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Abstract

As diversity in UK Higher Education Business Schools increases, the focus on ethnically diverse student achievement, experience, and attainment becomes prominent. This thesis investigates the role of Business School academics and Business School institutions in shaping a pedagogical process that is culturally responsive, to support the changing needs and expectations of ethnically diverse students. In order to achieve this the thesis introduces the five-pillar framework, which has been specifically designed and developed to help academics develop consistent pedagogy for ethnically diverse students. In order to investigate this in more detail, the research undertook a constructionism approach and employed the use of methodological tools including interviews, memoing and document analysis. By the end of the data collection process twenty-two rich interviews had been collected. The findings of the research where quite clear that the development of pedagogy is inconsistent across academia and training support and guidance is needed to help academics develop their skills and confidence in creating pedagogy for culturally diverse students. In addition, it was identified that many institutions could provide more support in creating policies and procedures which reflect the changing reality of ethnic diversity in UK higher education. Institutions could also do more in supporting academic staff with finding a balance between research, teaching and administration and hence allow for more time to create culturally responsive pedagogy. Finally, this research advocates the implementation of a cultural consciousness in UK higher education which moves away from culturally responsive teaching and towards culturally responsible teaching.
## Contents page

Abstract ......................................................................................................................... 3

List of Tables .................................................................................................................. 9

List of Figures .................................................................................................................. 10

Dedications and Acknowledgements ............................................................................. 13

**Chapter 1: Introduction** ............................................................................................. 14

1.1 Aim of the Study ....................................................................................................... 14
1.2 Increase in student diversity ...................................................................................... 15
1.3 Challenges for UK Business Schools ....................................................................... 16
1.4 Overview of the Thesis .............................................................................................. 20

**Chapter 2: Cultural and ethnic diversity in HE** ......................................................... 22

2.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................... 22
2.2 Inequality in higher education ................................................................................... 23
2.3 Giving a voice to the ‘other’ ...................................................................................... 26
2.4 The experience of culturally diverse students ......................................................... 28
2.5 Multicultural education in higher education ......................................................... 31
2.6 Critics of Multicultural education ............................................................................ 36
2.7 Business School pedagogy ....................................................................................... 39
2.8 The Multicultural Academic ................................................................................... 42
2.9 Moving forward ......................................................................................................... 46

**Chapter 3: Towards a consistent framework** ............................................................ 48

3.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................... 48
3.2 The Emergence of Culturally Responsive Teaching .............................................. 48
3.3 Culturally Responsive teaching ................................................................................. 52
3.4 A Consistent Business School approach .................................................................. 56
3.5 The Five-Pillar Framework ....................................................................................... 61
    3.5.1 Pillar One – Cultural consciousness .................................................................... 64
        3.5.1.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy .............................................. 65
        3.5.1.2 Empowerment through academic success .............................................. 66
3.5.1.3 Transformative academic ........................................... 67
3.5.2 Pillar Two – Curriculum resources ................................. 69
3.5.2.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy ................ 70
3.5.2.2 Confidence to develop relevant pedagogy .................. 70
3.5.2.3 Multidimensional approach to resource design ............ 72
3.5.2.4 The transformative academic .................................... 73
3.5.3 Pillar Three – Moral Responsibility ............................... 74
3.5.3.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy ............... 75
3.5.3.2 Passion to act as an agent of change ......................... 75
3.5.3.3 Expectation to succeed .......................................... 76
3.5.4.4 Disruption of oppressive constructions ....................... 78
3.5.4 Pillar Four – Cultural bridging ..................................... 79
3.5.4.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy ............... 80
3.5.4.2 Knowledge construction process ............................... 80
3.5.4.3 Self reflection to construct tangible meaning ............... 82
3.5.4.4 Modify instruction and curriculum for equity pedagogy .. 84
3.5.5 HE Curriculum .......................................................... 86
3.5.5.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy ............... 86
3.5.5.2 Conducive climate to the achievement of diversity ....... 87
3.5.5.3 Deconstruction of a white syllabus ........................... 90
3.6 Literature overview ....................................................... 91

Chapter 4: Methodology and Theoretical Perspectives .............. 95
4.1 Introduction ..................................................................... 95
4.2 Research approach ....................................................... 95
4.2.1 Guiding framework .................................................... 97
4.3 Theoretical approach ..................................................... 99
4.3.1 Ontology .................................................................... 100
4.3.2 Epistemology ............................................................ 102
4.3.2.1 Objectivism .......................................................... 102
4.3.2.2 Constructionism ...................................................... 103
4.3.2.3 Subjectivity ........................................................... 105
4.3.2.4 Epistemological position ........................................ 105
4.3.3 Theoretical perspective .............................................. 107
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Methodology</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Reflexivity</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Summary</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5: Data Collection methods</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Introduction</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Sampling approaches</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1 Identifying institutions</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2 Institution selection</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Permissions for access</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Types of Qualitative data to collect</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1 In-depth interviews</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2 Memoing</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3 Document analysis</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4 Interview questions</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.5 Pilot interviews and outcomes</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Procedures to record the data</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Ethical considerations</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6: Data Analysis</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Introduction</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Data preparation and analysis</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 Voice recognition software</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2 Data Management</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Explore and code the data</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1 Interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2 Template Analysis</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3 Computer tools for interview analysis</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Coding to build descriptions and themes</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.1 Initial Template</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.2 Finalising the template</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Representing and reporting the findings</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Interpreting the findings</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7 Validate the accuracy of the findings…………………………………… 169
   6.7.1 Pre-research stage………………………………………………….. 172
   6.7.2 Data collection stage………………………………………………. 173
   6.7.3 Data analysis stage………………………………………………… 174
   6.7.4 Implementation of a reflective diary……………………………… 174
6.8 Identifying quotations…………………………………………………….. 175
6.9 Introduction to the findings chapters……………………………………… 176

Chapter 7: Cultural Consciousness…………………………………………….. 178
   7.1 Introduction……………………………………………………………… 178
   7.2 Background and Heritage……………………………………………….. 179
   7.3 Academic confidence…………………………………………………… 193
   7.4 Student Understanding………………………………………………….. 202
   7.5 Chapter summary………………………………………………………… 211
       7.5.1 Closing of the loop………………………………………………… 212

Chapter 8: Culturally diverse resources……………………………………… 214
   8.1 Introduction……………………………………………………………… 214
   8.2 Diverse resource design………………………………………………… 215
   8.3 Transformative academic…………………………………………….. …… 225
   8.4 Chapter summary………………………………………………………… 231
       8.4.1 Closing of the loop………………………………………………… 231

Chapter 9: Moral Responsibility……………………………………………… 233
   9.1 Introduction……………………………………………………………… 233
   9.2 Passion………………………………………………………………….. 234
   9.3 High expectations………………………………………………………… 242
   9.4 Agent of Change………………………………………………………… 251
   9.5 Chapter summary………………………………………………………… 257
       9.5.1 Closing of the loop………………………………………………...  258

Chapter 10: Cultural Bridging………………………………………………… 260
   10.1 Introduction .............................................................................. 260
   10.2 Culture as a vehicle for learning……………………………………….. 262
   10.3 Intercultural engagement…………………………………………….. 276
   10.4 Cultural adjustment………………………………………………….. .  284
   10.5 Student capability and attitude……………………………………….. 293
List of tables

Table 1 – Adapted Culturally Responsive teaching framework 59
Table 2 – The Five Pillar framework literature 63
Table 3 – Constructs of Culturally responsive teaching 94
Table 4 – Broad types of research study 96
Table 5 – Creswell five steps 116
Table 6 – Institutions in relation to the five pillars 122
Table 7 – Culturally responsive institutions 123
Table 8 – Interview questions 137
Table 9 – 6 steps of Qualitative data analysis 150
Table 10 – Data familiarisation process 155
Table 11 – Objectives and Findings 176
Table 12 – Academic stereotypes 187
Table 13 – Pillar 1 achievement of Objectives 213
Table 14 – Pillar 2 achievement of Objectives 231
Table 15 – Pillar 3 achievement of Objectives 258
Table 16 – Four approaches of Banks 270
Table 17 – Pillar 4 achievement of Objectives 301
Table 18 – Pillar 5 achievement of Objectives 330
# List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Constructs of Cultural Consciousness</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Constructs of Curriculum resources</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Constructs of Moral responsibility</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Constructs of Cultural Bridging</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Constructs of HE Curriculum</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Four elements of Crotty (1998)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Sampling strategy</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Data analysis approach</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Themes of Cultural Consciousness</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Influential themes for Background and Heritage</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Strongest voices in Background and Heritage</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Influential themes for Academic confidence</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Strongest voices in Academic confidence</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Influential themes for Student understanding</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Strongest voices in Student understanding</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Themes of Curriculum resources</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Influential themes for diverse resource design</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Strongest voices in diverse resource design</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 11.3 – Strongest voices in Climate of learning
Figure 11.4 – Influential themes for Academic pressure
Figure 11.5 – Strongest voices in Academic pressure
Figure 11.6 – Influential themes for Consumerisation of HE
Figure 11.7 – Strongest voices in Consumerisation of HE
Figure 12.1 – All voices within the research
Figure 12.2 – Key themes for the achievement of Objective 1
Figure 12.3 – Key themes for the achievement of Objective 2
Figure 12.4 – Key themes for the achievement of Objective 3
Figure 12.5 – Key themes for the achievement of Objective 4
Figure 12.6 – Evolution towards culturally responsible teaching
Figure 12.7 – Accumulation of all nodes and Influences
Dedications and Acknowledgements

In my life this has been by far the most difficult task I have undertaken. Many countless hours, nights, days, weeks and weekends have passed by in finishing what can only be described as “My Everest”. Hence in completing this I praise Allah and thank him for his bounty and mercy in completing this task.

From the mortal realm I would first like to thank my supervisor Mohammad Mirza for his tireless use of the word “structure”, and for his support and calm demeanor. I would also like to thank Wilma Teviotdale who has been such a constant source of support and inspiration during a period of my life where things were very difficult, and thanks to Janet Handley in being understanding and supportive in giving me the time and space to finish this PhD. Thanks must also go to my very good friends Sharika Saeed and Alan Scully who have been a great source of strength, support and laughter. Thanks also to Steve Lawson and Fiona Cheetham who were instrumental in helping me develop and gain access to my sample, alongside Sam Horsfall who gave me plenty of data to help me along my way. Thanks must also go out to Elizabeth Marsden who helped me to “cross the t’s and dot the i’s”.

This PhD would not have been completed without my loving wife Safina and my two beautiful children Muhammad and Zainab; their support and understanding in helping me through my mood swings and allowing me to focus on my PhD during family activities and chores will always be remembered and cherished. Also thanks to my two elderly parents who have sacrificed much in helping me become the man I am.

And finally, I dedicate this PhD to my brother Moazam who passed away from cancer in 2013; you will always be with me and this is for you little brother.
Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Aim of the study

Although she (the lecturer) tried to explain it to me and she tried her best to explain it, but I still can’t get anything. I still can’t get any information. I don’t think I can connect to the things that she said, connected with the knowledge that I learned before. (Turner, 2006)

I feel ignorant about religious beliefs and what the rules and customs are e.g. drinking behaviour, making jokes about the typical student lifestyle that might offend. (Tomalin, 2007)

One thing I struggled with was the students’ lack of imagination. You couldn’t get them to draw a picture because they would get the book and they would just copy the picture (Santoro, 2013)

Above are just three examples based on the collected research, which outline some of the issues students of ethnic diversity face in the pursuit of academic achievement. These issues stem from a lack of clear communication, negative perceptions, poor student understanding and inconsistent pedagogy development. In order to investigate these issues’ future, this study aims to investigate the experiences of academics in teaching ethnically diverse students in UK Higher Education Business Schools.

To accomplish this, the researcher will attempt to identify and explore how academics develop pedagogy for ethnically diverse students, what are the challenges and anxieties that academics face and what role does the higher education institution play in supporting their pedagogy development. Hence the aim of this study is addressed via the research question:

*How can culturally responsive teaching be developed in UK Higher Education Business Schools for students from an ethnically diverse background?*
This research question will be explored through the following four objectives:

**O1:** To explore the role of the Business School Academic and the higher education institution in the development of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students.

**O2:** To analyse current methods and techniques in pedagogy development for ethnically diverse students.

**O3:** Investigate academic perceptions and attitudes in the creation of pedagogy for students of an ethnically diverse background.

**O4:** Investigate the Climates of Learning created by higher education institutions for ethnically diverse home and international students.

### 1.2 Increases in student diversity

In developing the discussion around these objectives, the research takes the view that there are complex pedagogical issues which are compounded by being shaped by Western business practices, and dominated by the aspirations of Western culture (Ngambi, 2008; Y. Turner, 2006). These aspirations of Western culture have been a catalyst for many ethnically diverse students from an international background to apply to and express an interest to study in the UK. This has become a trend that has accelerated over the last 25 years, with data from UKCISA (2013) suggesting that since 1997 there has been a 100% increase in students from an ethnically diverse international background studying in the UK. This increase in student numbers has particularly benefitted UK Higher Education Business Schools (ABS 2009/10), which are the focus of this particular thesis. This research proposes that the Higher education Business School is appropriate for this thesis based on a number of factors which include income and large international student numbers, in addition to the author teaching and developing research within a Business School. In relation to the large student numbers
and income, the UK British Council (2013) outlines that there were over 90,000 students from an ethnically diverse international background studying a Business-orientated degree (e.g. Economics, Business Studies, Accounting, Marketing) in the academic year 2013/14.

Humfrey (1999) argues that it is clear that the continued acceptance and admittance of students from culturally diverse ethnic minority backgrounds has had a significant impact on the diversity of the student body in UK Higher Education Business Schools. While Bolsmann & Miller (2008) suggest that the increase in admittance of international students is an indicator of quality. Woodall, Hiller, & Resnick (2014) take the opposite view, and argue that the induction of so many students is a indication that many higher education institutions are now viewing students as consumers and hence as an increased source of revenue. For many institutions this increased focus on revenue has become a necessity due to the increase in tuition fees and sector wide competition in the UK (Connor, Tyers, Modood, & Hillage, 2004; Molesworth, Nixon, & Scullion, 2009; Woodall et al., 2014). This increase in competition and perceived quality has been essential for many British Universities, which view ethnically diverse international students as a form of financial stability (Y. Turner, 2006).

1.3 Challenges for UK Business Schools

The development of this diversity has led to increased student social and geographical mobility with students developing confidence to study in countries outside of their home countries. This places increased pressure on higher education Business Schools to adapt to the changing pedagogical needs and institutional structural challenges (Zamudio, Bridgeman, Russell, & Rios, 2009) required to manage the learning experiences of students from an ethnically diverse home and international
background (Y. Turner, 2006). The challenge for Business Schools during this time is to establish teaching policies, pedagogy, and practices that reflect the changing needs of an ethnically diverse UK home and international student body. This challenge is not always being met with research suggesting (Connor et al., 2004; Modood, 2006; Turner, 2006; Tomalin, 2007; Richardson, 2008) that current UK higher education practice, theory and policies favour the dominant Western learner, and that any pedagogy does not conform to these practices is seen as the “other” (Ngambi, 2008).

This continuous focus on the Western learner and Western-based pedagogy leads Vita (2001) to suggest that traditional pedagogy transmission is ineffective when applied to students who are from an ethnically diverse background. In the view of Turner (2006), this focus on the Western learner disadvantages many ethnically diverse international students who are all too often left trying to unravel elements of UK academic culture by themselves, almost piecemeal from tangible practice-based aspects of university life. Turner (2006) argues that this has a detrimental effect on the achievement of students from an ethnically diverse background, affecting not just their grades but also their student experience. As these issues accumulate over time in Higher Education, Richardson (2008) argues that this leads to ethnically diverse students being fundamentally disadvantaged in terms of achievement and attainment:

“Graduates from every ethnicity were less likely to obtain good degrees than their white counterparts. In particular, the proportion of graduates who were awarded good degrees was lower in the case of Asian students (47.8%) than in the case of White students (64.9%), and lower still in the case of Black students (37.9%).”

In the view of Modood (2006), the low achievement and attainment of ethnically diverse students is a symptom of a wider malaise that is based on negative academic perceptions, which also leads to admission problems and representation issues at various institutions. Modood (2006) argues that students from an ethnically diverse
background are under-represented at the ‘prestigious’ pre-1992 Universities, and where students have managed to gain admission to these ‘prestigious’ pre-1992 Universities, they are more likely to drop out, and are less likely than their white counterparts to get a high-grade degree.

While this may be a controversial viewpoint, research from the Social Mobility Commission (2013) has identified that the Russell Group universities have become less socially representative, with admission for students from an ethnically diverse background falling. In the view of Turner (2006) and Tomalin (2007) the falling numbers can be attributed to academic and institutional ignorance on student background, beliefs and value systems which leads to negative perceptions and increased social challenges on behalf of the ethnically diverse student. These negative perceptions can also manifest themselves in other ways such as poor pedagogy development (Gay, 2000, 2002), inadequate institutional policies and procedures (Nieto, 1999), and out-dated training strategies (Sabry & Bruna, 2007).

Research suggests that the development of teaching practices that are inclusive and engaging, which span curricular and pedagogical approaches, strategies, programs and policies underpinned by a perception of learning are essential to the success of ethnically diverse students (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Gay, 2000, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Durden, Dooley, & Truscott, 2014). Through the development of this research it was clear that while there was a concerted effort to create equitable learning experiences that were inclusive and engaging, there was no real consistency; many academics defined differing methods, some of which worked well and some of which required further development. There is no single real approach, and hence the approach of the five-pillar framework (Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013) is an attempt to establish consistency for ethnically diverse students. This lack of
consistency was also prevalent across the literature review, it was clear that different authors define different solutions for creating pedagogy that resonates across cultural boundaries. For example, Nieto (1999) argues for institutional policies and procedures to be re-written to become more inclusive, Gay (2002) argues that students should be viewed as capable learners, Sabry & Bruna (2007) alongside Durden & Truscott (2013) propose the need for training that supports the development of new culturally-relevant teaching staff from multiple ethnically diverse backgrounds. What is clear is that whichever viewpoint is developed will lead to different curricular decisions, teaching approaches and classroom engagement and relationship strategies.

The authors above outline differing viewpoints, however in the view of Gaffney (2008) whatever these view points maybe it is essential for Business Schools to engage with students from an ethnically diverse background:

“It is my firm belief that, until Business Schools can fully and actively engage in cross-cultural education practices, then we are not practicing what we may like to preach” (p, 124)

Here Gaffney (2008) supported by Ngambi (2008), refers to the Business School as having an obligation to create engaging pedagogy for students of different cultures and ethnicities to help develop achievement and attainment through the development of teaching practices that are meaningful for them. Hence in the view of Gay (2000), Villegas and Lucas (2002), Gaffney (2008) and Ngambi (2008) current teaching practices that favour the Western learner need to evolve and factor in cross-cultural educational practices that resonate across cultural boundaries. Practices must also move towards a responsible approach which critiques current educational practices rather than placing the blame on the student. As argued by Nieto:
“Inequality, lack of learning, and poor academic achievement are firmly linked. There is a widespread assumption that students fail to learn primarily because they are unmotivated, their gene pool is inferior, their families do not care, or the cultural values of that particular ethnic group are not orientated toward education. This assumption leads to placing the blame for the failure to learn and achieve on students and their families.” (Nieto, 1999, p. 19)

1.3 Overview of the Thesis

In order to develop this research, this thesis aims to look at the various approaches towards multicultural education and identify tools and techniques which can make the process of developing pedagogy consistent, fair and achievable in UK higher education Business Schools for students of ethnic diversity. Hence, in order to develop this research, this thesis intends to investigate and explore the various methods and mechanisms that can be used in developing a more responsive higher education Business School environment. This discussion will be centred on the role of the Business School academic and the Higher education Business School in the construction, implementation, development and maintenance of pedagogy and the student experience.

To achieve this, the thesis will be structured in the following manner:

- Chapter 2 will be used to deliver context and justify the need for a pedagogical perspective that acknowledges the increasing student diversity in UK higher education Business Schools.
- Chapter 3 then concentrates the discussion around multicultural education and more specifically culturally responsive teaching as a mechanism to develop pedagogy in UK Business Schools. In this chapter the research also introduces the five-pillar framework of Jabbar and Hardaker (2013) as a guiding principle
in the creation of consistent and fair pedagogy in higher education Business Schools.

- Chapters 4, 5 and 6 discuss the epistemological positioning, alongside the data collection methods and data analysis methods used in this research.

- Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are the finding chapters organised into key themes. Each chapter discusses the data collected around the five-pillar framework. The pillars are:
  - Chapter 7 - Pillar 1: Cultural consciousness,
  - Chapter 8 - Pillar 2: Curriculum resources,
  - Chapter 9 - Pillar 3: Moral responsibility,
  - Chapter 10 - Pillar 4: Cultural bridging,
  - Chapter 11 - Pillar 5: Higher education curriculum

- Chapter 12 concludes the thesis, summarising the main findings and identifying the key contributions to knowledge.
Chapter 2
Cultural and ethnic diversity

2.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter this research discussed the changing cultural nature of the student body in UK higher education and the pressure this places on UK business schools to develop pedagogy that is appropriate and suitable. In order to underpin this discussion, this thesis intends to formulate a frame of reference for students of ethnic diversity by investigating the concept of culture and ethnicity within UK higher education. This research starts by discussing the view of Masemann (1999) who argues that over the years “considerable criticism has been levelled at earlier definitions of culture in their unquestioning assumption of homogeneity” (p. 114) and the denial that a social group can have a plurality of perspectives. However Masemann (1999) does propose that there is still the argument that although groups of people may not exhibit identical forms of behaviour, they may possess similar kinds of “control mechanisms – plans, recipes, rules, instructions… for the governing of behaviour” (p. 114)

For the purposes of this thesis the research takes the view of Nieto (1999) and defines ethnic diversity as “students whose background, ethnicity and experience differ from the dominant culture”. Hence in taking this view the research places ethnicity as a connection between sub groups within a larger culture. However this is just one definition of culture, there are many different definitions of culture; Hoebel (1972) describes culture as a system of learning but also a pattern of behaviours and characteristics which are specific to that group. Nieto (1999) defines culture in a similar vein:

The ever-changing values, traditions, social and political relationships, and worldview created, shared, and transformed by groups of people bound together by
a combination of factors that can include a common history, geographic location, language, social class and religion. (p. 48)

However, Nieto (1999) also mentions that defining culture can be a problematic task with multiple viewpoints being put forward, it is either used interchangeably with ethnicity or defined from the perspective of tradition. What is clear in this research is that both Hoebel (1972) and Nieto (1999) view culture as an intangible, dynamic and ever changing set of beliefs and behaviours, which are gained through knowledge not through biological inheritance. Masemann (1999) argues that because culture is based on knowledge, then it can be learned through a process of enculturation as long as “the knowledge transfer process has the fundamental assumption that education has a cultural component” (p. 114) and is not simply viewed as information transfer. This view is supported by Nieto (1999) who argues that culture is learned through families, communities and educators. It is the knowledge transfer process that is essential in developing a base for this thesis. In analysing the work of Hoebel (1972) & Nieto (1999) this research views culture within education as a mechanism for change and argues that culture is fluid and open to elements of plurality, it is dynamic, active, changing, always on the move (Gay, 2000; Hoebel, 1972; Masemann, 1999; Nieto, 1999). Culture is a construct that can contribute to the development of teaching that suits a plurality of needs, frames of reference, and learning styles of students who are culturally diverse, this thesis intends to investigate and explore these elements from the perspective of UK higher education Business Schools.

2.2 Inequality in higher education

The challenge therefore for educators is to utilise culture in the development of pedagogy that is meaningful for ethnically diverse students. What this research has uncovered so far is that culture is always seen as “different”, something to be managed
or controlled. Abrahams and Troike (1972) agree with this view and argue that educators must learn wherein the cultural differences lie and capitalise upon them as a resource rather than disregarding the difference. Nieto (1999) proposes that to overcome these differences, and for culture to have meaning for educators in the development of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students, then culture needs to be thought of in an unsentimental way otherwise it becomes ‘nostalgia’, a harking back to a bygone age. Gay (2002) moves away from sentiment and places the issues of difference firmly at the feet of the educators and calls for a process of critical reflection, educators need to “analyse their own cultural attitudes, assumptions, mechanisms, rules, and regulations that have made it difficult for them to teach these student's successfully” (p. 26).

The continuous focus on difference (Abrahams & Troike, 1972) allows for the growth of a culture and climate of “legitimised institutionalised inequality”, which in the view of Banks (1995) breeds preference at the expense of multicultural diversity. In the view of Modood & Shiner (2002) the debate around inequality and disadvantage in UK higher education is long overdue. Kelsall, Poole, & Kuhn, (1972) agree with this view and argue that traditionally the debate about inequality and disadvantage has primarily focused on employment and labour markets at the expense of other areas of inquiry such as the link between education, ethnicity and social stratification. This then reinforces the view of Modood & Shiner (2002) that education has considerable potential in increasing equality and minimising disadvantage not just in educational attainment but in social mobility. While social mobility is an admirable aim, Cheng & Heath (1993) view this as an idealistic interpretation of the role that higher education plays in society. In their view it would be erroneous to assume that higher education is a platform of equality and justice, they argue that in many cases higher education can simply serve to reinforce broader patterns of social inequality:
At each stage of their educational and occupational career the members of some ethnic minorities might experience discrimination leading to a cumulative pattern of disadvantage. (p. 152)

While the view of Cheng & Heath (1993) may be pessimistic, Tomalin (2007) takes an opposing stance and argues that higher education is one of the “Key sectors within modern societies that reflects, but also has the potential to shape, public attitudes towards multiculturalism”. However again there is an opposing view, Mirza, Senthilkumaran, & Ja’far (2007) reinforce the issue of inequality and argue that within wider society, not just in higher education, ethnic minorities are, on the whole, disadvantaged in terms of employment, educational attainment, housing and health. Mirza et al., (2007) argue that under the majority of key metrics and poverty indicators ethnic minorities are disadvantaged: they argue that half of Pakistani and Bangladeshi households live in the highest 10% of the most deprived wards in England, and 28% of Pakistanis and Bangladeshis live in social rented accommodation, they surmise that this is the largest proportion of disadvantaged people in any minority group. However Modood & Shiner (2002) argue that without higher education these figures will perpetuate; they argue that for many ethnically diverse students higher education is the key to social mobility and propose that the higher the levels of achievement the greater the chances of success, though this is not guaranteed.

Turner (2006) argues that inequality manifests itself in numerous ways, and while “Universities in Britain have long been multi-cultural, multi-ethnic communities, with a membership of scholars from a broad range of overseas nations”, the major problem has been that the “overwhelming majority amongst [the] student and academic population was domestic, predominantly white British”. This lack of ethnic diversity breed’s inequality, which by default creates teaching policies and practices in universities which reflect the needs of the dominant population, therefore policies and
practices stem from and are created based on the style of the selective British education system (Bauman, 1997; Scott, 1995). While Cheng & Heath (1993) and Mirza et al., (2007) both highlight serious issues around inequality in UK higher education and in society in general, Modood & Shiner (2002), Turner (2006), Tomalin (2007) and Gatimu (2009) argue that higher education, for many culturally diverse students, plays an essential role helping their social and economic advancement. Turner (2006) builds on this discussion and argues that for many universities, as they become reliant on ethnically diverse international students for their income the issue of inequality can no longer be ignored and nor can the implications this inequality can have on educational quality.

2.3 Giving a voice to the ‘other’

In meeting the challenges of inequality in higher education, Nieto (1999) argues that organisations need to rebuild their perspectives of education and redevelop their policies and procedures to minimise these inequalities. This, in the view of Gatimu (2009), is an essential aspect of giving a voice to the other but is, Gatimu argues, hampered by current structural factors within UK higher education that are archaic and require rebuilding. Gatimu (2009) proposes that this process should be undertaken in conjunction with the challenging of the ‘Eurocentric perspective’ that is so prevalent within educational institutions in the UK. Gatimu describes the Eurocentric perspectives as “western school of thought that encompasses rationality, positivism and pragmatism”, also referred to as eurocentrism (Gatimu, 2009). This method is not without its critics, as Giroux (2005) mentions eurocentrism threatens the notion of subjectivity and critical thinking, especially when they expunge the stories, traditions, and voices of the ‘Other’. Here the criticisms of Giroux (2005) mainly fall on the asphyxiation of the voice of the ‘other’ also defined by Giroux as anyone who does not
subscribe to the ideology of “eurocentrism”. The development of a “voice” for ethnically diverse students is in the view of Bowl (2003) a very real issue and in her research she suggests that students from culturally diverse backgrounds felt they were being ‘silenced’ and alienated from the institution and from their fellow students. Bowl (2003) mentions that this “silencing” came in many forms and the support they needed from the organization was not forthcoming, Bowl (2003) argues that for many it was an uneven playing field:

“The research showed that there was an uneven playing field in education; that these students were constantly engaged in an uphill struggle; that the odds were stacked against them from the outset and that the system within which they were trying to strive and succeed was structurally unfair”. (pg, 125)

In the suppression of the “voice” Housee (2011) argues that many ethnically diverse students can feel alienated and silenced in higher education classes as a result of institutional and interpersonal racism, Housee continues to argue that these experiences can effect student participation and indeed progression in higher education. In defining institutional and interpersonal racism, Housee (2011) uses definitions from the Macpherson Report (1999) where racism has two faces: institutional racism can be embedded in structures, processes and institutions, while interpersonal racism is expressed through everyday relations and interactions. In the view of Figueroa (1999) both types of racism allow institutions to disadvantage certain groups and advantage others. Housee (2011) argues that there are severe structural inequalities within institutional and interpersonal racism that are replicated in education every day through the combination of uneven access, unfair practice and harmful beliefs. Nieto (1999) suggests that learning is heavily influenced by various cultural differences and by the context in which it occurs, she argues that if the context of education is stifling and students feel that they are being marginalized, and their ‘voice’ is not being heard then
this is a failing of the organization not of the student.

2.4 The experience of culturally and ethnically diverse students

In giving a ‘voice’ to the other, Tinto (1975, 1997) argues that educators and institutions need to understand that students have accumulated a wide range of educational experiences, beliefs, values and skills that are heavily influenced by their families, communities and cultural backgrounds. These skills are learned (Hoebel, 1972) and in the view of Tinto (1975, 1997) and Richardson (2008) they have a significant influence on student academic integration, achievement and experience.

In the view of Modood & Shiner (2002) and Connor, Tyers, Modood, & Hillage (2004) ethnic diversity student participation in higher education has steadily increased while attainment levels for these students has decreased to the level that it is substantially less than their white counterparts, in addition, Connor et al., (2004) argue that ethnically diverse students face discrimination at all stages of their student life. Modood (2006), Richardson (2008) and Singh (2011) quantify this view and argue that the current experience of culturally diverse students is a poor one, littered with stereotypes, records of poor achievement and low student expectations. In developing this research further Modood (2006) argues that student discrimination does not begin when diverse students arrive on campus, but is also apparent in elements of bias during the application process.

Modood & Shiner (2002) and Modood (2006) moot the possibility that students of ethnicity are disadvantaged by what they refer to as an ‘ethnic hierarchy’ in the application process stage. They argue that this has surreptitiously been implemented within the admission departments of the traditional “old” (pre-1992) universities. In the view of Modood (2006) this ‘ethnic hierarchy’ has manifested itself in the fact that ethnically diverse students are over-represented within the “new” (post-1992)
universities, creating an imbalance in admission rates between “old” universities and “new” universities. This impacts on student achievement but more importantly the experience of ethnically diverse students within the higher education sector Modood (2006). This view is corroborated by the Open Society (2005, p. 141) whose statistics reveal that there are significantly higher proportions of culturally and ethnically diverse students in the “new” universities as opposed to the “old” universities.

In exploring this phenomena in further detail, Modood (2006) identified that medical school applicants from ethnically diverse groups were 1.46 times less likely to be accepted onto a medical course even when qualifications and other factors were taken into account. Modood (2006) therefore concludes that a White student has a 75% chance of receiving an invitation to study at an “old” university as opposed to a ethnically diverse candidate, who being identical in every single way, has only a 57% chance of an offer. Modood (2006) argues that such poor experiences, disparities and barriers in any other sector would have raised many an eyebrow, however, higher education, Modood (2006) rather controversially suggests, is ambivalent towards diversity equality.

Singh (2011) disagrees with this view and argues that this is not intentional; while there is recognition within higher education that there are issues around student experience and attainment, these may not be fully discussed due to the sector’s “self-image as liberal minded, middle-class and progressive”. This is a problem for Universities, and in the view of Bahra (2007), Singh (2011) and Housee (2011) universities are now lagging behind other public institutions in addressing the challenge of interpersonal and institutional forms of racism. What is clear is that there seems to be a certain level of naivety about how inequality affects the student experience and student attainment. In attempting to explain the attainment gap Sanders & Rose-Adams
(2014) put forward two dominant narratives: firstly they suggest that institutional racism (Bahra, 2007; Housee, 2011; Macpherson & Britain, 1999) or ethnic bias (Modood, 2006) are common place in higher education and a complacency has set in which allows organisations to be in a state of denial about this gap, secondly they suggest that many institutions have a student deficit model; in this scenario research suggests (Ahmed, 2007; Jacobs, Owen, Sergeant, & Schostak, 2007; Jones & Thomas, 2005) students from the non-dominant background are seen as academically weak and lacking in ability and hence are more likely to fail.

This naivety leads to many institutions becoming complacent about their role in the student experience and in student attainment. This research concurs with this view and argues that while this complacency is not intentional it is nevertheless significant in relation to the impact it has on the student experience, educational achievement and student motivation. Richardson (2008) concurs with this view and argues that poor experience has a negative impact on student achievement:

“Graduates from every ethnicity were less likely to obtain good degrees than their white counterparts. In particular, the proportion of graduates who were awarded good degrees was lower in the case of Asian students (47.8%) than in the case of White students (64.9%), and lower still in the case of Black students (37.9%)”. (Pg. 36)

This poor experience is another contributor to feelings of isolation, segregation and dissatisfaction within higher education (Bowl, 2003; Modood, 2006; Rienties, Beausaert, Grohnert, Niemantsverdriet, & Kommers, 2012), which can become a mechanism for poor retention and high dropout rates alongside a statistically higher chance of failing to obtain a good Honours degree and poor progressions towards full-time employment (Connor et al., 2004).
This research acknowledges that there is plenty of evidence to suggest that many ethnically diverse students have to face many hurdles during their higher education experience. For some these hurdles affect the very essence of their lives and can affect social mobility (Modood & Shiner, 2002), can harm their job prospects (Connor et al., 2004), can become a hurdle in admission to the more prestigious universities (Modood, 2006), and can severely restrict their levels of achievement (Richardson, 2008). However what is clear is that the research suggests there is a lack of focus and clarity in relation to ethnically diverse students, which leads to confusion in the curriculum and students struggling to adapt to UK higher education (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006). What should therefore be a time of wonder and independence for many ethnically diverse students becomes a higher education experience where students are grappling with issues of identity and negative perceptions of underachievement as opposed to success (Modood, 2006; Singh, 2011).

In developing an environment of equality, Banks (1995) and Zamudio, Bridgeman, Russell, & Rios (2009) argue that criticality should underpin the teaching and learning process, in their view it is essential that students understand the reality of structurally entrenched inequality, and the negative influence this has on students of ethnic diversity. It is this criticality which underpins much of the multicultural educational theory.

2.5 Multicultural education in higher education

This research so far has suggested that ethnically diverse students are disadvantaged in every stage of higher education from application to completion (Connor et al., 2004; Modood & Shiner, 2002). This disadvantage leads to lower attainment (Richardson, 2008) and a poorer student experience (Singh, 2011). These
issues all serve to highlight that higher education is still afflicted with severe structural inequalities (Gatimu, 2009; D. G. Singh, 2011)

In trying to improve the student experience and manage the attainment gap, Turner (2006) raises the spectre of appropriateness in relation to current pedagogy, policies and procedures and how they are constructed and implemented within higher education. In the view of Grant & Sleeter (1993) this has been an on-going problem for many years with very little progress being made in developing teaching practices and curriculum that meet the needs of culturally, racially, and socially diverse classrooms. Banks (1995), Nieto (1999) and McArthur (2010) argues that it is essential that these issues are addressed to achieve social justice, freedom and equality, and to this end Banks (1995) proposes for the need to implement a multicultural education perspective, which in the view of Jenks, Lee, & Kanpol (2001) should be underpinned by educators who take issues of equity and excellence seriously in relation to their ethnically diverse students.

