, social, and geographic aspects of the university, the language is of the rotating. References to diversity and rankings and status are given as statements of fact, but void of support. Who is present on campus, how they represent diversity and which rankings, the metrics used or the ongoing debate around the use of rankings is absent.

Below the fold is the personal welcome from SFU President Andrew Petter which replicates the promotional language adopted by FIC throughout. The paragraph concludes with reference to SFU’s international reputation. The page closes with a video. Multimedia utilizes image and music, shown to effectively manipulate emotion. The video on the ‘About SFU’ page draws on SFU’s “ARE YOU SFU” recruitment campaign. The video asks students if they are
“fearless, innovative, ambitious, an explorer, a visionary, collaborative”. Comic book text and graphics are superimposed on student actors represented by two white women, two white men, and two men of Asian descent. All are young, able-bodied, fashionable, confident, and native English speakers with North American accents. While a short clip features study of the arts, the only occupation mentioned is found in the spoken phrase, “I was planning on becoming a doctor, so I wanted a rigorous education”. Other key words spoken and even repeated include “possibilities”, “open”, “explore”, “horizons”, and “play”.

6.3.2 About FIC

The top left corner of the ‘about FIC’ page continues to house the FIC and SFU logos side by side. The top half of the screen is taken up by the photograph of carefree students taken from the home page. This group of students is ethnically diverse, but similar in their dress and demeanour. They are joyful, connected and inviting the viewer in. The foregrounding, bold colours, and sharp focus create an impact. As a whole, the image is symbolic of connection and support, and a sense of belonging. The inclusion of the SFU architecture reaffirms the connection between FIC and SFU.

There is very little information really given about FIC. Instead, there is a list of bullet answers to the questions “What”, “Why”, “Where”, “When”, Who”, and “How”. The description of “what” FIC is, is less about the college and more about what it (may) do. While there is no agent in the short answer (the “direct pathway” appears to exist outside of the organizations or individuals which may administer it), the paragraph located at the bottom of the page offers some clarity. The closing paragraph on the page identifies an agent which “FIC provides international
students”. The verb “provide” still indicates a structure which students are responsible for navigating their way through with little mention of the obstacles they may face. The answers to “Why?” repeat the notions of city, rankings, and personal gain through both school degree and work permit. The word choice in reference to school and work are somewhat uncertain. There is a letter of offer from Simon Fraser University, but the requirements to meet that offer are absent. FIC students are able to apply for a work permit.

A substantial FIC letter of welcome at the bottom of the page names FIC as ‘providing’ a ‘direct’ and ‘smooth’ pathway into SFU. The following sentence references courses taught by ‘qualified’ instructors on the main SFU campus. The sentence is somewhat ambiguous as it could, if not read closely, infer that the instructors are from SFU. References to ‘our students’, ‘very best’, ‘personalized attention’, and ‘better equips them’ infers exclusivity and a focus on an individual edge. Notably, while the first sentence refers to a pathway into SFU, subsequent sentences refer only to an exclusive advantage for students attending (any) university.

Like the ‘About SFU’ page, the FIC page features a short video. While the SFU video graphically opens with the question “Are you SFU?”, the FIC video is entitled “Why I chose FIC”, implying student authorship. Both videos reference the notion of choice and exclusivity in their titles. The FIC video shares the same kind of light, upbeat music as the SFU video, but rather than have a few students speak, follows one student through his day using stop-motion animation and a number of graphics and special effects. The images begin with a single young man of color starting his day. He awakes and begins his day from a well-appointed, modern apartment. He leaves and jumps on his unlocked bike, propped up against a bush. He cycles on empty streets to campus, where he drops his bike, unlocked, and makes his way to a generic building and into a reception area. He is directed into an office. Both the reception and
administrative offices are staffed by young, white women. As the second women shows the student into her office, the viewer is somewhat bizarrely taken off the path through this student’s day and brought back to the student’s bed, on which lay a picture of the administrator and student in her office. The video continues with meeting friends and concludes with the implication that this student has entered into SFU. There are no pictures of classes, instructors, books, research, or anything else which may indicate the video is to promote an educational experience.

There are no spoken elements, only large, super-imposed graphics and statements. The words explicitly tie in with larger generic messaging of individual success and privilege. Specifically:

“I want to be the next great business leader”
“I want to design the game, not just play it”
“I needed to stand out in today’s world”
“I wanted to study on a university campus”
“I wanted to live in Vancouver the world’s most livable city”

Notably, the video ends with the caption “After three semesters in FIC…” followed by a montage of stop-motion images of the student walking towards a building where we see a flash of the SFU red, then a closing in onto the student’s folder. The folder is branded with the SFU logo and the previous tagline of “SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY THINKING OF THE WORLD”.
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At first glance, there was a noticeable difference between the kind of language employed on the SFU home page and the ‘About SFU’ page as linked to on the FIC site. The SFU home page iterated connotations of community, learning, access and inclusion. Through its home page, SFU was building on its foundational roots. Contrary to much of what has been documented in the literature on university web sites, there is, at first glance, little of the promotional discourse of accolades and rankings. Where Vancouver is a recognizable name, there is only reference to Burnaby. And rather than images worthy of a tourist brochure, there are abstracted tools of learning. The dominant impression speaks to a movement away from education as a private good, and movement towards education as a public good. While the focus of this page is the local community, the tagline ‘engaging the world’ is repeated. However, the FIC linked ‘About SFU page’ replicates the more promotional language of FIC with a focus on location, individual success, and the perceived markers of educational quality (buildings, sports, and more recently, rankings).

While both ‘about us’ pages attempt to represent, primarily through their videos, ethnic diversity and inclusion, as noted in the literature review, it is important to interrogate the ideology behind representation. In both the SFU and FIC images and videos, all students were of a type and representative of a visibly generic western sensibility in their fashion choices. In the SFU video, students spoke with unaccented English. Further, in the FIC video, young, white women held positions of authority, in opposition to the student. The overall implication is that diversity is welcome if you act, dress, speak, and behave as ‘us’ (‘us’ represented by the white women in authority, as well as the messaging of what ‘success’ is articulated as). Not visible
were members of the local community in which FIC is located, including any First Nations people on whose traditional land FIC sits. SFU, on its own website, notes that its location on traditional First Nations lands (Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh) should be acknowledged with sample phrases provided, but are not referred to on the FIC website. Diversity in its many other manifestations, for example, of class, ability, and age were unattended to.