McGee Banks & Banks (1995) define multicultural education as:

“A field of study and an emerging discipline whose major aim is to create equal educational opportunities for students from diverse racial, ethnic, social-class, and cultural groups. One of its important goals is to help all students to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function effectively in a pluralistic democratic society and to interact, negotiate, and communicate with peoples from diverse groups in order to create a civic and moral community that works for the common good”. (Pg. 1)

In relation to this, the purpose of multicultural education in the view of Banks (2008) “is to transform the structural factors in the educational system in order to redress inequalities and inequities for historically underprivileged populations” (Pg. 8).
McGee Banks & Banks (1995) argue that multicultural education concentrates on the notion that students from different backgrounds of race, cultures, class, and diversity should receive equal learning opportunities. The concept of multiculturalism is based on the premise that students from different backgrounds, cultures and experiences should be at the centre of their teaching and learning, and educators should recognise that there is a plurality to ways of thinking, teaching and learning (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999). However the problem within multicultural education is that one size does not fit all and many educators, no matter how well prepared, will struggle to engage all students when the student body is multicultural (Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Sleeter, 2001; Vita, 2001). In the view of Vita (2001) “Traditional methods of uniform instruction seem to be ineffective with a student group that is very diverse” (Pg. 165).

There seems to be a clear body of work (Banks, 1995; Gay, 2000; McGee Banks & Banks, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Sleeter, 2001; Vita, 2001), which advocates the need to consider culture and background within the development of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students. In framing this debate solely within the context of multicultural education Banks (1995) makes a key distinction between the concepts of ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘multicultural education’. In discussing the concept of multiculturalism Banks is supported by Taylor (1994) who describe it as a political tool, which champions the politics of recognition, and multicultural education is in the view of Banks (1995) an educational reform movement.

Firstly in discussing multiculturalism in more detail Tomalin (2007) refers to it as a notion that is based on the ideal that “all cultures in a given location can live side-by-side to everyone’s mutual benefit”. However to often in the view of Taylor (1994) and Banks (1995) multiculturalism is discussed within an educational context, and is used by critics (D’Souza, 1991, 1995) of multicultural education to describe a set of
educational policies and practices they oppose. This intended confusion (Banks, 1995) has lead to a scattergun approach to multiculturalism in higher education with no real clear direction and strategy.

In order to clear some of this confusion, scholars of multiculturalism (Goldberg, 1994; McLaren, 1995; Warren, 2003) identify three trends, which are common in the construction of pedagogy within multicultural education; they identify them as conservative, liberal and critical multiculturalism. In discussing the first trend, McLaren (1995) describes conservative multiculturalism as an ideal that wants to “assimilate all students to an unjust social order”. In the view of McLaren (1995) and Banks (1995), within this approach difference is tolerated but the dominance of white culture is affirmed. The work of Tomalin (2007) builds on this discussion and argues that cultural diversity is viewed purely as a ‘bolt-on’ approach where diversity is taught separately from the core subjects. In describing the second trend, Warren (2003) suggests that this approach goes to the other extreme and tends to ‘exoticise’ otherness by treating “difference as an essence, rather than as something shaped by such forces as class, race and gender”. In the view of Tomalin (2007) this is what would also be referred to as ‘politically correct’ which is dominant within UK discourse, which Tomalin argues instead of promoting commonality between different groups, has instead fostered fragmentation. The third trend identified is critical multiculturalism, which, in the view of Warren (2003), aims to “expose how power, inequality and oppression operate via the dominant culture and its racist and sexist practices, and, secondly, to develop an alternative democratic vision of ‘unity in difference’”. Thus where the liberal approach is inclusive, the critical approach aims to be transformative (Tomalin, 2007). Within the educational context Tomalin (2007) views critical multiculturalism as a method that best reflects a student centred approach to pedagogy. This type of approach promotes a
process of dialogue to enable students to think critically about issues of power and inequality (Vita, 2001; Warren, 2003).

In discussing the concept of multicultural education in more detail Banks (1995) argues that multicultural education is made up of three distinct variables, it is an “idea or concept, an education reform movement and a process”. It is an idea as it allows the education and equality of all students regardless of background, race or ethnicity (Nieto, 1999, 2000), it is a reform movement that tries to change institutional perspectives that give students “an equal opportunity to learn” (Banks, 1995) and teaching strategies that empower students. As a process it has a goal to “create within schools and society the democratic ideas” (Banks 1995). In the view of Banks (1995) one of the strengths of multicultural education is in the way it provides opportunities to learn regardless of background, and as a process how it helps articulate the ways in which students from diverse backgrounds are denied equal educational opportunities.

In conceptualising and implementing multicultural education within aspects of curriculum, programs, and practices, Banks (1993, 1995) advocates the use of a typology called the “five dimensions of multicultural education”, they are:

a) Content integration – The extent to which teachers use examples, data and information from a variety of cultures.

b) The knowledge construction process – The procedures by which knowledge is created and the biases within a discipline which influence the way that knowledge was constructed.

c) Prejudice reduction – Strategies to help students develop democratic attitudes and values

d) Equity pedagogy – The use of techniques and methods that support the academic achievement of students of diversity.
e) Empowering school culture and social structure – Restructuring of school culture for educational equality.

What is not clear is how higher education institutions implement the “five dimensions of multicultural education” (Banks, 1995). Warren (2003) argues that many educational institutions struggle and many who do try and develop multicultural education end up creating a liberal approach to multiculturalism. In the view of Nieto (1999) this is not enough unless issues of structural inequality are addressed, which as a concept is closer to the view of critical multiculturalism.

While it may seem that multicultural education and multiculturalism are the same by all but name, Banks (1995) and Nieto (1999) are keen to stress the difference. Banks (1995) argues that the “five dimensions of multicultural education” can serve “as a benchmark criteria for conceptualising, developing, and assessing theory, research and practice”, however multiculturalism is now tainted with political negativity and may no longer be appropriate (Banks, 1995; Taylor, 1994). Therefore in moving the debate around multicultural education forward and to discuss eradication of inequalities within higher education (Gatimu, 2009) and to let universities become multi-ethnic communities (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006) then structural factors in the education system need to be addressed through multicultural education by challenging eurocentric perspectives (Gatimu, 2009; Giroux, 2005).

Nieto (1999), Gay (2000, 2002), Sleeter (2001), Vita (2001), Sabry & Bruna, (2007) acknowledge the need for the development of pedagogy that supports multicultural education, they all outline different challenges, from pedagogical approaches (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Vita, 2001) to cultural mismatch (Sabry & Bruna, 2007). These authors agree that the creation of positive perception, history, and
contributions can be used as a tool for instilling students with pride and confidence in their unique and special backgrounds.

2.6 Critics of Multicultural education

However multicultural education and its presence within education is not without its controversy and its critics. These criticisms have a negative impact on multicultural education within popular culture and on educators (Banks, 1995). The majority of this confusion is caused by a select few authors, Banks (1995) and Sleeter (1995) identify Schlesinger Jr (1991) and D’Souza (1991, 1995) as the primarily culprits in this regard and argue that confusion is created by stating and repeating claims about multiculturalism and diversity that are documented with isolated incidents, anecdotes, and examples of poorly conceptualised and implemented educational practices. At this juncture Banks (1995) reiterates that in many cases “the critics of multicultural education direct their criticism towards what they call multiculturalism”, which in the view of Banks and as discussed earlier have different meanings. Banks (1995) argues that it is important to make clear differentiation between these two terms.

One of the most vocal critics of multicultural education is D’Souza (1991) and his highly controversial book Illiberal Education and an End to Racism. Within this book D’Souza (1991) is very vocal about his criticisms and argues that multicultural education is central to the dilution of the core curriculum in education, with the focus moving away from the “great works of western civilisation” towards a more inclusive curriculum, which includes a greater emphasis on non-western issues, Afro-American studies and women’s studies. Tancredo (2006) views multiculturalism as a “cult” which is destroying American society.

Other criticisms put forward by D’Souza (1991, p. 5) include the argument that many academics are often discouraged from critically engaging with their minority
students under the guise that ethnic minority students are often provoked or irritated easily. This has led to what Nicol (2013) refers to as the culture wars, which she defines as an assault against ethnic studies disciplines through the movement of conservatism to safeguard ‘American culture and Values’. The attack on ethnic studies continued apace with D’Souza (1991) also criticising university policy and procedures, which in his view give preferential treatment to the views of students from a diverse background. He mentions the example of universities who seek to protect the sensitivities of ethnic minorities by “imposing administrative sanctions ranging from forced apologies to expulsions” (p. 8). D’Souza (1991) noted that these sanctions are mainly applied to white males and the “blacks, feminists, and homosexuals are regarded as oppressed victims” (p. 8) hence they are exempt and immune from these sanctions. Banks (1995) rebuffs this final criticism by arguing that this example is very anecdotal with little evidence and focuses on just one individual case. D’Souza (1991) has his credibility further undermined by the revelation of Nicol (2013) who points out that during “1988 to 2002, D’Souza has received over $1.6 million dollars in grants”, that were primarily received from powerful conservative lobbying groups.

In tackling these criticisms and providing a firm rebuttal, Sleeter (1995) breaks down the majority of the criticisms around multicultural education into two opposing positions: firstly multicultural education is to radical, this is a view of the conservative group, secondly it is seen as too conservative, which is a radical leftist position. Whatever the view, Sleeter (1995) argues that the debate around this field has become overtly political and therefore “it is important to frame this discourse within a political spectrum, as it is political issues, which define much of the debate”.

In the first instance, the work of Sleeter (1995) supports the view of Banks (1995) that many of the conservative critiques are written for a popular audience, this
has been evidenced through the work of D’Souza (1991). Sleeter (1995) argues that within a conservative critique commentators normally begin by outlining as a notion what they think children should be taught and this quickly descends into a broad attack on multicultural curricula in general. Sleeter (1995) argues that in many cases the targets of these broad attacks are not the multicultural education literature, but rather the curricular changes and policies being instituted in schools and universities on a wide scale. We can again use the work of D’Souza (1991) as an example of this type of attack, D’Souza (1991, p. 13) argues that across the land universities are revising rules governing which students are admitted to college, how they are admitted to college and what it is they learn. D’Souza (1991) laments that the very structure of life on campus is changing, he describes it as a “basic transformation of American higher education” (p. 13). As discussed by Sleeter (1995) and Banks (1995) this is not an attack on the literature but an attack on the changes and policies which are allowing this to happen.

In continuing to deconstruct the attacks on multicultural education, Sleeter (1995) identifies three key weaknesses of these critics. Firstly she argues that these critics ignore research and theory in multicultural education, this view is also supported by Banks (1995) Nieto (1999) and Gatimu (2009), very few of these critics include the work of the scholars of colour. Secondly Sleeter (1995) argues that many of these critics have a poor analysis of inequality today, this is primarily due to the fact that these critics frame their discussions mainly around unity versus dissension rather than justice and define equality only as the equal rights of individuals before the law. Finally Sleeter (1995) argues that the viewpoints of these critics are very much rooted in politics of a conservative viewpoint, Sleeter (1995) argues that while these viewpoints are apolitical, they try conceptualising them as rooted in intellectual training, hence the class wars as discussed by Nicol (2013).
2.7 Business School pedagogy

In helping to develop this debate, the research has investigated and explored issues of culture, inequality, experience and multicultural education from a holistic university-wide perspective. The research has looked at the debate from the perspectives of the critics (D’ Souza, 1991; Tancredo, 2006) and its champions (Banks, 1995; Sleeter 1995; Nieto, 1999) and what has become clear is that in narrowing the focus of this research there is a need to develop pedagogy for students of ethnic diversity. The research will now narrow the focus to explore the impact of multicultural education on UK higher education Business Schools.

As discussed earlier, one of the biggest beneficiaries of the internationalisation of UK higher education are UK higher education Business Schools with 1 in 4 international students studying a business related degree (The Association of Business Schools (2009/10); UKCISA, 2011/2012). As the pressure to recruit increases with the financial viability of many universities at stake (Y. Turner, 2006) business school are increasingly starting look for differentiation strategies, which allow them to become distinct from the global market and the number of competitors they are faced with (Karlsson, 2008).

In developing a differentiation strategy, institutions will need to rethink their perceptions on education, support, structure and policies. Allen (1998) argues that many educational institutions are underpinned by a ‘white’ syllabus, this has been discussed earlier and reinforces the discussion that the established power structures and pedagogical frameworks are alienating & isolating (Bowl, 2003), while seeking to portray negative perceptions of ethnically diverse students, and downplay issues of racism and achievements (Housee, 2011).

In the view of Turner (2006), Business Schools need to continually push to be at the forefront of the internationalisation of Universities and provide an insight into the
future diversity of UK universities. This insight needs to acknowledge that during this process of change, Business Schools are increasingly seeking to establish teaching policies, pedagogy and practices that reflect the new global reality, as discussed by Gaffney (2008):

It is my firm belief that, until Business Schools can fully and actively engage in cross-cultural education practices, then we are not practicing what we may like to preach. (p. 124)

As higher education Business Schools become more diverse, Business School academics and higher education institutions are central to the development of a consistent and fair higher education experience for ethnically diverse students, according to Gaffney (2008), taking any other view is hypocritical. The increase in diversity has its financial rewards but it provides institutions with new challenges which require academics to manage diversity in the classroom, this challenge is not an easy one and in many cases academics and institutions do not fully understand the pedagogical and cultural challenges and difficulties faced by many diverse student populations (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006). Research (Houser, 2008; Howard, 2003; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006; Waistell, 2011; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004) suggests that this view may not always be popular as it requires Business schools to ignore the traditional mainstream view of higher education which is developed from a dominant western perspective which advantages the indigenous population (Gay, 2000; Masemann, 1999; Nieto, 1999; D. G. Singh, 2011; Vita, 2001).

However, good and in-tune pedagogy should allow things to be more equal for learners by supporting individual differences, it is within this context that Levsen, Goettel, Chong, & Farris (2001) propose that Business Schools need to increasingly focus on emphasizing diversity in curriculum and pedagogical approaches. For the
development of this kind of pedagogy, Nieto (1999) calls for academics to put aside their own widespread erroneous assumptions that “students fail to learn primarily because they are unmotivated, they have an inferior gene pool, their families do not care, or simply the cultural values of that particular ethnic group are not oriented towards education” (Pg. 19). In the view of Nieto (1999) it is too easy for educators to place the blame of failure and lack of success on the shoulders of the students, the role of academics and Universities is all to often overlooked or explained away.

Therefore this research emphasises the role of Business Schools within the higher education experience of ethnically diverse students, and that designing and developing pedagogy that is suitable for student of different cultures and ethnicities is essential. For this process to develop naturally, Nieto (1999) and Gay (2000, 2002) argue for the need to promote learning and achievement, this can be done fully by carrying out a complete analysis of the societal and school conditions in which culturally diverse students learn, in support of this Turner (2006) recommends that in any analysis:

“Consideration must also be given to the ‘post-imperial’ assumptions within underlying UK pedagogical frameworks that construct one-way flows of learning benefits from the university to the international student rather than more reciprocal learning cultures”. (Pg. 28)

Nieto (1999) and Turner (2006) both advocate a move towards pedagogy and teaching which takes into consideration the pedagogical needs of ethnically diverse students. This will require Business Schools to focus on the development of societal and school conditions to challenge physical obstacles such as appearance, colour of skin, religious symbols and gender as a marker of identification and to have a comprehensive view of learning (Gaffney, 2008; Higbee, Siaka, & Bruch, 2007; Jacobsen, 1998; Nieto, 1999).
2.8 The Multicultural Academic

The crucial stakeholder within the development of a multicultural higher education environment is the Business School academic. They are the human face of Business Schools who require high levels of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994) to provide a student experience that minimises educational inequalities, and encourages students to develop critical discourses around citizenship, social justice and multicultural education (Giroux, 1992; Kellner, 1998).

However Schapper & Mayson (2004) argue that academics do not get the recognition they deserve with increasingly restrictive demands made on academic staff in both curriculum development and teaching, which has led to academics being intellectually deskilled in order to deliver an organisational approach to internationalisation (Schapper & Mayson, 2004; Welch, 2002). As higher education continues to transform, Schapper & Mayson (2004) argue that with the continuous focus on internationalisation aspects of curriculum, policies and procedures now restrict academics, with the emphasis now on central control. Meyer (2002) argues that as higher education begins to adopt corporate values which often fit unfavourably within a university environment, there will be higher levels of “corporatisation”. In the view of Giroux (1992) this is a backwards step as the focus should always be on the development of pedagogical practice, which should provide the ideological and institutional conditions for an on-going dialogue between academics and students.

This research argues that academics and institutions need to work together to create a climate of learning (Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999). Institutions need to recognise that success hinges on academics who have confidence and believe that the “strength of their own instruction influences students' perceptions of themselves as competent and confident learners” (Colvin & Schlosser, 1997), academics also need autonomy and trust from their host institutions (Schapper & Mayson, 2004; Welch,
In the view of Jenks et al., (2001) this is a dilemma that urgently needs addressing with many educators viewing issues of equity and excellence in respect to ethnically diverse students as a non-issue. When academics have this kind of perspective, Jenks et al., (2001) argues that academics fall back onto common teaching practices that fail to address the diverse learning styles of their students who differ culturally, racially, and socially. To address this the role of the academic in the creation of pedagogy is essential (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999). If, as Schapper & Mayson (2004) suggest, academics are alienated from the decision making process by managerialsim and centralised decision-making this will slow down the progress of multicultural education, which is already hampered by significant little progress in developing teaching practices and curricula that meet the needs of culturally, racially, and socially diverse classrooms (Sleeter & Grant, 1991).

In order to develop teaching practices and curricula that meet the needs of diverse students, Banks (1995) proposes that:

Academic achievement of students of colour and low-income students can be increased when teaching strategies and activities build upon the cultural and linguistic strengths of students, and when teachers have cultural competency in the cultures of their students.

Here Banks (1995) is advocating the need for educators to have “cultural competency” which is defined as educators understanding their own worldviews and those of their students, while avoiding stereotyping and misapplication of educational knowledge. This requires educators to obtain cultural information and then apply that knowledge within an educational context. This cultural awareness allows educators to see the entire picture and improves the quality of education provided to the student (Banks, 1995; Cross, Benjamin, & Isaacs, 1998).
Adapting to different cultural beliefs and practices requires flexibility and a respect for others’ viewpoints. To achieve this successfully, Moodley (1995) argues that educators need to develop strategies that help to create better “information and awareness of the cultural backgrounds of pupils in order to better diagnose strengths, weaknesses, and differences in cognitive styles” (p. 817) The first step in this process is for academics to develop cultural competency (Banks, 1995; Cross et al., 1998; Murrell, Jr, 1994), which then leads to the creation of a climate that is free from prejudice and inequality and provides a holistic view of the student (Murrell, Jr, 1994; Vita, 2001; Waistell, 2011). In the view of Nieto (1999) the climate is essential, as learning cannot take place within a vacuum it cannot be separated from context.

To develop context and to allow academics to build student understanding Murrell, Jr, (1994) advocates the need to develop a knowledge base based on student development and socialisation, this can be linked to the work of Banks (1995) and his view on cultural competence. Gay (2002) argues that a knowledge base is a crucial aspect, as all too often educators are blissfully ignorant of the students they teach and cannot fathom the fact that they will continue to come into contact with students whose cultural, ethnic, linguistic, racial, and social class backgrounds differ from their own. In order to develop this knowledge base, Howard (2003) proposes the need to develop educators who contemplate, reflect and address the demographic divide. This is differentiated from cultural competence (Banks, 1995) as the view of Howard (2003) focuses on the inner self, thereby developing a critical consciousness.

For many educators, developing the ability to reflect is not an easy objective, as Spindler (1994) controversially proposes that all educators are ‘cultural agents’ who perceive students with inevitable prejudice and preconception. If the view of Spindler (1994) is prevalent within higher education, then Business School academics will
continue to teach from their own perspectives and will struggle to teach students from whom their background and culture is vastly different from their own, as this research has already discussed, this taints the student experience. Ngambi (2008) calls for academics to “lay aside these negative preconceptions and prejudices and take up the obligation to students of different cultures and ethnicities and to develop pedagogy that is meaningful and resonates with their educational practices” (p.103).

2.9 Moving forward

Therefore to move the debate forward this thesis agrees with the notion that pedagogy should be developed and ingrained with culture, this research echoes and relies on the work of Ladson-Billings (1995), Nieto (1999), Villegas & Lucas (2002), and Gay (2000, 2002) in advocating the need for a culturally responsive approach towards the creation of pedagogy. This research so far argues that there is a clear need to move beyond the fragmented and cursory treatment of diversity that is currently taking place, this research puts forward the case that educators and Business Schools must have a vision of teaching and learning that acknowledges the diversity of modern society. This vision needs to include policies and procedures that include culture as part of the main curriculum with a perspective of critical multicultural education (Banks, 1995; McLaren, 1995; Warren, 2003) that develops a platform that embeds and promotes equal opportunities to learn, regardless of racial, ethnic or social class. Currently the research argues that this platform does not exist and current provision for ethnically diverse students is inadequate. In addition, the research argues that the issues discussed and articulated within this chapter cannot be rectified without fundamental change in UK higher education Business Schools, Shaw (2009) agrees with this view:

“Simply increasing the numbers of ‘diverse’ or ‘non-traditional’ students in an institution without addressing the norms, practices and tacit assumptions embedded
Within this research, fundamental change is required to embed multicultural education in UK higher education. Hence in moving this research forward this thesis takes the view that UK higher education Business schools need to develop strategies and teaching to support ethnically diverse students. As explained earlier in the thesis this research defines ethnic diversity as *students whose background, ethnicity and experiences differ from the dominant culture*, this is based on the view of Durden, Dooley, & Truscott (2014), Gay (2000, 2002), Ladson-Billings (1995a, 1995b), Villegas & Lucas, (2002). Hence within this thesis ethnicity is viewed as a connection between sub groups within a larger culture. To investigate this further in the next chapter this research discusses the perspective of culturally responsive teaching as a driver for implementing a vision for multicultural education within UK higher education.
Chapter 3
Towards a consistent framework

3.1 Introduction

The research in chapter 2 has outlined issues of inequality, attainment and marginalisation and their effects on the ethnic minority student experience within UK higher education. In grounding this debate in multicultural educational theory the research within this chapter explores the concept of culturally responsive teaching as a mechanism to teach students more effectively through the use of their cultural backgrounds and experiences to create a consistent and equal learning experience for students of ethnic diversity (Black, 2010; Gay, 2000, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

3.2 The Emergence of Culturally Responsive Teaching

The creation of a consistent and fair pedagogical approach for ethnically diverse students has been gathering momentum for some time, for example in the United States the role of culturally responsive teaching has been discussed and implemented in pre-college education primarily in the areas of middle and high school (Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Nieto, 1999). Traditionally this has had a particular emphasis on Hispanic and African American communities where numerous reputable scholars (Banks, 1995; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) have undertaken research in this area.

In developing a frame of reference for culturally responsive teaching it is important to note that this pedagogical approach is also connected to a wider body of literature in areas such as multicultural education and cultural difference (Banks, 1995; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Grant & Sleeter, 1993) and in some cases is viewed through the lens of critical race theory (McArthur, 2010). In bringing clarity to this perspective the research intends to situate culturally responsive teaching within
multicultural education, which has already been discussed in a little detail in Chapter 2; at this juncture the thesis will intend to make this position clearer.

Different authors propose different solutions for developing culturally responsive teaching within multicultural education, Nieto (1999) frames multicultural education around the idea of creating a culture and environment of learning that is conducive to the student experience, Gay (2000, 2002) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) advocate the need to create a curriculum that embeds multicultural education at the heart of its teacher training program. Whatever the solution, these authors are in agreement that current strategies employed by institutions in relation to multicultural education are insufficient; they advocate the need for a pedagogical method that is responsive to the requirements of their students (Ngambi, 2008; Shaw, 2009).

In the view of this research there is a parallel to be drawn between critical multiculturalism and culturally responsive teaching. Within critical multiculturalism there is an intention to expose how power, inequality and oppression operate via the dominant culture but it is also viewed as a method that best reflects a student centred approach to pedagogy (Tomalin, 2007; Vita, 2001; Warren, 2003). In comparison to this, culturally responsive teaching is seen as a contextual and situational process and it is most effective when ecological factors, such as prior experiences, communities and backgrounds are included in its implementation which places ethnically diverse students at the heart of policies, procedures, curriculum and institution (Ball, Reay, & Miriam, 2002; Gay, 2000; Mirza et al., 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

However this research proposes that critical multiculturalism, as an approach for embedding teaching within higher education does not go far enough in placing the student at the heart of the institution. Tomalin (2007) describes critical multiculturalism as “student-centred, but also engaging in a process of dialogue”, however this process
primarily takes place within the classroom where issues of power and inequality can be critiqued and reconstructed (Warren, 2003). Culturally responsive teaching builds on this approach and is multi-faceted (Gay, 2000) in that it takes its perspective from a multitude of approaches. The classroom is an essential aspect of learning but this is not sufficient on its own. Culturally responsive teaching takes an overall holistic approach; this research argues that not enough resonance and attention is given to the role of the home culture and its influence on the learning process (Nieto, 1999; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Shaw, 2009; Vita, 2001). While the discussion around multiculturalism has been used to inform our perspective around culture in the classroom, Tomalin (2007) argues that multiculturalism is often understood as a position that one either agrees or disagrees with: it has ideological connotations. Tomalin (2007) also argues that debates about multiculturalism often downplay or ignore altogether the impact of diversity on education.

Based on this discussion, this research advocates and proposes the need to develop culturally responsive teaching within UK higher education Business Schools; this keeps the focus on education and moves away from contentious political issues (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This focus on pedagogy allows culturally responsive teaching to flourish and act as an enabler for teaching methods that allow for the use of cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively (Gay, 2002). This perspective also differentiates itself from critical multiculturalism (Warren, 2003) with an additional impetus on educational institutions and educators to critically examine current policies, procedures and teaching methods for their appropriateness within a culturally responsive environment (Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Waistell, 2011). This focus on policies and procedures is in response to the years
of neglect that have afflicted this area and the fact that current proposed educational reform is often inadequate (Gay, 2000) and very superficial (Banks, 2008). This superficial approach is linked to previous discussions on conservative multiculturalism (Goldberg, 1994; McLaren, 1995; Warren, 2003) where specific cultural elements such as “heroes, holidays, folk talks, food, and clothing” (Black, 2010) are celebrated but the core curriculum is unchanged.

In relation to this, Gibson (1987) identifies a curious phenomenon he refers to as “accommodation”, whereby he identified that culturally marginalised groups who are successful at school have found a way to achieve “accommodation without acculturation”. Gibson (1987) gives the example of successful Punjabi students who often treat education as a game which has rules laid down by the dominant group, they view their academic success as an additional set of skills, rather than as a replacement for their traditional culture. This has significant implications on the notion that total assimilation is needed in order to succeed at school. In the view of Gibson (1987) and Gay (2000) attempting to divorce academic performance and student experience from critical factors such as culture, ethnicity, and personal experience can do more harm than good to student achievement and experience.

In order for this discussion to move forward, this thesis proposes the need to acknowledge that current Business School pedagogy is inadequate, and higher education Business Schools need to adapt and change. Avery and Thomas (2004) are of the opinion that Business School curriculums still view diversity as an element that can be incorporated through the implementation of diversity enriched curricula. This perspective still treats cultural diversity as an element that can be learned and taught distinct from the mainstream curriculum, thereby situating it firmly at the periphery. Black (2010) refers to this as an “additive” approach where specific units of study are
attached to the curriculum but no change to the structure takes place. This thesis proposes that culturally responsive teaching appropriately fits into multiple approaches that are theoretical and practice orientated.

3.3 Culturally Responsive teaching

This research proposes that the move towards incorporating culturally diverse teaching into mainstream Business School education is long overdue with Joy & Poonamallee (2013) mentioning that conversations around cross-cultural educational issues have been in progress for over three decades. Culturally responsive teaching is a mechanism designed to address these issues of neglect and is based on issues of social justice and democracy. Gay (2000) defines culturally responsive teaching as:

“Using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them. It teaches through the strengths of these students. It is culturally validating and affirming.”(p. 29)

It is also referred to as culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b); teaching against the grain (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999), teaching for diversity (Melnick & Zeichner, 1998), teaching to change the world (Oakes & Lipton, 2002), and multicultural education (Banks, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Sleeter & Grant, 2006).

In the view of Villegas & Lucas (2002) culturally responsive teaching is a broad approach to education that aims to have all students reach high levels of learning and to prepare them all for active and full participation in society.

Culturally responsive teaching requires academics to have a broad range of skills that take into account the plurality of multiple cultural perspectives (Gay, 2000). Within this methodology, mastery of content knowledge is no longer enough, educators should also have mastery of the student population, understanding student background and
behaviour and their role in the classroom (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In the view of Howard (2003) this brings with it many challenges for Business School academics, requiring them to acknowledge and raise awareness of students whose cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds differ from their own. This ability to understand students’ backgrounds is a skill that can be developed and learned, to this end Gay and Kirkland (2003) emphasise the need for educators to prepare and develop practice that acknowledges the requirements of culturally responsive teaching within teacher training. Within this program of teacher training, Higbee, Lundell, & Duranczyk (2007) argue for the need to make prominent issues of inequality, inclusion and ineffective teaching methods and the damage they can cause in diverse student communities.

In order to implement a culturally responsive teaching framework and address the gap in the knowledge and understanding of Business School academics, different authors propose different methods. Firstly in the view of (Ladson-Billings, 1995a) the emphasis should be on the individual academic, with the expectation that culturally responsive educators develop intellectual, social, and emotional learning by bringing back cultural associations to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Villegas (2007) argues that:

[To] achieve these goals, teachers need a broad range of knowledge and skills. To begin with, they need a comprehensive grasp of content knowledge, including a deep understanding of the concepts in their academic disciplines and how those concepts relate to one another.

This is a view supported by Ngambi (2008) who argues that this broad range of knowledge should be supported through the use of personal teaching experiences. Secondly Nieto (1999) and Gay (2000) look at this from the lens of the institution and propose that mastery of content knowledge needs to be underpinned with teacher training to provide skills, knowledge and attitudes to develop culturally responsive
teaching practices. Finally Villegas and Lucas (2002) propose a more reflective approach where the focus is on creating a ‘cultural consciousness’ where academics through reflection and critical analysis develop an understanding of how students think and behave, and how this is deeply influenced by factors such as race, ethnicity, social class, and language. One way to accomplish this in the view of Houser (2008) is the need for academics to take the ‘cultural plunge’, which is defined as “intense exposure to social and cultural settings in which the students' norms are clearly in the minority”.

The views of Villegas & Lucas (2002) and Houser (2008) focus on developing empathy and understanding through the means of internal reflection.

However there are some stumbling blocks in the implementation of culturally responsive teaching. Gay (2002) identifies that many educators have the erroneous perception that their subjects (particularly Maths and English) are incompatible within a culturally diverse curriculum. Gay (2002) argues that:

Misconceptions like these stem, in part, from the fact that many teachers do not know enough about the contributions that different ethnic groups have made to their subject areas and are unfamiliar with multicultural education.

In the view of Gay (2002) these misconceptions are based on superficial or distorted knowledge, which is conveyed through popular culture or mass media. In addition, these misconceptions are underpinned by academics arguing against the hierarchical and bureaucratic nature of the educational system, time pressure, insufficient opportunities for collaboration with others, resistance by those in positions of power to equity-oriented change and lack of personal understanding of oppression (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

To overcome these obstacles, different strategies and techniques can be developed to embed culturally responsive teaching within UK higher education.
Business Schools. While this research discusses implementation issues in more detail in later chapters, this section is a quick overview of the current pertinent research in this sector. This research has identified a plethora of activities both theoretical and practical which allow educators to develop different approaches to implementing culturally responsive activities. The first activity discussed by the research is the use of popular media, Bartolome & Macedo (1997) argue that “Academia needs to understand that the popular press and the mass media educate more people about issues regarding ethnicity and race than all other sources of education”. This view is discussed by Cortés (2000) who outlines the importance of implementing popular media as a resource to discuss and deconstruct stereotyping and negative portrayals of culturally diverse students, this is also discussed by Song, Singleton, Hill, & Koh (2004) however they move the focus more towards online learning and the internet as opposed to traditional media.

Gay (2002) discusses the concept that educators should build a knowledge base which allows educators to critique curriculum designs and strategies. This broad range of skills allows educators to determine the strengths and weaknesses of curriculum design and instructional materials and thereby make the necessary changes (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Zamudio, Bridgeman, Russell, & Rios (2009) take a slightly different approach and argue for the need to develop collaborative support between educators, here the focus is on building networks of support to better teach students of ethnic diversity. Finally the work of Coulson and Harvey (2013) discuss the need for learners to be supported through structured development activities that progressively increase their abilities while reducing academic -led direction, a process termed as ‘scaffolding’.

However such a structured approach would in the view of Nieto (1999) require institutional support in creating a culturally responsive curriculum, which should be articulated in the form of modified school policies and practices, not just simply
pedagogy and curriculum (Jenks et al., 2001). The advantages of a scaffolding approach allow educators to develop teaching and learning which acknowledges students’ previous experience and background (Villegas and Lucas, 2002). Thus, for many Business Schools to continue to attract and support ethnically diverse students, Turner (2006) argues for additional focus and emphasis to be given to the support and resources required to meet the needs of culturally diverse students (Waistell, 2011). Turner (2006) emphasises the importance of this:

Business Schools as a whole need to consider how far the organisation of taught degrees in subjects like Business and Management sets international students up for failure because we do not make sufficiently explicit the dominant cultural epistemology underlying curriculum design, and focus instead on the tangible aspects of learning procedures.

The view of Turner (2006) in this scenario supports the view of Sabry and Bruna (2007) who argue that not enough attention is placed on curriculum development and the teaching of diverse students. At this juncture this thesis is in agreement with the view of Turner (2006) and Tomalin (2007): educators and Business Schools need to acknowledge that current pedagogical techniques aimed at the western learner are not appropriate for the needs of ethnically diverse students.

3.4 A Consistent Business School approach

In creating pedagogy that is appropriate, this research has already identified multiple approaches to meeting the requirements of ethnically diverse students within a higher education setting. In the creation of this pedagogy Gay (2000) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) argue that educators and institutions need to move beyond the fragmented and superficial treatment of diversity that currently prevails in education. Therefore in relation to this fragmented approach within culturally responsive teaching both Gay
(2000) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) propose the need for a guiding set of principles for academics that minimise inconsistencies in dealing with students from a ethnically diverse background. The framework approaches proposed by Gay (2000; 2002) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) both have a focus on primary and high school education in the United States of America, this research argues that while these two frameworks are relevant, they are not appropriate for UK higher education Business Schools.

In creating a framework for UK higher education Business Schools the two frameworks of Gay (2000, 2002) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) will be investigated and analysed to ascertain elements that can be utilised to create a set of guiding principles and to create a theoretical approach that provides an intervention to stimulate conversations among academics and higher education institutions. In creating the framework this research argues that to make full use of culturally responsive teaching as part of their pedagogy development, educators must recognise that there are certain characteristics that make up the key fundamentals of culturally responsive teaching. In order to create a literature base, this research underpins the two culturally responsive teaching frameworks of Gay (2000, 2002) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) against the work of Banks (1995) and his five dimensions of multicultural education. Villegas & Lucas (2002) present their proposition as the six salient characteristics and Gay (2000, 2002) presents her framework as the five essential elements.

Firstly, in analysing the work of Villegas & Lucas (2002) it is clear that the focus is on developing teacher training that gives academics the skills and confidence to teach students of ethnic diversity. Villegas & Lucas (2002) propose six salient characteristics: they argue that in the first characteristic a culturally responsive teacher should be socio-culturally conscious, that is, they should recognise that there are multiple ways of perceiving reality and that these ways are influenced by one’s location
in the social order. Within the second characteristic, the teacher should have an affirmative attitude towards students from diverse backgrounds; the teacher should see resources for learning in all students rather than viewing differences as problems to be overcome. In the third characteristic teachers should perceive themselves as agents of change and have a responsibility to bring about educational change that will make schools more responsive to all students. The fourth characteristic advocates that teachers should understand how learners construct knowledge and be capable of promoting learners’ knowledge construction. The fifth characteristic mentions that teachers should make a conscious effort to know about the lives of their students. Finally within the sixth characteristic teachers should use their knowledge about students’ lives to design instruction that builds on what they already know while stretching them beyond the familiar.

In addition to the six salient characteristics, Gay (2000) puts forward her five essential elements of culturally responsive teaching. The first essential element is the need for educators to develop a knowledge base about cultural diversity. The second essential element argues that educators have the ability to design culturally relevant curricula. Thirdly, educators should demonstrate caring and build learning communities. The fourth element describes educators having the confidence to communicate with ethnically diverse students across cultures. The fifth element discusses having the ability to respond to ethnic diversity in the delivery of instruction. Table 1 outlines both frameworks side by side:
The above Table outlines the two key frameworks which were discussed before final implementation. Both the Five essential elements of Gay (2000) and the six salient characteristics of Villegas & Lucas (2002) could have been suitable, however it was decided that these frameworks were not appropriate due to their focus on pre-school and high school pedagogy. In mapping these two approaches in Table 1 it is clear that the research identifies areas of overlap between the two approaches. In discussing the areas of overlap, this research takes the view of Gay (2000) and argues for a concise and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1) Develop a cultural diversity knowledge base</td>
<td>VL1) Socio culturally conscious</td>
<td>Both authors agree that cultural consciousness is the foundation of culturally responsive teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2) Design culturally relevant curricula</td>
<td>VL2) Affirming views</td>
<td>Design resources that are based on culturally responsive strategies that affirm learner backgrounds and allow academics to engage with students on a more meaningful level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3) Demonstrate cultural caring and building a learning community</td>
<td>VL3) Responsibility for change</td>
<td>Have a moral responsibility to challenge students to achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4) Cross cultural communications</td>
<td>VL4) Knowledge construction</td>
<td>Develop cultural bridging as a platform for communication and understanding between academic and student. This understanding is the foundation for future knowledge construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5) Ethnic diversity in the delivery of instruction</td>
<td>VL5) Knows about the lives of students.</td>
<td>G5, VL5 and VL6 have scope to allow for the fusing of these three elements to develop HE curriculum. Understanding the learner and developing curricula and practice that is consistent and thoughtful requires a climate of learning in higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VL6) Design instruction that builds on what they know.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Adapted Culturally Responsive Teaching framework
developed framework which supports a learning environment that makes learning encounters for culturally diverse students more relevant. This research argues that the six characteristics of Villegas & Lucas (2002) and the five essential elements of Gay (2000, 2002) are the standard for creating a framework that is sustainable for UK higher education Business Schools. In taking this forward this our research proposes that there is significant scope to integrate the two frameworks and develop an adapted theoretical framework of culturally responsive teaching that is relevant for pedagogy development in British university Business Schools. In Table 1 this research outlines justification for the adapted Theoretical Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching (Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013) and in section 3.4 this research develops this justification in more detail.

However this research proposes that culturally responsive teaching is underpinned by multicultural education, within the context of this research both of the frameworks put forward by Gay (2000, 2002) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) are underpinned by the five dimensions of multicultural education as proposed by Banks (1995). These are:

a) Content integration

b) The knowledge construction process

c) Prejudice reduction

d) An equity pedagogy

e) Empowering school culture and social structure.

Banks (1995) defines his five dimensions of multicultural education by arguing that content integration is related to embedding various cultures, ethnicities, and other identities within the curriculum to be taught. Banks (1995) proposes that the knowledge construction process helps students to develop critical consciousness (Gatimu, 2009) so
that they question the knowledge that is put in front of them. Banks (1995) defines prejudice reduction as the use of resources to develop positive perceptions of other ethnic groups, in relation to this, Banks (1995) discusses equity pedagogy as teachers having the passion and responsibility to modify teaching styles and approaches with the intent of facilitating academic achievement for all students. Finally, Banks (1995) argues that an empowering school culture focuses on policies and procedures, which are an obstacle to the learning of students from different backgrounds.

The next stage of this research outlines the adapted theoretical approach towards UK higher education as articulated and discussed in Table 1.

3.5 The Five-Pillar Framework

Within this section this research articulates the vision for culturally responsive teaching within UK higher education Business Schools. The proposed theoretical framework is designed to support academics in understanding the pertinent aspects of developing pedagogical approaches that support ethnic and culturally diverse students. The proposed framework is grounded in the work of Villegas & Lucas (2002) and Gay (2002), and in introducing this framework this research does not propose that one pillar has a higher relevance than the other. Similar to the work of Gay (2000) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) these elements are viewed as a platform on which to build pedagogy, they cannot be used on a piecemeal basis. In creating this template for a platform this research also identified certain areas of overlap between the two frameworks in Table 1, showing that there was scope to merge some of the areas for a more efficient framework. Elements G5, VL5 and VL6 were merged into one pillar named “HE curriculum”. This decision was based on the view that the works of Gay (2000, 2002) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) have an emphasis on teacher training and pedagogy implementation. This research concurs that this is an essential element of pedagogy
development but within this research there is the proposal that there should be a recognition that the role of the institution in developing policies and procedures is just as important. There needs to be additional support in the creation of a climate and the development of a culturally relevant curricula (Howard, 2003; Nieto, 1999; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006) which has a perspective that the fundamental purpose of education is to improve social justice (McArthur, 2010).

By overlaying the theoretical approaches presented in Table 1 this research proposes an adapted theoretical framework that is specifically designed to enable the implementation and creation of pedagogy for culturally responsive teaching within UK higher education Business Schools. The adapted theoretical framework is presented as five-pillars:

1. Cultural consciousness
2. Resources
3. Moral Responsibility
4. Cultural Bridging
5. HE Curriculum

There is an acknowledgement within this research that there are limitations within this framework. Firstly there is the suggestion that this framework is being applied in an entirely new setting, within the context of UK higher education Business Schools. As discussed earlier, the majority of the research surrounding culturally responsive teaching carried out by Nieto (1999), Gay (2002) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) is very much rooted in primary through to high school education. Secondly it can be argued that certain elements of curricula and policies & procedures are different between higher education, primary education and high school education, it is unclear
how these changes will affect the implementation of the framework. Thirdly a qualitative framework such as this has not been developed within UK higher education so the appropriateness of this framework and whether it would yield any valuable data can be questioned at this stage.

To position the five elements henceforth known as the five pillars, Table 2 outlines the key literature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Consciousness</td>
<td>Academics should have empathy and understanding with the students they teach. This is underpinned by Banks’ (1995) content integration.</td>
<td>Villegas and Lucas (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gay (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durden (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular resources</td>
<td>Academics should have affirming and validating views of their students and identify resources that are important to them. This is underpinned by Banks’ (1995) knowledge prejudice reduction.</td>
<td>Villegas and Lucas (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gay (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabry and Bruna (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiz (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Responsibility</td>
<td>Academics should see themselves as agents of change, with the ability to make a difference in the lives of their students. This is underpinned by Banks’ (1995) equity pedagogy.</td>
<td>Villegas and Lucas (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladson-Billings (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gay (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durden (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nieto (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Bridging</td>
<td>Academics should be able to help students construct and scaffold knowledge between what they do know and what they do not.</td>
<td>Villegas and Lucas (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gay (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durden (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabry and Bruna (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Curriculum</td>
<td>The organisation should support the academic in the development of pedagogy that is fair and consistent. This is underpinned by Banks’ (1995) empowering school culture.</td>
<td>Nieto (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabry and Bruna (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomalin (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turner (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McArthur (2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – The Five-Pillar literature underpinning

This research argues that the construction of the five pillar framework places the student
at the heart of the higher education Business School learning process with an emphasis on the home and school relationship, classroom pedagogy, student well-being and cultural climate. Each of the five pillars in Table two is underpinned firstly through the work of Villegas & Lucas (2002) and Gay (2000, 2002) and then within multicultural education within the work of Banks (1995) and Nieto (1999). This approach differentiates itself from other approaches through the use of cultural bridging as an exclusive element in bringing together the home and school background knowledge (Sabry & Bruna, 2007). It is also important to note that this proposed five pillar framework is intended as a template and guidance in the development of pedagogy, it is not intended to be a calculative tool. This research will now discuss each pillar in turn and identify the identifying characteristics of each pillar.

3.5.1 Pillar One - Cultural consciousness

The first pillar as part of the proposed theoretical framework aims to explore the complex relationships that exist between Business School academics and their ethnically diverse students. This pillar acknowledges that academics need to have an understanding of student background and culture as part of their pedagogy creation. To develop this pillar in more depth this research identifies and articulates an overview of the key constructs of cultural consciousness. This is outlined into Figure 3.1:

![Figure 3.1: Constructs of Cultural consciousness](image)

One of the fundamental aspects of cultural consciousness is to recognise that there is plurality in the way that students think, behave and are deeply influenced by
factors such as race, ethnicity, social class, and language (Banks, 1995). This concept of plurality is also discussed by Villegas & Lucas (2002) who argue that educators need to be comfortable with the notion that there are differences between the way students think, talk, behave and learn. Both Banks (1995) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) underpin this issue of plurality with race and ethnicity and argue that pedagogy should be developed with empathy, student experience and history. In exploring the concept of empathy, McAllister & Irvine (2002) describes it as a ‘caring’ relationship between educator and student. Gay (2000), supports this discussion by proposing that equality and empathy are underpinned by a culture of caring; she argues that effective cultural consciousness requires academics to care for the students they teach, she defines caring as a “concern for the person and performance”(pg. 45). This view is supported by Ladson-Billings (1995b) who makes the point that while the perception of caring may seem unexpected, having empathy for the needs of students is integral to academic awareness of student concerns and learning aspirations, Gay (2000) views this awareness of student concerns as a moral imperative, a social responsibility, and a pedagogical necessity.

3.5.1.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy

In the development of these two characteristics within cultural consciousness this research merges the discussion around validating pedagogy and affirming heritage. The research argues that validating and affirming pedagogy (Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) is essential in developing empathy, which is an integral element for the development of a cultural consciousness for Business School academics (McAllister & Irvine, 2002; Ngambi, 2008). This view of empathy is discussed by numerous researchers (Foster, 1995; Gay, 2000; Irvine, 1990) who suggests that when educators
care for their students this can lead to increased student motivation and student's from a
cultural background perform better academically.

This ability to understand student background, history and experience in the
view of McAllister & Irvine (2002) allows educators to identify and modify pedagogy
based on student needs and thereby create a better learning experience. This view is also
supported by Nieto (1999) who argues that to often the role of the academic in the
student experience is ignored and many institutions underestimate the impact that
academic attitudes, beliefs and behaviour has on the expectations, engagement and
success of students of ethnic diversity. Empathy is essential in raising awareness of
student backgrounds but also in changing academic expectations, it forces many
academics out of their comfort zone and places them in what Villegas & Lucas (2002)
describe as 'social cultural environments' where equity is used to develop social and
educational justice. In raising student achievement academics should have high
expectations and a ‘cultural understanding’, which is based on a validating and
affirming perspective which views student experiences and their history as positive
aspects of pedagogy (Gay, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

3.5.1.2 Empowerment through academic success

In order to fully understand the impact of a validating and affirming perspective
on student expectations and engagement, Cummins (1992) argues that ethnically diverse
ethnic minority students will only succeed if the patterns and trends in school
interaction reverse those that prevail in society at large. Cummins (1992) is of the view
that ethnically diverse minority students are "empowered" or "disabled" as a direct
result of their interactions with educators in schools. In order to combat this, Nieto
(1999) advocates the need for academics to treat home cultures and native languages as
part of the learning process. This is a view that is reiterated by Cummins (1996) who
proposes that educators should see their role as aiding to supplement rather than supplant their native language and culture this is more likely to empower students of ethnic diversity. Educators who see their role as getting their students to replace their home language and culture with English and white values to assimilate them into the dominant culture are more likely to create the conditions for student failure.

Nieto (1999) argues that too often student background and culture are seen as obstacles to academic success and progress, and are seen by many educators as constructs that need to be designed out of the curriculum (Jim Cummins, 1992; Ogbu, 1990). This perception is based on the view that the values, variables and history of culturally diverse students do not conform to the way that the dominant members of society define teaching and learning (Nieto, 1999; Y. Turner, 2006). In the view of Nieto (1999) student empowerment and recognition of culture and language can work in a mutual and collaborative manner to promote learning rather than obstruct it, which leads to empowerment of the student within the learning process.

3.5.1.3 Transformative academic

This research situates the transformative academic within a cultural consciousness based on the view of Banks (1995) who argues that when educators challenge the concepts, paradigms and themes of mainstream academic knowledge in order to reform the curriculum then academics are undertaking a “transformative process”. Banks (1995) states that these educators have amassed “transformative” knowledge, and through experience, now view knowledge as related to the cultural experiences of individuals and groups. In relation to this view, Tisdell (2009) views transformation as an element linked to spirituality and cultural identity. In the view of Tisdell (2009), when “learners engage on the personal, cultural, structural, political, and the artistic levels of the cultural imagination, there is greater chance that education can
be transformative, both for learners and educators” (pg.24). Gatimu (2009) takes a more critical stance and argues that while transformation of curriculum and learning is a critical outcome of multicultural education, current theories from Morgan & Burrell (1979) subvert these original goals. In order to reiterate the goals of transformation, Gatimu (2009) advocates the need to place “critical consciousness at the centre of educational structures and pedagogy”. Gatimu (2009) argues that there is great mileage in employing critical consciousness in changing the lives, aspirations and achievements of those who fall in the “other” category of social theory.

The transformative academic is essential in the development of a cultural consciousness (Banks, 1995). For Business School academics to develop a cultural consciousness, having the ability to challenge and transform mainstream academic knowledge is a key component of cultural consciousness. This type of knowledge allows academics to make connections between Business School environments and ethnic minority student achievement. In the view of Turner (2006), understanding student achievement is underpinned by academics trying to develop more sophisticated cultural interfaces and communication exchanges.

In closing the discussion around this pillar of research (Nieto, 1999) and Gay, 2000) both agree that there needs to be a consistent approach in minimising barriers to student learning, and greater emphasis on understanding the effects of academic beliefs and behaviours on students. To obtain this, both Howard (2003) and Gay & Kirkland (2003) propose the use of self-reflection and internal critical analysis. Gay & Kirkland (2003) make the case that these methods are essential in helping to improve the educational opportunities of culturally diverse students and also in creating a validating and affirming learning environment. Another technique recommended by Nieto (1999) is for academics to be supported in getting to know their ethnically diverse students
better, and for institutions to allow the utilisation of home culture and language as part of the learning process. Another technique proposed by Gatimu (2009) is to allow ethnically diverse students to be producers of knowledge that is associated with their lived experiences (Jim Cummins, 1992; Ogbu, 1990). When students are allowed to produce knowledge that is linked into their lived experiences, then learning becomes more meaningful, however this can only be done effectively when educators create a pedagogical context within the lived experiences of the culturally diverse students (Gatimu, 2009).

3.5.2 Pillar Two – Curriculum Resources

The second pillar as part of the adapted theoretical framework investigates the role of curriculum resources in the success and attainment of culturally diverse minority students. This pillar acknowledges that academics should view knowledge as related to student experience and history. To develop this pillar in depth the key constructs of cultural consciousness are outlined in Figure 3.2:
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In the development of this theme and in recognition of the characteristics in Figure 3.2 this research argues that culturally responsive teaching needs to be supported by a balanced view towards resource development and implementation. Sleeter and Grant (1991) argue that currently in education there is an imbalance in many
educational resources which are still very much targeted at ‘white’ European and American students. To apply a holistic view of resource creation, and not one that is targeted at one specific group, Gay (2002) discusses resource creation within the context of the lived experiences of students, she argues that this creates engaged teaching and learning which students find meaningful. The topic of engagement is essential in student success and educational resources should have context and relevance to the students that are being taught, and academics should utilise and consume resources that have an international context and flavour which better represent the needs of the international student community (Gaffney, 2008; Ngambi, 2008).

3.5.2.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy

The five pillars within the adapted framework all have a validating and affirming perspective. These characteristics are repeated throughout the thesis, and are henceforth referred to within the research as the baseline characteristics. This view is based on the work of Gay (2000), who argues that culturally responsive teaching by its very nature is “culturally validating and affirming” (p. 29). An affirming and validating perspective towards cultural resources legitimises the cultural heritage of ethnically diverse students and acknowledges that different approaches to learning are worthy to be taught in the formal curriculum. Developing resources that are meaningful to students improves their learning and affirms and validates their cultural heritage (Gay, 2000, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

3.5.2.2 Confidence to develop a relevant pedagogy

The implementation of curriculum resources requires academics to have confidence in themselves and in their subjects. This characteristic in the view of this research gives academics the freedom and confidence to teach against prevailing
stereotypes and also to become experienced in better judging the standard, quality and relevance of textbooks for Business School teaching.

In the view of Maeroff (1988) confidence is a fragile thing, which can shatter in an instant. In the view of Gay (2002) academic confidence in their abilities is essential in developing a culturally responsive teaching base. In building confidence Gay (2002) advocates the need for a secure knowledge base. This base should be supplemented with cultural awareness of textbooks and supporting educational resources, the knowledge base should not be solely dominated from within a western resource framework (Gay, 2002). Turner (2006) agrees with and extends this discussion by proposing that a knowledge base is not enough, educators should take more responsibility for individual and group welfare and, in many ways, educators should see themselves as more in the role of an advocate, educator and friend. This research argues that academics have a responsibility to obtain a worldview that supplements a comprehensive and appropriate knowledge. This kind of approach combats low academic confidence as discussed by Tomalin (2007):

Many staff are concerned that they cannot work effectively because they do not have sufficient knowledge about different cultures and religions. Others are worried that they may unwittingly discriminate against a student on cultural or religious grounds from a position of ignorance.

In pushing back against this low academic confidence Maeroff (1988) advocates the need for the teaching profession to achieve the status it deserves and develop a knowledge base that allows them to become experts in their field (Gay, 2000, 2002), and be empowered by being involved within the decision making process in regards to their students (Nieto, 1999). This is supported by Sabry and Bruna (2007) who propose the need for professional development activities that allow academics to challenge biases and misconceptions, and to promote critical thinking, not only within the
curriculum, but also within resource design decisions. For Business Schools to better develop, academic confidence authors (Gay, 2000; Howard, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) suggest that institutions develop specific training courses that allow academics to build confidence in creating resources that offer a balanced view which reflects the increasing ethnic international diversity of the student community (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006).

3.5.2.3 Multidimensional approach to resource design

Increasing academic confidence will require academics to undertake a multidimensional approach to resource design. Gorski (1997) views this approach as academics being comfortable with the multitude of educational resources used in the classroom in order to make learning more meaningful for students, while Gay (2002) views this approach as educators confronting erroneous misconceptions around different learning styles. This multidimensional approach is further complicated due to the increasing emergence of digital technologies within the educational sphere, which opens up multiple possibilities about teaching, collaborating, reflecting and participating in the digital age (Rose & Meyer, 2002). The proliferation of such technologies opens up different multi modal approaches in the development of culturally responsive teaching resources. Through the use of virtual worlds, social networking, and micro blogging this changes the dynamics of communication and also how educators teach and how students learn (Vasudevan, DeJaynes, & Schmier, 2010).

In the view of Gatimu (2009) these conditions of change are embryonic and allow for students to generate meanings in response to new ideas and experiences they encounter in their learning. This dynamic approach allows students a certain level of freedom to create resources and content that is relevant for them, making them producers of knowledge (Gatimu, 2009). In all cases, these new learning experiences
require academics to ‘scaffold’ student knowledge from a multidimensional perspective, Gay (2002) refers to this process as helping students develop mental structures as resources to tap into the foundations that learners use to attach context and meaning to their learning.

3.5.2.4 The transformative academic

The final characteristic within this theme is the acknowledgment that effective culturally responsive teaching needs to be underpinned by the transformative academic. The role of the transformative academic requires educators to help “students acquire new perspectives” on history and society through the reformation of the curriculum (Banks, 1995). In expanding on this notion Banks (2001) discusses the concept of the transformative academic as interrelated to transformative academic knowledge, with the underlying notion being that “Transformative scholars assume that knowledge is influenced by personal values, the social context, and factors such as race, class, and gender” (Banks, 2001). Here transformative scholars argue for the need to focus the debate on creating knowledge that challenges mainstream academic understanding in its production and implementation (Banks, 1995, 2001).

In challenging this mainstream academic knowledge and being more responsive in the creation and production of knowledge many academics may have to widen the net in the types of resources they develop (Avery & Thomas, 2004) and use and start to include research papers and evidence based case studies that validate different ethnic minority groups (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). For many academics this requires them to develop additional critiquing skills, which allows them to identify and eradicate stereotypes in educational resources and in the development of curricula (Ngambi, 2008; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Schapper & Mayson, 2004). This research proposes that when learning and resources are situated in and validated by previous student
experience the transformative academic recognises that teaching in the increasingly
diverse student environment poses learning challenges that need to be addressed
through classroom pedagogy Ngambi (2008).

This research argues that within the context of curriculum resources, when
academics create content and resources that have a holistic worldview this helps
culturally diverse students to engage and interact with the content and resources in a
more meaningful way (Connor et al., 2004; Gay, 2000; Ngambi, 2008; Nieto, 1999). In
order to foster and encourage engagement within culturally responsive teaching, and by
extension, curriculum resources, Gatimu (2009) argues:

A successful multicultural educator helps students produce alternative knowledge
that use story lines that empower and liberate. Students become producers of
knowledge that is intimately linked to their lived experiences.

At this stage this research identifies an overlap between the work of Howard
(2003) and Gatimu (2009); they both push for pedagogy and resources that help
academics to be critical of social injustice and inequality. Through the process of
critical reflection (Howard, 2003) and multiple worldviews (Sabry & Bruna, 2007;
Gatimu, 2009) academics build a comprehensive knowledge base which is liberated
from the traditional western dominated pedagogical approaches and allows academics
to become transformative, confident and multidimensional in their approach towards
pedagogy development.

3.5.3 Pillar Three - Moral Responsibility

As UK Business Schools continue to become fiscally reliant on ethnically
diverse international students (Turner, 2006) the responsibility academics and
institutions have towards these students’ wellbeing and achievement is taking on
prominence (Schapper & Mayson, 2004; Tomalin, 2007). In starting the discussion
within this pillar, the research proposes the need to acknowledge that teaching is not solely confined to the classroom (Nieto, 1999), but institutions and societies are interconnected and academics can make a difference to the lives of their students (Giroux, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). To develop the this concept in depth Figure 3.3 articulates an overview of the key constructs of moral responsibility:
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**3.5.3.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy**

The five pillars within the adapted framework all have a validating and affirming perspective. Within an affirming and validating viewpoint academics should have high expectations for all students not just for some (Goodlad, 1994; Tom, 1997). High expectations are a moral imperative that allows academics to increase learning and educational opportunities while at the same time viewing students in a positive light (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

**3.5.3.2 Passion to act as an agent of change**

In the view of Villegas & Lucas (2002) passion is based on compassion and high moral standards, they argue that academics should have a moral imperative towards the students they teach. This is because many academics are in a privileged position to facilitate the growth and development of other human beings and thereby challenge the
status of the dominant group; educators are in the view of Villegas & Lucas (2002) essential ‘moral actors’. This research suggests that many ethnically diverse students view academics with a certain respect and view them as role models to aspire to. In the view of Villegas & Lucas (2002) this places on academics a moral responsibility to make sure they do the best for those students, they refer to this as academics viewing themselves as agents of change.

Becoming an agent of change requires passion and motivation (Villegas & Lucas, 2002), this is a view also echoed by Day (2004) who argues that passion is not a luxury, it is the essential backbone of all teaching, however, in the long term many academics find this difficult to maintain due to teaching being such a complex and demanding career (Carbonneau, Vallerand, Fernet, & Guay, 2008). Here there is an equation between passion and moral responsibility, you can’t develop passion if you don’t feel responsible for your students.

Motivation and responsibility can also be affected via numerous obstacles and challenges, some of the obstacles described by Villegas & Lucas (2002) include the hierarchical and bureaucratic nature of the education system, time pressures, stress (Carbonneau et al., 2008), insufficient opportunities for collaboration, lack of empathy for the oppressed and despair that change is possible (Freire, 2000).

3.5.3.3 Expectation to succeed

This research therefore argues that the development of moral responsibility requires academics to have an affirming and validating view of their ethnically diverse students alongside passion for their subject. These characteristics are essential in the development of high expectations about how students grow, achieve and engage (Nieto, 1999). Expectations are essential in developing a positive student experience; this has been suggested by numerous authors (Jussim, 1989; McKown & Weinstein, 2002;
Rubie-Davies, Hattie, & Hamilton, 2006) who also suggest that there is a link between classroom educator expectations and their positive or negative effect on the performance and achievement of students.

This issue of academic expectations has also been discussed through the government funded Swann Report (1985) which looked at the effectiveness of education for ethnic minority groups in the United Kingdom. Pellegrini & Blatchford, (2000) reported that one of its main findings was that low expectations for these students were a major factor in their poor academic achievement. This supports the view of Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) who argue that certain characteristics such as ethnicity may be a significant factor in educator expectations (Baron, Tom, & Cooper, 1985).

The danger in academics having such low expectations especially in relation to ethnic minority students is that it can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Research suggests that ethnic minority students are highly influenced by low expectations, more so than their white counterparts, and this may serve to further widen the achievement gap when such students accept and confirm teachers’ negative expectations (McKown & Weinstein, 2002; Nichols & Good, 2004; Sabry & Bruna, 2007). Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) discuss this phenomenon in more detail and argue that students are well aware of academic expectations and will respond accordingly. In response to this, Nieto (1999) argues that students need to develop critical thinking skills, which teaches them to have high expectations of themselves and their educators. Gay (2000) argues that the increase in student expectations is for many an empowering experience that translates into academic competence, personal confidence, and the will to act. However there is a caveat, high expectations are not a one-way street, academics should equally have high
expectations of their students, they should expect them to succeed and commit themselves to making this success happen (Gay, 2000).

3.5.3.4 Disruption of oppressive constructions

The final characteristic within a moral responsibility concept focuses on trying to investigate the role of academics who continue to take on the role of an agent of change and become the catalyst to fight inequality in education and society (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This view links to an earlier discussion within this research where the argument was made that a Eurocentric curriculum and other structures make schooling oppressive for students from subordinated groups (Gatimu, 2009). This discussion was utilised to justify the need for a culturally responsive teaching framework, which was underpinned by multicultural education. Another element that can help to disrupt these oppressive constructions is critical consciousness (Howard, 2003; Gatimu, 2009). Durden & Truscott (2013) argues that critical consciousness is a tool that explores and engages subjectivity and identifies issues of social struggle alongside helping educators develop understandings of culturally relevant pedagogy. In the view of Gatimu (2009) “Critical consciousness develops as one acquires skills to critique society and school structures. It is a tool for disrupting oppressive constructions”.

Disrupting oppressive constructions is not about breaking rules and regulations and overseeing general anarchy, it is about giving marginalised groups a voice, a stage to air their grievances and analyse the forms of oppressive policies and regulations that they encounter in their lives (Freire, 2000; Gatimu, 2009; Giroux, 2004). It also allows educators to take responsibility to identify and rectify areas of inequality in curricular and structural issues. Through a process of critical reflection (Howard, 2003), students can start to articulate what ails them and thus are much more likely to acquire insights
into the dominant ideology and become independent knowers (Gatimu, 2009; Y. Turner, 2006).

Developing a moral responsibility requires a multifaceted approach that explores academic intentions and passions and implements them within a culturally responsive framework. For many Business School academics this will require dedication, hard work and a genuine passion to see your students succeed (Gay, 2002). The concept of moral responsibility is very demanding, with high levels of commitment required, this research argues that to meet these commitments academics need to embody a passion to fight social inequities and reconstruct education to give all students opportunities (Gatimu, 2009; Nieto, 1999). This is a view shared by multiple authors who each have their own views, for example Cochran-Smith & Lytle (1999) views academics as key participants in the struggle for social justice, for Nieto (1999) this struggle is based on social and educational change and for Turner (2006) it simply embodies itself in the recognition that many culturally diverse students study in ways that are different from the implicit student norms. What each of these views do agree on, is that moral responsibility is an essential aspect of any adopted approach.

3.5.4 Pillar Four – Cultural bridging

In the view of this research cultural bridging as a concept is closely related to cultural consciousness. However, this research argues that there is a differentiation between the two and identifies that cultural bridging is about academic implementation and cultural consciousness is about academic awareness. While there is a distinct difference between the two concepts, the techniques employed in creating culturally responsive pedagogy are similar. To develop this pillar in more depth we identify and articulate an overview of the key constructs of cultural bridging. This is incorporated into Figure 3.4:
3.5.4.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy

Within this concept the role of the Business School academic is to equip students with the skills and confidence to build bridges between their pre-existing knowledge and what they are expected to learn (Sabry & Bruna, 2007). This is also discussed by Gay (2000) who describes culturally responsive teaching as validating pedagogy that teaches through the strength of its students. It also, in her view, acknowledges the legitimacy of the cultural heritages that are associated with different ethnically diverse groups, both as legacies that affect students’ thinking and behaviour and their approach to learning. In order to overcome these challenges Villegas & Lucas (2002) emphasise the need to both understand the student and the subject matter they teach, and to utilise student culture as a vehicle for learning (Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999).

3.5.4.2 Knowledge construction process

In the view of Ladson-Billings (1995a) utilising students’ cultures as a vehicle for learning is an essential aspect of helping students to integrate and achieve in higher education. However in utilising this culture academics are required to understand
student background and knowledge (Banks, 1995; Durden et al., 2014; Ladson-Billings, 1995a), be knowledgeable about student lives, and be able to incorporate into classroom activities student background and culture (Moll & Gonzalez, 1997). Wertsch (1997) concurs with the view but also adds that for many educators, understanding social interaction, in particular the interaction that occurs between the younger knowledgeable members of society, allows academics to understand how students shape knowledge and truth as part of their culture. This is also discussed by Nieto (1999) who argues that culturally diversity can influence students emphasis on family values, respect for elders and responsibility, this is in contrast to cultures who value independence, and often value individualisation, separation, and self creation.

For academics to support ethnically diverse students in the development of a knowledge construction process, Gay & Kirkland (2003) echo the work of previous authors (Banks, 1995; Moll & Gonzalez, 1997; Wertsch, 1997) in arguing that educators need to make teaching relevant to diverse students, and this needs to be done thorough understanding not only their own culture but also the culture of their students. In the view of Gay (2002) when academics understand student background and culture this becomes the catalyst for developing positive student experiences within the classroom. However this is not an arbitrary process and requires not only careful planning and scaffolding of students’ personal knowledge alongside their academic knowledge, but also curriculum content and material that is relevant to the experiences and backgrounds of culturally diverse students (Gay, 2002; Ngambi, 2008). In the view of Turner (2006), current attempts to create a conducive knowledge construction process are hampered by western epistemological assumptions that frustrate the culturally diverse learner due to a lack of opportunity to explicitly contextualise and discuss these issues within the framework of formal learning.
Thus, to overcome these frustrations and try to implement learning opportunities which help develop the knowledge construction process for culturally diverse students within formal learning, Nieto (1999) makes the case for the development of a more equitable learning environment. However, equitable pedagogy does not exist in a vacuum but is most effective when academics modify teaching in ways that will facilitate the academic achievement of culturally diverse students (Banks, 1995; Nieto, 1999). Hence Nieto (1999) argues the need for educators to recognise that there are a plurality of learning styles within culturally responsive teaching and these styles have multiple viewpoints and characteristics. What Nieto (1999) and Sabry & Bruna (2007) both agree on is that knowledge of student backgrounds is essential in understanding how students learn and think. Academics need to acknowledge that in many cases students from diverse backgrounds come with a variety of skillsets, which should be valued, and academics should focus on building on what students do have, rather than lament about what they do not have (Nieto, 1999; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

3.5.4.3 Self reflection to construct tangible meaning

The third characteristic within the concept of cultural bridging is the development of self-reflection to help ethnically diverse students construct tangible meaning. This characteristic builds on the knowledge construction process, and alongside self-reflection and critical consciousness, contributes to the development of cultural bridging by helping students to critically make connections between what they know and what they do not know (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Sabry & Bruna, 2007). At this stage, Ladson-Billings (1995b) links self-reflection to heritage and culture and views this as a positive construct that can lead to achievement, identity, and help to foster a sense of community and responsibility. However,
traditionally for many academics helping students to reflect and make these connections between their heritage and culture and what they are expected to learn has not been without its controversies and problems. In the view of Nieto (1999) this is primarily down to negligence by academics and institutions regarding the attention they have given to the makeup of schooling, treating culture as a static concept, which is unchanging, and unwieldy.

In moving away from this static thinking, Ladson-Billings (1995b) proposes the idea of educators rejecting a deficit based thinking approach towards culturally diverse students. In the view of Howard (2003) this will require educators to firstly view culturally diverse students as capable learners and secondly to “engage in honest, critical reflection that challenges them to see how their position influences their students in either positive or negative ways”. Critical reflection within this context is not just a reflection of an individual’s background and teaching methods, but should also include a meticulous examination of how “race, culture and social class” shape student understanding and thinking within the world (Howard, 2003). Critical reflection requires academics to look inward to find deeper levels of self-knowledge and identify how one’s own worldview can shape students’ conceptions of self (Howard, 2003), this will lead to increased empathy and broader social identification (Houser, 2008).

Discussions of self-reflection by numerous authors (Houser, 2008; Howard, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999) very much focus on turning the critical eye inward and interrogating personal attitudes, beliefs and actions. This supports the work of Freire (2000) who argues that educators cannot effectively support critical growth among students unless they too are willing to identify, acknowledge, and resist personal complicity in existing systems of oppression.
3.5.4.4 Modify instruction and curriculum for equity pedagogy

The final characteristic of cultural bridging identified within this literature review relates to educators having the confidence and ability to modify instruction and curriculum for equity pedagogy. This section will detail the importance of actively involving ethnically diverse students within the knowledge construction process (Gatimu, 2009; McGee Banks & Banks, 1995) and also helping students to reflect on modern society and their role within it.

In developing this characteristic this research utilises the definition proposed by McGee Banks & Banks (1995):

We define equity pedagogy as teaching strategies and classroom environments that help students from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural groups attain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to function effectively within, and help create and perpetuate, a just, humane, and democratic society.

This definition supports the previous discussion within this research associated with culturally responsive teaching and specifically fits within a cultural bridging concept. As McGee Banks & Banks (1995) argue, it is no longer sufficient to help students to learn to read and write, there should be additional emphasis on students becoming reflective and active citizens of a democratic society. This definition also touches on previous work and reinforces discussion around the negative outcomes caused by existing assumptions and structures and how this will not lead to equity pedagogy (Banks, 1995; Gay, 2000; McGee Banks & Banks, 1995; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006).

In the movement towards equity pedagogy numerous authors have different solutions, McGee Banks & Banks (1995) propose the dismantling of existing school structures, Nieto (1999) proposes the reformation of current curricula, policies and procedures and Gay (2000, 2002) proposes the reconfiguration of classroom pedagogy
and pre-service teacher training, however each author agrees on the perspective that the traditional power relationship between academic and student is changing from a one-way passive relationship to a dialogue based relationship. This dialogue based relationship requires academics to understand student background and behaviour, looking beyond the physical characteristics of students and considering the complexity of the individual groups and their collective experiences (McGee Banks & Banks, 1995).

In the exploration of the complexity surrounding differing cultural groups and experiences, multiple authors (Suleiman, 2001; Taylor & Whittaker, 2003) identify the curriculum as a negative element within the experience of ethnically diverse students, because a traditional curriculum does not adequately represent their history. The modification of instruction and curriculum to better support the needs of students from an ethnic minority background allows students to identify themselves within the curriculum (Nieto, 1999). This process in addition also allows academics to nullify the effects of cultural mismatch, a theory which regards academic failure not as a result of genetic or cultural inferiority, but a mechanism which highlights the gap between home and school cultures (Sabry & Bruna, 2007).

Cultural bridging is the recognition by Business School academics that they have a crucial role to play in stitching together students’ previous knowledge with what they are expected to learn, Nieto (1999) refers to this process as using culture as a vehicle for learning. In the development of this concept, Villegas & Lucas (2002) argue that academics need to view all students as capable learners, who should view their role as ‘adding to’ rather than ‘replacing’ what students already have, hence the term cultural bridging. In order to accomplish this effectively, Gay and Kirkland (2003) talk about the importance of self-reflection and critical consciousness in understanding how
academic behaviour and beliefs affect the process of implementing teaching that allows students to identify links between student home and school culture.

3.5.5 Pillar Five – HE Curriculum

The final concept within the adapted five-pillar framework of Jabbar & Hardaker (2013) investigates the role of the higher education institution in the experience and support provided for the achievement and success of culturally diverse students. To develop this pillar in more depth we identify and articulate an overview of the key constructs of the HE Curriculum. This is incorporated into Figure 3.5:

![Figure 3.5: Constructs of the HE Curriculum](image)

3.5.5.1 Affirming heritage and validating pedagogy

It is essential within this concept that higher education institutions alongside educators also have validating and affirming perspectives of their ethnically diverse students (Nieto, 1999). This thesis starts the discussion within this concept by investigating the work of Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen (1999) who argues that educational climates and perspectives are heavily influenced by the heritage and history of an institution. Hurtado et al., (1999) suggests that this heritage and history shapes how institutions view culture, and how this then shapes policies, procedures and academic practice. The background and perspective of an institution
will influence whether educators have validating and affirming viewpoints on the types of policies and procedures they are asked to implement.