The notion of place was also central to both webpages. While the SFU page featured a birds-eye view of the iconic SFU Burnaby building and environs, the FIC page chose close-ups of students with somewhat abstracted, blurred building features in the background. While the FIC images are somewhat generic, the video makes specific references to studying on a university campus and Vancouver being the world’s “most livable city”. It is unclear whether FIC is located in what was public educational space, and there are no links or references to the determination or criteria of Vancouver’s ‘livability’. The use of the present simple indicates a timeless truth. Worth repeating is the fundamental lack of engagement either webpage has with the local community. These schools are presented as singular entities, facilitating a personal journey of commercial success to those exceptional students who make the right choice. Structures which facilitate or hinder, people such as teachers, campus workers, or those who live in the local community, are absent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible on the FIC web pages</th>
<th>Invisible on the FIC web pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Wide angle views of Vancouver and Burnaby Mountain: ocean, sky and forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well-off, clean-cut, able-bodied, physically fit and happy individuals exhibiting a conservative western sensibility in fashion choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual or small groups of students</td>
<td>• Local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some ethnic and gender diversity, but no diversity of class, visible physical or mental disability, age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers, campus community, support network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acknowledgement of Musqueam, Squamish, or Tsleil-Waututh traditional lands upon which FIC/SFU sit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final observation concerns the difference in the content and styles of navigable items on the SFU and FIC home pages. The SFU home page has two distinct rows of links. The top right row targets specific audiences such as ‘students’, ‘faculty’, ‘alumni’, and ‘parents/public’. More visible and in larger font below, is a row of links:

“ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS LEARNING RESEARCH COMMUNITY ABOUT”

The row of links at the top of the FIC home page is markedly different. There are no links to specific audiences. The one row of links, situated at the top of the page read as follows:

“PROGRAMS ABOUT US ADMISSION & FEES STUDENT SERVICES DOWNLOADS&LINKS ESSENTIAL INFORMATION”
The SFU links work in relation to the images and text found below. There is a focus on learning, research, and community. The FIC links move from programs right into ‘About Us’. A click on this link releases a drop down menu which begins with a list of further links topped by Vancouver, then SFU, then FIC. Admission is linked with fees, something not mentioned on the SFU home page. When I click on this, another drop down menu appears. A click onto ‘admission requirements’ brings the viewer to a page dominated and led by English language requirements. Prospective students are informed that if they don’t meet the language requirements, FIC can refer them to either the English Language and Culture Program at SFU or a number of off-campus partners. Who these partners are, or the relationship FIC has with them, is not referred to. If applicants meet a minimum IELTS requirement of 5.0, they are eligible to enter FIC’s “Cornerstone” English Program.

Further clicks on the top menu reveal some distinct differences from the SFU site. A click on ‘Downloads and Links’, for example, brings the user to a page which requires them to enter the category of viewer they are from a drop-down menu, provide their email address, check an agreement to terms and conditions and a privacy policy, as well as accept further advertising before they can download anything. The two items offered for download are simply the ‘student guide’, offering more information to prospective students, in English and Mandarin. The visitor to the FIC website isn’t able to do much but provide personal information. As a researcher or member of the public looking for information about how the pathway works, it is somewhat disconcerting to have to register. The “essential information” link on the FIC homepage refers to website use, and under the heading ‘feedback’, makes explicit that FIC gains the right to “delete, reproduce, modify, adapt, publish (and more) any submission, and the right to use the name attached to the submission.
In fact, the SFU homepage has nothing like the link to ‘essential information’ on the FIC website. This link opens to a page which, in essence, prohibits users and protects FIC. The heading “Modifications to Terms and Conditions” encourages users to read the terms and conditions with each visit to the website as they may change at any time. Further, the headings “Disclaimers” doesn’t represent or warrant that the Material (on the website) is, among other disclaimers, accurate, complete, or current, “Limitation of Liability” (clears FIC and anyone connected to it from any liability), and “Indemnification” (users agree to “save harmless FIC and… from and against any claim).

6.4 Tensions, Contradiction, Absences

This final section will draw on the SFU and FIC/Navitas home pages, about us pages, and letters of celebration to identify principal tensions, contradictions and absence. The most noticeable aspects connect to the nature of the partnership and progression, financial information, aid, or alternatives if progression is not achieved, and the role of EAP in the international university. As one concern raised by this research is in regards to the ethical implications of the partnership, this section will draw on ethical concerns previously laid out as articulated by ACDE, for organizational purposes. Specifically, it will explore if, and/or how, data indicates risks of exploitative practices, systemic exclusion, and/or the risk of personal and social disruption and neo-colonization.

6.4.1 The risk of exploitative practices

Western research universities with English as a Medium of Instruction sit in a relatively privileged place in relation to recruitment of international students, and, as education has become
commodified, have attracted the attention of for-profit organizations. In this case, an understanding of how the matriculation pathway is marketed and operationalized through institutional websites may provide insight into whether a focus on profit is at risk of exploiting students and their families.

The FIC webpages, and the SFU text and visuals incorporated into the FIC site, draw on promotional and ideational discourses. Through language and visuals, a picture is painted of social and academic success. The students pictured sit in groups laughing, or march resolutely forward with purpose. Attention is given to the beauty of the surrounding environment, the opportunities and access to SFU amenities, and Vancouver sites and activities. Language and graphics highlight a ‘direct’ and supported pathway into SFU. Application to FIC (and by implication, SFU) is made easy and explicit, and a letter of offer is implicit.

While the task bar at the top of the SFU homepage contains a link to ‘admissions’, the top task bar on the FIC home page has a link to “admissions and fees”. A click on this produces a drop-down menu of choices to be selected in isolation. Topping the list is “How to accept your offer”. A click on this reveals a three-step process. The first step, labelled “understanding your offer” instructs the reader to simply sign and return the acceptance of offer form. There is no indication of how a student or family might, in reality, understand the offer. This points to admission initially relying on ability to pay.