3.5.5.2 Conducive climate to the achievement of diversity

Heritage and history have a significant influence on policies and procedures and this then mirrors itself on the creation of a fair and equal climate (Hurtado et al., 1999). In the view of Cheng & Heath (1993) and Higbee et al., (2007) the construction of a fair and equal climate is not always guaranteed, Shaw (2009) supports this view and takes a dim view on the erroneous assumption that many institutions believe that a diverse student body contributes to a fair and equal climate. However this is not always the case, with multiple authors (Cheng & Heath, 1993; Hurtado et al., 1999; Shaw, 2009) arguing that the continuous enrolment of a ethnically diverse student body will not fix issues of unfair and unequal access but rather continue to contribute to widespread student failures if the climate is viewed as hostile by diverse students.

In moving this debate forward Nieto (1999) discusses the role of the higher education institution in creating a climate that treats learning as an active process in which meaning is developed based on experience as opposed to a pedagogy of direct transmission (McGee Banks & Banks, 1995; Nieto, 1999). In moving away from the static approach of direct transmission, Nieto (1999) recommends the need for drastic changes to all school policies and practices, not simply pedagogy and curricula. A focus on specific strategies is no longer enough, educational institutions need to go through a critical transformation process to create conditions of learning that are conducive for ethnically diverse students. This is a politically charged view not without its merits of how education needs a revolutionary change against oppression (Freire, 2000), which requires a radical shift in higher education Business School strategy, thinking, focus and course design (Ngambi, 2008). Gay (2002) takes a slightly different view and proposes
the need for educational institutions to implement and acquire a cultural knowledge base about ethnically diverse students. This knowledge base can be used as a foundation for Business School academics to develop culturally responsive curriculum designs and instructional strategies, which support a conducive climate of learning for ethnically diverse students.

In creating this climate for learning and defining a knowledge base, Gay (2002) defines three types of curricula, which are routinely presented in the classroom, each one offers a different opportunity for developing cultural diversity:

- Formal Plans
- Symbolic Curriculum
- Societal Curriculum

Firstly, Gay (2002) defines formal plans as the key policy and procedural documents that have been deemed relevant by the governing bodies of educational systems. Numerous research (Gay, 2002; Hurtado et al., 1999; Y. Turner, 2006) suggests that current formal plans are anchored in and complemented by adopted textbooks and curriculums that are defined as “standard” issue by education authorities, which in the view of Gay (2002) do not do enough in responding to culturally diverse student needs. For formal plans to play a key part in the development of a HE Curriculum, a medium needs to be found which places students’ achievement at the heart of its ideals. Banks (1995) and Gay (2002) advocate the need for transformative academics to have cultural competency in identifying the multicultural strengths and weaknesses of formal plans, curriculum designs and instructional materials and make the changes necessary to improve their overall quality (Gay 2002). Banks (1995) warns against quick fixes when undertaking this process, he argues that quick fixes lead to “marginalising content about ethnic groups by limiting them to specific days and
holidays such as Black History month and Cinco de Mayo”. For effective formal plans both Banks (1995), Nieto (1999) and Gay (2002) advocate a systematic review of educational policies and procedures.

The second curricula method that is used to teach culturally diverse students is symbolic curricula (Gay, 2002). Gay (2002) defines this as the use of “images, symbols, icons, mottos, awards, celebrations, and other artefacts that are used to teach”. This in the view of this research is closely linked to the second pillar “curriculum resources”, where they differ is through their implementation. The symbolic curriculum takes a different form in the guise of bulletin boards, corridors, walls, classrooms etc. Gay (2002) sees classroom walls and bulletin boards as valuable “advertising” space, which can help diverse students learn, and value what is there and devalue what is not. Within a higher education Business School environment this can be enhanced and duplicated through the use of websites and virtual learning environments.

The third curricula element defined by Gay (2002) is the societal curriculum, which she defines as “The knowledge, ideas and impressions about ethnic groups that are portrayed in the mass media”. Cortes (2000) argues that television, newspapers, magazines and movies have a disproportionate influence on many students, in addition Gay (2002) argues that these mediums are inaccurate and frequently laced with prejudice. In the view of Gay (2002) culturally responsive teaching within these curricula involves a thorough critical analysis of how different culturally diverse ethnic groups are stereotyped and presented in the mass media. This research suggests that educators should use critical analysis and reflection within the classroom to act as a counter balance towards these distorted messages (Coulson & Harvey, 2013; Howard, 2003). In the creation of a conducive climate to learning this research argues that educators and institutions need to be in a position to develop formal school curricula
and instruction that teaches students to be discerning consumers of and resisters to ethnic information disseminated through a traditional western pedagogy dominated curriculum (Gay, 2002; Nieto, 1999; Y. Turner, 2006).

3.5.5.3 Deconstruction of a white syllabus

The next stage within the development of a HE curriculum is to undertake a process of ‘deconstruction’. This research defines this as a process where climate and curriculum is carefully sculpted to meet the learning requirements of ethnically diverse students. Within this characteristic the main constructs relate to institutions going through a process of change and reflection to fully realise their role in the deconstruction of the “white syllabus” (Allen, 1998) or the eurocentric perspective (Gatimu, 2009). Nieto (1999) has a very specific view of deconstruction and proposes that all educational policies and practices, not simply pedagogy and curriculum, need to change if student learning is to be fostered.

For Business Schools the key output of this deconstruction process should be a culturally responsive curriculum that allows for the creation of what Hurtado et al., (1999) refer to as a “climate of learning that is conducive to the achievement of diversity”, this viewpoint fits within the discussion on the previous characteristic.

In order for the deconstruction process to be effective, Waistell (2011) proposes that Business School pedagogy should focus on curriculum design and pedagogies that harness diversity to enhance the quality of learning. In support of this, Ngambi (2008) advocates a conscious approach that explores student needs by developing a personalised understanding of student perceptions and history. For this process of deconstruction to be effectively implemented educational organisations need the support of all faculties and staff to create strategic awareness of culturally diverse challenges and how these can be overcome (Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).
In closing it is clear that the HE curriculum is heavily influenced by institutional past and heritage (Hurtado et al., 1999). This history has an impact on how institutions shape policies and procedures for students of ethnic and cultural diversity. Historically the focus has been on maintaining this heritage and history, which sometimes has been to the detriment to students of ethnical diversity (Modood, 2003, 2006; Y. Turner, 2006). This focus has led many institutions to have the erroneous assumption that a diverse student body addresses issues surrounding unequal access and poor achievement (Hurtado et al., 1999; Shaw, 2009). This research suggests that current perspectives on the HE curriculum tend to exacerbate these problems (Shaw, 2009) and a fundamental change to school climate, policies and curriculum (Gay, 2000, 2002; Nieto, 1999) needs to take place for culturally responsive teaching to impact on student lives.

This research intends to advance discussion on how the role of the HE curriculum through the process of a knowledge base (Gay, 2002) can be utilised to deconstruct elements of the HE curriculum’s formal plans, symbolic curriculum and societal curriculum (Gay, 2002) in making learning relevant for ethnically diverse students.

3.6 Literature overview

As UK higher education Business Schools are increasingly internationalised there is now the emergence of a more global outlook that seeps into the very fabric of higher education. This literature review investigates in detail the work of many authors within the field of culturally responsive teaching (Banks, 1995; Connor et al., 2004; Gay, 2000, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; McGee Banks & Banks, 1995; Modood & Shiner, 2002; Modood, 2006; Nieto, 1999; Richardson, 2008; D. G. Singh, 2011; Y. Turner, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) who all surmise that there is a link between poor ethnic minority experiences and low ethnic minority achievement. This
research also investigates the numerous criticisms that are levelled at the implementation of cultural diversity within higher education and its role in the fragmentation of western education, teaching, admission and experience (D’Souza, 1991; Schlesinger Jr, 1991). The criticism of D’Souza (1991) argue that ethnic minorities receive preferential treatment in relation to how their voice is heard as they are continually treated as the oppressed ‘victims’.

In order to move the debate forward, different authors provide different solutions, for example Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue that academics are not responsive enough to the needs and requirements of students of culture and ethnicity, whereas Banks (1995) takes the view that empathy and understanding on issues such as race/ethnicity, social class, culture and language need to take a more prominent role in any on-going discussions. In collating the views of these authors this research agrees with the views of Villegas & Lucas (2002) and Gay (2002) in proposing that there are common areas that should be developed to consistently engage with students in a fair and equal manner.

In an attempt to document these common areas, in Table 3 this research establishes the key constructs that outline the work required for academics and institutions in expanding the debate and implementing a responsive and consistent approach in the adoption of culturally responsive teaching within UK higher education Business Schools. In order to provide a consistent framework the characteristics outlined in Table 3 refocus the debate on student experience and argue that the debate in the future needs to focus on cultural responsibility and expand on the notion of cultural responsiveness (Gay, 2000, 2002; Nieto, 1999) within the parameters of a responsible approach. To prepare for this change the research proposes that academics and
institutions should have an integral part to play in how they articulate their vision of
teaching and learning for culturally diverse students.

The constructs embedded into the adapted five-pillar framework (Table 2) act as
an organising framework for bringing to the attention of institutions and academics their
responsibilities in issues of cultural diversity, pedagogy creation, development and
implementation. These constructs also form the basis to help the research analyse and
organise the collected interview data for analysis (King, 2004, 2012), with an additional
benefit of allowing my initial codes to be based on literature. This will be discussed in
depth in chapters 4 and 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Cultural Consciousness</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Moral Responsibility</th>
<th>Cultural Bridging</th>
<th>HE Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirming cultural heritage (Villegas &amp; Lucas 2002)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy that is validating (Gay 2002)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment through academic success (Nieto 1999)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative academic (Banks 1995)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence to develop relevant pedagogy (Gay 2000)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional approach to resource design (Gay 2002)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion to act as an agent of change (Villegas &amp; Lucas 2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation to succeed (Nieto 1999)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of oppressive constructions (Gatimu 2009)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge construction process (Nieto 1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection to construct tangible meaning (Kirkland &amp; Gay 2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify instruction and curriculum for equity pedagogy (Banks 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducive climate for the achievement of diversity (Hurtado et al., 1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deconstruction of a ‘white syllabus’ (Allen 1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Constructs of culturally responsive teaching
Chapter 4
Methodology and Theoretical perspectives

4.1 Introduction
This chapter outlines the theoretical perspectives, philosophical underpinnings and the methodological decisions undertaken by this research. This chapter starts by arguing that for many research students, identifying their approach and their theoretical underpinnings can be an intimidating and daunting process, which causes a sense of bewilderment and in many cases confusion at the vast array of methodologies and methods that they have before them (Crotty, 1998; Groenewald, 2004). Thus one of the early tasks is to develop a structure which clearly outlines the approach to be undertaken by this research in the perspective, collection, analysis and discussion of the data intended to be collected.

4.2 Research approach
One of the earliest decisions for a researcher to make is to identify and resolve the methodological differences between qualitative and quantitative research. Selecting the correct approach at this early stage is essential in identifying the appropriate rich data to collect. As already discussed, the subject matter being researched has a certain degree of complexity and any research approach must acknowledge that there are multiple views and lens perspectives. In order to meet this requirement Orbe (2000) vouches for qualitative research and mentions that it can be an effective tool in giving a voice to the lived experiences of ethnically diverse individuals. An alternative to this type of approach is the use of quantitate data collection which has a focus on statistical, mathematical or numerical data (Given, 2008). There is a clear distinction between the two approaches here, qualitative research is often used to investigate and explore meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols and descriptions of
things, while a quantitative method is often used to measure and keep count of variables and elements (Given, 2008; Newman, 1998).

For the purposes of this research, a qualitative approach is better suited to exploring situational activities that locate the observer in the real world, it allows for context and clear discussion while allowing for flexibility in the interpretive, material practice that makes the world visible (Ritchie, 2003; Silverman, 2013; Snape & Spencer, 2003). The qualitative approach can be further broken down into four broad classifications: Contextual, Explanatory, Evaluative and Generative (Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam, 2003; Ritchie, 2003). Yin (2002) identifies similar categories but describes them as Exploratory, Descriptive and Explanatory. Table 4 outlines the various approaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual research</strong> is concerned with identifying what exists in the social world and the way it manifests itself (Miles &amp; Huberman, 1994).</td>
<td><strong>Exploratory</strong> research is used when the final answer is not known. The task becomes clearer as questions are asked and the phenomenon is investigated (Yin, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanatory research</strong> is concerned with why phenomena occur and the forces and influences that drive their occurrence. (Noor, 2008; Ritchie, 2003).</td>
<td><strong>Explanatory</strong> research is concerned with why phenomena occur and the forces and influences that drive their occurrence (Noor, 2008; Ritchie, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluative</strong> is concerned with issues surrounding effectiveness and efficiency (Ritchie, 2003).</td>
<td><strong>Descriptive</strong> is used to develop depth around a specific phenomenon, very popular within ethnographic research (Yin, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generative research</strong> is concerned with producing new ideas either as a contribution to the development of social theory or the refinement of policy (Ritchie, 2003).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Broad types of research study
Identifying and developing the correct method is a decision that is not made simple due to the complexity surrounding education-based research. Having looked at the approaches described by Yin (2002) and Ritchie (2003) this research utilises an exploratory approach. This research is interested in understanding why phenomena occur and the forces that influence them, the answer was not known at the start of the study and became apparent during investigation.

The next stage in the development of the research approach is for the researcher to build awareness of the various choices available to them within the scope of the research study (Bryman, 2012).

4.2.1 Guiding framework

Building this awareness can be a difficult task with Creswell (2002) proposing that researchers should have a general framework that encompasses all aspects of the study from philosophical ideas to analysis procedures. There are two main approaches that are suitable within this research to help organise and develop the research study, the first approach is by (Crotty (1998), which he refers to as the four elements and the second one is the reconceptualised framework of Creswell (1998, 2002, 2011)

Firstly, when using the framework of Crotty (1998), a researcher should be able to answer the following four questions when conducting their research proposal:

1. What methods do we propose to use? What are the techniques or procedures used to gather and analyse data?
2. What methodology governs our choice of methods? The strategy, plan of action, process or design lying behind the choice and use of particular methods
3. What is our *theoretical perspective*? The philosophical stance informing the methodology and providing context for the process and grounding its logic and criteria.

4. What *epistemology* informs our perspective? What is the theory of knowledge embedded in the theoretical perspective and thereby in the methodology?

(Pg. 2-3)

These four questions give a depth and breadth to the interrelated decisions that are essential in the design of research. In the view of Creswell (2002), these questions inform a choice of approach that encompasses broad assumptions from practical considerations to data collection. This for Creswell (2002) does not go far enough and hence he attaches an additional three questions for additional depth:

- What knowledge claims are being made by the researchers?
- What strategies of inquiry will inform the procedure?
- What methods of data collection and analysis will be used?

Creswell (2002, 2011) argues that these additional questions are needed to form different approaches to research, which in turn translate into research design processes. The view of Creswell (2002) is heavily influenced by the four elements of Crotty (1998) in terms of structure and development. Crotty (1998) argues that a structured but broad approach allows researchers to make sense of the vast amount of research approaches that are out there. In addition to this, the four questions proposed by Crotty (1998) propose that epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology and methods are elements which are all reliant on each other; any decision made in one element affects decisions made in the others; they all inform each other. This is a view that is supported by King & Horrocks (2010) who state that “ontology, epistemology, methodology and
methods are all connected and cannot be viewed in isolation” (Pg. 10). In addition, King and Horrocks (2010) argue that any decisions made within these elements need to be fully justified for high quality research. In moving this discussion forward, this research will develop its structure around the four elements of Crotty (1998), these areas are outlined in Figure 4.1 alongside the chapter in which they will be discussed in detail.

![Figure 4.1: The four elements of Crotty (1998)](image)

4.3 Theoretical approach

In order to develop discussion around theoretical and methodological issues, this research intends to utilise the work of Crotty (1998) as a guide to form the theoretical approach to this thesis. Figure 4.2 outlines the decisions made by the researcher in relation to epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology and methods.
Each decision will now be discussed in detail.

4.3.1 Ontology

Ontology is concerned with the theory of being (Bonner, Francis, & Mills, 2006; Crotty, 1998; Marsh & Stoker, 2002), underpinned by the question “is there a real world out there that is independent of our knowledge of it?” (Crotty, 1998). This is supported by two definitions, firstly King & Horrocks (2010), define ontology as the science or study of being, or in more detailed terms “the claims or assumptions that a particular approach to social enquiry makes about the nature of social reality” (p. 8), secondly Clough & Nutbrown (2012) define ontology as a “theory of what exists and how it exists”, these two definitions focus on what it means to know and what is the nature of this knowing.

In developing this section, Snape & Spencer (2003) define three distinct positions within an ontological perspective: “realism, materialism and idealism” (pg. 11). Realism claims that there is an external reality, which exists, independent of
people’s beliefs and behaviours (Marsh & Stoker, 2002). Materialism also claims that there is a real world but only that material elements hold any real meaning, and idealism asserts that reality is only knowable through the human mind (Snape & Spencer, 2003). King and Horrocks (2010) in addition suggest two ontological positions: realist and relativist and argue that a realist ontology subscribes to the view that “the real world is out there and exists independently from us” (p. 9), and they define a relativist ontology as a more unstructured and diverse tradition, which is based on “our understandings and experiences which are relative to our specific cultural and social frames, being open to a range of interpretations” (p. 9). In the view of King and Horrocks (2010) all other positions are in some way a variation of the ontological positions of realist and relativist, this includes the variations discussed by Snape & Spencer (2003).

Before a decision is made in relation to the ontological position, it is interesting to note that within his schema as represented in Figure 4.1 Crotty (1998) does not outline ontology as a separate element. This omission is by design and not by accident Crotty (1998), argues:

> Ontological issues and epistemological issues tend to emerge together (…) to talk of the construction of meaning is to talk of the construction of meaningful reality (…) because of this confluence, writers in the research literature have trouble keeping ontology and epistemology apart conceptually. (p. 11)

This is not an isolated view with King & Horrocks (2010) supporting this position by arguing that “ontological and epistemological issues often arise together” (pg. 8). Hence the ontological decision will be made as it emerges within the epistemological discussion which the research will now discus.
4.3.2 Epistemology

Epistemology is defined as the philosophical theory of knowledge, which deals with the nature of knowledge (Crotty, 1998), what is it we claim to know (King & Horrocks, 2010) and the truth behind this knowledge (Audi, 2010). Each theoretical perspective embodies a certain way of understanding what is (ontology) as well as a certain way of understanding what it means to know (epistemology).

The epistemological position is essential in providing a philosophical grounding for deciding what kind of knowledge is appropriate and how it can be ensured that the selected position is adequate and legitimate; this decision has an impact on the way research is conducted and analysed (Creswell, 2011; Ritchie et al., 2003). In developing an epistemological position, this thesis investigates three main epistemological positions defined by Crotty (1998): objectivism, constructionism and subjectivity.

4.3.2.1 Objectivism

Objectivism as an epistemological position has dominated the field of education for many years with most educators believing that there is only one true and correct reality which is deeply embedded in the scientific perspective (Vrasidas, 2000). This is a view that is also shared by King & Horrocks (2010) who regard objectivism as a “scientific epistemology, which is appropriate for studies that involve queries, numbers, principles and laws” (Pg. 10), it is ideal for aggregating large data that claims to make known the real aspects of ‘existence’.

By taking such a view, (Bernstein, 2011) argues that at its most basic premise objectivism suggests that “there is or must be some permanent, ahistorical matrix or framework to which we can ultimately appeal in determining the nature of rationality” (p. 8), also referred to as the “what is” of knowledge. The role of the researcher within this type of position is to acknowledge that the object in question already has its
meaning and would exist in its current form with or without the knowing of the researcher (Bernstein, 2011; King & Horrocks, 2010).

In discussing objectivism from a cultural perspective it is clear that it is fully secular with a focus on the virtues of rational self-interest, independent thinking, productiveness, justice, honesty, and self-responsibility (de Vries, 2005).

4.3.2.2 Constructionism

The second epistemological position discussed by Crotty (1998) is Constructionism, this is based on the work of Papert & Harel (1991), which is in direct opposition to the objectivist approach. The key difference between objectivism and constructionism centres around how they perceive knowledge: constructionism takes the view that truth or meaning comes into existence due to how individuals engage with the realities in the world, this is opposed to objectivism which proposes that meaning exists whether we are aware of it or not (Crotty, 1998; Papert & Harel, 1991). From a critical perspective this research suggests that the key difference between the two positions is that meaning is not discovered but constructed. This is also supported and discussed by Silverman (2013) who argues that constructionism “places an emphasis on the theoretical and constructive aspects of knowledge” (p. 107), which is to realise that facts are socially constructed in particular contexts.

In developing this position within education, Papert & Harel (1991) suggest that constructionism is by its very nature a functional approach towards learning, this is further discussed by Avery & Thomas (2004) who suggest that constructionism as a perspective has a focus on the “building of knowledge structures” irrespective of the circumstances of the learning, and through the lens of ‘learning-by-making’. This reinforces earlier discussion about cultural bridging and the view of Gay (2000) that
academics should support ethnically diverse students in the creation of a knowledge base to help them better critique the world around them.

This research views constructionism as an epistemological perspective, which views learning as practical and dynamic focusing on making things happen during the learning process (Crotty, 1998; Papert & Harel, 1991; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In moving this discussion towards culturally responsive teaching, the research suggests that there is considerable scope in investigating how higher education learners engage and the conversations that take place about their own histories and culture and how this then boosts self-directed learning and facilitates the construction of new knowledge (Gay, 2002; Papert & Harel, 1991). This research also argues that constructionism as a practical method of teaching fits in with the very nature of management education; this view is also supported by Joy & Poonamallee (2013) who argue that current management education theory is, by its very nature, dominated by functionalist approaches due to management education being so practice-orientated.

However, the major issue identified by this research in relation to this position centres on the role of the researcher and their influence on the world around them. In the view of Crotty (1998) “meaning is constructed based on the individual’s interactions with the world” (Pg. 42). However within this epistemological stance it can be argued that the behaviour of the researcher and their own assumptions can adversely influence and affect their findings and the way in which the research is conducted (Crabtree & Miller, 1999; Finlay, 2002; Hellawell, 2006). In order to address this issue, multiple authors (Ahern, 1999; Finlay, 2002; Snape & Spencer, 2003) advocate the need for reflexivity within the collection, interpretation and presentation of qualitative data. King & Horrocks (2010) view the process of reflexivity as particularly relevant as it requires the researcher to consider their contribution to the construction of meaning. The role of
reflexivity and its use within constructionism is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

4.3.2.3 Subjectivity

The third epistemological position discussed by Crotty (1998) is subjectivity. This stance is in direct conflict with constructionism and has the view that meaning does not come out of the interplay between subject and object, but is imposed on the object by the subject (Crotty, 1998; Solomon, 2005). The key distinction between constructionism and subjectivity is that in subjectivity meaning is created out of nothing whereas within constructionism meaning is created out of something (Crotty, 1998). In the view of Solomon (2005), subjectivity is a state of being, i.e. the subject is imbued with characteristics such as perspectives, experiences, feelings, beliefs, desires and power. These characteristics are already resident and subjectivity is utilized to explain the influences of these subjects in relation to truth or reality. In discussing these characteristics, Crotty (1998) argues that meaning still has to come from somewhere, whether it is our dreams or from our background and culture. The key distinction borne out when discussing the difference between constructionism and subjectivism is to acknowledge that within constructionism meaning is constructed out of interaction between the researcher and the object, in subjectivism it is borne out of nothing, it is already there (Crotty, 1998).

4.3.2.4 Epistemological position

Based on the research undertaken so far, this thesis deems it is prudent and appropriate to adopt the epistemological stance of constructionism. In the view of this research this is an appropriate stance to undertake as the research views culturally responsive teaching as an interaction that happens between academic and student. This
interaction is further influenced by understanding and experience that is specific to cultural and social frames of reference (King & Horrocks, 2010), this epistemology emerges under a relativist ontological position.

As educators and students continue to converse and engage (Papert & Harel, 1991) this then facilitates the construction of new knowledge, which is an active process whereby meaning is constructed on experience and background (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999). Within this epistemological stance, this research takes the view that teachers learn from students and vice-versa, and through this relationship, pedagogy and learning is scaffolded on student background and constructed around culture (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The appropriateness of this position is further clarified by Snape & Spencer (2003) who mention that constructionism allows the displaying of multiple constructed realities, they mention that all reality is contingent upon human practices, which are themselves constructed in and out of interactions between humans and their world (Crotty, 1998; King & Horrocks, 2010; Vrasidas, 2000). Snape & Spencer (2003) further mention that this constructed meaning is then developed and transmitted in essentially a social context, it is this social context that allows for the development of different constructed realities, with each individual academic having their own social context which influences their view of the world and affects their construction of pedagogy. In finishing this section Crotty (1998) mentions:

We depend on culture to direct our behaviour and organise our experience (….)
Culture is best seen as the source rather than the result of human thought. (p. 53)
4.3.3 Theoretical perspective

Continuing with the guiding four elements of Crotty (1998, p.4) as illustrated in Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2, the next stage within this chapter is to identify an appropriate theoretical perspective. Current discussions in this thesis so far have veered away from a theoretical base that is rooted in a scientifically-based approach; this is primarily down to the qualitative nature of the research and the focus on culture, beliefs and behaviour and its influence on educators.

Initial efforts to study culture originated from the within the fields of anthropology and sociology. The majority of this anthropologic work was carried out under interpretivist approaches (Geertz, 1973). During this period, Business School and cross management education was still primarily dominated by the functionalist tradition (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013), which is aligned more toward positivism as practiced in the natural sciences (Jackson & Aycan, 2006; Joy & Poonamallee, 2013).

Hence, in creating a theoretical perspective it is important to distinguish the differences between positivism and interpretivism for the investigation of culture within Higher education Business Schools. Positivism follows the methods of the natural sciences, which offer tools to identify universal features of mankind, society, and history, which then allows researchers to implement certain explanations, which allow for better control and predictability (Crotty, 1998). The process of positivism therefore lends itself well to open accounts wherein the study is systematically clear, factual and open to observation (Pring, 2004, p. 91). The approach of positivism also considers culture as an objective phenomenon that can be accurately observed and measured (Yeganeh & Su, 2006). King and Horrocks (2010), argue that the “idea that human beings and human behaviour are reducible to variables that can be measured and subject
to statistical analysis” (p. 12) makes this approach a very controversial and much-contested viewpoint in the social sciences.

This research has sympathy with the view of King & Horrocks (2010) and rejects the notion that human behaviour can be predicted and compartmentalised into specific variables and thereby controlled. This research argues that each academic has different experiences and backgrounds and thereby their construction of pedagogy cannot be predicted, or controlled (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013). Cohen, Manion, & Morrison (2013) argues that as a theoretical perspective positivism is not appropriate within the context of the classroom and school where the problems of teaching, learning and human interaction present the positivistic researcher with a mammoth challenge.

Based on this perspective this research identifies interpretivism as an ideal theoretical perspective to underpin constructionism. As noted by Ellis & Bochner (1996) the aim of interpretivism is to deal in perspectives on life, not expert answers. This perspective is also supported through the work of Crotty (1998) who argues that interpretivism has emerged in ‘contradistinction’ to positivism in attempts to understand and explain human and social reality (p. 67). In the view of King and Horrocks (2010), interpretivism is usually seen as a counter to scientific approaches such as positivism and is ideal for “describing aspects of the social world by offering a detailed account of specific social settings, processes or relationships” (p. 11). A thesis of this nature with a focus on the social sciences falls into an Interpretivist framework.

4.4 Methodology

An interpretivist approach can come under many guises but in general the two main themes are phenomenology and symbolic interactionism (Crotty, 1998, p. 71). Within the view of symbolic interactionism, Blumer (1986) discusses the role of the self and how this defines an individual’s situation and influences the way in which they act.
In the view of Blumer (1986), society is comprised of many social actors all involved in
the process of interaction, in the view of Ahern (1999) and Finlay (2002) within this
interaction each person is 'reflexive' in their own definition of the situation. Crotty
(1998) is broadly supportive of this view and argues that within this kind of view
human’s react to situations and things based on the meaning these things have for them.

The other approach discussed by Crotty (1996, 1998) is phenomenology. In the
view of Orbe (2000) phenomenology is the study of essences, which has a “focus on the
conscious experience of how a person relates to the lived world that he or she inhibits”.
Within this type of approach, phenomenology requires the capturing of rich and varied
descriptions about different phenomena and the context in which they occur
(Groenewald, 2004). This is because phenomenology is a viewpoint that advocates the
study of the direct experience, and the behaviour is determined by the phenomena of
experience rather than external reality (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 18).

The key difference between these two approaches lies in how they treat culture
Crotty (1996, 1998). Symbolic interactionism requires the researcher to be able to have
the ability to put him/herself in the place of the other, this also requires the researcher to
acknowledge that we owe to society our very beings as conscious and self-conscious
entities (Blumer, 1986; Crotty, 1998). In taking this perspective as a foundation for
research, Crotty (1998) argues that the ability to take the role of the other is an
interaction in itself, and the symbolic aspects come from symbolic tools that humans
share, such as language, and through dialogue the researcher can become aware of the
perceptions, feelings and attitudes of others (Bajunid, 1996; Blumer, 1986; Crotty,

Phenomenology however treats culture with a measure of suspicion, which in
the view of Crotty (1998) is necessary as it has such a big impact on the lives of people.
Crotty (1998) argues that phenomenologists recognise that culture is a huge influence on our humanness:

> It is culture that allows us to emerge from our immediate environment and reflect upon it. It is because of culture, our symbols and our meaning systems that we know our past and can plan for the future (p. 81)

It is through this investigation of the environment and everyday experiences that phenomenologists can begin to understand various cultural practices and the impact they have within a larger context (Fiske, 1991). This is especially important within the investigation of culture as such everyday experiences are a mirror of everyday society and politics (Houston, 1997). While culture is liberating, it is also for many the guiding light in their life and hence it sets boundaries, and also gives people a voice (Orbe, 2000).

Thus the phenomenological approach is suitable for the investigation of pedagogy creation for students from an ethnically diverse background. It is important to make clear at this juncture that the methodological approach taken is suitable for pedagogy construction hence is best suited for the analysis and development of pedagogy. While this thesis could develop a student approach this research surmises that this may not accurately reflect the lived in experience of the academic and how this affects their pedagogy creation as discussed by Orbe (2000), this thesis is about the mechanisms of pedagogy construction not the actual student experience of pedagogy. In addition the creation of pedagogy by Business School academics is highly influenced by background culture, organisation culture, student culture, and societal culture, and this has an impact on the way academics develop pedagogy for culturally diverse students (Banks, 1995; Cohen et al., 2013; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; Orbe, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The role of phenomenology has expanded over time and has been used
by scholars from a number of disciplines to explore the role that culture can play in human interaction, including Business Management (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013; Ngambi, 2008; Orbe, 2000). Understanding the methods and mechanisms of pedagogy development requires the researcher to interpret events from the consciousness of experience and relation, to the lived in world of habitation (Gay, 2000; Ngambi, 2008; Nieto, 1999; Orbe, 2000). It is this ability to explore the phenomenon of behaviour and interaction that makes this an appropriate theoretical perspective.

4.5 Reflexivity

However, developing a phenomenological enquiry is fraught with its own unique danger. Crotty (1998) argues that for the researcher to observe the phenomenon as it should be experienced, the researcher is required to lay aside their belief systems, (p. 82), this view is also supported by (Crabtree & Miller, 1999). This is an important process for researchers, as meanings and symbols that the researcher has grown up with are limiting and can act as a barrier between the researcher and the immediate experience of the object (Ahern, 1999; Crotty, 1998).

Within a phenomenological approach researchers need to be careful not to prejudice the data they are collecting, it is recommended that researchers should put in place a number of procedures to prevent, or at least minimise, the contribution of the researcher to the construction of meaning (Ahern, 1999; Crotty, 1998; Finlay, 2002).

For effective data collection within a phenomenological enquiry the researcher is required to undertake a process of setting aside their assumptions about the phenomenon they are investigating and to see it afresh (Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom, 2006; Hellawell, 2006). The process of laying pre-conceptions, meanings and humanness to one side in the classical definition is referred to as epoche (Moustakas,
1994) but is also referred to as bracketing (Finlay, 2002; King & Horrocks, 2010) this is discussed in Chapter 5 in more depth.

In developing a reflexive process Finlay (2002) argues that researchers need to reflect honestly on their position within the research and the methodology. Extra care needs to be taken to not fall into the trap of undertaking excessive self-analysis at the expense of focusing on the research participants (Ahern, 1999; Finlay & Gough, 2003; Finlay, 2002). Thus in the view of Ahern (1999) the process of bracketing is an iterative, reflexive journey that requires the researcher not to be over exuberant and to develop a clear plan that entails preparation, action, evaluation, and systematic feedback about the effectiveness of the process. The main output and advantage of this process is that rather than trying to eliminate one’s experiences from the research, the researcher’s energies are spent more productively in trying to understand the effects of their experiences on the research (Ahern, 1999).

Therefore when undertaking a phenomenological enquiry it is important to acknowledge that there is no such thing as a uniform experience; each person will perceive the same phenomenon in a different way (Finlay, 2002). Each person brings to bear his or her lived experience, specific understanding, and historical background (Ahern, 1999; Finlay, 2002). Therefore one of the early tasks as part of this iterative process is to clarify the researcher’s personal value and belief systems and identify some of the interests that the researcher might take for granted.

Hence at this stage it is important for the researcher to outline any specific variables, values and beliefs, which may inadvertently affect the data collection process. The key issues to be managed in the view of the researcher at this stage are background, ethnic and home culture. This view mainly stems from the confidence and background of the researcher who is a relatively new academic and had, at the time of writing,
joined academia within the last four years. Other influences include the researcher’s home background and the struggles that the researcher has personally witnessed of how students from a ethnically diverse background struggle to integrate and develop their higher educational experience. These experiences mirrored the struggles of the researcher who struggled to integrate into a course where he was the only student of ethnic diversity.

Issues that may arise during the data collection process include academics being wary of discussing issues of ethnic diversity with an academic from a ethnically diverse background. There is an implication that the background of the researcher may become a barrier, which will adversely influence responses during the interviews. It was identified early on that the researcher would need to adjust his approach during certain scenarios. There were instances during the data collection process where academics were reticent to discuss the finer aspects of pedagogical development for students of ethnic diversity. When this situation did arise the researcher followed the advice of Ahern (1999) by reasserting his academic credentials and gave working examples of how the researcher himself is trying to implement pedagogy for their students of ethnic diversity. The assertion of academic credentials is essential, it negates the view that the researcher considers himself to be an outsider (Hellawell, 2006).

4.6 Summary

In taking a constructionist viewpoint, the research reinforces the focus on identifying academic meaning and truth based on their engagement with the realities of the world, so meaning is constructed within a social context (Crotty, 1998; Papert & Harel, 1991). As an academic of ethnic diversity the primary focus which was achieved during the research was to develop appropriate skills that view the phenomena not influence the phenomena (Ahern, 1999; Finlay, 2002). There are no hard and fast rules
and no real specific answers; there are only different views and perspectives on life (Ellis & Bochner, 1996).

The phenomena could only be truly observed through the development of a reflexive strategy that showed that the researcher was prepared to engage in a careful systematic way with in-depth self-evaluation. Finlay (2002) commends this approach and argues that this demonstrates a certain level of integrity. In supporting the development of a reflexive strategy Finlay (2002) puts forward a reflexive three stage framework that allowed the researcher to understand and implement the key concepts, the three stages are: pre-research stage, data collection stage and finally the data analysis stage. This framework is applied and discussed in Chapter 5 – Research Methods.
Chapter 5
Data Collection Methods

5.1 Introduction

In the view of Silverman (2013) there are no right or wrong methods, there are only methods that are appropriate or inappropriate to your research topic and the theoretical perspective you are working within (p. 153). In chapter 4 this research detailed the epistemological and theoretical perspectives undertaken as part of this thesis (Figure 4.2). This chapter aims to build on the epistemological and ontological underpinnings by describing the research data collection methods. Having chosen a phenomenological perspective the data that the researcher collected needed to allow for the exploration of experience, influences from the participants’ backgrounds and the ability of the participants to discuss their perceptions on things in a free, forthright and open manner.

In developing a guiding framework for this section, Crotty (1998) describes this section under the heading of “methods” within his four elements. This framework has been useful in structuring the epistemological and theoretical discussion. However, for the implementation of data collection methods the research requires a specific framework that gives additional depth. To accomplish this, Creswell (2011) outlines five interrelated steps, which can help in the process of qualitative data collection:

- Sampling approaches to select participants
- Gaining access to these individuals
- Defining the types of information or data to be collected
- Designing protocols or instruments for collecting and recording
- Administering the data collection and developing ethical consideration

(p. 205)
Table 5 outlines the decisions made in relation to the achievement of Creswell’s five steps (2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creswell (2011) Five steps</th>
<th>Researcher decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling approaches to select participants</td>
<td>HE Business School academics, snowball and purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining access to the individuals</td>
<td>Senior academics, Heads of Departments (HODs, principal lecturers, registrar, school managers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of data to collect</td>
<td>Interviews, memos, document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording data</td>
<td>In-depth interviews, memoing, document analysis, reflexive diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical considerations for data collection</td>
<td>Data storage on electronic devices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – Five steps of Creswell (2011) in collecting Qualitative data.