The SFU website lists FIC as a partner offering an opportunity to matriculate into the university. The FIC website details what matriculation into SFU is dependent on, and also what entrance into FIC is dependent on. The top task bar and its links don’t present any wording regarding English language requirements the admissions link does. At the top of the admissions page students see that there are various points of entry. As noted in data, the viewer is presented
with a per term fee for the laddered programs, which are presented in chart form, accompanied by a ‘normal duration’ period for each step. The English language components, ELC, AEP, and AES, note 16 weeks or a one term duration. No information is readily available on how these assessments regarding completion times are made, nor data on ongoing veracity. There is also no information available on the website regarding what happens to students who don’t complete the steps in the ‘normal time’, or what supports will be available to them. The delineation of a ‘normal’ time to acquire requisite language skills may serve to shame students who aren’t able to meet the unqualified standard, and even silence them. Further, family members, unaware of the structural constraints on EAL/EAP students taking courses in the program, may add to the pressure the students themselves face.

There is no apparent recourse or advocacy for FIC students and their families on the SFU web pages. While there is a link to scholarships offered by FIC on the FIC website, they do not apply to English language courses. The very recent SFU-initiated creation of a co-ordinator position for the FIC-SFU pathway may address the issue somewhat.

Data from the website indicates there is a risk of exploitation in this partnership. SFU cites FIC as a viable and trustworthy pathway partner into SFU. FIC forefronts the ease of progression through text and visuals, and accepts or accommodates acceptance for, it appears, anyone able to pay. The reality of time required to progress through English language and integrated English language and content classes is minimized and unsubstantiated. Recourse or support for those unable to follow the FIC timeline is unclear, and responsibility for failure to do so implicates the students is at fault.
6.4.2 The risk of systemic exclusion

Both the SFU and FIC websites tend to portray a particular type of ‘student’. While diversity is touted in both text and visuals, the focus is on a diversity of ethnicity, with an emphasis on young White and Asian students. Also noticeably absent is a diversity of socio-economic class. All students pictured are uniform in their dress and demeanour. They are young, attractive, and able-bodied. They are well-dressed and in glowing good health. The students are often presented in isolation, or with each other. Both the academic community (teachers, in particular) and the local community is absent.

Although diversity through student nationality is lauded and made explicit on the FIC and SFU web pages and used as a contributing factor in justifying the partnership in some instances, it is unclear just how diverse this population is. International education initiatives have been shown to target countries with growing middle and upper-middle classes able to afford the cost of sending their children abroad.

The SFU home page referred to access in an inclusive way, opening its doors to the community and offering free and accessible events. The presence of this ideal of education as available, accessible, and open to community contributes to public support and social capital for SFU. This messaging is lost when coupled with the FIC partnership.

6.4.3 The risk of personal and social disruption and of (neo) colonization

Personal and social disruption may occur if individual identities and/or cultural practices are marginalized. Neo-colonization is connected here to the commodification and intrinsic valuing of one language/culture over others, and further, the employment of a privileged positioning for exploitation. While many “anti-globalization” movements target transnational
corporations as promoting and enacting new forms of economic, political, social, and environmental injustice connected to older forms of colonialism, it is worth noting Choudry’s observation that neocolonial attitudes and agendas also sit in the movements organized to combat the mentioned injustices (Choudry, 2007). Canadian public universities are typically perceived as progressive spaces where exploitative and unjust practices might be countered. However, even if we return to the mythical roots of SFU as a place of equity and access, and an intention of democratic administration, there is evidence of neocolonial practice in regards to “language” and “culture”. EAL and EAP classes have typically been positioned as money-makers for the institution. Website data illustrates that this positioning has simply intensified as mastery of English in the context of globalization has become much higher stakes. The rewards of entrance into a ranked Western university based on English language ability are made explicit on both the SFU and FIC/Navitas websites. The financial gains to be made through pathway partnerships mean that it is not just the ‘private corporation’ which should be held to account, but universities and their communities (including administrative bodies, unions, and teachers) which need to reflect on their roles and contribute to the creation of new ways to talk about and assess the establishment and impact of these types of partnerships.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

This research was motivated by the change I, an EAL/EAP instructor in a public post-secondary program, experienced over a fifteen-year period in the context of an internationalizing public Canadian university. Embroiled in global, federal, and provincial discourses which champion and promote international education as a new market are private for-profit outfits looking to capitalize and grow, and public universities negotiating budget cuts and strict accountability measures. In-house EAL/EAP programs and support are located in a paradoxical space. On the one hand, they are an essential component of accessibility and success in higher education due to the global turn in privileging English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), of relevance to both international and domestic EAL students in our global cities, one of which is Vancouver, Canada. On the other hand, a case study approach has highlighted a significant shift in how EAL/EAP support is approached and delivered in Western EMI universities. A number of post-secondary institutions, led by Australia, and followed by the UK, the US, and Canada, have turned to private, for-profit multinationals to, ostensibly, recruit and facilitate the entry of ‘international students’. A for-profit approach centers profit. Profit in the business of international pathways providers is dependent on demand, escalating growth, education as a commodity, and access to international markets. From the classroom, the question, of who is profiting, and how, in the face of troubled students, contingent faculty, the intensification of boundaries between administration and teachers, and the siloing of related programs required a systematic approach.
7.1 Case study and MCDA

Settling on an approach to this research led to many false starts, but new understandings and eventual connections. I did not set out to highlight the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership. But this is where, from holding onto those introductory stories, my research grew. Although conflicted -- is it my place to throw a stone in the still waters? After all, the SFU community, and my own work is now invested in the success of this partnership, and not just financially – I felt a reflection may point to where I as an instructor, and post-secondary internationalization in Canada, could do better. Discursive framings and material dependencies work on our being, and we become invested in the controlling vision. Testing and pathways culture combined with teacher precarity create just enough diversion and vulnerability that belief in meritocracy to the exclusion of structural barriers means that those who make it are held up as exemplars, and those who don’t are dismissed as ‘not working hard enough’. However, the burgeoning literature in this field substantiated my impression that this is not really the case, or just about SFU-FIC/Navitas, but a window into larger practices of “internationalization”. I came to believe documenting my experience of post-secondary internationalization in a time of economic globalization might serve as a reminder that current framings of education are not ‘natural’, nor timeless. Case study and critical discourse analysis would best serve as rigorous approaches able to surface nuanced data.

7.2 A Glonacal Lens

Landing on Marginson and Rhoades’ “Glonacal Agency Heuristic” to inform and forefront the case study of the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership allowed for an emergence of how global, national, and local dynamics contributed to the fact and form of the SFU-FIC/Navitas
partnership. I was first drawn to this heuristic as a way to identify the role of English and EAP programming in current internationalization practices. I found that although my focus was on the local, and while my position gives me insight into one particular case, the literature, international in scope, supports its claim as a generalizing example. In Canada, all public research universities are facing the same pressures to capitalize on internationalization as replacement for diminishing public funding. Some universities -- the ‘Ivory Towers’-- can rely on their size and social capital, reinforced by placement in international rankings to attract large numbers of international students. Many mid-size and smaller universities claim they have to look to the alternatives presented to them by multi-national, for-profit partners who offer a grab-bag of marketing, recruitment, and ‘supported’ matriculation pathways, encompassing EAL/EAP remediation. Of these, some have declined a private partnership, which others have accepted. All, in their diversity of forms, position EAL/EAP as cost-recovery, or for-profit. A ‘glonacal’ analysis aids in highlighting institutional choices, consequences, and ways forward.

The next section will reflect and offer a discussion inclusive of the data, the literature, and my experience. How this research aligns with current findings and what it may contribute to critical work on internationalization of higher education and the intersecting role of English and EAL/EAP programs and support will follow. The relevance of the findings will be considered in relation to Marginson and Rhoades’ Glonacal Agency Heuristic. Specifically, the findings will be employed in an effort to map how the ‘local layers and conditions’ manifested this partnership in discourse and actual form, how it grows back out into the world, and, further, where opportunities to initiate and grow ethical approaches may exist.
7.3 Discussion

My research questions reflected an interest in understanding how critical multimodal analysis of institutional web pages could inform an understanding of the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership. I was seeking to document their vision of post-secondary education in a time of internationalization as a fundamental priority for all levels of government and post-secondary institutions in Canada. Further, I was looking to understand how EAL/EAP programs were implicated, both as cause and consequence.

7.3.1 Website discourse and the SFU-FIC/Navitas Pathway Partnership

Much of the discourse on the FIC/Navitas web pages, authored by both FIC/Navitas and SFU to international students and families, is reflective of what stands in the literature. The FIC website is replete with images of education as an individual good motivated by material success. FIC/Navitas pathways usher international students seamlessly into a top-ranked comprehensive Canadian university, SFU. The campus is presented devoid of local community, surrounded by mountains, ocean, and blue sky.

A keyword in the promotion of internationalization and on institutional websites is ‘diversity’, however, it is diversity of a particular type. As documented in previous studies, diversity refers primarily to culture. The desired SFU-FIC/Navitas student, while presented as linguistically or culturally diverse, is in many ways interchangeable in terms of socio-economic position. Images were of clean, seemingly comfortable well-off, attractive young people. All presented in the bounds of a comfortable conservatism. Jeans, sweaters, and jackets, presented a unifying outfit. Women had long hair and make-up, while men had short hair, and were clean-cut.
Equally reflective of the existing critical literature is the positioning of students as autonomous beings, alone or with small friend groups. The majority of images are of confident individuals situated on a ‘campus’ devoid of teachers, administrators, or a larger university community which might indicate structural support.

As noted in Chapter 1, when I began this research, I could find no Canadian case studies which documented the unfolding of, or reflected on the experiences of individuals caught up in a private, for-profit matriculation pathways partnership with a public university. My research may add insight into how the partners come to understand and negotiate their relationship as evidenced through website discourse and substantiated by case study data. Specifically, this data reveals that in private-public partnerships, the public institutional brand is essential to the success of the private partner. Equally interesting, in this case, is the diminishment of the private partner by the public institution on its own web site.

FIC/Navitas relies heavily on the SFU brand in explaining its partnership. The ‘About Us’ link in the FIC home page task bar leads with Vancouver, then SFU. SFU is described as one of ‘the best’ universities in Canada, and each page is double branded with both logos. The pages are graphic heavy and indicate an obvious and facile transition into SFU from high school (domestic or international). The dominant impression is that FIC is SFU.

However, apart from the instance of the ten-year anniversary, the FIC partnership is relegated to a link, numerous clicks in from the SFU home page. Additionally, it is placed below, and in smaller font than, the reference to the local, public pathways partner, Douglas College. Further, as commercial pressures encourage institutional isomorphism, university brands are dependent on a sliver of difference. In the case of SFU, in Vancouver, web pages reveal a layering of its mythical foundations. There is an appeal to the local, burgeoning community it was initially built
to serve, as a piece of the national project to grow access. This messaging is heightened, perhaps, by how it sits in opposition to Vancouver’s other research university, UBC, which currently emphasizes international student numbers in its promotional website discourse.

Where and when SFU does promote its partnership – on the FIC/Navitas web sites or in one-time celebratory anniversary letters, rationalization is dependent on audience. When first proposing the partnership to the SFU community, SFU administration and website discourses highlight the ability of FIC/Navitas to increase diversity on campus, recruit solid candidates, and offer the support international students require to matriculate successfully into SFU. SFU speaks this way to other institutions as well. Dr. Tim Rahilly, named as Associate Vice-President, SFU, on the Navitas partnership page, also speaks to the meeting of rigorous standards and high progression and retention rates. When speaking to potential students and their families on the FIC web pages, the messaging shifts slightly into what has been identified in the literature as fairly standard promotional discourses. The welcome letter from President Petter leads with location and ranking and continues with the benefits FIC students will enjoy through association with SFU, and the ability of the pathway to ease transition. Not included in the website data, but accessed through websites, and included in the case study is the articulation of profit as a motive. When speaking to government, or the public, in the institutional accountability report, the partnership is noted as one element of making up for funding shortfalls.

Both SFU and FIC/Navitas craft particular visions of their partnership and post-secondary education in a time of internationalization. The maintenance of seamless visions of untroubled pathways, whether for students, faculty, or the larger university and local community depends on a high degree of control. The turn to web pages to unpack the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership was partially motivated by an inability to access information when considering a case study. While
the turn to institutional websites allowed for data collection, accessing information which quantified the claims made or inferred by promotional discourses was extremely challenging, and often impossible. In addition, the on-line search for it through institutional websites was littered with requests for identification.