5.2 Sampling approaches for selecting participants

The first step within the realm of social enquiry includes making decisions, which allows for the design and selection of a research sample that matches the focus of this study. In the view of Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam (2003) even if a study involves very small populations or single case studies, then decisions still need to be made about people, settings or actions (p. 77). In the view of Creswell (2011) in qualitative inquiry the intent is not to “generalise a population but to develop an in-depth exploration of a central phenomenon” (p. 206).

A popular strategic approach to the creation of an appropriate sample is the use purposive sampling (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Ritchie et al., 2003). This is defined by Ritchie et al., (2003), as a strategy where “Members of a sample are chosen with a purpose to represent a location or type in relation to the criterion” (p. 77). The defining attributes of the purposive sampling strategy, which make it reasonable for this thesis as opposed to other methods such as the theoretical sample, is the ability to critically think and define the parameters of the population that is intended to be studied.
at an early stage (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Silverman, 2013). A complementary strategy to this, used to obtain richer level of depth and detail in the view of Ritchie et al., (2003), is the use of a snowballing strategy, which involves asking people who have already been interviewed to identify other people they know who fit the selection criteria (Crabtree & Miller, 1999; Groenewald, 2004). The research then utilised the original group as informants who helped in identifying additional academics who qualify for inclusion and these, in turn, identify yet others – hence the term snowball sampling (Cohen et al., 2007). Based on this research, the two sampling strategies discussed above were chosen. First, institutions and academics were chosen via a purposive sampling strategy and then additional participants were identified via a snowballing strategy. Figure 5.1 outlines how this strategy was used within the data collection process:

![Figure 5.1 – Implementation of sampling strategy](image)

As figure 5.1 shows the purple shading outlines the purposive sampling strategy (eight interviews) and the pink shading outlines the snowball strategy (Fourteen interviews).
Interviews Twelve, Thirteen, Nineteen and Twenty are additional snowball interviews, which originated from Interviews eleven and Interview eighteen.

During the implementation of the sampling strategies outlined above Ritchie et al., (2003) recommend than when selecting a purposive sampling strategy, criteria should be carefully chosen that spans across areas such as demographics, characteristics, circumstances, experiences and attitudes. Thus to incorporate as much of this as possible the criterion was kept very simple, this is also supported through the view of Ritchie et al., (2003) who argue that complex criteria can affect the quality and range of the sample. Hence it was decided to focus the sample on some basic criteria:

- Higher education academics who had a minimum of three years’ experience teaching and researching in higher education Business Schools and had a
- A subject focus in one of the following areas; Law, Leadership, Management, Strategy, Marketing, Transport and Logistics.

5.2.1 Identifying institutions

The final sample size was made up of twenty-two business school academics across three different institutions in the North of England. Of these twenty-two academics nine interviews were from male academic members of staff and thirteen were from female members of staff. The collected research suggests that this composition did not impinge on the data. This research suggests that twenty-two as a sample size is appropriate for a small-scale qualitative research project such as this. Ritchie et al., (2003), suggests that within qualitative research the sample size is usually small primarily because phenomena only need to appear once to be part of the analytical map. After a while there is a point of diminishing return when increasing the sample size no longer contributes to new evidence. Diminishing return is a problem that occurs
depending on the type of data being collected, Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom (2006) refer to this process of diminishing return as data saturation and a signal that the data collection process is now complete or near completion. In the view of Guest, Bunce, & Johnson (2006) data saturation can occur within the first twelve interviews and after that very few new phenomena are likely to emerge. In the view of Gonzalez (2009) when undertaking research that is reliant on a phenomenological approach, the sample size is usually driven by the need to uncover all the main variants within the approach, he suggests that within conditions such as this, small survey samples of less than twenty are common. Finally the view of Creswell (2011) in relation to sample size is that normally within qualitative research it is typical “to study a few individuals or a few cases” (pg. 209). Based on this discussion this research suggests that a sample size that does not exceed twenty-two is appropriate.

The next stage within a purposive sampling strategy is to identify Business School organisations that would be suitable for this research. There were many factors to evaluate and consider at this stage, the researcher had to be reflexive but at the same time consider issues around managing a full-time occupation, time required for undertaking travel and conducting the interviews, and costs associated with travelling. Ritchie et al., (2003) argues that “qualitative studies are almost invariably confined to a small number of geographical, community and organisational locations” (p. 100), hence for this study it was sensible and appropriate to put a geographical limit in how far the researcher should travel for face-to-face interviews. Thus it was decided at an early stage to primarily focus on universities within a 70-mile radius of the home institution, in this case Huddersfield. A 70-mile radius extends the boundary of the region of Yorkshire into different regions of the country, though it is important to remember that this is not a sample that will represent the University sector.
The first part of the purposive sampling strategy is identifying all the institutions within a 70-mile radius of the home institution. The next step was to obtain a list of institutions from the UCAS website. At this juncture each University location was plotted into Google Maps and the mileage from the base was noted. It is important to clarify at this stage that the list only included higher education Business School establishments and did not include colleges that had recently been awarded degree-awarding powers. The following list was produced:

- Huddersfield University 0.0 Miles
- Bradford University 15.0 Miles
- Leeds Trinity 20.4 Miles
- Leeds University 21.2 Miles
- University of Sheffield 27.3 Miles
- University of Manchester 28.0 Miles
- Sheffield Hallam 28.1 Miles
- Manchester Metropolitan University 28.8 Miles
- University of Salford 30.3 Miles
- University of Bolton 33.1 Miles
- York St John 48.2 Miles
- University of York 49.3 Miles
- University of Central Lancashire 53.8 Miles
- Liverpool Hope University 55.4 Miles
- The University of Liverpool 57.0 Miles
- Liverpool John Moores University 57.4 Miles
- Edge Hill University 57.8 Miles
The next stage of the sampling strategy was to map the institutions against the five-pillar framework of Jabbar and Hardaker (2013) as displayed in Table 2. This mapping process was essential for identifying the current situation of each institution in relation to culturally responsive teaching. The next stage was for the researcher to identify the situational analysis of each institution and categorise them into one of the following three areas:

- Low culturally responsive teaching awareness (1-2 pillars)
- Medium culturally responsive teaching awareness (3-4 Pillars)
- High culturally responsive teaching awareness (4-5 Pillars)

All the institutions above have an official strategy in relation to culturally responsive teaching, the five-pillar framework by Jabbar and Hardaker (2013) allowed the researcher to map the awareness of the organization onto the five pillars. This was carried out through a process of document analysis, which is discussed later.

5.2.2 Institution selection

When reading through the policies and procedure document, the key challenge faced by the researcher is to identify pertinent information (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), which is achieved through a process of iteration and content analysis (Silverman, 2005). For the purposes of this research, the main pertinent information will be analysed in its relevance to two the five pillar framework (Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013) and Government legislation. Each document was iteratively analysed and interpreted. Table 6 displays the data that describes the University, its distance from the home institution and how it maps against the five pillars.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huddersfield University</td>
<td>0.0 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford University</td>
<td>15.0 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan</td>
<td>20.4 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds University</td>
<td>21.2 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sheffield</td>
<td>27.3 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td>28.0 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Hallam</td>
<td>28.1 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan</td>
<td>28.8 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Salford</td>
<td>30.3 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bolton</td>
<td>33.1 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York St John</td>
<td>48.2 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of York</td>
<td>49.3 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>53.8 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Hope University</td>
<td>55.4 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Liverpool</td>
<td>57.0 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool John Moores University</td>
<td>57.4 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Hill University</td>
<td>57.8 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td>69.8 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lancaster</td>
<td>70.0 Miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Business Schools’ culturally responsive teaching awareness
After the process of document analysis as outlined in Table 6 the next stage was to organise each of the institutions into the three categories, which gave the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huddersfield University</td>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan University</td>
<td>University of Salford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford University</td>
<td>University of Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds University</td>
<td>Sheffield Hallam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td>University of Bolton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University</td>
<td>Liverpool Hope University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York St John</td>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Liverpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool John Moores University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Hill University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Institutions by culturally responsive teaching awareness
What was apparent through the institution mapping and document analysis process was that the majority of the institutions investigated had a low level of awareness in relation to culturally responsive teaching. Each of the higher education institutions identified approached diversity in a different way and each had a distinct idea about how they should approach this challenge. Some institutions take a holistic approach and try to develop policies and procedures that encompass every aspect of student life, while other institutions consider cultural awareness as a moral responsibility underpinned by their legal obligations to have a policy that caters to the needs of ethically diverse students. What is not clear throughout the strategy and policy documents is how this moral responsibility is measured in terms of pedagogy and how this is communicated to academics. The documents are very operational in nature and point to the fact that all responsibility in this field is underpinned by the race relation’s act (2000) and more recently the equality act (2010). Mapping the qualities of each institution against the five pillars gives a holistic view of areas where gaps are being shown.

Table 7 should be seen as an indicator in terms of the influence individual institutional cultures and policies have on the everyday experiences of academics. This will then be taken further and analysed within the context of how this affects their teaching mechanisms. Thus, one organization has been randomly chosen from the low and medium categories and the University of Salford Business School is the default from the high category:

- University of Huddersfield Business School (Low)
- Sheffield Hallam Business School (Medium)
- University of Salford Business School (High)
5.3 Permissions for access to the sample

Now that the Business School institutions have been chosen the next step in the view of Creswell (2011) is to identify how the researcher would gain access to the sample. To accomplish the next step, King & Horrocks (2010) argue that to gain access to the interview sample one must first obtain access from the “gatekeepers” (p. 31), they define these as the people who can control researcher’s access to those whom they really want to target, this is supported by Ahern (1999) and Groenwald (2004). Identifying the gatekeeper is the first part of the research, winning the support and trust of the gatekeeper can take time (Creswell, 2011). For this research this was an easy process, the following gatekeepers were identified:

- Registrar
- School Managers
- Senior Academics (HODs, Principal lecturers etc)

In the first instance, King & Horrocks (2010) mention the need to confirm that the correct gatekeepers were identified. The researcher first emailed the gatekeepers to make sure they were the correct people. The next stage was obtaining permission from the school managers and senior academics to approach Business School staff on campus. The response from the school managers and senior academics (Heads of Departments) was poor, and in some cases they were bypassed and senior academics were emailed to ask if they could identify any specific academics in the school who would be willing to volunteer for this research. Normally at this stage researchers are asked for additional information to ascertain the scope and the purpose of the research (Creswell, 2011) but the gatekeepers did not ask for anything additional. In addition,
academics who fitted the criteria of the purposive sampling strategy were also emailed directly; their details were taken from departmental websites.

In addition to the purposive sampling strategy the snowballing sampling strategy was effective in gaining access to individuals who fit the sample criteria but were difficult to get access to (Silverman, 2005). Ritchie et al., (2003) argue that it is a good idea to use the original group as informants who can help identify, or put the researcher in touch with, others who qualify for inclusion, and these in turn identify yet others – hence the term snowball sampling. The snowballing strategy was extremely effective; initially there was trouble in gaining access to the academics via the gatekeepers but through the use of initial interview participants the snowballing strategy gave the researcher access to peer groups and academic departments (Figure 5.1).

5.4 Types of Qualitative data to collect

The next stage in the view of Creswell (2011) is to identify the types qualitative data to collect as part of the research to help explore and investigate the proposed research question. There are multiple methods for collecting data that facilitate the collection of rich data which allows the researcher to investigate the phenomenon in detail.

Based on the epistemological and ontological discussions identified in chapter four, the use of a normal structured questionnaire is unsuitable as a research method, it does not allow the collection of a rich data set, and cannot give the detail and depth required (Oppenheim, 1992). Rich data collection in the view of Orbe (2000) fits very well within a phenomenological research study, as phenomenology encourages a certain attentive awareness to the details and seemingly trivial happenings of our everyday lives.
Hence this research identifies two methods of data collection that fit the requirements of the epistemological and ontological positioning discussed earlier, and also the phenomenological position outlined in chapter four. The two methods that are appropriate at this stage are interviews and focus groups (Guest, Namey, & Mitchell, 2012) Another method, which is appropriate within phenomenology, is observation, however in the view of Guest et al., (2012) this does not match an interpretivist viewpoint and is better developed under an ethnographic approach.

The first method is the use of the interview, Boyce & Neale (2006) define this as an appropriate method that involves focusing on a number of respondents to gauge their perspectives on a particular idea, program, or situation and is useful as an approach “when you want detailed information about a person’s thoughts and behaviours”. This is a view shared by King & Horrocks (2010) who define three characteristics for the generic qualitative interview:

It is flexible and open-ended in style, it tends to focus on people’s actual experiences more than general beliefs and opinions and finally the relationship between interviewer and interviewee is crucial to the method. (Pg. 3)

The alternative data collection approach suggested by Guest et al., (2012) is the focus group. In the view of Finch & Lewis (2003) the process of the focus group is vastly different from that of the interview hence the output also changes during the process of data construction. Finch & Lewis (2003) argue that within focus groups, data is generated between participants, the view of the participant is put forward but when they hear from other members of the group their view on reflection may change, or additional material may be triggered (p. 171). Finch and Lewis (2003) propose that focus groups are more synergistic; the researcher is taking on the views of the group as a whole rather than the individual.
There are key differences between the interview and the focus group. Both approaches have their advantages and disadvantages for collecting qualitative data. Finch and Lewis (2003) argue that focus groups allow for greater spontaneity as the discussion takes place within a stronger social context and that interviews allow for greater richness and depth. In the view of King and Horrocks (2010) research interviews are widely used to collect data in relation to background and experience, this view is also supported by Legard, Keegan, & Ward (2003) who mentions that interviews are one of the main methods of data collection used in qualitative research. King & Horrocks (2010) discuss this in more detail and argue that “within the stance of phenomenology research interviews are widely used as a data collection method because the emphasis within this method is on exploring how people interpret their experience” (p. 182). To explore this experience within phenomenological enquiry the richness and depth of the data is crucial, thereby making interviews the most appropriate method.

However one of the main challenges faced by researchers in the collection of a rich and varied dataset are the interpersonal and communication skills of the researcher. This is crucial for the collection of a comprehensive and accurate data set. To illicit the quality required requires high level communication skills, this view is endorsed by Oppenheim (1992), who mentions, “No other skill is as important to the research worker as the ability to conduct good interviews” (p. 65). The researcher agrees with the view of Oppenheim (1992), that good interview and interpersonal skills are essential in achieving depth within the dataset and will aid in the support and understanding of academic experience, background and culture. Oppenheim (1992), agrees with this view and argues that the role of the interviewer is crucial for maintaining spontaneity, this allows for not just data collection but also “ideas collection” (p. 67). This is a view shared by King and Horrocks (2010) who argue that within a qualitative interview
flexibility is a key aspect of the data collection (p. 35); researchers should breakaway from the assumption that interviews are a one-way interaction with the researcher providing a set of questions and the respondent giving a set of answers. This helps not only to maintain spontaneity but also improve the quality of the data and communication between researcher and interviewee.

Finally the response rate for interviews is higher than that of questionnaires Oppenheim (1992) argues that this is due to respondents becoming more involved with the research and hence motivated (p. 81-82). The use of interviews enables more to be said about the research than is usually mentioned in a covering letter or a questionnaire, and the use of interviews allows the researcher to better handle more difficult open-ended questions.

5.4.1 In-depth interviews

There are three fundamental types of research interviews: structured, semi-structured and unstructured (Burnard, Gill, Stewart, Treasure, & Chadwick, 2008; Gill, Stewart, Treasure, & Chadwick, 2008; Morse & Corbin, 2003), each with slight variations in their makeup and conduct. Morse & Corbin (2003) discuss this in more detail and note that between the three approaches the main differences is “The degree to which participants have control over the process and content of the interview”. In the view of Gill et al., (2008) the structured interview is by its very nature a very rigid instrument, they define the structured interview as a “verbally administered questionnaire” which does not use prompts and provides very little scope for follow up questions to investigate responses which warrant more depth and detail. However in the view of Gill et al., (2008) this structure has its advantages as it allows for the interview to be administered quickly, though it is of little use if ‘depth’ is required.
The opposite to this type of approach is the unstructured interview also referred
to by Legard et al., (2003) as the In-depth interview. Legard et al., (2003) describe the
unstructured interview as a “conversation with a purpose” (p. 138) as it is intended to
allow researchers to collect in-depth information. This is a view also shared by Morse &
Corbin (2003) who describe the unstructured interview as a shared experience “in which
researchers and interviewees come together to create a context of conversational
intimacy in which participants feel comfortable telling their story”. In the view of
Legard et al., (2003) one of the “main advantages of the in-depth interview is the ability
to combine structure with flexibility” (p. 141). Gill et al., (2008) view the unstructured
interview in a slightly different light and argue that the unstructured interview does “not
reflect any preconceived theories or idea and are performed with little or no
organisation”, thereby implying that the process of the unstructured interview can be a
little bit chaotic with little structure or planning.

The final interview approach is the semi-structured interview, Gill et al., (2008)
define this approach as an interview that has several key questions which help to define
the areas to be explored, but also allow the researcher the flexibility to pursue an idea in
a response in more detail, this is a medium between structured and unstructured
interviews.

Based on the research it was decided that in-depth interviews as a research
instrument were appropriate, while this research agrees with the view of Gill et al.,
(2008) that there is less structure within these types of interviews, this research takes the
view of Legard et al., (2003) who argue that even within the most unstructured
interview the researcher will have some sense of the themes they wish to explore. In
addition, this method fits in very well with the chosen epistemological and ontological
positions, King and Horrocks (2010), support this position:
The researcher is not simply a ‘pipeline’ through which knowledge is transmitted, they, too, see knowledge as constructed in the interview. (p. 139-140)

Construction of knowledge is only viable when the data collection method allows the researcher to use a range of probes and other techniques to achieve depth of answer in terms of penetration, exploration and explanation (Legard et al., 2003, p. 141). This view is also shared by Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom (2006) who mention that the individual in-depth interview allows the interviewer to delve deeply into social and personal matters. In addition to this, Legard et al., (2003) argue that in-depth interviews as a research technique are valuable because they are flexible, interactive and responsive, allow for probing during the interview, and thus enable researchers to explore the meanings people attach to their experiences. Legard et al., (2003), also mention that researchers should view interviewing as a special type of “partnership” and “conversation with purpose” (p. 41).

This justifies the suitability of this approach in developing interviews that focus on the academic experience of Business School pedagogy creation. This is a sensitive topic and touches on areas that can be perceived as controversial, these areas could potentially include cultural and ethnic diversity, race, multiculturalism and Xenophobia. It is the role of the researcher to build trust and develop a relationship based on good rapport that makes the respondent feel at ease (Legard et al., 2003, p. 143).

Once the decision has been made in relation to the in-depth interviews, King and Horrocks (2010) propose the need for researchers to make a decision about the format of interviews they want to use, they propose that researches should ask themselves if they want to use face-to-face interviews or whether telephone or internet interviews are appropriate. For this research the primary interview technique was face-to-face. However, in two cases a face-to-face interview was not possible, in those scenarios this
research utilised Skype for long distance interviews. These interviews were recorded electronically and were ideal for solving the issues of managing long distance interviews where timing was difficult. (Beddall-Hill, Jabbar, & Shehri, 2011). King and Horrocks (2010, pp. 84-85) advocate the utilisation of Skype for long distance interviews. King and Horrocks (2010, pp. 84-85) also argue that in cases such as this, it is best that the interviews are conducted with the use of a webcam as opposed to an audio-only interview, this allows the researcher to pick up visual clues and to identify why periods of silence are occurring.

5.4.2 Memoing

To enhance the data collected via the in-depth interviews the researcher supplemented the data collected through the process of ‘Memoing’ (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 69). This method in addition to the in-depth interviews allowed the researcher to collect additional data about what the researcher heard, saw, experienced and thought in the course of collecting and reflecting on the process. Groenwald (2004) and Cresswell (2011) argue that researchers are easily absorbed in the in-depth interview process and on many occasions may fail to accurately reflect on what is happening in front of their eyes, memoing allows that reflection to take place within the context of the interviews and allows for the collection of non-standard data such as gestures, facial expressions, and other non-verbal forms of expression.

5.4.3 Document analysis

The main method of data collection was conducted via the qualitative interviews and memoing. However in helping to select a sample of institutions supplementary data was collected and analysed through the use of document analysis. For each of the institutions identified within the 70-mile radius the researcher downloaded a copy of the
ethnic minority and diversity policy documents (Appendix B) from the respective institutions’ websites. This process allowed the researcher to situationally analyse each institution and categorise them into one of the following three areas:

- Low culturally responsive teaching awareness (1-2 Pillars)
- Medium culturally responsive teaching awareness (3-4 Pillars)
- High culturally responsive teaching awareness (4-5 Pillars)

While many of the institutions may not have an official strategy in relation to culturally responsive teaching, the five-pillar framework of Jabbar and Hardaker (2013) allowed the researcher to map the awareness of the organization onto the five pillars. It was deemed necessary at this stage to carry out a document analysis on these policies to identify the three categories and identify suitable institutions based on these categories. At this stage the process was mainly to verify that there was an appropriate sample available to conduct this research on. This is a view also supported by Bryman (1989) who explains:

> Although they are widely employed by qualitative researchers, documents are rarely used on their own. In most cases documents are used to provide additional data and to check on the findings deriving from other sources of data (p.151)

Bryman (1989) continues with this discussion and suggests that analysing documents can bring multiple advantages to the qualitative research study:

> They can provide information on issues that cannot readily be addressed through other methods; they can check the validity of information deriving from other methods; and they can contribute a different level of analysis from other methods (p.150)

This is complicated by the fact that in many cases documents already exist and govern how individuals and organisations should behave. This makes them different from other
sources of data such as interviews and observational attitudes (Bryman, 1989, 2003, 2012; Miller & Alvarado, 2005).

However, while the process of document analysis can bring advantages to the research process through additional validity and information it still has a few drawbacks which should be considered at all times. One limitation identified by Hodder (2000) is the issue of how the reader interprets the data, in the view of Hodder (2000) as the gap between the reader and the author widens there is a possibility of multiple perceptions on the purpose and the context of the document. This view is also supported by Miller & Alvarado (2005) who argue that through the use of documents the researcher is at some distance from the real people and the original situation. This opens up different interpretations and different viewpoints in relation to these documents.

In response to these limitations, the downloaded documents were utilised only to inform the sample, not to replace the more intimate data collection aspects of the interview. The documents have been utilised purely to provide background and context to the various institutions that may fall into the sample (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). Secondly the validity of the documents was verified due to them being underpinned by government legislation in the form of the race relations act of 2000 and the equality act of 2010. Analysing these documents in relation to the legislation gave the researcher an insight into what is expected from institutions and what type of support should be available to students of diversity. It is quite clear at this early stage that every institution feels it has a moral responsibility based on a legal framework, which is highlighted in the next section.

5.4.4 Interview questions

This section describes the problem of finding a balance between questions being too restrictive but open enough to allow additional avenues of data to open up
(Oppenheim, 1992). The creation of effective interview questions should in the view of Legard et al., (2003) be designed for maximum efficiency, each question should be analysed and designed to elicit personal responses. Legard et al., (2003), further continues to mention that when constructing the questions researchers should always bear in mind the interactive nature of the in-depth interview, this interactivity affects the interview style but also the nature of the questions. In a similar vein, Crabtree and DiCicco-Bloom (2006) propose that questions are open-ended, allowing for a richer data set, and also allowing for the use of probes so specific aspects of the data can be discussed, explored and investigated in more detail. The use of probes can also help the flow of the interview. The interview is a conversation and the use of probes helps to facilitate this conversation and researchers should use this opportunity to focus acutely on listening (Boyce & Neale, 2006; Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom, 2006; King & Horrocks, 2010; Legard et al., 2003).

Thus the challenge for the researcher is to construct questions which allow for a richer data set but accurately probe the academic experience with a clear and reflexive mind-set (Finlay, 2002). As discussed earlier, the five-pillar framework of Jabbar and Hardaker (2013) gives the interview a research framework structure in which to develop some pre-planned questions to help structure the basic elements of the interview and to elicit personal responses (Legard et al., 2003, p. 141). This approach fits in within the chosen method of the in-depth interview, there is not that much structure but the basic questions help the researcher to make sense of the themes they wish to explore (Gill et al., 2008; Legard et al., 2003).

Oppenheim (1992) likens the process of questioning people to that of trying to catch a particularly elusive fish (p. 120). To catch this fish Oppenheim (1992) advocates the need for the researcher to design questions in a way that allows the respondent to
form an ‘inner picture’ of their answers and reactions, Oppenheim discusses this further and mentions that poorly designed questions can become a mechanism for many respondents to go down the wrong track, compromising their answer. To combat wording problems, in this research the researcher followed the recommendation of Oppenheim (1992) by laying down rules for the structure of the questions, these rules include: “not making questions too long, avoiding double-barrelled questions, avoiding proverbs and double negatives” (p. 128); this makes the questions simpler and easier to digest and think about for the respondents. The researcher kept the terminology simple in the design of the questions, Oppenheim (1992) heavily stresses the importance of not humiliating respondents by baffling them with terminology, patronising them or making them feel in the wrong.

To justify the selection of each of the questions in Table 8 the researcher outlines the questions and their justification for their selection. The researcher undertook an exercise wherein each open-ended question was mapped against the five-pillar framework. Each of the questions has been mapped against a pillar and supported with the necessary literature. The final column on the table allows the researcher to identify the role of the question in helping to achieve the objectives of the research. This process has allowed the researcher to critically analyse every question clearly in terms of its relevance to the study, and its justification within the literature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Justification &amp; Literature</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport: What does it feel like to be an academic?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>These questions are designed to help build an understanding between the subject and the researcher. They are purely there to help break the ice (Glesne, 2010; King &amp; Horrocks, 2010).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: In your own experience can you describe some of your experiences about cultural and ethnic diversity in Higher education Business Schools?</td>
<td>Pillar 1 – Cultural Consciousness</td>
<td>This question is designed to help understand the academic experience and awareness of cultural and ethnic diversity. Ball, Reay, &amp; Miriam (2002) suggests that there is an implicit recognition of differences between universities and university intakes but there is no sense of awareness of the process of performance, choice and selection.</td>
<td>O1, O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: What does ethnicity and cultural diversity mean to you?</td>
<td>Pillar 1 – Cultural Consciousness</td>
<td>Tomalin (2007) discusses the lack of confidence academics have about different diversity groups, and some respondents in her research mention a certain level of ignorance. This question helps the researcher to understand what preconceptions academics have about diverse groups and how confident they are in discussing them.</td>
<td>O1, O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: How do you feel that students from a culturally diverse background adapt to life as a student in a British Business School?</td>
<td>Pillar 1 – Cultural Consciousness, Pillar 4 - Cultural Bridging</td>
<td>Nieto (1999, p. 58) argues that culturally diverse students whose cultures are disparaged by society sometimes feel that they have to accept either one culture or the other wholly uncritically. This question explores the ideas around how students from a diverse background adapt to a different environment and react to different cultures.</td>
<td>O3, O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: What do you feel these students should be able to accomplish and achieve?</td>
<td>Pillar 1 – Cultural Consciousness, Pillar 3: Moral Responsibility</td>
<td>Gay (2000, p. 47) defines a culturally caring academic as one who genuinely cares about their culturally diverse students and does their best to help them become high performers and achievers. This question investigates academic expectations and the responsibility they feel towards the achievement of students of diversity.</td>
<td>O2, O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: Do you feel that your culturally diverse students have pre-conceived expectations of you?</td>
<td>Pillar 1 – Cultural Consciousness, Pillar 3: Moral Responsibility</td>
<td>Gay (2000, p. 57) discusses the notion that if teachers expect students to be high or low achievers, they will act in ways that cause this to happen. This question probes student and academic expectations.</td>
<td>O2, O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6: What do you feel has influenced you in your life making you the academic you are?</td>
<td>Pillar 5: H.E. Curriculum</td>
<td>Rowley (1996) mentions multiple variables that have an impact on academic motivation and how academics adapt to change. This question investigates the primary motivating factors that influenced these individuals to become academics in higher education in the first place.</td>
<td>O2, O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7: Do you feel that your teaching methods are appropriate to a diverse student body?</td>
<td>Pillar 2: Curriculum Resources, Pillar 4 Cultural Bridging, Pillar 5: H.E. Curriculum</td>
<td>Teachers need to build on what students do have rather than lament what they do not have (Nieto, 1999, p. 7). This question is designed to help the researcher understand how academics perceive their chosen resource’s suitability, and how these resources are sourced and developed for students of diversity.</td>
<td>O1, O2, O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8: What feeling or feeling or</td>
<td>Pillar 1 – Cultural Vilaes &amp; Lucas (2002)mention that people’s ways of thinking, behaving, and</td>
<td>Villegas &amp; Lucas (2002)mention that people’s ways of thinking, behaving, and</td>
<td>O2, O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9: Do you feel that your experiences and status make you a good role model for your students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consciousness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 2: Curriculum Resources,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 4: Cultural Bridging,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For good culturally responsive teaching to occur there must be a relationship built on mutual respect and understanding (Gay, 2000). This question probes academic interactions and tries to discuss how academics feel about their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10: In your experience what is the best way to engage students from a diverse background?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 1: Cultural Consciousness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 4: Cultural Bridging,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage students in the construction of knowledge, academics need to know about students’ home life and background experiences. When educators understand context and background they can better prepare resources and activities within the curriculum and classroom (Villegas &amp; Lucas, 2002). This question explores academic experiences in their interaction with students of diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 11: How do you feel this institution supports you in your pedagogy development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 4: Cultural Bridging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 5: Higher Education Curriculum,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieto (1999, p. 162) suggests that student learning cannot take place without transformation of teachers and institutions. There is an emphasis by Nieto to create a learning environment that facilitates learning. This question probes this idea and discusses issues around the creation of a learning environment and how well the academic is supported in the creation of that learning environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 12: How do you feel this institution adapts to changes in the ethnic makeup of the student body?  

Pillar 3: Moral responsibility  
Pillar 5: Higher Education Curriculum  

Nieto (1999, p. 177) mentions that teachers are not the sole generators and advocates of uninspired pedagogy; often they are the victims of school policies and practices that restrict their freedom and choice. This question explores how Business School academics perceive their institutions in their adaptation to changes in their student body and how this is reflected in policies and procedures.

Table 8: Interview questions with literature justification
5.4.5 Pilot interviews and outcomes

The questions in Table 8 were tested via pilot interviews to ensure their validity within the research process, in the view of Oppenheim (1992) this is an essential aspect of the research and the researcher should pilot every question and every sequence, and go through an iterative process of evaluating their appropriateness and value. The added advantage of the piloting process is that it allows the researcher to try out their questioning style (Morse & Corbin, 2003) and to become comfortable with their questioning methods. Silverman (2013) argues that in “general researchers should try out different questioning styles and find one that best suits them and their research” (p. 207).

After reflecting on the initial interviews it became clear to the researcher that in the initial stages too much emphasis was being placed on the rapport section; in one interview this process took 12 -15 minutes. While Boyce & Neale (2006) advocate the importance of developing an interview protocol, the enthusiasm of developing rapport needs to be tempered with a practical approach. This required an early change to the researcher’s interviewing style, discussed within the reflexive diary (Appendix A), the primary change was acknowledging that not all silence is awkward. Within the reflections it was clear that as the researcher there is no need to fill every silence, in some cases silence is a prompt for the individual to discuss their ideas in depth (Legard et al., 2003). This ability to let the silence linger allowed the researcher to make strategic changes to the questioning and interviewing style to facilitate additional data collection, in some cases this silence is used to provide the empathy and support that participants might need to work through troubling experiences, which can lead to a richer data set (Legard et al., 2003; Morse & Corbin, 2003; Silverman, 2009, 2013).
The main outcome of the initial pilot interviews was the insertion of two additional questions. After the second interview a question was inserted which discussed Business School support and academic responsibility, after the fourth interview a question was inserted which probed their views on what cultural diversity meant to them, these additional questions are outlined in Table 8. These additional lines of questioning not only allowed the researcher to explore and probe academic perceptions of their home institutions but also to investigate the participant’s teaching philosophy, pedagogical viewpoint and their differing perceptions on the meaning and essence of cultural diversity.

The initial five pilot interviews formed the basis of the five-pillar framework (Table 1). After completing an additional five interviews the researcher published a paper documenting the findings in the *Journal Teaching in Higher Education* (Jabbar & Hardaker 2013). This paper helped to validate and verify the work done on the five-pillar framework and also gave the researcher confidence in the methods and philosophy adopted.

**5.5 Procedures to record the data**

While the main purpose of the interview is to obtain an understanding of the interviewee and their perspectives, Legard et al., (2003) notes that at the same time the research should have a clear idea of the issues they want to discuss, hence the researcher has a big role to play in directing and managing the interview. In managing this aspect of the research, one of the first challenges for the researcher is to ease the interviewee from the everyday social level to a deeper level where they can together focus on a specific topic or set of topics (Legard et al., 2003, p. 145). In helping to manage the interview, various authors (Boyce & Neale, 2006; Legard et al., 2003; Lewis, 2003; Oppenheim, 1992) propose the importance of developing an interview protocol. Boyce
& Neal (2006) take this further and recommend that each interview should have rules and guidelines that govern the outcome; this is critical to ensure consistency and thus increase the reliability of the findings.

In addition there is an emphasis on creating good rapport in the early stages of the interview (Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom, 2006; Crabtree & Miller, 1999; Hellawell, 2006; Morse & Corbin, 2003; Silverman, 2009, 2013), this is essential for developing a good relationship with the interviewee in the early stages of the interview. Crabtree and DiCicco-Bloom (2006) argue that we are asking the respondent to trust the researcher with their thoughts, feelings and experiences, therefore rapport is essential as part of the trust building process. Rapport was also used to put the respondent at ease, this involved asking questions in an interested manner, making comments of agreement and giving support without influencing the respondent (Morse & Corbin, 2003). In the view of Legard et al., (2003) the start of the interview should be used as an opportunity by the researcher to lay down the basic ground rules of the interview. These rules in the view of Legard et al., (2003) should incorporate and make clear the role of the researcher as that of a facilitator, thus enabling the interviewee to discuss their thoughts and feelings (p. 147). In addition Legard et al. (2003) proposes that the start of the interview is also a chance for the researcher to take this opportunity to reiterate the nature and the purpose of the research, re-emphasising the confidentiality of the interview (as detailed in Appendix C) and seeking the permission of the respondent to record the interview.

Each interview lasted approximately between 50-90 minutes. In total the researcher collected in excess of 30 hours of recorded audio footage, alongside 22 reflective memoing documents. The view of Cohen et al., (2007) suggests that as a rule in-depth interviews should take no longer than 60-90 minutes. In the view of Cohen et al., (2007) this gives the researcher ample time and opportunity to explore and develop
the interviewee’s experiences. In addition to this, Oppenheim (1992) recommends that all interviews should be carried out in a private, quiet and comfortable setting which is neutral and not intimidating. Trying to find a private and quiet place was not easy, one of the issues encountered during the research process was that the interview sample can be extremely busy and to meet them in a cafeteria or coffee house was not suitable or professional, therefore the meetings were arranged within the institution, either in the interviewee’s office or a meeting room. This was purely at the discretion of the interviewee, as Oppenheim (1992) notes that during any booking of rooms or selection of venue, consideration must be given to not disturb respondents or make them feel pressed or intimidated in any way.

All the interviews were recorded using an iPhone as opposed to a traditional Dictaphone, this allowed for high quality audio recording but most importantly, in the view of Beddall-Hill et al., (2011), there is an instant backup of data into the cloud hence the chance of data loss is minimal. The ethics committee from the researcher’s home institution did query the suitability of this method and asked for all devices on which the data resided to be password protected, the ethics form and the committee’s concerns are available in Appendix C.

One of the challenges faced by the researcher during the interview process was keeping the interview relevant and on-topic; the reflexive diary in Appendix A discusses some of the issues and feelings that the researcher had to contend with. However, Crabtree and DiCicco-Bloom (2006) argue that allowing the respondent to digress into elements they find interesting, while not necessarily relevant to the researcher, may open additional avenues of data and elicit additional information which may not be readily apparent. Another challenge faced by the researcher was ending the interview at the right time, Legard et al., (2003) recommend that when finishing the
interview the researcher should spend five to ten minutes before the end of the interview allowing the interviewee to gradually return to the level of everyday social interaction (p. 146). To help overcome this challenge during the interviews’ final stages the researcher would prompt the academic by saying “finally, before we wrap things up”, this helped the researcher to move out of interview mode, and allowed the interviewee the opportunity to discuss any final issues that they may want to discuss (Legard et al., 2003). The researcher also found that at the end of the interview it was useful to keep the audio recording running, as in some cases additional data was collected which may not have been picked up in the initial questions. In the view of King and Horrocks (2010) this is good practice:

As it is not uncommon for interviewees to mention something of interest and significance at this stage (p. 56).