This research hopes to add to the literature in highlighting these aspects. In the case of a private-public matriculation partnership, where is public accountability located? Who decides, and what is the rationale for those decisions? International students at Western institutions, particularly those on EAL pathways, are made responsible for their own success or failure. This was evidenced through website discourse data and aligns with my own experience. EAL students, international or domestic, are often blamed for being unrealistic about their abilities or expectations if struggling. However, in connection to this study and pathways partnership, an inability to access hard data troubles who is actually responsible for unrealistic expectations. Neither SFU or FIC/Navitas makes available the numbers of, for example, students who enter into a pathway agreement with Navitas, including those subsequently referred to remedial EAL/EAP classes or programs outside of FIC. Of all students who enter into agreement with FIC/Navitas, the numbers of those who progress into FIC at all, are unavailable, as are the percent of students who successfully matriculate into SFU. While the FIC website suggests ‘normal’ durations for successful completion of each level of the pathway, the numbers which support these averages are unavailable. The current creation, assumed to be at a cost to the public partner, of a FIC-SFU program coordinator, at SFU, indicate that transition is not seamless, and additional support continues to be required by SFU. Quantitative data regarding graduation rates is available from SFU but positions the FIC journey as starting from matriculation into SFU.
Case study data reveals that the graduation rates of international students from FIC are comparable to international students from other streams.

The availability of quantitative data is of relevance to those concerned with larger questions of access as well. If SFU has designated a certain percentage of seats for international students, where are they coming from? How many students are coming through the private pathways partner? As Navitas colleges are open to domestic, often, EAL students as well, what implications does this have for international and domestic students coming through other streams, such as local, public, high-schools and post-secondary institutions and partners?

Attempts to find answers to these questions, either as a ‘student’ on the FIC website or a researcher looking at both FIC and SFU websites, were often frustrated by requests for identification or password protected access. Each FIC web page contained the clickable online presence of an agent or ‘other’. While both websites were very controlling in what the viewer was able to do (often relegated to clicking on links with compartmentalized information), the FIC and Navitas website had opportunities to ‘speak’. The FIC website had a ‘chat’ option, and while perusing the Navitas pages, a box popped up asking me “how did you hear about us?”.

Under “essential information” on the FIC top task bar, a click on “2 minute quiz” simply elicited contact information and “English Test” to see how much “I can get” also, simply elicited contact information. Assistance from a university research librarian early in my research, equally fruitless in results, confirmed that inaccessibility was not just a result of my novice research skills.

This section detailed where this research aligned with previous studies on post-secondary websites and where new observations may exist. A critical multimodal discourse analysis of the SFU-FIC/Navitas websites reflected the promotional, marketized discourses documented in the
existing literature. Pertinent departures include the dependence of the private partner on the social and cultural capital of the public brand, and the investment of the public partner in that brand. Of further note, the narrative of the partnership is highly controlled through website image, access, and observances by each partner. The next section will review relevant findings on the intersection of EAL/EAP programming and support.

An interesting departure in the context of the current literature is the diminuation of EAL/EAP in this partnership. In current literature, EAL/EAP programming has typically been highlighted as a dominant aspect of the marketization of Western universities or universities embracing English as a medium of instruction. SFU has new supports in place for EAL/EAP students *already in content credit courses*, but information regarding their previous bridging programs links the viewer to FIC. On the FIC homepage the link to programs does not include the FIC EAP ‘Cornerstone’ program. English and EAP options surfaces when ‘admission requirements’ is clicked on. Considering a substantial number of FIC students enter the pathway through EAL/EAP courses, the lack of information or clarity raises questions.

The next section considers the import of these findings in relation to Marginson and Rhoades’ Glonacal Agency Heuristic. Marginson and Rhoades remind us that markets are shaped by choices and patterns of choices. Identifying the agencies and agency which shape what is on offer and what is chosen make apparent not only why what is, is, but how, and where harmful practices exist, disruption is possible. Mapping website and case study data onto Marginson’s and Rhoades’ Heuristic supports a surfacing of where applications as a result of this research may exist. Further, applications will be introduced in relation to and support of the ACDE accord on internationalization.
7.3.2 Marginson and Rhoades: Mapping the Glonacal Agency Heuristic

The ‘glonacal heuristic’ attempts to map the global, national, and local influences which result in manifestations of higher education market phenomenon at each of these levels. This case study is a focus on how internationalization is manifested at a local level. The case study and literature identify how choices made by public bodies, in consultation with private, for-profit interests, at global, national and provincial levels, repeatedly privilege economic rationales when making choices about the direction of post-secondary education in a globalizing world. These choices are reified and normalized through layered discourse which capitalize on the concepts and emotions of competition, material gain, fear, and desire. However, the glonacal agency heuristic positions choices and influence along lines of reciprocity. This research sought to understand how one university engaged with these choices and lines through institutional emphasis on ‘internationalization’.

To be sure, existing structures of inclusion, exclusion and access to post-secondary education were present prior to the rise of neoliberalism. Acknowledging this allows a recognition that the neoliberal agenda is not actually all that new, but its intensification may mean that these patterns are affecting new communities both domestic and international. Existing at the same time is an ideational valuing of public education, along with public health, in Canada. As noted, the second wave of universities built in the 1960s and 1970s were, in some instances, framed in terms of access for the masses and education as relevant to civic and social development. Institutional unions and faculty associations in Canadian universities developed, evolved, and were recognized as an integral voice. Early internationalization initiatives in Canadian universities were predicated on cultural exchange and partnership. While it is understood that these developments have plenty of room for critical analysis, the point here is that there were (and are)
choices in the direction the country and institutions could take in the turn to internationalization of education in a time of intensifying globalization.

A case study of the development of the FIC-SFU/Navitas partnership foregrounds the local, institutional layers and conditions in relation to the global and national. It revealed that the lines of access, transparency, and democratic control of the public institution were alive enough that networks comprised of unions, faculty, and international and domestic students came together to demand information and input. This has been the experience of every Canadian university Navitas has attempted to partner with. In some cases resistance was successful. In the case of SFU and the University of Manitoba, it was not. It is here that the literature, case study, website analysis, and personal experience informed an identification of the layers and conditions which manifested the SFU-FIC/Navitas partnership specifically.

This research highlights that the move to a private matriculation partner into SFU, ultimately rooted in budgetary concerns, was championed by administration, and speaks to a shift in spheres of influence, compared to, for example, the power faculty and academic chairs at SFU are described as having at its inception. The expansion of FIC/Navitas into the institutional EAP programming, located in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and its eventual takeover, may have been facilitated by an increasing marginalization and siloing of EAL teachers and students. Finally, increasing precarity in academia, and the loss of union protection for sessionals teaching in the private partner may present greater challenges to openly addressing any challenges experienced or observed.