5.6 Ethical considerations

Multiple authors argue for the need for researchers within qualitative interviews to be guided by a code of ethics and interviewer sensitivity to minimise distress to the respondents, in their view, when this is done properly it is beneficial for both the participants and the researchers (Cohen et al., 2007, 2013; Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom, 2006; Crabtree & Miller, 1999; Morse & Corbin, 2003; Ritchie, 2003).

In the view of Morse & Corbin (2003) there are risks associated with a qualitative interview; the researcher is asking the respondent to discuss personal, often intimate aspects of their lives, this can bring with it risks regarding confidentiality and anonymity. Therefore as part of this research it is important to identify the main risks and key issues associated with these risks. This is not always an exact science, as Lewis (2003) mentions, when developing your ethical guideline this process can raise issues that are not anticipated. In addition to this, Lapan, Quartaroli, & Riemer (2011) argues
that researchers within a “social environment face particularly complex ethical and moral issues” (p. 20) because their research involves personal interaction with individuals and communities.

In the view of Lapan et al., (2011) these unanticipated issues can be variable, even more so when researchers are not members of the community in which they are working. Thus there is a proposal (Lapan et al., 2011) for researchers to be clear on their ethical viewpoint, this needs to be carefully documented and discussed within a reflexive diary to minimise any bias and influence on the data (Finlay, 2002). The first step in creating ethical guidelines as part of this research involves the researcher obtaining ethical consent from the research committee. Lapan et al., (2011) proposes that the creation of these ethical review boards is a relatively new but welcome development as they emerge in response to harm associated with unethical research. A copy of the required form which was submitted to the ethical review committee can be found in Appendix C1 – Ethics. In some areas the ethical committee may not agree to specific aspects of the research, hence the researcher maybe required to make adjustments to the original proposal (Silverman, 2013). A copy of the feedback from the research committee can be found in Appendices C2 and C3, no major objections were raised, but the committee did emphasise the need to password protect all recording devices, especially in those cases where iPhones were used to record data and a cloud based system was used for data storage. In the view of Beddall-Hill et al., (2011) security issues can be minimised if a common sense approach is undertaken to data collection and storage.

Silverman (2013) at this stage cautions the researcher by reminding them that while consent may have been obtained it is important to remember that this approval can be withdrawn at any time and it is important for researchers to adhere to the original
principles as laid out in the proposal (p. 166). Therefore the next stage is the
development of a pro-forma that in the view of Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom (2006)
reduces the risk of unanticipated harm and protects the respondent’s information.
Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom (2006) and Lewis (2003) refer to the pro-forma as a consent
form, which acts as a mechanism to protect the respondent but also the researcher, a
copy of the pro-forma is provided in Appendix C4.

Silverman (2009, 2013) places a lot of emphasis on protecting sensitive
materials that are being discussed and recorded, and mentions that obtaining consent for
the recoding of the data is essential. The design and the development of the consent
form therefore needs to be robust, Lewis (2003) recommends that a consent form covers
as a minimum the following:

The purpose of the study, who the research team is, how the data will be used […]
and the proposed conditions for anonymity and confidentiality. (p. 66-67)

In addition to this, supplementary data and clarification was supplied regarding how the
data was to be stored, which in this research was on a cloud-based server, and how the
files would be named and who would have access to the information, this was
implemented at the signing of the consent forms. Each participant was reassured on
issues of confidentiality and anonymity, and it was reiterated that no quotes would be
attributed to individual academics, no data files would be stored by name, and no
transcripts would be labelled in ways that could compromise anonymity.

The consent forms were implemented as part of the interview strategy.
Confidentiality needed to be reinforced on a number of levels; this commenced from the
first contact with the academic or if contact was made via the gatekeepers. Morse and
Corbin (2003) suggest the need for verbal clarification from the interviewee, stating that
they are happy to continue with the interview and that they are happy for the interview
to be recorded. In order to implement this, at the start of each interview each academic
was given clear clarification on the aims and objectives of the interview and they were
asked to sign a consent form (Appendix C4), a copy of the signed consent forms are
available on request.
6.1 Introduction

After the data collection stage the researcher needs to turn their attention towards the process of data analysis. Approaches to analysis very much vary within a qualitative environment due to various epistemological positions about the nature and essence of enquiry. There are no clearly agreed rules or procedures for analysing qualitative data, this is a view supported by Cohen, Manion, & Morrison (2007) who argue that within a qualitative enquiry one size does not necessary fit all and in many scenarios researchers should consider the issue of “fitness for purpose” (p. 461). In identifying a strategy that is fit for purpose Creswell (2011) identifies six key steps in the process of analysing and interpreting qualitative data:

1. How do you prepare and organise the data for analysis?
2. How do you explore and code the data?
3. How do you use codes to build description and themes?
4. How do you represent and report findings?
5. How do you interpret findings?
6. How do you validate the accuracy of your findings?

(p. 237)

These are an outline of the key themes within a research analysis process and are also discussed broadly by Cohen, Manion, & Morrison (2013) and King and Horrocks (2010). In undertaking the approach above, the researcher needs to remember that data analysis is by its very nature a continuous and iterative process that requires complex skills including effective data management (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Spencer, Ritchie, & O’Connor, 2003). To facilitate this process, Table 9 outlines the decisions made in relation to the analysis and interpretation of data in Creswell’s (2011) six steps.
**Creswell’s (2011) six steps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you prepare and organise the data for analysis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you explore and code the data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you use codes to build descriptions and themes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you represent and report findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you interpret the findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you validate the accuracy of your findings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 – Six steps of Creswell (2011) in analysing Qualitative data.

**6.2 Data preparation and analysis**

As part of preparing the data, one of the first tasks the researcher will undertake is the process of transcription. King and Horrocks (2010) define transcription as “the process of converting recorded material into text and, as such, is usually a necessary precursor to commencing the analysis of your interview data” (p. 142). As a process, transcription is useful as a means of gaining insight into the data collected, this allows the researcher to understand and develop themes and concepts based on the collected data at an early stage (Tracy, 2012). It is a key part of the data analysis process and for many researchers can be valuable in developing their interview techniques but more importantly in giving them a chance to immerse and closely examine the data at an early stage. In short Tracy (2012) argues that the process of analysis starts as soon as the researcher is “transcribing the data” (p. 184).

This is a view also shared by Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) who equate the process of transcription to immersion in the data, in their view transcription is an essential part of creating an analytical process that is iterative and allows for the
investigation of phenomena. This has the additional advantage in that it allows the researcher to relive the interview and maybe identify themes and little nuances that were not apparent during the actual interview stage (Groenewald, 2004; Higbee, Siaka, et al., 2007; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Tracy, 2012).

In preparing the data for analysis Guest & MacQueen (2007) propose that there are different approaches to the transcription stage, which will require the researcher to acknowledge what is transcribed, the interpretative process undertaken, as well as how the data was transcribed. Guest & MacQueen (2007) propose that the first decision to be made is to decide on the method of transcription and the length. King & Horrocks (2010) ask the question will this transcription process be full or partial? This decision determines how much data is recorded, for example if the process is verbatim, where every second of every interview is transcribed word for word, then this is extremely time consuming (King & Horrocks, 2010). In the transcription of the interview data as part of this research, a decision was made to undertake a verbatim approach to develop as much detail and depth as possible. This approach allowed the researcher to interpret the data in a meaningful way and get to the essence of the data.

Once the decision has been made in relation to how much data should be recorded, the next stage in the view of Legard, Keegan, & Ward (2003) is not just to listen, but to remember. This is quantified in more detail by Bailey (2008) who argues that the process of transcription involves close observation of the data through repeated careful listening; this process has the advantage of helping the researcher build familiarity with the data the and attend to what is actually there rather than what is expected. The reflective diary also supports this approach; here the researcher supplements the transcribed data with reflections on any subtext that needs to be explored and any nuances in the participant’s account. This additional data was central
in helping to create depth, but also allowed the researcher to recognise meaning and subtlety in the data (Etherington, 2004; Finlay, 2002).

The next decision to be made is to identify to whom the process of data transcription should be entrusted, in the view of Guest & MacQueen (2007), because transcription is primarily viewed as a research activity it should only be conducted by individuals with interests within the research. In the view of Tracy (2012) researchers should carry out their own transcription duties and view the task not as “time wasting but time consuming” (p. 178). While the process of transcription is an extremely time consuming process (King & Horrocks, 2010), to delegate such an important task to a junior researcher may be a mistake if the transcriber is inadequately trained or briefed (Bailey, 2008; Tracy, 2012). In the view of Silverman (2013) researchers should carry out their own transcription duties in order to obtain maximum benefit from the data collected.

There are disadvantages to this type of approach; in the view of Bailey (2008) transcription is a long-winded process that requires a lot of time and energy. Bailey (2008) estimates that depending on the amount of data being transcribed it can take up to three hours to transcribe one hour of data and if there is a fine level of visual data this can be up to 10 hours for every one hour, this view is supported by King and Horrocks (2010) who mention that “one hour of data can take anywhere between four to eight hours” (p. 143), within this research the researcher can expect to spend a minimum of 900 hours transcribing 30 hours of interviews.

6.2.1 Voice recognition software

It is with this in mind that a computer based voice recognition approach through the use of Dragon Dictate was investigated to see if this could provide some support in the transcription process. Evers (2011) defines two approaches for the automated
transcription of data, one is speech recognition software which is able to convert speech that does not belong to a specified speaker, the other is voice recognition software which needs to be trained to a particular voice. As part of this study the researcher experimented with the use of voice recognition software; by following the approach of Evers (2011) the researcher initially trained the software to recognize the voice of the researcher and then experimented by transcribing two of the interviews. This small experiment outputted disappointing results, receiving similar results to Evers (2011) and Dempster & Woods (2011), the output of the transcript was riddled with errors and required a lot of editing to make it legible and coherent. Thus it was decided at this stage that voice recognition software was not a serious replacement procedure for manual transcription, so it was decided to implement a manual verbatim transcription strategy.

6.2.2 Data Management

Once the data had been transcribed the next stage was to consider the process of data management. The main issue which arose out of the transcription process was the large amounts of data that had now been collected, Cohen et al. (2007 acknowledge this:

> At a practical level, qualitative research rapidly amasses huge amounts of data, and early analysis can reduce the problem of data overload by selecting out significant features of focus. (p. 539)

The collection of large amounts of data is quite normal in qualitative data, however in the view of Auerbach & Silverstein (2003) this data for the novice researcher can be intimidating, and for some researchers overwhelming. This is certainly true within this study; after the transcription process had been completed the researcher was faced with the very real problem of data overload. In total, including all the transcription data, the
amount of information collected spanned three different higher education institutions with a total of 22 interviews, each with a length of approximately 50-90 minutes in length. In total the amount of audio recorded was in excess of 30 hours. In addition this data was supplemented with the reflective diary and the researcher’s own personal notes made during the interviews, also known as memoing.

To overcome this challenge of data excess Spencer et al. (2003, p. 221) propose that within a qualitative data collection and management framework there should be an emphasis on the construction and indexing of initial themes or concepts. In the view of Spencer et al. (2003, p. 221) most analytical approaches have some kind of data management strategy, which involves deciding upon the themes, and concepts under which data will be stored. This process has now finished and as discussed earlier the researcher used the guiding five-pillar framework of Jabbar & Hardaker (2013) to provide structure and support to the data management strategy. In order to identify a suitable data management strategy and to decide in which area the transcription data should be placed Spencer et al. (2003, p. 221) propose that the researcher takes time to become familiar with the data.

To accommodate this process, Spencer et al., (2003) identifies some key concepts and methods that should be employed by the researcher in familiarising themselves within the data, this is outlined in in table 10 – Data familiarisation process:
Table 10 – Data familiarisation process

Table 10 lays out clearly the process of making sure the researcher is comfortable and confident in the data management process. Once the raw data was assembled, and in this case verified against the five-pillar framework the next stage was to identify a suitable data analysis method.

### 6.3 Explore and code the data

Within the process of data analysis, once the data has been collected the next stage is to make sense of the data (Spencer et al., 2003, p. 221). Making sense of the data relies heavily on the method or tool that is used to order and categorise the data (Spencer et al., 2003). At this stage the researcher identified two analytical methods that not only matched the chosen epistemological and ontological position but also supported the process of thematically organisations and analysing textual data within the chosen data management strategy. The identified methods were template analysis and interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) (King, 2004).
6.3.1 Interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA)

Interpretative phenomenological analysis, which from here forthwith will be referred to as IPA is defined as the detailed exploration of a participant’s view of the topic under investigation, the emphasis is on developing detail and creating an insight through the lived experience with an idiographic focus (Langdridge, 2007, p. 107). This idiographic element allows the researcher to focus on specific cases and to investigate these cases within a very narrow context. Within an analytical process such as this, Langdridge (2007) argues that initially at least the researcher will focus on a single case before moving onto other cases and more general-knowledge claims. King (2004) argues that while this may result in a lot of detail and rigour it can quickly become unwieldy and inefficient due to the large amounts of data collected. Collecting and transcribing this data is, in the view of Langdridge (2007), a time consuming process that works best with small sample sizes, with five or six participants being the norm.

IPA as an analytical process fits with the aim to collect rich and detailed data about the lived experience of academics, and also fits with the chosen sampling strategy. Langdridge (2007) argues that sampling within IPA is primarily purposive rather than random as the aim is to gather detailed information about the experience (p. 110). IPA is also a good fit for the data collection method which has been employed; the focus is on collecting as much data about the experience as possible, additionally, IPA fits with the researcher’s world view regarding the exploration and investigation of peoples lived experiences. In the research of Langdridge (2007) the use of IPA encompasses multiple processes, it can be viewed as a theoretical framework or it can be viewed as a means of collecting and analysing data. Phenomenology has already been defined as this research’s theoretical framework and for the purposes of this research IPA is primarily a method of data analysis.
6.3.2 Template analysis

A viable alternative to IPA in the analysis of qualitative data is template analysis (King, 2004; Langdridge, 2007). It is described as a template approach as it involves applying a template (categories) based on prior research and theoretical perspectives (Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom, 2006). This is a relatively new method and while Langdridge (2007) mentions that it is now as well-known as IPA it still provides similar analytical rigour and facilitates the production of similar findings. In the view of King (2004) template analysis is not associated with a single delineated method, it refers to multiple but related techniques for thematically organising and analysing codes (p. 256), therefore template analysis is a way of thematically analysing qualitative data (Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1994). The key difference between IPA and template analysis in the view of Langdridge (2007) is that IPA is always inductive and is grounded in the data with themes emerging from the text, thematic analysis differs from this and often uses pre-selected codes as a way of interrogating the data (Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom, 2006; Crabtree & Miller, 1992, 1999; King, 2004; Miles & Huberman, 1994) the differences do not just stop there, he argues that template analysis is ideal for handling large data sets in an efficient and timely manner as opposed to other analysis approaches such as IPA, which is a lot more time consuming.

After analysing the two analytical approaches it was decided to utilise the method of template analysis as discussed by Crabtree & Miller (1999) and King (2004). The researcher takes the view that within this thesis this approach is appropriate and well suited to the analysis of qualitative data due to its inherent flexibility allowing it to be used across multiple methodological and epistemological approaches (King, 2004). This flexibility also extends to template analysis having fewer specified procedures, permitting researchers to tailor it to match their own specific requirements (King, 2004).
Also within this research there is a larger data set and hence because, as Langdridge (2007) points out, IPA as an analytical process works well with sample sizes of 5 to 6, the transcription of 22 interviews would not be suitable and the dataset would become unwieldy. This research also argues that similarly to IPA, template analysis also lends itself well to a phenomenological inquiry primarily due to its ability to handle the “vast amounts of rich data that are normally accumulated within this process” (King, 2004, p. 256). It was these practical concerns which helped to govern the decision on a template analysis process.

Within template analysis, numerous authors (Crabtree & DiCicco-Bloom, 2006; Crabtree & Miller, 1999; King, 2004; Langdridge, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994) discuss the use of pre-defined a priori codes in helping to structure and analyse the collected interview data. Within a template analysis approach, King (2004) encourages the researcher to conceptualise the form of the template and identify how extensive this should be early on, in order to develop these priori codes the constructs of culturally responsive teaching as identified in Table 3 on page 94 were essential. King (2004) argues that it is easy to get carried away in this process, and where large amounts of data have been collected, it is easy for researchers to become overwhelmed (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). In the creation of a template, King (2004) does caution the researcher against developing a template that is too extensive and becomes an obstacle in the data analysis process, or at the other extreme, developing a template that is so sparse that clear direction is lacking. To help support this process the researcher has already defined the a priori codes, which will inform the initial template. A copy of the a priori codes can be found in Table 3 – Constructs of culturally responsive teaching, which gives an overview of the initial coding template and its literature underpinning.
6.3.3 Computer tools for interview analysis

As discussed earlier, as part of this study the researcher investigated the use of voice recognition software for the transcription of interview data. Additionally, the researcher also investigated the use of computer-based software for exploring and coding the collected data, this is a topic also discussed by King (2004) who argues that in recent years there have been major developments in qualitative research software in terms of their power and utility. The power of qualitative research software lies in its ability to support researchers in indexing segments of text to particular themes, nodes or codes, which for many researchers is a common task as part of the data analysis. Kvale & Brinkmann, (2009), discuss the role of computer software as “programs that can facilitate the analysis of interview transcripts” (p. 198). They describe these programs as aids in structuring the interview material for further analysis, the task and responsibility for interpretation, however, still remain with the researcher. This is a view supported by Spencer et al., (2003) who mentions that the use of software cannot be a substitute for learning data analysis methods; in their view many researchers have the erroneous belief that “computer analysis can alleviate the burden of data analysis” (p. 208). Spencer et al., (2003) cautions against this mind-set and reminds researchers that there is a danger in assuming that qualitative research software will provide data in a form that is ready for analytic commentary.

As part of the investigations for this study the researcher implemented the use of NVivo as a data management tool. King (2004) endorses this method and argues that software such as “NVivo is invaluable in helping the researcher index segments of text to particular themes” (p.263), to link research notes to coding, to carry out complex search and retrieve operations, and to aid the researcher in examining possible relationships between the themes. However the researcher did heed the caution of
Spencer et al. (2003) and viewed NVivo primarily as a tool for data administration and archiving and not as a data analysis tool. The NVivo software was primarily employed in the organisation of the data into themes and made the retrieval of such data quicker and more efficient. In closing, Spencer et al., (2003) supports this choice and mentions that qualitative research software is invaluable for content analysis because of the capacity it brings in helping to retrieve word strings in large data sets. Spencer et al., (2003) finishes by adding that the use of hyperlinks to find connections and relations would be very difficult and time-consuming if done manually. Based on the advantages of time and efficiency and seeing links across large data sets, NVivo was a deemed a suitable tool, Appendix D provides an overview of all the nodes employed within the NVivo software.

6.4 Coding to build descriptions and themes

Within this section the research discusses the process of template creation within a template analysis approach in more detail. In the first instance (Auerbach & Silverstein (2003) describe the dread that many new researchers feel when they are first faced with all of the data they have collected, and when they read through it they are almost certainly going to feel overwhelmed. Many researchers will feel a certain level of anxiety at the collection of all this data. Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) break these anxieties down into two main categories: firstly they argue that the researcher will perceive everything to be important and secondly the researcher will be afraid to choose any one thing to focus on in the fear that they may miss something important. In order to overcome these insecurities Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) recommend that researchers must be comfortable with the notion that there is no singular right way to proceed at the data analysis stage, and the novice researcher should have the mentality that their work is just one of several right ways.
6.4.1 Initial template

In relation to this discussion, King (2004) reminds the researcher that when developing the initial template and coding structure a balance has to be found between having not enough levels of coding, thereby presenting data as unclear and sparse, or too many levels of coding which can be counterproductive to the aim of attaining clarity in organising and interpreting the data. During this process the researcher did encounter these anxieties in the early part of the template analysis stage; it was difficult to find a balance in having too many codes in the initial template and not having enough. In the view of King and Horrocks (2010) the researcher must “continually acknowledge that template analysis is a very iterative approach” (p. 166), which must be revised as necessary until it captures a full picture of the dataset accumulated.

The initial template has been structured and constructed within the higher-order codes (King, 2004) of the five-pillar framework (Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013). To help in organising the data within template analysis King (2004) discusses two primary methods which are effective when used in conjunction with each other: the hierarchical approach and the parallel coding approach.

King (2004) advocates the use of a hierarchical approach, arguing that it allows for the clustering of data that is related in general to higher-order clusters and sub-clusters. In organising the data, elements that are related are clustered together allowing more general higher-order or sub-order codes to emerge. Similar to this is the use of parallel coding for segments of text, whereby the same segment is classified within two or more different codes at the same level; this approach allows for the placement of data into multiple codes but also allows for the emergence of relationships across clusters and themes (Crabtree & Miller, 1999; King, 2004). This flexibility allows for the creation of templates, which view the data from multiple perspectives (Crabtree &
Miller, 1999), for example the use of parallel coding in Table 3 allowed the researcher to identify baseline codes for culturally responsive teaching across all the five higher-order codes. This thesis agrees with the view of King and Horrocks (2010) and acknowledges that this is a “flexible method which allows researchers to use as many levels as they see fit to capture and organise the meanings they find in the data” (p. 166). In the analysis of the data, both coding approaches were used to give the data meaning and to place data into additional data code containers which are deemed to be related.

The initial template can be viewed within both a hierarchical approach (Appendix D1 – Initial template for data analysis) and a parallel coding approach (Table 3 – Constructs of culturally responsive teaching), in both templates the researcher identifies their relevance to the study by underpinning the results within the relevant literature. This strategy has been extensively utilised throughout this study, especially in the identification of the higher-order codes, which were sourced from the academic literature. This is a valid strategy as the higher-order codes can be sourced from academic literature in addition to the researcher’s own personal experiences, both anecdotal and informal (Crabtree & Miller, 1999; King, 2004, 2012).

King and Horrocks (2010) add to this view and propose that the initial template (Appendix D1) can also be based on a sub-sample of the data set. As can be seen from the initial hierarchical template (Appendix D1) there are five higher-order codes, these are based on the five pillars (Chapter 3) and the initial data set, which was obtained via the pilot interviews (Chapter 4). As King and Horrocks (2010) mention, template analysis is a very iterative approach, so it is clear that as new data is analysed and tagged new themes may emerge which were not part of the initial template, the finalisation of the template will now be discussed and documented.
6.4.2 Finalising the template

King and Horrocks (2004) advocate the need to be thorough in the creation of the initial template, as during the course of research inadequacies in the initial template will be revealed, requiring changes of various kinds. It is through these iterative changes that the template develops into its “final form” (p. 261). Therefore the next step in the analysis was organising the data into specific aspects of the template for clarity and analysis. Saldaña (2012) defines this process as the researcher making “connections and meaningful links between individual pieces of data for later purposes of pattern detection, categorisation, theory building, and other analytical processes” (p. 4). For this research, in following the view of Saldaña (2012), the researcher went through each interview line-by-line, and paragraph-by-paragraph to identify relevant data that could be included in the final analysis.

To help in organise the data within the finalised template, the research continued to utilise the hierarchical and a parallel coding approaches (King, 2004). When the initial template was complete, the next stage was for the researcher to read through the data again and identify gaps in the template; it became apparent at an early stage that while the initial template was robust as a basic guiding principle, there were, gaps in the initial template (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; King, 2004, 2012). These gaps led to the continuous development of the template through a process of redefining, merging or deleting codes as part of the data analysis (Brooks, Mccluskey, Turley, & King, 2015; King & Horrocks, 2010).

The research identified a number of descriptive codes that needed to be added to the initial template to give a better overview of the data and to better understand the lived experience of the Business School academic. A revised version of the template can be viewed in Appendix D2. The main change between the initial template
(Appendix D1) and the revised template (Appendix D2) is the identification of additional sub-themes and an additional layer of hierarchical coding within the majority of the sub-themes. To differentiate the difference, the additional sub-themes in the revised template (Appendix D2) have been highlighted in red. Theoretically there is no limit to the amount of hierarchical coding levels needed; the researcher should use as many as they see fit in identifying the data, though four to five levels is not uncommon (Brooks et al., 2015; King & Horrocks, 2010). The additional sub-levels were required as the researcher identified that the prior sub-themes did not adequately represent the data collected; this is not an uncommon phenomenon (King, 2004).

The next stage is to read through the transcribed data for the third time and identify any additional themes or sub themes which may have been missed in earlier iterations. However having read through the data multiple times (King, 2004) there must come a point when the template must be finalised. King (2004) and (Brooks et al., 2015) rightly point out that if the researcher does not have a cut-off point then the researcher could go on modifying and refining definitions of codes almost ad infinitum.

As a guideline for finalising the template, the researcher followed the advice of King (2004) that a researcher, as a general rule of thumb, should scrutinize the data and read it fully at least twice, however King tempers this with the suggestion that closing the template is a personal choice and it is not uncommon for researchers to read through the data multiple times. Having read through the data for a third time in detail a final template can be located in Appendix D3. For additional validation before any decision was made to finalise the template it was thoroughly discussed and validated with the research supervisor. Through these discussions a final change was made, this was the addition of another hierarchical level within the HE curriculum and cultural
consciousness as highlighted in green in Appendix D3. This now finalises the process of creating the template.

6.5 Representing and reporting the findings

White, Woodfield, & Ritchie (2003) describe the reporting of data as a continuation of the journey of interpretation and classification, requiring continued exploration; this stage like the previous stages is an iterative process, which requires continuous evaluation and reassessment of the data. Thus White et al., (2003), argue that the key aim when presenting the data is to:

Present findings in an accessible form that will satisfy the research objectives and enable the audience to understand them (p. 288)

This is a view supported by King (2012) who again mentions that it would be erroneous of the researcher to identify one single correct way of completing this stage; the nature of the data, the document type and the intended relationships are all variables that impact the presentation of the data. In helping to present the data in an accessible way King (2012) identifies three approaches for presenting template analysis data, they are:

- A set of individual case studies.
- An account structured around the main themes identified with illustrative examples from each transcript.
- A thematic presentation of the findings where a different individual case study is used to illustrate the main themes.

(p. 446)

With the richness of data collected each of the above three approaches would be suitable, though only one can be chosen. Whichever approach is taken the use of direct quotes from the participants is essential, these should include short quotes to aid the understanding of specific themes and more extensive quotes, giving readers a flavour of
the original texts (Brooks et al., 2015; King, 2012; Santoro, 2013).

Gonzalez (2009) recommends the use of a structured approach in the presentation of research findings, with the use of themes and subthemes to highlight the key aspects of the data. This view broadly fits in with the second approach discussed by King (2012), and therefore this researcher deems it appropriate to use the following method in the reporting of data for this thesis:

- An account structured around the main themes identified, drawing illustrative examples from each transcript as required (p. 446).

The only issue with this type of approach in the view of King (2004) is that the researcher must not become blinkered by the initial research, so that they make the mistake of disregarding all other themes that may not have direct relevance to the study, these unintended themes may be useful in providing a background story to the research. The other challenge within this type of approach argues King (2012) is that this type of approach produces a clear and succinct thematic discussion; there is a real danger that the researcher may fall into the trap of over-generalization and lose sight of individual experiences.

### 6.6 Interpreting the findings

In meeting the challenges of over-generalisation this section outlines the decisions made in selecting the approach taken to interpret the findings. The approach adopted is important as it ensures consistency in the codification of data, rigour in the approach of qualitative research and outlines in detail the in-depth planning that was undertaken in interpreting the findings. This discussion starts with the view of King (2004) who argues that the template and coding used thus far are only a framework for the interpretation of text, which is designed to support the researcher in the creation of a
phenomenological account which does as “much justice as possible to the richness of
the data within the constraints of a formal report, paper or dissertation” (p.266). This
process of interpretation is a skill which relies on the experience and understanding of
the researcher in arriving at verifiable meaning about what is said in an interview
(Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

In interpreting the findings, the research has already decided upon representing
the data in a structured way, governed by the five main themes of this research based
upon the research objectives. This approach helps to place the majority of the data in
specific codes, which allows the researcher to explore the sub-themes in more depth
(Gonzales, 2009). This approach allows the researcher to look at the data iteratively
(King, 2004) and make additional changes when needed so that essential data is not
discarded. Secondly the researcher intends to articulate the key themes at the start of
each chapter and identify their relationship with the aims and objectives (Table 11). By
undertaking this process the researcher does not over-generalise and can identify and
discuss interview participant experiences within themes, this also helps to reinforce
rigour within this research (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2008).

Articulating the themes at the start of the chapter helped the researcher to stay
focused and allowed the reporting to be clear and coherent, “the researcher should take
the rich and detailed data that has been collected and present it in a way that guides the
reader through the findings” (White et al., 2003, p. 288). The displayed data will be
easy to understand with relevant quotes from participants utilised as necessary where
they supports the theme (White et al., 2003).

In the analysis of this data there are two fundamental approaches that can be
applied to the analysis of qualitative data: the deductive approach and the inductive
approach (Burnard et al., 2008). In the view of Spencer et al., (2003) deductive
approaches involve using a structure or predetermined framework to analyse data. Within this scenario, essentially the researcher already has theoretical structure that they impose on the data, this structure is then utilised to analyse the interview transcripts (Williams, Bower, & Newton, 2004). In response Ryan & Bernard, (2003) advise, the themes were identified through the analysis of the data (inductive) and from the investigator’s prior theoretical understanding of the phenomenon (a priori approach). An inductive approach fits very well within the process of template analysis in interpreting and analysing findings from the interviews. King (2004) agrees with this and advocates the use of a strategy that is open in its approach.

Thus in defining the themes, the process of template creation (King, 2004) allows for the critical evaluation of data in an iterative approach. The initial and final templates were created using the inductive approach (Appendix D2 & D3) (King, 2004; 2012). The researcher outlines the flexible approach in Figure 6.2 – Outline of data analysis approach. This diagram has been adapted from the work of Crabtree and Miller (1999) and Fereday & Muir-Cochrane (2008). This inductive analytical approach allows for a flexible step-by-step process in the collection, codification and interpretation of data (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2008).
Figure 6.1 – Outline of data analysis approach

Figure 6.1 outlines the data analysis process step-by-step. Stages 1 and 2 are essential in setting the template for analysis, here the template is based on the five-pillar framework. Stages 2-4 show an iterative process where the data is analysed and additional codes and templates are added and themes identified. Once the data has been read numerous times, stage 5 finalises the template and allows for the investigation of the key themes.

6.7 Validate the accuracy of the findings

Whilst reflexivity is commonly discussed within the disciplines of sociology and ethnography it is now becoming a key issue for researchers within the field of management (Nadin & Cassell, 2006). Hence in defining validity within qualitative research Lewis and Ritchie (2003) in quoting Hammersley (1992) argue “we can never know with certainty that an account is true because we have no independent and completely reliable access to reality. We must therefore judge validity on the basis of...
the adequacy of the evidence offered in support of the phenomena being described” (p. 276). Within qualitative research it is not possible for researchers to be totally objective, because total objectivity is not humanly possible (Crotty, 1996, 1998).

Therefore, demonstrating validity is essential within a qualitative framework as one of the main drawbacks of the in-depth interview is that the respondent is prone to bias during the interview. Finlay (2002) argues that reflexivity, as a method where the researcher is self-aware of their role is an essential tool in increasing the integrity and trustworthiness of qualitative research. Wall, Glenn, Mitchinson, & Poole (2004) agree with this and refer to the process of reflexivity as a mental method that is about developing a “psychological orientation towards oneself rather than an observable set of procedures to be adopted by the researcher”, the focus is therefore on the researcher’s behaviour, beliefs and perceptions, and putting these to one side during the interview process. The researcher should also understand that they are part of the social world they study (Ahern, 1999; King & Horrocks, 2010).

Another method that is similar to reflexivity is the use of bracketing within qualitative research. Ahern (1999) refers to “Bracketing as a means of demonstrating the validity of the data collection and analytic processes”. This is a view echoed by Beech (1999) where bracketing is referred to as a process wherein the “researcher resolves to hold all preconceptions in abeyance in order to reach experiences” (p.36).

However bracketing is not without controversy and differs from reflexivity in that while reflexivity encourages conscious self-awareness (Beech, 1999; Finlay, 2002; Hellawell, 2006; Higbee, Siaka, et al., 2007), bracketing encourages researchers to shut off their own lived experiences (Ahern, 1999; Beech, 1999; Wall et al., 2004). Many phenomenologists find the idea that a researcher can entirely bracket themselves off from their own lived preconceptions a little far-fetched, arguing that total objectivity is
neither achievable or desirable (Ahern, 1999; King & Horrocks, 2010). However this
does not mean that the idea is abandoned, but that researchers need to acknowledge that
it is of fundamental importance to strive to go beyond habitual ways of seeing things
(King & Horrocks, 2010).

Hence in order to develop validation within the research Finlay (2002) proposes
the use of a reflective diary in illustrating the process researchers undertook in “how
they have probed the influence of their thinking and responses and how they have used
reflexive analysis both to gain insight and as a tool for evaluation” (p.536). While this
may seem like an abstract approach it opens up the researcher’s account to public
scrutiny, and while it may not prove anything it does allow the researcher’s thought
processes to be probed, which demonstrates in itself a level of integrity (Ahern, 1999;
Finlay, 2002; King & Horrocks, 2010). In the view of Kvale and Brinkmann (2009)
integrity is not solely defined by the methods that are used but also the “moral integrity”
of the researcher.

In addition, a reflective diary can be used for the purpose of recording
significant points from each interview along with personal feelings and reflections on
the interview (Beech, 1999). Wall et al., (2004) concurs with this view and argues that a
reflective diary can help the researcher become aware of what their thought processes
are before the interview; researchers should ask themselves how do I feel, what
assumptions have I made about the academic and the institution?

In general, authors (Finlay, 2002; King & Horrocks, 2010; Nadin & Cassell,
2006) agree that reflexivity is a useful tool within management research, however there
is no concrete process in undertaking reflexivity and too much is left to the researcher
(P. Johnson & Duberley, 2003). In addition to this there seems to be confusion about
how reflexivity should be undertaken in practice (Finlay, 2002; Nadin & Cassell, 2006).
Hence in order to clear up any confusion and for the researcher to be consistent within their reflexivity, Finlay (2002) recommends the compilation of a reflective diary within a three-step framework that should be followed during the data collection stage, these are pre-research stage, data collection stage and the data analysis stage. Keeping a reflective diary would be beneficial across the three stages, this allows the researcher to evaluate and reflect on their own key internal issues which need to be placed to one side so as not to inadvertently bias the interviewee (Ahern, 1999; Beech, 1999; Finlay, 2002).

6.7.1 Pre-research stage

In the view of Finlay (2002) the researcher should commence the process of reflection and reflexive analysis from the moment the research is conceived. However this may not always be the case, Nadin & Cassell, (2006) for example, discuss the conception of a research diary within the literature review stage. The pre-research stage is an essential part of the research as the “researcher prepares to approach the phenomenon to be investigated with openness and wonder” (Finlay, 2002). The key variable to be managed at this stage is the assertion of Johnson and Duberley (2003) that any reflexive researcher needs to understand their own epistemological position in relation to reflexivity.

During this stage lingering issues around ethnicity and background were perceived to be barrier in the research process, it was felt that Business School academics may skirt around the controversial issues and let the researcher hear what they thought he wanted to hear, without fully describing the phenomenon (Ahern, 1999). In the view of Wall et al., (2004) it is essential to open and investigate one’s own perspective before commencing the journey through this process. To bypass these
challenges, Wall et al., (2004) are of the view that the researcher should within the pre-
research stage prepare mentally for certain situations in advance.

6.7.2 Data collection stage

The second aspect of the reflective diary proposed by Finlay (2002) in the data
collection stage, is the researcher reflecting on the data collection process. In the view
of Wall et al., (2004) it is at this juncture that the researcher needs to reflect upon
current situations and specific incidents that may occur during the interview process. At
this point the memoing approach decided upon earlier can help in developing key
reflections (Groenewald, 2004). The ability to make notes as the interview occurs
allows for internal evaluation and the opportunity to reflect on the methodological
progression of the phenomenological research study itself.