Marginson and Rhoades’ heuristic requires an analysis of not only where agencies and agency were instituted in response to, but how choices made at global levels move back along the lines of reciprocity. Case study and website analysis reveal that a powerful sphere of agency -
the SFU senate, board of governors, and executive administration -- made choices which, as a local institution, aligned and strengthened economic rationales for education, while extending its global reach through access to new markets. The choice to partner with a multinational, private, for-profit pathway partner further solidified its own position through acceptance of the corporate partner’s apparent conditions of privacy of information and contingent instructional staff. As the institution becomes invested in the profits made from the partnership, there is less incentive to trouble these observable aspects.

Entering into a partnership rooted in marketing and competition for international students, who pay differential fees, implicates SFU as a significant agent in normalizing a vision of post-secondary internationalization as predominately a revenue generation activity.

Organizations like Navitas, as described in the literature, incentivized by, and encouraging of, the marketization of international education as a product and profit, are still relatively new, but are already encouraging new markets and multinational for-profit models. including the growth of English language training partnerships which facilitate post-secondary placement, the most significant of which is IDP, also part owner of IELTS. Finally, of relevance to this research are the turn to platforms which both facilitate interaction between recruitment agencies and universities, connect with students and allow for tuition payment from one site.

The intention here is not to exaggerate a simplified dichotomy of “private bad” and “public good”, but to document how particular choices influence and contribute to the growth of new markets and models. Of note is not just ideological growth, but how practice is expressed as a continuation of previous models. For example, this research has raised concerns regarding accountability and transparency, for example, which if normalized, may continue to grow. However, if we consider that even with transparency, choices can be manipulated, and accept
that the role of EAP in the current pathway is an extension of already marginalizing and exploitative practices in Canadian post-secondary, then perhaps what is indicated is a need for a new way to talk about these partnership models and the values which inform them. The mapping of the glonacal indicates spaces of depth at the nodes, places where solidarities may contribute to transformation.

The next section builds on the previous one to identify where different choices are available to be made, and agency available to be enforced.

7.4 Research Applications

This section turns to applications of the research based on reflection of case study and website data. Suggested applications are framed within the context of potential benefits of internationalization as identified by the ACDE, but organized along lines of government, institutional, and program and field (EAP) agencies/agency.

7.4.1 Applications for SFU/Institutions

As I am located in the public institution, I will limit my recommendations to the public half of the partnership. A key application would be to develop a response to claims of secrecy. Greater transparency of process across the board would serve to support more ethical manifestations of these kinds of partnerships. Standard processes and guidelines should articulate community announcements and time for research and response. Reviews should be regular and reported, and should reflect the views of all stakeholders, including faculty and students. A transparent accounting of profits made and funneled should also be publicly available. For meaningful research and reflection, their needs to be greater transparency on the part of SFU and
FIC/Navitas. Ongoing and publicly informed reviews, and the collecting and sharing of data, would be reflective of an ethical partnership. Good pedagogy requires that instructors, as well as administration, have access to the parameters of the partnership and a realistic understanding of pathway progression. Administration and teachers placed throughout the partnership, from my program in Lifelong Learning at SFU, to FIC, and into Foundations of Academic Literacy (FAL), the Centre for English Language Learning, Teaching and Research (CELLTR), and the Teaching and Learning Centre, all supporting credit work at SFU, should regularly connect. Teachers and administrators need to share their respective experiences and information and include the voices of students. Together, these currently disparate centres can identify research questions and advocate for issues experienced ‘on the ground’. EAL/EAP support should thus be considered an essential piece of student success. Institutional support for content faculty and EAP instructors to connect and work together should constitute a piece of the support. In recognition of how marginalization enables privatization and a profit motive to influence why and how we navigate learning, tenured faculty may support their more contingent colleagues, such as individual sessionals or precarious programs such as EAL/EAP.

If internationalization ideally creates opportunities for exposure to different contexts and world views as well as increased intercultural understanding, we should be creating opportunities for our international students to meet, study, socialize, and work with members of the SFU community and the local Vancouver, Burnaby, and Surrey communities in all their diversity. It would follow that marginalization of EAL/EAP students in the university community early on may contribute to feelings of disenfranchisement later in the journey. Emphasis should be placed on the value of our international students as partners in the university community. A beginning may be found in discourse which values their experience and contributions as opposed to their
money. Institutional websites, such as SFU’s, should draw boundaries of community, not commodity. SFU may consider diverting some of the profits of internationalization to improving access to post-secondary education and EAL/EAP support and programs for underserved communities. This may include traditionally under-resourced groups, such as refugees in the local community. SFU might consider the idea of quotas to widen diversity to include socio-economic backgrounds.

SFU should build on its branding. An analysis of partner web pages revealed similar marketing, or promotional discourses. There was some divergence by SFU in keeping with the role and responsibility of a public research university to speak to something greater than profit in its internationalization initiatives. Further, the actual navigation of the FIC website in relation to information regarding placement and progression is somewhat problematic. Rather than simply linking to FIC/Navitas, SFU may consider making explicit the relationship between the two institutions, and any challenges of placement and progression. Additionally, it may offer a space for questions, feedback, or linking to current FIC student communities.

7.4.2 Applications for EAL/EAP programs and the field

Although hidden from view on partner web pages, EAL/EAP instructors are positioned as gate-keepers on a high-stakes pathway. Through this research, I came to an understanding of how layered economic discourses and policy work to manifest and further for-profit motivations and partnerships in the university. EAL/EAP teacher education and on-going professional development must include a survey of and grappling with the larger discourses and contexts which affect our work. Program and teacher pedagogy must take into account the motivations
and realities of students and encourage space to reflect on how our practice enables, mediates, or challenges the acknowledged risks of for-profit motives in internationalization initiatives.

Further to this, EAL/EAP instructors and students would benefit from less precarity and contingency in their work. An understanding of the emotional toll neoliberal website discourses and enactments take on students, teachers, and program administrators must also be made explicit. The ways in which people are positioned in policy and websites, which tap into emotions of excitement, hope, and happiness can have negative consequences if the representations aren’t realized. Increasingly, issues of health and well-being are forefronted in union and faculty priorities. These might be places to increase awareness of how the pathways system places growing pressure on the most vulnerable, and contingent populations (students, sessionals, and contract labour). The discourse and enactment of ‘individual success’ lends to a silencing and shaming of those who don’t succeed. Contingency and vulnerability create competition and fear. These taken together with an investment on the part of all to support discourses of institutional success lead to complicity in the face of unethical practices. Senior teachers with professional security should be encouraged to work with their unions and professional associations to create more equitable spaces all around.

7.5 In summary

One of the primary outcomes of this research was the finding through case study and website discourse that private profit in this case depends on public social capital. It matters that SFU is a “community engaged” university and retains the patina of ‘radicalness’ and progressiveness that defined its beginnings. SFU’s brand distinguishes it from other post-secondary institutions and is leading many non-profit and community-based initiatives. SFU
could conceivably look for ways to develop actions and discourses which build on the benefits of internationalization for international and domestic students, and the SFU and larger community.

7.6 Future Research

These public-private matriculation partnerships may start small and often take root through oft-marginalized programs, such as EAL/EAP. But this research also noted how these partnerships can grow and develop new initiatives and markets, often drawing on the brand name of the public institution.

There is much work to be done in understanding the intersections and implications of internationalization and the commodification of and privatized matriculation pathways into public higher education. The following suggestions may be the most relevant to this work:

- Further case study of private for profit-public partnerships, ideally including interview and quantitative data to further surface the risks and benefits to students, teachers, the public institution and surface issues of inclusion, exclusion and the legitimizing of this form of internationalization.

- Research into the connection between matriculated pathway partnerships and pedagogy. How can pathway programs and classrooms contribute to ethical expressions of internationalization which value student languages, culture, and educational experience?

- Research into the roles mediating agencies such as student and teacher unions may play in mediating the risks associated with for-profit matriculation partnerships.

- Research into and a survey of policy and legislation which offers protections to international students and their families at all levels of the ‘glocal’.
• Research into global and institutional policy initiatives, legislation, and programs which encourages development of more equitable and inclusive policies and make these opportunities accessible to students from a range of socio-economic backgrounds.

• Further critical research on the impact and operationalization of university website discourses.

Conclusion

In this period of neoliberal-informed globalization and internationalization of education, we are responsible for all learners. Students are encouraged to leave home for ‘abroad’ at younger ages in the name of future success as defined by marketing techniques which prey on vulnerability and suggest exclusivity. If we believe in the higher ideals of internationalization, then, at the very least, the research universities should be approaching student mobility as one of accommodating access, inclusion and scholarship, whether it is facilitating international students studying in Canada, or Canadian students looking to experience scholarship abroad. It is hoped this research opened a window into how internationalization in education in its present form is being driven, by who, and why. Equally, it is hoped that potential for counter discourse and reframing along more transparent and inclusive lines might exist.
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## Appendices

### Appendix A  Janks Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Feature</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Data: SFU</th>
<th>Data: FIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexicalization</td>
<td>The selection/choice of wordings. Different words construct the same idea differently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlexicalization</td>
<td>Many words for the same phenomenon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical cohesion</td>
<td>Created by synonymy, antonymy, repetition, and collocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphemism</td>
<td>Hides negative actions or implications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitivity</td>
<td>Processes in verbs: are they verbs of? • doing: action and material processes • being or having: relational processes • thinking/feeling/perceiving: mental • saying: verbal processes • physiological: behavioral processes • existential: experiential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Active and passive voice constructs participants as actors or as reactors to actions. Passive voice allows for the deletion of the agent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalization</td>
<td>A process is turned into a thing or an event without participants or tense or modality. Central mechanism for reification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoted speech</td>
<td>Direct speech (DS) Indirect speech (IS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Is the clause a statement, question, offer or command?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>Social authority and degrees of uncertainty Modality created by modals (may, might, Could, will), adverbs (possibly, certainly, hopefully) intonation, tag questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>Inclusive: we/exclusive we/you Us and them: othering pronouns Sexist/non sexist pronouns: generic “he” The choice of first/ second/third person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing of information Logical connectors: conjunctions set up the logic of the argument</td>
<td>Sequence sets up cause and effect. Conjunctions are: • Additive: and, in addition • Causal: because, so, therefore • Adversative: although, yet • Temporal: when, while, after, before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix B  Kress and van Leeuwen Visual Analysis Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual Feature</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Data: SFU</th>
<th>Data: FIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptors</td>
<td>A basic description of the visual elements such as: actors and carriers; angle; colors; graphics; font; page design; perspective; settings; spatial relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>The active participant(s) in an action process is the participant(s) from which the vector emanates or which is fused with the vector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>The passive participant in an action process is the participant at which the vector is directed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactors</td>
<td>The participants in a transactional action process where the vector could be said to emanate from, and be directed at, both participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reacter</td>
<td>The active participant in a reaction process is the participant whose look creates the eyeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional reaction</td>
<td>An eyeline vector connects two participants, a Reacter and Phenomenon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-transactional reaction</td>
<td>An eyeline vector emanates from a participant, the Reacter, but does not point at another participant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>The setting of a process is recognizable because the participants in the foreground overlap and hence partially obscure it; (e.g. soft focus, over/under color saturation) and overall darkness or lightness between foreground and background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>A process used to create image (e.g. photograph, graphic, logo).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Feature</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Data: SFU</td>
<td>Data: FIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Attributes</td>
<td>Symbolic Attributes are made salient in the representation in one way or another. For instance, by being placed in the foreground, through exaggerated size, through being especially well lit, through being represented in fine detail or sharp focus, or through their conspicuous color or tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Suggestive</td>
<td>Symbolic Suggestive depictions are not represented as a general essence rather than a specific instance. Visuals of this nature may use soft focus, blending of colors, outlines or silhouettes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing of information</td>
<td>Sequence sets up cause and effect. Placement of images on a page (e.g. high, low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix C  Machin and Mayr Multimodal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data: SFU</th>
<th>Data: FIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semiotic Choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words and Images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connotations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression or Lexical Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Semiotic Choices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes – meaning of solid objects and how interpreted against images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foregrounding, central symbolic value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Color</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presenting Speech and Speakers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoting verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing speakers’ attitudes through visual semiotic resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representing People:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language and Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representational strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referential strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of social actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specification v. genericisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honorifics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anonymization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppression and absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Data: SFU</td>
<td>Data: FIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visually Representing people/identity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning viewer in relation to people inside the image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualisation v. Collectivsation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups can be homogenised, Generic and specific dispositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concealment and taking for granted:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presupposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persuading with Abstraction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric and Metaphor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committing and Evading:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth, Modality and Hedging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D  President Petter’s Blog

SFU and FIC celebrate a decade of "engaging the world"

April 08, 2016
Simon Fraser University and Fraser International College (FIC) celebrate a decade of engaging the world together as partners in Canada's first pathway program for international students.