At this stage Ahern (1999) recommends:

Researchers should be continually looking at and identifying, is there anything new
or surprising in your data collection or analysis? If not, is this cause for concern, or
is it an indication of saturation? On occasion, stand back and ask yourself if you
are ‘going native’. (p. 409)

Through the process of reflection and self-analysis the researcher should be continually
monitoring their feelings and their perceived neutrality (Ahern, 1999). This is a view
also shared by Wall et al., (2004) for whom reflections at this stage would involve
describing the situation in detail, identifying any factors that had an influence on the
situation, and providing evidence of critical analysis on the extent to which bracketing
was achieved, where appropriate.
6.7.3 Data analysis stage

The final stage of the reflective diary as proposed by Finlay (2002) is the data analysis stage. At this stage Ahern (1999) argues that the process of reflection is an ongoing process, researchers should ask themselves:

Are you quoting more from one respondent than another? If you are, ask yourself why. Do you agree with one person’s sentiment or turn of phrase more than those of another? (p. 409)

Finlay (2002) argues that after each interview the researcher needs to be clear on their motivations and they should understand what it is that has come away with them from the interview: How or has their thinking changed? Was the interview carried out in an appropriate manner? And what elements need to be considered before the next interview? Wall et al., (2004) argue that reflection needs to go beyond just internal analysis and should also include interpersonal aspects of conducting interviews and document the learning that has taken place as part of the experience. In the view of Nadin and Cassell (2006) the process of reflection during the transcription stage can bring to the fore feelings of anger and irritation in relation to specific individuals or interviews and the researcher should reflect further on the power dynamics of the interview. The reflective diary for each interview can be found in Appendix A.

6.7.4 Implementation of a reflective diary

The research diary was primarily made up of notes made on the researcher’s iPad. Every time an academic was interviewed an entry was made into the iPad under the headings described in Finlay’s framework (2002). Each entry was made in two ways; one entry was made before the interview including the date, time and other basic demographic data alongside my early preconceptions and reflections. The second reflection was made straight after the interview in which it was recorded how the
researcher felt the interview went and the practical issues of the interview. Typically the comments centred on the academic’s demeanour, and my feelings and the body language of the interviewee in relation to specific questions.

Using the reflective diary served a number of practical purposes. The recording of comments allowed the researcher to continually reflect on the methodological issues of constructionism within this research and the role of culture in reflexivity. In addition, the reflective diary allowed the researcher to collect additional data for identifying additional themes and also the non-verbal clues and behaviour of the interviewee. Through this process the researcher reflected on his role within the research process and identified areas where he could improve his research technique. The researcher also took into consideration his assumptions, values and beliefs and how these impacted upon the research.

6.8 Identifying quotations

In helping to identify the quotes within the research a very simple uncomplicated approach has been used. All interviewees and the institutions they work for have been anonymised but given a label to indicate gender (M=Male, F=Female), and a number for the direct quote so it can be differentiated. As an example, M9 indicates that this quote is from a Male Interview 9.
### 6.9 Introduction to the findings chapters

The next five chapters explore and detail the research findings. In table 11 below the research objectives are mapped against the chapters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1 - To explore the role of the Business School Academic and the higher education institution in the development of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students.</td>
<td>Chapter 7 discusses academic cultural consciousness and its role in the development of student understanding. Chapter 9 investigates the feelings and responsibilities academics have towards the student's they teach. Chapter 11 discusses the role of the higher education in creating a climate of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2: To analyse current methods and techniques in pedagogy development for ethnically diverse students.</td>
<td>Chapter 8 looks at the academic in the creation of resources in creating and implementing pedagogy for culturally diverse students. Chapter 10 discusses key areas that support student bridging in higher education and the role of the academic but also the teaching institution in supporting this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3: Investigate academic perceptions and attitudes in the creation of pedagogy for students of an ethnically diverse background.</td>
<td>Chapter 7 discusses academic cultural consciousness and its role in the development of student understanding. Chapter 8 looks at the academic in the creation of resources in creating and implementing pedagogy for culturally diverse students. Chapter 9 investigates the feelings and responsibilities academics have towards the student's they teach. Chapter 10 discusses key areas that support student bridging in higher education and the role of the academic but also the teaching institution in supporting this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4: Investigate the Climates of Learning created by higher education institutions for ethnically diverse home and international students</td>
<td>Chapter 7 discusses academic cultural consciousness and its role in the development of student understanding. Chapter 10 discusses key areas that support student bridging in higher education and the role of the academic but also the teaching institution in supporting this. Chapter 11 discusses the role of the higher education in creating a climate of learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 – Mapping objectives onto findings
Table 11 shows that the chapters overlap in a number of areas giving a clear and holistic picture of the methods and mechanisms employed by academics and higher education institutions in creating pedagogy that is suitable for culturally diverse students.

In constructing the data chapters, the researcher decided to develop a data analysis strategy underpinned by the considerations of relevant research objectives that allowed the researcher to develop corresponding codes and themes as shown in Figure 6.1. This approach is consistent with the work of King (2004, 2012).
Chapter 7  
Cultural consciousness (Pillar one)

7.1 Introduction

This is the first chapter that discusses the findings of this research. As discussed in detail within chapters three and five the majority of the data was collected around five areas of culturally responsive teaching as outlined by Jabbar & Hardaker (2013). The first pillar, also referred to as “cultural consciousness” investigates and explores the complex relationships between Business School academics and their students. In exploring this relationship this chapter intends to achieve the following objectives:

- O1 - To explore the role of the Business School Academic and the higher education institution in the development of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students.
- O3 - Investigate academic perceptions and attitudes in the creation of pedagogy for students of an ethnically diverse background.
- O4 - Investigate the Climates of Learning created by higher education institutions for ethnically diverse home and international students

For a detailed mapping process please refer to Table 11.

In chapter six this research came to the conclusion that the most appropriate way to organise the data was through the use of themes and sub-themes (King, 2004, 2012). Through a process of template analysis (Figure 6.1), within the first pillar the researcher identified three themes that dominated not just academic practice but also academic perspectives. In identifying the three themes, the collected data supports the view that for academics to develop cultural consciousness they need to rethink current pedagogical practice and base their pedagogy and teaching on **affirming cultural heritage.** The implication being that there will be a requirement on academics to
acknowledge and understand aspects of student culture and background. This research also proposes that academics should create a **validating pedagogy**, this is based on the premise that pedagogy should resonate with students of ethnic diversity. Finally this research proposes that academics and organisations should be proactive in creating environments of **student understanding**. These three themes are visualised in figure 7.1.

![Figure 7.1: Key themes of Cultural consciousness](image)

### 7.2 Background and Heritage

The first theme identified by the researcher is background and heritage. This is based on the premise that pedagogical practice should be affirming of cultural heritage and background. In developing this theme the research was influenced by the work of Nieto (1999)) who proposes that learning is a social experience built on social relationships. Academics are encouraged to build on what students do know, rather than lament what they do not have. Secondly this research is influenced by numerous authors (Giroux, 2004; Higbee, Lundell, et al., 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) who propose that an affirming attitude toward students who differ from the dominant culture is fundamental for teaching successfully in a ethnically society. Having an affirming view encourages educators to acknowledge the existence and validity of a plurality of ways of thinking, talking, behaving, and learning (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).
In order to visualise this data and to identify the key influential nodes within this theme, in Figure 7.2 the researcher outlines the key elements of background and heritage. The emphasis is on cultural background but also on educational experience and current academic strategies. The academics interviewed felt that students from different cultures come with different backgrounds and experiences and are expected to integrate quickly into higher education, for many this was an issue that they did not fully feel comfortable with and felt they were approaching from a position of ignorance (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013; Tomalin, 2007). This theme outlined in Figure 7.2 implies that academics have difficulty in engaging with students whose background and history is so different from their own; this is a difficult process and there are multiple influences on how academics perceive students, and how this then influence their actions and behaviour.
Figure 7.2  Elements that influence Background and Heritage
Figure 7.2 re-enforces the view that affirming cultural heritage for ethnic minorities within education and learning is not a generic process and requires academics to develop ‘equity pedagogy’ (Banks, 1995; McGee Banks & Banks, 1995; Schmeichel, 2011). Banks (1995) defines ‘equity pedagogy’ as a pedagogy that exists when educators modify their teaching in ways that will facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse, racial, ethnic, cultural and gender backgrounds. Thus one of the first tasks within this research was ascertaining academic perceptions towards students of ethnic diversity:

“I know that you should put individuals together and have commonness but every year I see individuals that have different issues, different aspirations, different weaknesses, and different strengths” (M3)

“I do think I take special care when I’m creating activities and I’m sensitive to cultural differences” (F2)

“I think one of the worst things you can do is treat everybody the same” (M18)

At first glance the data suggests that the majority of academics interviewed were sympathetic to the view that different ethnically diverse students have differing needs and requirements. There was an acknowledgement at this early stage that academics and institutions have a responsibility to create and develop pedagogy that was affirming of ethnic students’ background and culture.

Here the research suggests that this responsibility should be used to acknowledge that there is plurality in the teaching and learning process (Gay, 2000, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In order for academics to engage students within the teaching and learning process they need to understand that plurality is central to this; students learn in different ways and if academics want their students to achieve then the onus is on them to create affirming
pedagogy that empowers students to do this (Banks, 1995; McGee Banks & Banks, 1995). By undertaking this type of approach in acknowledging different cultural backgrounds and experiences within teaching and learning, educators are allowing students not to just academically achieve, but also to maintain a sense of identity and connection with their communities (Gay, 2000; Tisdell, 2009).

In discussing this concept of plurality, Gatimu (2009) takes the view that this mechanism can cultivate higher levels of engagement and higher student achievement. However, different authors have differing views on how this concept of plurality can be achieved. Gay (2000) and Villegas & Lucas (2002) place the onus on the shoulders of the academic to create a curriculum that is open and conducive to learning. Gatimu (2009) takes a slightly different view and argues that academics should allow students to become producers of knowledge that is directly related to their lived cultural experiences. This research suggests that in actual practice there is a balance between the two perspectives. The curriculum needs to support the creation of student knowledge; one aspect of engagement is not relevant without the other, and this is referred to within this research as a ‘multi-sided partnership’ with students as producers of knowledge and academics as facilitators of knowledge.

The creation of this ‘multi-sided relationship’ requires UK Business School academics to do more in developing interactions based on cultural interfaces and communication exchanges. An effective ‘multi-sided relationship’ is based on an affirming relationship with an understanding of cultural heritage (Durden & Truscott, 2013; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006).

In moving towards this ‘multi-sided relationship’ there needs to be an acknowledgement from educators that all students can succeed, regardless of race, ethnicity or cultural background (Durden & Truscott, 2013; Durden, 2008; Nieto,
During the course of this research it was important to identify how academics developed social relationships to create these ‘multi-sided relationships’.

The data argues that an affirming pedagogy requires a ‘multi-sided relationship’ but needs to be based on a better understanding of student background and worldview as discussed below:

“I remember the shock I felt when one girl asked, what is Christmas and who is Christ? I was totally surprised and ashamed I took for granted that everybody knew what Christmas is.” (F6)

“A lot of the Chinese students announce they are Gay as soon as they hit the tarmac they just blossom” (F7)

“Some of my Asian students have the attitude that I only want a degree so I can marry a better girl” (M5)

“I can accept different groups will need different help, support & encouragement” (M3)

The data above suggests that when educators take the time to get to know their students, many are surprised about what they learn; for some academics understanding cultural heritage can be a real wake up call. The research suggests that the opportunity to develop affirming relationships increases when academics take the time to develop student interactions based on cultural influences and differences (Rubie-Davies et al., 2006).

In the view of Gay (2000) this relationship can only really blossom when educators genuinely care about their students and have high expectations. This is based on educators having passions not just for the subjects they teach but also for their students regardless of culture (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Day, 2004; Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). The more time, passion, and energy is invested within this
relationships, the more that students tend to achieve higher levels of engagement and perform at a higher standard (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999).

This theme is not however without its controversies. During the data collection phase the researcher came across evidence that outlines a clear tension between perceptions of ‘mainstream’ students and ‘the other’ (Durden & Truscott, 2013; Tomalin, 2007), students from a non mainstream western background. This is also discussed by (Ghere, Kampsen, Duranczyk, & Christensen, 2007) who argue that a lot of this tension stems from educational theory, which defines cultural capital primarily from within a western dominated context. Hence there is a view that students from ethnically diverse backgrounds lack the cultural capital to access teaching and learning (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Leese, 2010) within UK higher education Business Schools. This tension allows academics to build negative perceptions and ignorance about students from ethnically diverse backgrounds (Tomalin, 2007).

This research investigates this tension in more depth, and there is substantial evidence to support the notion that many academics have prevailing negative stereotypes and poor academic perceptions towards students from a ethnically background (Connor et al., 2004; Modood, 2006; Richardson, 2008). This research identified the same phenomena:

“They expect me to give them work that they can then jumble up and give it back to me and get a good grade because that's what they've been taught to do” (F7)

“There is a significant minority of female Muslim students who seem childish, they tend to behave almost like thirteen or fourteen year olds” (M3)

There are significant stereotypes at play here, which are investigated in more detail in chapters three and ten. However, it will be briefly discussed within this section that there is an erroneous view by UK academics that students of ethnic diversity have
poorer ability and skills (Richardson, 2008). While investigating this issue, this research tried to identify issues where these negative stereotypes can become an obstacle in the creation of an affirming pedagogy. Numerous authors (Richardson, 2008; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006) argue that many ethnically diverse students face significant disadvantages before they start their course. Tomalin (2007) refers to this phenomenon as a process of entrenchment where views of non-western learners are represented as the ‘other’ or as deficient and inferior. This point of view reaffirms the dominance and superiority of the culture of the western education system (Y. Turner, 2006).

This research investigates the phenomenon of negative perceptions and poor stereotypes in more detail. In order to achieve this, the researcher maps the collected data onto the framework of Kumaravadivelu (2003), which outlines the typical stereotypes applied to non-western learners. The results of our data mapped onto this framework are overlaid in Table 12.
Table 12 - Academic stereotypes of students of ethnic diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotypes of Kumaravadivelu (2003, p. 710)</th>
<th>Academic responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Non-Western learners are obedient to authority.</td>
<td>“We have a lot of Chinese students, you really notice that with these people the lecturer is the big boss and you don’t question what they say” (M1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“In Chinese and Asian cultures teachers are second to their parents, there has to be a great respect for the teachers.” (M5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Non-Western learners lack critical thinking skills</td>
<td>“It’s a completely different learning style, they are regurgitating, not expecting me to ask them questions and for them to have an opinion.” (M4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’m not sure what goes on in China, but quite a number of them repeat anything they come across” (M1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Chinese students have never ever been encouraged to speak, to give an opinion”(F7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Non-Western learners do not participate in classroom interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Non-Western students have severe language issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Western students have motivational issues:

- “It’s all about status, and the students that come over to the UK from China are always sold the dream” (F7)

- “At the risk of sounding really bad, one or two Asian lads is better than a group of Asian lads, one or two Asian lads, they are willing to mix, they are willing to contribute, because if there is a bunch of them, they all sit together and don’t mix.” (M5)

- “I find the Asian girls more difficult to deal with than the boys, the girls are just very hard work, a bit precious.” (F8)

Table 12 - Academic stereotypes of students of culture
The data in Table 12 outlines the perceptions that UK Business School academics have in relation to ethnically diverse students based on the framework of Kumaravadivelu (2003). Without over-generalising, approximately 14 out of the 22 academics interviewed had negative or borderline negative views and perceptions about students of diversity. For the sake of brevity not everything could be added to the above table.

Nieto (1999) argues that negative perceptions and low expectations are an obstacle in the creation of affirming pedagogy, and can be identified as one of the key factors that contribute directly towards poor student academic achievement (Rubie-Davies et al., 2006). This research suggests that academics are all too willing to push the blame on the student and do not spend enough time analysing their own specific pedagogical issues. Some of the charges levelled at ethnically diverse students include: students fail to learn because they are unmotivated, their gene pool is inferior, their families do not care, or the cultural values of that group are not orientated towards education (Nieto, 1999; Schmeichel, 2011), for example M1 complains that:

“When I give out a sizable case study and you get well I can’t do it, the students will say well this is too long, I can’t read it” (M1)

Here the issue is: Is this the problem with the student or with the development of poor pedagogy? Does this kind of western-dominated pedagogical approach support subtle aspects of ethnically diverse pedagogy (Turner, 2006).

In the view of this research these complaints, issues and problems for many academics stem from a lack of understanding in relation to student background. Nieto (1999) argues that a lot of the assumptions made by academics are by their very nature racially orientated, this kind of approach is controversial and also fails to look at the problem from a holistic perspective. In order to overcome these issues, M18 proposes:
“I also try to make sure that staff travel abroad, so in my role, I try to get as many academics as possible to go to places like India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and China to actually see what the teaching is like there, so they can get an idea of where these students come from”. (M18)

Thus the researcher agrees with the view of Kumaravadivelu (2003) that academics lack awareness and make assumptions based on ignorance. Nevertheless, by following the above proposal this ignorance can be minimised (Tomalin, 2007).

Both Nieto (1999) and Kumaravadivelu (2003, 2008) agree that if an effort is not made by academics to get to know their students via training methods, curriculum or M18’s proposal, then this, for some, can lead to a “fear of the unknown”. This then creates a vicious cycle of low student expectations, not viewing students as capable learners and having a lack of confidence in a student’s ability and achievement alongside the development of negative pedagogy and curricula (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999).

By developing interactions based on affirming cultural differences many of these stereotypes can be negated, leading to an affirming viewpoint of student ability. Villegas & Lucas (2002) propose that an affirming attitude towards ethnically diverse students is a fundamental aspect of teaching success, this requires viewing students as a valuable resource for learning, and embracing the idea that culture can be used as a vehicle for learning (Durden & Truscott, 2013; Nieto, 1999, 2009). For this perspective to be successful, educators are required to view ethnically diverse students as capable independent learners who have the ability to achieve at a high academic level (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Within this theme the views of ten different academics have been represented. There are multiple narratives each with their own views and perspectives; this is articulated in Figure 7.3. Within this Figure different sized circles identify the amount
of input the interview had in this theme, this number was obtained by counting all the individual instances where a quote for the interview was used. So, for example, within the theme of Background and Heritage interviews F7 and M1 had the loudest voices with the most impact on the data:

![Figure 7.3: Strongest voices within Background & Heritage](image)

What the data does suggest is an interesting juxtaposition, M1 is a quintessential academic who has been an academic for over forty-five years and was just coming to the end of his service; hence he felt he could speak openly about his experience and views. In contrast F7 was a relatively new female academic who had been in the job for less than five years and in her own words, didn’t feel like an academic, she had less experience and was still learning the job.
In summary, this theme articulates the importance of academics spending time in getting to know their students and building meaningful relationships based on high expectations and mutual respect. Unfortunately the data suggests that too often an affirming pedagogy is hampered by academic stereotypes and negative perceptions. This research agrees with the view of Bourdieu & Passeron (1990) and Howard (2003) by arguing that educators need to understand that ethnically diverse students frequently bring cultural capital that is often different from mainstream norms and worldviews. In the view of this research this is not something to fear but something to develop and integrate within higher education pedagogy.

7.3 Academic confidence and skills

The second theme identified as part of this chapter is the development of academic confidence and skills in creating validating pedagogy. In the cultivation of pedagogical practice that is based on culturally responsive teaching, numerous authors (Coulson & Harvey, 2013; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Gay, 2000, 2002; Goodman & Cirecie, 2009; Howard, 2003) suggest that academic reflection and student understanding should be a major component in the training and development of educators. This training and reflection should imbue academics with the analytical skills and confidence (Bajunid, 1996; Gay, 2002) not only to have mastery of the subject matter, but also to identify their needs regarding the creation of a validating pedagogy. Academic confidence can suffer if academics feel they have insufficient knowledge about different cultures (Tomalin, 2007), which then has the unintended effect of affecting the academic confidence of ethnically diverse students who become even more insular in their transition to UK higher education Business Schools (Ball et al., 2002; Leese, 2010; Y. Turner, 2006).
In order to contextualise this theme within the research that has been conducted thus far, Figure 7.4 articulates the different nodes within the research that have influenced this theme. Within this theme the research suggests that academic confidence and skills are based on academics’ understanding of different aspects of pedagogical experience and their views and beliefs. The research suggests that the academics interviewed felt that students from different cultures came from inferior educational systems, hence academics felt that the students had poor skills when they came to UK higher education. This theme, with the data outlined in figure 7.4, argues that academics do not have the confidence and skills to move out of their teaching comfort zone, hence when they are faced with students from different ethnic backgrounds they revert back to teaching strategies that they have always employed. This is articulated through the node of selfish and patronising pedagogy.
Figure 7.4 Elements that influence Academic confidence
In order to investigate this phenomenon within this theme in more detail the researcher attempted to investigate current strategies utilised by academics to build confidence and skills as part of their pedagogy development:

“Acceptance and valuing difference and being open to learning from others” (F12)

“I’m still continually learning and developing what I do in the classroom” (F2)

“It’s about giving them something that they can succeed at it’s the experience that they’ve had while they have been doing it” (M3)

The process of understanding and reflection allows academics to become accepting and to value difference (Howard, 2003), however, within the research this practice was found to be a minority view. In the view of Ladson-Billings (1995b) this practice is the first step towards developing a confident, validating, and culturally responsive pedagogy, which becomes the basis of academic success alongside educators encouraging students to recognise, understand and critique current social inequalities (Gatimu, 2009; Jenks et al., 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Hence, Howard (2003) emphasises the need for critical reflection about race and culture as an essential component within culturally responsive teaching to push back and to teach against these social inequalities. However, teaching against these social inequalities makes the assumption that educators are aware of, or can recognise, social inequalities in the higher education system.

The main issue to arise from this discussion as articulated by numerous authors (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Nieto, 1999) is that many educators lack the skills and confidence to teach against these social inequalities. While this is a major challenge, this research identifies further issues around the concept of challenging social
inequalities with some academics within this research actively rejecting that inequality exists:

“I think it’s patronising, after all in a world of no racial discrimination then you need to treat everyone the same. If I’m treating everyone the same, why do I need to know where somebody comes from?” (M1)

“I don’t make any allowances for specific ethnic groups. It is the same for everybody” (F13)

“I accept exactly what the culture is, but with me in this room you can pretend that that doesn’t exist” (F11)

During this line of questioning the researcher identified peculiar behaviour from some of the respondents. The reflections of the researcher at this point observed that there were indications that some academics felt uncomfortable discussing these issues, eye contact was reduced, and the tone of voice changed, additionally some academics crossed their legs in a defensive pose. These are all signs of discomfort and this research argues that this discomfort stems from academics struggling to relate to students from different ethnic cultures and backgrounds. Banks (1995) and McGee Banks & Banks (1995) both attribute this notion to the idea that academics feel uncomfortable with the prospect that students’ thinking and behaviour are deeply influenced by factors such as race, ethnicity, social class, and language. Kellner (1998) takes a slightly different view and argues that there is a lack of social literacy. The indication stills exists that many academics struggle to develop interactions based on cultural influences and differences, this leads to the impression that students from different cultural backgrounds perceive their relationships with their academics to be unequal (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013).

In order to overcome these issues, Howard (2003) and Bajunid (1996) propose that educator practice and thought must be re-conceptualised in a manner that
recognizes and respects the intricacies of cultural and racial difference, this should ideally be underpinned by reflection and confidence. This will then lead to the construction of pedagogical practice that is culturally relevant, racially affirming, and socially meaningful for their students (Giroux, 2004; Howard, 2003; Zamudio et al., 2009). The research suggested that this process was not being undertaken, and hence required further investigation.

While continuing this line of questioning the researcher identified the phenomenon that while student and academic relationships need to be based on mutual respect and trust (Jenks et al., 2001; Tomalin, 2007), some academics had trouble creating getting to know their students and hence did not attempt to cultivate these relationships:

“I don’t even agree, personally, with all this ‘crap’ about what’s your ethnic background?” (M1)

“There is some resistance to change here and I’ve heard a comments in relation to Chinese students that have shocked me” (F9)

“I look at their faces, are they falling asleep? Are they talking when I am lecturing?” (F10)

“The only group that I sort of start with a pre-view of is the British Asian girls because they don’t half mess about” (F8)

Within the research at this stage there were a mixture of responses, which in some cases were derogatory. During the course of the interview these comments were not perceived to be racist but the body language of the interviewee suggested a certain level of frustration at their inability to relate to their students and also at their inability to reflect on their teaching.
In the view Nieto (1999), frustration is a natural emotion and in some cases it can be aimed at the institution in which academics work, she argues:

Educators are not the sole generators and advocates of uninspired pedagogy; often they are the victims of school policies and practices that restrict their freedom of choice. (p. 77).

Here multiple authors (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Howard, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999; Oikonomidoy, 2010; Vita, 2001) suggest that this frustration is borne out of a feeling of helplessness and a lack of skills, she argues that through critical reflection and training staff can feel empowered to develop a critical consciousness and student understanding. However, the sources of frustration need to be put to one side and educators need to get past their own personal issues (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999), develop pedagogical strategies that go past generic teaching methods (Jenks et al., 2001) and embrace multiple teaching perspectives (Durden, 2008; Vita, 2001) that make explicit connections between culture and learning (Howard, 2003).

In making these connections between culture and learning Nieto (1999) argues that academics should appreciate students as cultural resources rather than lament what they do not have. Villegas and Lucas (2002) hold a similar view and argue that academics should use culture as a vehicle for learning. For many academics this means having an appreciation of what students bring with them to the classroom:

“As individuals we all see the world in a slightly different way and that is based on our past experiences [.....] and cultures” (M3)

“I ask why are you here to try and find that ambition and aspiration” (F14)

“I like to treat them as equal rather than a superior, so in that sense it breaks down the barriers” (M5)
“I try to get as many academics as possible to go to places like India, Sri Lanka or Bangladesh to actually see what the teaching is like there, so they can get an idea of where these students are from” (M18)

Here the research suggests a more positive outlook on students from different cultural backgrounds. There is a tentative attempt to try to understand students and what motivates them. It is interesting to note here that two of the respondents from the data above were from ethnically backgrounds and hence made an increased effort to engage their diverse students. Students who are taught by academics from ethnically diverse backgrounds tend to work harder and achieve higher (Dee, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995b), which can be a very ad-hoc approach to the creation of a validating pedagogy; this is not a process that can be created on the fly it needs to be developmentally appropriate and strategic (Jenks et al., 2001).

In closing the discussion around this theme the research takes into account the views of twelve different academics. The dominant narrative within this theme seems to be frustration and a lack of understanding. Figure 7.5 outlines the dominant voices within this discussion and the influence these had on the research; what is interesting to note within this theme is the mix of voices with no single dominant voice. Investigating this single dominant view in more detail the data suggests that many academics see issues of equity and excellence in relation to ethnically diverse students as a non-issue while others are failing to develop teaching practices that are appropriate for ethnically diverse students. This research suggests that this type of pedagogy is unique and still very new; the differences of opinion in the research do suggest that many academics and institutions lack the interest and commitment to change, and are not ready to embrace culturally responsive teaching.
Figure 7.5 outlines the various voices and opinions within this theme. Firstly there is a tension in the creation of a validating pedagogy, which either leads to academic frustration or a lack of a strategic approach to ethnically diverse students. Secondly there is an acknowledgement that many academics do not have the confidence or the critical reflection skills to support their students as critical learners. Thirdly many academics feel hindered by their own ignorance and lack of understanding and do not want to offend their ethnically diverse students.

Figure 7.5: Multiple voices within confidence and skills
7.4 Student Understanding

The final theme identified as part of the first pillar is the development of student understanding. This theme is a direct extension of the previous theme “validating pedagogy” where the research proposed that academic confidence and reflection can help to develop student understanding and facilitate academic critical reflection. One method for promoting student understanding proposed by (Ladson-Billings, 1995a) and Dee (2005) is through the recruitment of educators from different cultures and backgrounds. While this may be a very controversial approach (D’Souza, 1991, 1995), Dee (2005) argues that statistics show that students who share a heritage with their educators are seen as more attentive and more likely to complete their work.

In order to contextualise this theme within the research that has been conducted thus far, Figure 7.6 articulates the different nodes within the research that have influenced this theme. The research suggests that student understanding is based on academics having the passion and motivation to create meaningful learning experiences based on student background and validating pedagogy. This theme investigates the view that in many instances academics have attempted to provide meaningful experiences, but all too often these are underpinned by erroneous views and perceptions.
Figure 7.6 Elements that influence student understanding
In developing student understanding, Figure 7.6 illustrates the importance of having affirming views of students from different backgrounds that act as an enabler for student interaction in the creation of a validating pedagogy. This should be underpinned by attentiveness, which is a key aspect of success. Ladson-Billings (1995a) argues that there is evidence to suggest that classroom interactions make important contributions to demographic gaps in student achievement, thus re-enforcing the need for institutions to develop policies and procedures that involve recruiting underrepresented teachers (Gay, 2002; Nieto, 1999). Jenks et al., (2001) argues that this program of recruitment must run in parallel to a program of educator training that makes a commitment to develop transformative learning that eventually leads to a powerful and validating pedagogy.

The role of a powerful and validating pedagogy is essential in the development of student motivation and achievement. Finn & Voelkl (1993) argue that understanding student motivation early is essential for combatting issues of non-participation and dis-identification. This is supported by Villegas and Lucas (2002) who put forward the notion, that to engage students in the construction of knowledge, educators need to know about student experiences outside school. Gay (2002) reminds us that culturally responsive teaching places the onus on academics to be comfortable with the notion that they cannot teach what they do not know and whom they do not know, thus Gay (2002) educators need to have more than just mastery of content knowledge but also mastery of the student population.

Howard (2003) takes this thinking one step further and argues that academics cannot know their students if they do not know themselves, here Howard (2003) situates good pedagogy as part of a reflective process. Gay (2002) then builds on this notion and proposes that effective reflection can lead to educators being comfortable with the cultural characteristics and contributions of different ethnic groups. This is an important
process as self-reflection and cultural critical consciousness are essential in improving the achievement of students of diversity (Gay & Kirkland, 2003). Therefore, one of the first phenomena to be investigated was the process of self-reflection and content mastery:

“It’s important to be approachable, articulating your values, treating people with dignity, respect and being open to different experiences” (F12)

“I think the key elements are empathy and taking time to listen and understand” (F18)

“I try and sort of compensate and make sure I am checking people are alright, is this right for you, do you understand that?” (F2)

The respondents at this stage continually reflected on their environment and how their students were progressing. This research implies that current student understanding is very much based around pastoral support. In the view of Jenks et al., (2001) this is not appropriate and any understanding should be based on high expectations and achievements. In order to achieve this the research follows the view of Gay & Kirkland, (2003) who mention that high expectations and achievements should be based on thoroughly analysing and carefully monitoring both personal beliefs and instructional behaviours on the value of ethnic diversity.

As part of this research the academics interviewed placed emphasis on valuing and accepting difference as an essential aspect of the student and academic relationship, Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue that it is important for educators to understand the consequences of attitudes on student learning. Here the research mentions academics using their own backgrounds and beliefs to create relationships, which are based on trust and create a platform for ‘engaged’ learning. Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, (1999) mention that relationships “based on trust are a critical element for
educators developing pedagogical techniques” (p. 40), they give ethnically diverse
students structured opportunities to interact across cultural divisions. Villegas and
Lucas (2002) refer to this structured approach as “scaffolding diverse student learning”.

When ‘scaffolding’ is not structured into pedagogy this research suggests that
academics can make sweeping assumptions on the skills and passions that ethnically
diverse students have, this has already been discussed within the context of the
framework of Kumaravadivelu (2003), which is outlined in Table 12. These negative
perceptions significantly affect the quality of cultural interaction that academics have
with their students:

“An enormous amount of my students have no real passion for the subject [...] so
now I just send students away because nobody’s done any work.” (M1)

“The Chinese students like being boxed in; the UK students don’t like being boxed
in” (M7)

“They seem semi comfortable on regurgitating theory because they can memorise
it. When you memorise stuff you don’t have to understand it.” (M4)

In ignoring a ‘scaffolded’ approach academics are following a dogmatic and rigid
approach towards pedagogy development, Nieto (1999) argues that many educators fail
to recognise students’ “existing knowledge and the learning strategies that could help
them to achieve” (p. 99).

In a challenge of rigid pedagogy numerous authors (David & Kienzler, 1999;
Swartz, 1996) propose the need for an emancipatory pedagogy to break the vicious
cycle of privilege. Swartz (1996) argues that when “students and educators are regularly
exposed to the hegemony of Eurocentric master-scripting through ‘languaged’ vehicles
(oral and written pedagogy)” they continue to produce writings which continue to
establish the status quo thereby limiting the life chances of some students while
privileging the life chances of others (Swartz, 1996). In order to break this cycle David and Keinzler (1999) propose that within an emancipatory pedagogy the focus for the academic is to create pedagogy which is open-ended, looks at course material from multiple perspectives, and has a focus on critical reflection not on what’s right or wrong.

An opposing view to this is the view of Dimitriadis & McCarthy (1999) who argue that pedagogy for ethnically diverse students should be more critical with the emphasis on students obtaining a “political education”, they argue that this type of critical awareness gives students the skills, ability and awareness to fight indoctrination. This is a highly politicised view and while it may highlight the issues of rigid pedagogy and Eurocentric hegemony, this type of pedagogy development does not stop educators having a tendency to fall back on negative stereotypes as evidenced in the research above. In moving this debate forward Sabry and Bruna (2007) propose the need to develop relevant and appropriate instruction, which needs to be embedded in critical reflection and multicultural consciousness.

A multicultural consciousness can help to foster school and community relationships creating an environment where academics make an effort to understand student behaviour and how this can bring tangible understanding to the academic in the way they develop pedagogy:

“Many Chinese students don’t understand the concept of continuous assessment. If I say this is not assessed they just switch off, no assessment, no reward, off!” (F7)

“I am now basically telling them what to do, whereas I'm of the opinion that you need to develop as an independent thinker” (M21)

“You can’t help but to be influenced by your own experiences so that is something that I would want people to feel comfortable within my classes and then I think that
In the development of pedagogy there were a couple of issues raised, firstly academics raised the issue of student motivation towards assessment and secondly there were issues around student confidence and ability. To meet this challenge, Swartz (1996) mentions that during the creation and delivery of assessments students should be exposed to curriculum material that is multicultural by nature (Banks, 1995; Howard, 2003; McGee Banks & Banks, 1995; Ngambi, 2008; Pittman, 2007), this links to the view that students do not engage if they feel the subject does not provide value and they are not given appropriate opportunities to demonstrate what they know (Higbee, Siaka, et al., 2007). In addition to this know Higbee, Siaka, et al., (2007)argue that students of ethnicity should be allowed to develop their learning within a culturally sensitive assessment environment to help them build confidence.

Critics of culturally responsive teaching such as D’Souza (1995) argue that in scenarios such as this, the ethnically diverse student is receiving preferential treatment and is benefitting from their ‘victim’ status. Gay (2000) rejects this notion and argues that it is giving students access to tools to make learning simple and more efficient and to empower students in the teaching and learning process.

In the view of Gay (2000) when diverse students are given a chance, when confidence is placed in them and when they feel that academics believe they can succeed in learning tasks they will be much more motivated and willing to pursue success until mastery is achieved. When this understanding has been developed, the role of the academic is to create a platform that allows students to blossom and achieve this mastery:
At this stage of the research the data suggests that academics try to make a conscious effort to understand and support their students through various engagement techniques. In the view of Gay (2000), ethnically diverse students can only achieve mastery of the subject if they engage in the learning process. Engagement and student understanding are two characteristics which are essential in helping students from diverse backgrounds achieve, however these need to be designed and scaffolded into a multicultural curriculum, they cannot occur in a vacuum (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

In the view of Beekes (2006) students from a ethnically diverse background are often reluctant to participate in classroom discussion; therefore building student understanding is not an easy task. Within this scenario, academics should be aware that many ethnically diverse students are better prepared for self-directed study; they are not comfortable with responding in an instantaneous fashion and therefore are often reluctant to contribute in class if they fear producing the wrong answer and thereby ‘losing face’ (Beekes, 2006; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006). One proposal put forward by Beekes (2006) to help students to engage is the use of technological innovations such as PRS (Personal Response) systems to allow deep learning to take place.
In closing the discussion around this theme the research takes into account the views of eleven different academics. This theme is different from the other discussions so far; there is no dominant narrative with academics having their own views on the most effective ways of developing student engagement and understanding. Figure 7.7 outlines this in diagrammatic form:

![Strongest voice within Student understanding](image)

**Figure 7.7: Multiple voices within student understanding**

The majority of the views outlined by the voices in Figure 7.7 had mixed views on the need for student understanding. The data collected as part of this research suggests that academics in UK Business Schools struggle to engage and understand
students from different backgrounds. In order to tackle this issue Dee (2005) recommends the need for institutions to employ ethnic minority staff who can better relate to students of diversity. In the view of D’Souza (1991) this is a self-defeating act as it continues to perpetuate a victim mentality in diverse students. This is a controversial process but this research suggests that there are various approaches utilised by academic members of staff in trying to understand their students, these approaches include implementing assessment through group work, reflecting on their own practice and developing tasks and learning opportunities that are scaffolded in student culture. The negative aspect is that sometimes these approaches are underpinned by negative stereotypes and academic assumptions (Table 12).

Within this theme the research proposes that there is a need for student understanding which supports the creation of a culturally responsive pedagogy. However, within this theme the majority of the academics interviewed regarded student understanding as superfluous and something that got in the way of the transmission of material, therefore, the first challenge will be getting academics to think and reflect upon their own beliefs and behaviours before the issue of pedagogy is tackled.