Ten years ago SFU joined with global education organization Navitas to provide opportunities for international students to transfer into SFU degrees. FIC opened its doors in 2006 with just 85 students. Today, the program boasts 2600 students from 60 countries around the world.

Moreover, the program has proved itself to be highly effective at promoting student success. Students who go through the program have excellent graduation rates, as reflected in the fact that FIC students enjoy a 95 per cent retention rate at SFU.

The success of the College is attributed to the high levels of personal support provided to international students. FIC’s small classrooms and student-focused activities prepare international students to do well in SFU’s research-intensive programs. Students also receive help adjusting to living and learning in a new country and culture.

The FIC-SFU partnership is a key contributor to our university-wide International Engagement Strategy and its goal of attracting well-prepared scholars from around the world.

You can find FIC students in all SFU faculties, and these students enrich our classrooms and encourage domestic students to think globally even while they are at home on campus.

Thanks to the FIC partnership, international student enrollment at SFU has increased from just seven per cent in 2006 to 18 per cent as of Fall 2015. As a result, the 2015 QS World University Rankings ranked SFU second in Canada for the international diversity of our student body.

A further measure of the program’s success is reflected in the high level of student engagement amongst FIC alumni. FIC students have a high participation rate in experiential learning opportunities such as Co-op, exchanges and study-abroad. They’ve founded many international clubs and associations on campus, and participate on the SFSS Executive, and even on Senate.
Thank you to our partners at Navitas and Fraser International College for engaging the world with SFU. And congratulations to all involved on our tenth anniversary.
Appendix E  Navitas Letter in Celebration

4th April, 2016  Feature story:

Simon Fraser University and Navitas mark a decade of successful partnership at Fraser International College, Canada's flagship Pathway program

A gala to commemorate 10 years of partnership and student success will be held on April 5 at SFU's Diamond Alumni Centre

Vancouver, British Columbia - April 4, 2016 - Fraser International College (FIC), a collaboration between Navitas, a global higher education partnering organization, and Simon Fraser University (SFU), will mark 10 years of student success with an anniversary celebration this week.

The partnership began in 2006, launching Canada's first Pathway program for international students. In that first year, FIC opened its doors to 85 international students. Today its enrollment comprises more than 2,500 students from over 60 countries, making it one of the largest and most successful programs of its kind. Ninety-five per cent of FIC students matriculating to SFU degree programs have completed their degrees.

FIC students benefit from an integrated and structured "Pathway" program comprised of intensive English language instruction, academic course content, study skills development, and high levels of social and academic support. The program gives international students the unique opportunity to demonstrate their ability to succeed in SFU's rigorous environment before enrolling in a degree program.

"SFU’s partnership with Navitas has increased our ability to recruit international students who are well prepared to enter SFU's programs and who meet the high standards that we require," says SFU Vice-President Academic Jon Driver. "As the reputation of FIC has grown, we have been able to recruit students from a greater range of countries, and to diversify our undergraduate student body. We are building connections to many countries through our international alumni, and this will increase opportunities for international exchanges of students and researchers."

FIC Director and Principal Christa Ovenell says FIC students consistently demonstrate successful outcomes after transferring to SFU.

"High levels of personalized support mean that FIC students achieve excellent academic results when they progress to the University," she says. "They are also better prepared to engage quickly and deeply with our community, taking full
advantage of the broad range of opportunities available to them at SFU. Our FIC alumni run clubs, sit on Senate, go on exchanges, and participate in global competitions, adding to the richness and diversity of perspectives on campus and beyond."

The 10th anniversary celebration will kick off with a gala tomorrow evening at the Diamond Alumni Centre, which will be attended by SFU and FIC faculty, staff, students and alumni.

Fast Facts:
FIC opened its doors to 85 students in 2006 and its current enrollment comprises more than 2,500 students from over 60 countries.

More than 1,300 former FIC Pathway students have earned SFU degrees and over 2,500 are currently enrolled at the University.

International students at SFU represent more than 17 per cent of its undergraduate enrollment. The average across Canada is 11 per cent, according to the Canadian Bureau for International Education.

SFU is known for its commitment to internationalization as a means to increase intercultural understanding- the school's motto challenges students, faculty and community members to "Engage the world."

About Simon Fraser University:
As Canada's engaged university, SFU is defined by its dynamic integration of innovative education, cutting-edge research and far-reaching community engagement. SFU was founded 50 years ago with a mission to be a different kind of university- to bring an interdisciplinary approach to learning, embrace bold initiatives, and engage with communities near and far. Today, SFU is Canada's leading comprehensive research university and is ranked one of the top universities in the world. With campuses in British Columbia's three largest cities - Vancouver, Burnaby and Surrey - SFU has eight faculties, delivers almost 150 programs to over 35,000 students, and boasts more than 135,000 alumni in 130 countries around the world.
About Fraser International College and Navitas

Launched in 2006 as Canada's first Pathway program for international students, Fraser International College is located on the campus of Simon Fraser University. The program currently enrolls more than 2,500 students from over 60 countries. FIC was established by Navitas, a global higher education organization that has partnered with universities for over twenty years to increase international students' access to higher education and prepare them for future success. The Navitas & SFU collaboration supports the University's internationalization goals resulting in a stronger, more diverse international student population; improved academic outcomes; increased global profile for the institution; and sustainable revenue streams for reinvestment in key areas of the university.
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Home Pages:

SFU Home Page: https://www.sfu.ca/ (accessed April 9, 2016)
FIC Home Page: https://www.fraseric.ca/ (accessed April 9, 2016)

SFU Partnership Page

SFU Partnership Page: https://www.sfu.ca/students/admission/admission-requirements/partnerships.html (accessed April 14, 2016)

About Us Pages:

FIC About us Page: https://www.fraseric.ca/about (accessed April 2, 2016)