7.5 Chapter summary

Thereby in closing this chapter the research has identified three themes under cultural consciousness. The data suggests that for academics to build a comprehensive understanding of their students and to help their students engage within the teaching and learning process they need to develop what is defined by Kirkland & Gay (2003) as a ‘multicultural consciousness’. Within this concept of Cultural consciousness this research proposes that academics can no longer just rely on a rigid and inflexible pedagogy underpinned by wide ranging assumptions as discussed by Kumaravadivelu (2003), there is scope to develop wide ranging pedagogy that acknowledges that
academics have a big part to play in the success and achievement of ethnically diverse students. This research echoes the work of Gay (2002) who mentions that educators need to have knowledge about ethnic diversity that goes beyond a mere awareness of, respect for, and general recognition of the fact that ethnic groups have different values or express similar values in various ways.

In developing a cultural consciousness this research has studied the view of a number of respected authors, for example Swartz (1996) proposes for the need to create assessment that resonates with students of diversity. Whereas Gay (2002) argues that educators need to have specific knowledge about the cultural particularities of specific ethnically groups, which makes schooling more engaging and representative. In the view Dee (2005) this does not go far enough and hence there should be an implementation of policies and procedures, which focus on employing academics from different backgrounds to better understand students of ethnic diversity. What is clear within the research is that all educators need to have the necessary training in educational diversity and the skills to develop cultural reflection before they are allowed to teach classes, thereby placing culturally responsive teaching at the heart of the teaching process (Nieto, 1999; Gay, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

7.5.1 Closing of the loop

In conclusion this research suggests that many academics lack the skills to develop ethnically diverse teaching methods, hence when they are faced with a ‘culturally different’ dilemma they tend to fall-back on methods of teaching they are comfortable with. Hence in closing the loop for this chapter Table 13 outlines how the objectives identified at the start of the chapter have been met.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1</strong></td>
<td>This research suggests that academics struggle to identify their role within the teaching process. This problem is exacerbated by a lack of confidence and skills in engaging with diverse students. This is a training issue that can be rectified through educator training and reflection to support the creation of pedagogy that is validating and affirming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3</strong></td>
<td>In meeting this objective this research argues that academic perceptions and attitudes change depending on the classroom dynamic. Current teaching practices do not take this fluid dynamic into consideration and there is a focus on a “bolt-on” approach to teaching. Within this approach culture is seen as an additional element, which is not part of mainstream teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4</strong></td>
<td>Current learning climates are manufactured to support the predominately white mainstream male student population (Turner, 2006). There have been many attempts by academics to develop climates of learning, which have been hampered by issues of confidence, training and support. Where a climate has been created this tends to focus on pastoral support and care as opposed to issues of pedagogy, teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Achievement of objectives for Pillar 1

In closing this research argues that there are varying complex issues of cultural consciousness, and the different elements that academics need to be comfortable within this concept to support and teach ethnically diverse students. The findings and the contribution to knowledge is discussed in more detail in Chapter 12.
Chapter 8
Resources for Learning (Pillar Two)

8.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines and explores the methods and mechanisms adopted in the creation, development and usage of resources by Business School academics for students of ethnic diversity. This chapter draws specifically on the research of Gay (2000) who defines culturally responsive teaching as a “concept that encompasses multiple pedagogical tasks such as the learning context, instructional techniques and performance assessments” (p.31). This chapter intends to utilise this definition in discussing the importance of creating resources and instructional techniques, which are validating and affirming for students of ethnic diversity. In exploring these mechanisms this chapter intends to achieve the following objectives:

- O2: To analyse current methods and techniques in pedagogy development for ethnically diverse students.
- O3: To investigate academic perceptions and attitudes in the creation of pedagogy for students from a ethnically diverse background.

For a detailed mapping process please refer to Table 11.

In continuing to develop this concept two themes have been identified that dominated this area of the research, they are; diverse content resource design and transformative academic knowledge. These two themes are illustrated in Figure 8.1: Resources for learning key themes. In the development of this section the research first discusses the view of Ruiz (1991) who argues that the majority of text book authors are heavily influenced by authors from the West and in particular Europe, hence the content of these books is still predominately targeted at ‘white’ European and American students. This outlines the importance of good and fair resource design. In the view of
Gay (2000), resource design is essential as curriculum content is crucial to academic performance and is an essential component of culturally responsive teaching. Thus this chapter focuses on trying to identify the importance of creating cultural resources for learning, which support ethnically diverse students.

In developing the discussion around these two themes, the research first examines the role of the academic in creating and propagating **diverse content resource design**. This requires academics to have the confidence to be able to navigate through a range of diverse resources and identify what is best for their students. Secondly this research discusses the importance of academics having the ability, training and support to create resources that are supportive of culturally diverse teachers, therefore allowing them to have **transformative academic knowledge**.

![Figure 8.1: Resources for learning key themes](resources.png)

**8.2 Diverse resource design**

The acquisition of a knowledge base around cultural diversity is only useful if this is utilised to create culturally responsive curriculum designs and instructional strategies (Gay, 2000, 2002; Stein, 2000). Many educators have a mastery of content knowledge, but a struggle to scaffold this knowledge within a culturally diverse environment. There are contrasting views about how this can be achieved, Nieto (1999)
takes the view that academics should take a “pro-active approach in building respect and understanding about other cultures” (p. 144), this should then be used as a baseline to help develop academic confidence and ability in applying this knowledge to everyday teaching and learning.

In taking a pro-active approach and helping to shape this theme Figure 8.2 outlines the main elements which influence the way that academics construct and create resources for their students. The main thing attribute of this theme is that good resource design is not solely attributed to mastery of content knowledge. This research suggests that an academic should have passion for the subject they teach and see themselves as an agent of change in the lives of their students. This is the first diagram which moves across the higher order codes as outlined in the final template appendix D3.
Figure 8.2: Multiple voices within diverse resource design
Figure 8.2 suggests that for academics to be able to develop diverse resources they must take a broader view which incorporates more than just the classroom but acknowledges student backgrounds and history. In the view of Gay (2002) this view needs be built through periodic training offered by the institution to help educators offer and deliver culturally diverse teaching. This is based on the premise that good resource design is not solely based on repeating one or two words in a student’s language nor is it celebrating an activity or singing a song related to their culture (Schapper & Mayson, 2004), it is about having the ability to translate knowledge from multiple contexts and make it relevant to ethnically diverse students (Pittman, 2007; Sabry & Bruna, 2007).

One method put forward by Stein (2000) to facilitate the translating of knowledge from multiple contexts is multimodal pedagogy, in the view of Stein (2000) this is an ideal mechanism to transform what students of diversity know, remember, sense, feel, and believe into meaningful content and knowledge. This is a view that is also supported by Traxler (2009) who views multimodal channels as the ideal flexible mechanism to help students build their own knowledge representations either through technology or through two or more semiotic systems. Anstey & Bull (2010) define the five key semiotic systems as linguistic, visual, aural, gestural and spatial. The multimodal approach of allowing students to build their own knowledge representations is a flexible approach which views students as producers of knowledge, not just consumers (Gatimu, 2009; Traxler, 2009). This production of knowledge can be further enhanced through the use of multimedia technology, which allows content to be delivered across multiple media channels and technologies, and thereby expand the classroom (Anstey & Bull, 2010; Kukulska-Hulme & Traxler, 2005; Traxler, 2009).
The extension of the classroom across boundaries is a fundamental principle that acknowledges that there is a plurality of learning and teaching styles (Ladson-Billings, 1995b). The utilisation of multi modal technologies within this context define it is as a natural mechanism for disseminating and using culturally responsive teaching resources (Stein, 2000). There are however still recurring issues of quality and the perception that courses offer an almost exclusively Anglo-centric view and in many cases this view is presented as if it were universal (J. Ryan, 2000). The issue with this type of approach as discussed by Ryan (2000) is that many ethnically diverse students complain that what they are being taught will be of limited value to them when they return to their own culture.

Amid these complaints many educators have become complacent about the resources they implement and have continued to implement pedagogy that has a dominant western narrative and flavour (Giroux, 1992, 2004; Y. Turner, 2006). In order to broaden the worldview of academics, Stein (2000) proposes the need for educators to understand different communities and how they prioritise and implement different semiotic modes. Stein (2000) gives the example of Black South African students who emphasise knowledge transmission primarily through oral, gestural, and musical modes of communication as opposed to literacy. These were discussed with the academics:

“I try to give them some examples from different cultural backgrounds.” (F17)

“I try not to use things that are culturally bound, it’s like an English joke doesn’t translate into a lot of cultures” (F2)

“When creating resources I want that they can have an appreciation of it, that they can relate it to their other experiences, cultures” (M3)
“Chinese students love talk and chalk, they like it being up on the board fact, fact, fact, the UK and EU students would just fall asleep.” (F7)

There was a sense of trying to bridge the gap between knowledge transmission and cultural resources. This type of scenario is not uncommon, and Stein (2000) argues that academics who want to engage their students need to reconceptualise representation in the classroom; the classroom is after all a semiotic space in which students are the agents of their own meanings (Stein, 2000). In the research of Beverly (2003) she suggests that the classroom as a dynamic semiotic space is often under-utilised and underrepresented as a place to bring the culture of the students into the curriculum.

The research also suggests that there is a undercurrent of anxiety with academics acknowledging that not enough was being done in the development of classroom spaces and literature which acknowledged different culturally diverse backgrounds. Though the research of students are the agents of their own meanings (Stein, 2000). In the research of Beverly (2003) there is an acknowledgement that attempts were made to implement literature that represented the background lives of some students into the classroom, this was often not enough. There was a perception that literature which contained characters from their students’ ethnic, cultural and racial group was often found in meaningful and good urban teaching.

This research suggests that an effort was made to try and develop differing teaching methods to allow students to engage with the material within their own comfort zones:

“If you give out your case studies before-hand, nobody reads it, nobody’s answered any questions, and they just want to sit there while you spoon feed them.”(M1)
“I try and put support materials onto Blackboard, it might be videos, it might be links to papers, and links to articles, so yes I think it’s accessible.” (M3)

“I said alright go, take a text book, read about this type of research method, if it is not clear come and see me and we will talk about it, but I want you to read it.” (F13)

“I would give the students articles to read and then in the morning everyone is sat there and it’s time to discuss the article, I say have you read it? But you ask yourself why do you need to do that because always the English people read, the Europeans always read, who didn’t read, the Libyans, the Nigerians, the Pakistanis, the Chinese they didn’t read.” (F14)

Here the research identifies two key elements which form part of resource design and implementation. Firstly there are characteristics of multimodal pedagogy design as discussed by Stein (2000) and Anstey and Bull (2010) in interview M3. Secondly the research identifies frustrations about students not following clear instructions on the usage of resources; this is especially evident in interviews M1 and F14. The latter two academics seem to be quite animated in discussing the lack of skills that many ethnically diverse students come to UK higher education with. While this theme does not investigate the lack of skills, this again amplifies the Eurocentric view discussed by Ryan (2000) regarding how curriculum content and pedagogy advantages the Eurocentric learner.

In discussing these frustrations with the academics there were no real answers or solutions, Gay (2000) identifies these frustrations as a training issue and argues that this stems from academics having a lack of background knowledge about their students. Therefore Gay (2000) puts forward the proposal that this background knowledge is essential in the composition of curriculum content and is central to the empowerment of students. However there are still issues around quality and rigour
(Ryan, 2000) in the composition of curriculum content. To build quality and rigour, Gaffney (2008) proposes wholesale changes in the collection of student thoughts and reflections, he argues that traditional ethnographic approaches are no longer suitable for understanding what students think and feel and the focus should now shift to encouraging more qualitative programme evaluations. This in the view of Gaffney (2008) gets to the heart of the issues that many students face and identifies many of the problems that they come across. This process is about listening to their students and trying to understand their needs and resource requirements. However for some academics the process of listening was difficult:

“*What does it matter if the real life example is something they don’t particularly know very much about? It almost about fussiness*” (M1)

“They didn’t want you to talk at all except from a book” (F8)

“I can push them a little bit, but then, I respect that well you don’t want to be pushed, end of the story, you do what you prefer to do” (F13)

During the reflexive process the researcher at this stage sensed a lot of frustration emanating from academics in relation to how students engage and also about student expectations. MI1 again is foremost in articulating this frustration. Here the research suggests that the majority of the academics interviewed had issues in developing or procuring resources that were appropriate for ethnically diverse students. This is a common problem with frustrations typically centring on language and skills (Gatimu, 2009; Rubie-Davies et al., 2006).

This frustration is exacerbated through the perception that students who struggle to subscribe to the dominant western view are part of the ‘other’ (Tomalin, 2007; J. H. Turner, 2006). The frustration displayed above could be borne from a
variety of variables, in the view of Gay (2000) this frustration could stem from the fact that culturally diverse content is derived from a variety of sources and many of these exist outside the formal boundaries of schooling. Academics need to extend these boundaries and read content and material outside of their immediate comfort zone otherwise they may have trouble developing culturally responsive resources (Gay, 2000). As discussed earlier many academics lack confidence and reflection skills (Rynes & Quinn Trank, 1999) in creating culturally diverse pedagogy, this lack of confidence allows academics by default to ‘fall-back’ on what they know and have always done. To overcome these challenges, Beverly (2003) proposes the need for educators to acknowledge the contributions made by different ethnic groups to history, science and maths and to ensure that curriculum content and material encourages scope for discussion on diversity issues. In addition, Ngambi (2008) mentions the need for academics to read widely across multiple disciplines and backgrounds to obtain a flavour of different issues and themes.

In closing this theme this research again looks at the dominant voices that came out of the research and also for any underlying narratives. The key thing to notice here is that out of the twenty-two academics interviewed, only eight voiced an opinion on the development of cultural resources:
The research within Figure 8.3 suggests that many academics are uncomfortable with creating and designing resources that do not match a current western pedagogical framework. These feelings are exacerbated by the fact that for the creation of diverse content resources academics need to widen their reading and acknowledge multiple backgrounds in the classroom. This is a process of reconceptualization where the formal boundaries of education are starting to become fluid and dynamic (Stein, 2000). The accusation that mainstream education is an oppressive tool (Freire, 2000) would no longer be valid with educators no longer pushing a dominant Anglo-centric view. This opens up ways of knowing that are no longer wholly occupied by students in the centre (mainstream students) with students from the periphery (ethnically diverse students) also benefitting (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013).
However, students from the periphery can only fully benefit if the curriculum content is meaningful to these students and helps improve their learning (Gay, 2000). When this was not adequately carried out, the research suggests that educators became frustrated. When this does occur, rather that ‘giving up’ on the student, Ngambi (2008) suggests the need for academics to continually reflect on the curriculum content and materials they utilise, and for academics to be clear about their teaching philosophy.

8.3 Transformative academic knowledge

The second theme identified within this pillar is “transformative academic knowledge”. In defining this stream the research takes the view of Banks (1995) and McGee Banks & Banks (1995) who define transformative academic knowledge as educators helping their students to acquire new perspectives on culture, history and academic content. (Banks, 1995, 2001) advocates a transformative academic knowledge approach as essential in helping organisations and academics to develop perspectives and content that is suitable for ethnically diverse students.

This theme is differentiated from diverse resource design, as it emphasises the influence of academic knowledge and life perspectives on academics’ resource creation and implementation. This is in contrast to the previous theme, which had a focus on implementation and conversion of knowledge into the classroom through the use of multiple pedagogical methods. This is outlined in Figure 8.4, which also outlines the importance of the transformative academic getting to know their students and understanding their needs and requirements:
Figure 8.4: Influential themes for the Transformative academic
Figure 8.4 illustrates that the transformative academic also needs to develop understanding of student backgrounds and how they integrate into higher education. There is a suggestion here that academic knowledge is not enough; the transformative academic has the ability to give this knowledge context. In order to investigate this further the research on this theme attempted to identify the academic perspectives of different ethnic groups and their learning styles:

“I’m kind of very aware about the different learning styles. I always try to have something that is going to appeal to different styles of learners.” (F2)

“The majority of Chinese students work immensely hard and I know that they are listening to what I am saying and I suppose I have to adapt my teaching” (F11)

“At the start I try to find out a little bit about them, who they are and where they are from. It’s easy to see Chinese students as Chinese, but China is such a big country, there’s different regions and provinces and cities, background and experiences.” (M18)

At this juncture the research identifies that there is currently a small but positive trend in relation to academics making an effort to understand student backgrounds and using this to create consistent pedagogical resources. For this to continue to grow and improve, Nieto (1999) and Gay (2000) argue for wholesale institutional and organisational change. This is however increasingly an uphill struggle with the academic community in the UK finding themselves increasingly faced with a diverse student population, but often with very little support, training and resources (Oikonomidoy, 2010; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006). Tomalin (2007) does not advocate a revolutionary approach that involves institutional and organisational change, but is of the view that many higher education institutions have a lack of clarity and strategic focus and hence output poor quality culturally diverse resources and support to academics at a faculty and
In moving this debate forward, Banks (1995) proposes a holistic definition of the transformative academic. He argues that a transformative academic should acknowledge and consider the cultural heritage and contribution of ethnically diverse students to a country’s social and economic development (Nieto, 1999), and implement this within the classroom (Gay, 2002). This is a view shared by Joy and Poonamallee (2013) who argue that too often western management education is seen as the leading light and anything else is constructed as antiquated and “pre-scientific”. This negative view of other cultures and history then leads to specific branches of knowledge being re-contextualised within a western conceptual framework of modern management. This research is of the view that rejecting historical contributions to a field from a diverse culture negates the contribution of that culture and their history and heritage.

In rejecting this view of rewriting specific aspects of a country’s history to support the current western narrative, this research takes the view of Gorski (1997) who argues that good resource design that has been implemented as part of the pedagogy needs to contain contributions that represent the international context of the student community. This pedagogy needs to be supported by institutions that allow academics to develop a perspective that helps them to probe strengths and weaknesses of curriculum design and instructional materials (Avery & Thomas, 2004; Gay, 2000; Rynes & Quinn Trank, 1999). In order to investigate this phenomenon, the concept of academic curriculum freedom and also resource design based on student background was discussed with the respondents:

“I predominately now teach Chinese and Indian students, so there shouldn’t be any academics around now that are not familiar with multicultural examples and material aids.” (F22)
“I am very sensitive to different cultures and ensuring that I don’t offend somebody, and something that I did at Christmas I realised that actually it did not work at all because it was so culture related and around Christmas.” (F2)

“I try and use materials that the different experience people have had, and I was going to say the different perspectives that I think they have on things.” (M3)

“I do try to incorporate as many multicultural examples as I can throughout my teaching.” (F22)

“I don’t know why but very often Europeans just stick with Europeans and those students from Africa will stick with those from Africa” (F6)

This aspect discusses different approaches to the development of transformative academic knowledge. Here there is a correlation with the view of Vita (2001) who proposes that Business School academics need to be comfortable with multiple teaching styles and multiple learning styles (Kolb & Kolb, 2005; Yamazaki, 2005). This research acknowledges a small amount of evidence which suggests that students from different backgrounds are starting to be viewed from a more positive perspective. This positive perception is important for students of ethnic diversity, with research suggesting (Banks, 2008; Black, 2010; Gay, 2002; Leese, 2010) that a negative portrayal of ethnic groups and poor climate development leads to culturally diverse groups having self-esteem and trust issues. A transformative academic creates a positive perception of students, which allows for greater student engagement within the classroom.

In closing this theme this research again looks at the dominant voices that came out of the research and for any underlying narratives. The key thing to notice here is that out of the twenty-two academics interviewed, only six voiced an opinion on learning styles and the creation of resources based on student background and history:
Within this theme it was clear that many academics struggled to discuss this topic, this is evidenced by the omission of so many interviewees in Figure 8.5. Having transformative academic knowledge in the view of Banks (2001) means having the courage and conviction to challenge mainstream academic knowledge. This research suggests that for many academics the influx of international and ethnically diverse students is a phenomenon that is perplexing and requires additional support from institutions in creating transformative academics (Kellner, 1998; Sleeter, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).
8.4 Chapter summary

This chapter has identified two key themes under cultural resources. Both these themes are underpinned by the work of Nieto (1999), Gay (2000) and Villegas and Lucas (2002) who suggest it is not enough to just say one or two words in a student’s language and assume that this is enough to move towards having culturally responsive resources, there needs to be a consistent approach that has the support of the institution. Consistency is a problem which this research has identified as a major issue in the creation and development of culturally diverse resources. In order to achieve consistency Sabry and Bruna (2007) and Ngambi (2008) propose that academics should undertake professional development that helps them to identify and teach against whatever remaining stereotypes may exist in textbooks and curricular materials.

8.4.1 Closing of the loop

In conclusion, this research suggests that many academics lack the confidence, skills and institutional support to develop awareness of multiple resource design within transformative academic knowledge. Hence in closing the loop for this chapter Table 14 outlines how the objectives identified at the start of the chapter have been met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2</strong></td>
<td>In meeting the requirements of objective two it is clear that many academics struggle to develop consistent materials across multiple resource design approaches. This inconsistency is then underpinned by a lack of training and institutional support in the creation and implementation of resources. This research argues that academics need to have the skills, confidence and ability to analyse resources and define which ones are appropriate for their current methods and techniques, in this research many academics struggled with this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 3

In meeting the requirements of objective three, the research showed that academic perceptions and attitudes can change towards ethnically diverse students through a process of understanding and critiquing of existing stereotypes and diversity in textbooks (Gay, 2000; Sabry & Bruna, 2007).

Table 14: Achievement of objectives for Pillar 2

In meeting these objects, the research argues that the overall quality and treatment of ethnically diverse groups and their experiences continues to be inadequate within textbooks and case studies (Gay, 2000; Ngambi, 2008), which is particularly problematic considering the influence textbooks have on students. The dominance of textbooks and or Journal articles for higher education increases as students advance in their education and this domination is perceived as authenticity and absolute truth (Gay, 2000).

In conclusion, this research argues that there are differing complex issues that underpin the development of cultural resources. Academics need to have the ability to critique, design, and implement multidimensional resources, which will require them to step out of their comfort zone. The development of resources in a culturally responsive pedagogy is essential in helping students to relate to content that is meaningful to them and hence improve their learning (Gay, 2000)
Chapter 9
Moral Responsibility (Pillar three)

9.1 Introduction

This chapter explores and investigates the expectations of higher education academics towards students of ethnic diversity. In establishing this section, the research takes the view of Villegas and Lucas (2002) and Jabbar and Hardaker (2013) who discuss moral responsibility as a mechanism for empowering and safeguarding the interests of ethnically diverse students even though it may clash with the interests of the Higher Education Business School. Within the context of moral responsibility, Villegas and Lucas (2002) emphasise commitment, they view educators as moral actors who are committed to changing and facilitating the growth and development of their students. Thus this chapter intends to identify the importance of academics having a moral responsibility towards their ethnically diverse students. This chapter intends to frame the discussion within the following objectives:

- **O1** - To explore the role of the Business School Academic and the higher education institution in the development of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students.
- **O3**: To investigate academic perceptions and attitudes in the creation of pedagogy for students of an ethnically diverse background.

For a detailed mapping process please refer to Table 11.

Through the process of template analysis (Figure 6.1, Appendix D) this research identifies three key themes that influenced the way academics help their students to achieve and attain. In identifying the three themes, the data suggests that academics need to develop internal processes, which would help them to support students of diversity. Within the first theme the data identifies that academics should have passion...
not just for their subject matter, but also for the students they teach. This passion is then the foundation on which academics develop expectations of their students. This research argues that academics should have **high expectations** for the students they teach and should only expect the very best, this is essential when developing a culturally responsive pedagogy. High expectations and passion embody what Villegas and Lucas (2002) refer to as being an **agent of change**, an educator who puts the needs of their students before the needs of the institution for which they work. Figure 9.1 visualises these three key themes, which the data suggests are dominant within a moral responsibility framework. In the view of this research, these three themes help to explore and identify how academics perceive their students of ethnic diversity.

![Figure 9.1: Key themes of moral responsibility](image)

9.2 Passion

The first sub-theme identified within the theme of moral responsibility is academics having the passion to see their students succeed. To provide context, this research starts by discussing passion within the context of achievement and personal wellbeing. Vallerand and Houlfort (2003) define passion as a “strong inclination or desire for success in a specific activity or task” (p. 176), Carbonneau, Vallerand, Fernet, & Guay (2008) agree with this but add that within the context of education, sincere passion for success also allows educators to derive psychological wellbeing and satisfaction, this
satisfaction in the view of Carbonneau et al., (2008) can only be obtained if educators have an emotional attachment towards their students and their teaching. These definitions equate passion to the success of something or someone you care about deeply.

In order to visualise this data around passion and to identify the key influential nodes within this sub-theme, in Figure 9.2 the researcher outlines the key elements of passion as identified within the collected data. The data suggests that currently there is an emphasis on pastoral care with little or no attention paid to high expectations. In the view of Jussim (1989) these low expectations may become a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is further suggested by Van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, & Holland, (2010), in many instances educator expectations can be negatively influenced by prejudices and previous experiences.
Figure 9.2: Key nodes that influence academic Passion
Figure 9.2 outlines the importance of pastoral support in creating passion, Day (2004) agrees and argues that passion is “not a luxury, a frill, or a quality possessed by just a few teachers. It is essential to all good teaching” (p.11). In an extension of this viewpoint, Carbonneau et al., (2008) equate teaching and passion closely with a strong sense of identity, Carbonneau et al., (2008) give this example of educators: “they don’t merely say that they teach: they are teachers”. Passion is essential in the teaching realm and research suggests that passionate teachers have a positive influence on their students’ achievement and attainment (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Day, 2004; Elliott & Crosswell, 2001).

In developing this research further, Vallerand & Houlfort (2003) and Carbonneau et al., (2008) mention that there are two types of passion; harmonious and obsessive. Harmonious passion in their view promotes positive intrapersonal outcomes related to perceived student outcomes, and obsessive passion occurs when educators become too closely aligned to activities and this then takes up a disproportionate space in their lives, to the detriment of other aspects. This research equates moral responsibility and culturally responsive teaching very much within the mould of harmonious passion in that it is a caring and responsible approach.

From a moral viewpoint, Gay (2002) argues that for educators caring is a moral imperative, a social responsibility and a pedagogical necessity, by taking this view within the research there is a reasonable assumption that there is a clear link between passion and responsibility. Academic passion and caring should, in the view of Villegas and Lucas (2002), be utilised to help educators develop their own personal vision of education and teaching. This vision should incorporate empathy and involve the promotion and development of caring for students of ethnically diverse backgrounds, and nurturing their own individual passions and idealism for making a
difference in students’ lives. The research of Ladson-Billings, (1995), Nieto (1999) and Gay (2000; 2002) suggests that educators should have a harmonious passion which contains elements of obsessive passion, it is through empathy that educators should care so much about ethnically diverse students and their achievement that they accept nothing less than high-level success from them and work diligently to accomplish it. Gay (2002) clarifies this position and argues this is not about the “gentle nurturing and altruistic concern” which can often lead to neglect under the guise of “let ethnically diverse students make their own way”, this is about making success happen and caring about their achievements.

Thus one of the most interesting aspects of this research was identifying academic responsibility and how this relates to passion:

“Understanding students from broken, disruptive family backgrounds, students who have parents going through divorces” (M3)

“Years ago it was because you were almost seen as a pastoral role” (M4)

“A lot of pastoral care and I’d like to think that is reflected on in the NSS surveys where I get ninety odd percent regularly” (M5)

“They think you are just an old nag, who’s got nothing better to do, you just want to shake them sometimes and say do you not realise this is the rest of your life” (F8)

What became quite clear quite early on within the interviews was the passion academics had for their subjects; this was made clear due to the animated discussions that took place on how they try to convey their teaching to the students. To achieve engagement within their subjects, in some cases academics adopted and nurtured informal relationships in what is a very formal classroom-based setting, this was especially evident in interviews M3 and M5. In the view of Banks (1995) and McGee
Banks & Banks (1995), pastoral care is an essential characteristic of good teachers; they define academics who integrate pastoral care and support alongside academic responsibility as “warm demanders”, they argue that these educators are the most effective teachers of ethnically diverse students. This is a view further developed by Gay (2000) who mentions that academics need to have a “caring attitude that is manifested in the form of teacher attitudes and expectations about students’ human values, intellectual capabilities and performance responsibilities” (p. 45). Turner (2006) commends this type of approach and mentions that in spite of classroom formality, many educators and ethnically diverse students engage in friendly extramural relationships, where the teacher acts as a personal mentor as well as an educator and disciplinarian. Within this area of the research there was a recurring trend of pastoral care and support, while Banks (1995) as mentioned above, refers to these academics as being ‘warm demanders’, Nieto (2000) disagrees with this approach by arguing that being nice is not enough; there must be a more concerted effort to get to know who your students are and what they need to do to achieve. A more obsessive passion is advocated by Nieto (1999) and Carbonneau et al., (2008).

In her research, Turner (2006) outlines some of the frustration that ethnically diverse students have in respect to their academics, revealing that many felt alienated from their field of study and found their academics unapproachable. Turner (2006) outlines the theory that this dissatisfaction was related to issues of cultural interfaces and communication exchanges not necessarily being clear. While this view is not fully supported by the academics interviewed, the data collected suggests an effort to engage, support and develop their ethnically diverse students while they are studying:

“I think you do need to have a passion to stay in academia. The passion means that you have a passion to teach” (M5)
“Yes, and I see and I try and sympathise, these are somebody’s children, and their parent’s expectations are on them” (F10)

“Yes both in terms of their academic goals, but also their kind of the other aspects of their lives” (F9)

Within this research it is evident that passion has manifested itself within pastoral support for the students with no real discussion about expectations, behaviours and capabilities (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In the view of Black (2010) this is very much a contribution-based approach to pedagogy, which is very superficial and always looks for a “quick fix”. However this is not always the case. In the data collection stage there was one academic (M3) who showed passion that went past the “contributions”-based approach and showed real intent and passion for the students they taught:

“You can’t treat everybody the same, and if you do try and treat everybody the same then it’s a crap experience for everybody I think” (M3)

“Giving them the feeling that you do care about them, they aren’t just a ‘flippin’ number, […] they are individuals and that they matter.” (M3)

“I think they gain a confidence from the experiences that you provide them with.” (M3)

This interview was very much in the minority and in comparison to the rest of the research went past pastoral support and embodied the kind of passion and caring proposed by Nieto (1999) and Gay (2000) which fell very much into what Black (2010) described as a “transformation approach” where there is an emphasis on developing the student and creating an environment of culturally responsive learning. In this scenario, the use of the words “crap” and “flippin” does not reflect the academic’s intention to be coarse, but to try and articulate the passion and the
responsibility this academic feels for his students. This was also displayed in relation to his body language; the academic was very forthright in his views and displayed elements of obsessive passion where educators are more aggressive in what they require from their students (Carbonneau et al., 2008).

Within this theme the views of six different academics have been represented. It is interesting to note that out of all the topics discussed, many academics grappled with the concept of passion and either viewed it through the lens of pastoral support or as the responsibility of university services such as student support. Only M3 outlined passion as a responsibility of the academics, the differing voices are outlined in Figure 9.3 below:

![Figure 9.3: Loudest Voices for Academic Passion](Image)
Figure 9.3 suggests that M3 had the loudest voice within this theme and displayed high levels of passion for the students he teaches. There seems to be a lot of focus by this academic on creating meaningful experiences; this is not reflected in the same way by the other academics who view passion as pastoral support. In summarising this theme Nieto (1999) argues that passion is aptly described as caring for and developing the ethnically diverse student. However in the view of Nieto (1999) true passion starts with academics treating ethnically diverse students as capable learners with a focus on the individual not on the homogeneous group, this was found to be relevant especially in interview three. Gay (2000) mentions that academics who show passion towards their students help them to feel empowered and engaged; this empowerment translates into academic competence, personal confidence, courage and the will to act.

9.3 High Expectations

The second sub-theme identified as part of the moral responsibility theme is high expectations, here the research analyses the expectations academics have for students of diversity. Moral responsibility is concerned with empowering students, and for educators to achieve this there must be an acknowledgement that culturally responsive teaching is action oriented in that it demonstrates high expectations (Gay, 2002; Nieto, 1999; Rubie-Davies et al., 2006). This is a view that is further discussed by Black (2010) who frames high expectations as very much a ‘social action’ approach that facilitates student exploration of multiple perspectives. In order to visualise the data on passion and to identify the key influential nodes within this sub-theme, in Figure 9.4 the researcher outlines the key elements of high expectations as identified within the collected data.
Figure 9.4: Key Nodes that influence academics expectations
Figure 9.4 outlines the importance of educators understanding student background and behaviour; this is the foundation on which high expectations are built. Banks (1993) and (Ladson-Billings, 1995b) propose that understanding student background is an important variable in the creation of high expectations; other variables include close monitoring of student progress and positive integration into higher education. In the view of Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) high expectations should not be taken for granted; within many scenarios ethnically diverse students inherit low academic expectations based upon academic perceptions that are invariably based on an individual’s background, history, colour and ethnicity. This is a problem that in the view of Bhatti (2011) needs remedying urgently, Bhatti argues that when educators have high expectations for their students this can act as a catalyst for their students having positive experiences and better relationships with those educators.

In taking this discussion forward, research (Connor et al., 2004; Rubie-Davies et al., 2006; Van den Bergh et al., 2010) suggests that academic expectations can also have an effect on student achievement. This is further discussed by Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) who mention “there is clear evidence that expectations do exist in regular classroom situations and that they can positively and/or negatively influence student performance” (p, 429). This is further broken down into two categories: firstly the ‘sustaining expectation’ effect and secondly the ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’ effect. Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) outline the ‘sustaining expectation’ effect as occurring when educators perceive and expect that students will continue to behave, act or perform according to previous patterns and trends. Within this type of approach educators tend to disregard contradictory evidence of change. Thus a self-fulfilling prophecy effect occurs when educators have the capacity to create change in student
performance. This is distinct from sustaining expectations, which tend to thwart the potential for change.

Thus, high expectations can be based on how academics push their students to achieve, and on creating an environment where academics can make a change to student progress and achievement (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999). In developing high expectations Nieto (1999) and Villegas and Lucas (2002) discuss the importance of creating specific strategies in developing student expectations, which include exposing students to an intellectually rigorous curriculum, teaching students strategies they can use to monitor their own learning, setting high performance expectations for students and consistently holding them accountable for meeting those expectations.

In the view of Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) and Van den Bergh et al., (2010) high expectations are essential in motivating ethnically diverse students to improve and achieve, Banks (1995) also emphasises the importance of high expectations in “explicitly teaching students the rules of power governing classroom interactions, and to create equal-status situations in the classroom.” This view proposed by Banks (1995) is highly politicised and it can be seen as controversial, however what it does highlight is that for many academics there are a myriad of issues and problems in developing high expectations:

“Tell the truth, what’s it like, incredibly frustrating […] you can’t develop the really good ones, because you are constantly trying to push the one’s up from the bottom”. (F7)

“I think in that sense the students know my expectations are very high, and the amount of work that they put in I put exactly the same amount in.” (F12)
“Across the world you have to go through that school of hard knocks but I expect them to be able to get back up and say bloody hell I know I can do this.”

(F20)

The interesting point within this section is the identification of resilience as a key variable within high expectations. During these interviews the academics’ body language and demeanour suggested that academics had to have resilience in developing not just their expectations but also the expectations of their students. In comparing these responses in light of the work of Nieto (1999), this research suggests that high expectations are underpinned by resilience but there also needs to be an emphasis on students monitoring their own learning (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

The monitoring of learning alongside academic resilience falls under the self-fulfilling prophecy effect as discussed by Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) the self-fulfilling prophecy effect in the view of Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) can have a positive (Galatea) effect or a negative (Golem) effect, in both cases Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) take the view that Galatea and Golem effects are directly influenced by high or low teacher expectations. The Swann Report (1985) supports the work of Rubie-Davies et al. (2006) in this regard and one of the major findings of their report was that low expectations of ethnically diverse students were a major factor in their poor academic achievement.

Low expectations is an issue that has been discussed in a lot of depth by multiple authors (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; McGee Banks & Banks, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), this research suggests that low expectations can be linked to academics giving a high level of pastoral care and support to their students, as Nieto (1999) argues, kind words are not enough, there needs be affirmative action. This research argues that continuous focus on pastoral care and support does not address issues of pedagogy, this is articulated in interview F7 where
the academic details the struggles encountered in trying to develop student expectations and is becoming frustrated in their endeavours. In the view of this research, this is because the academic continues to perpetuate teaching methods and curriculum that are not appropriate for ethnically diverse students. This conflicts with the view of Villegas & Lucas (2002) who argue that the development of culturally responsive teaching needs to be underpinned by an intellectually rigorous curriculum and diverse teaching strategies.

The issue of appropriateness is covered also by Banks (1995), Turner (2006) and Tomalin (2007) who are of the view that the main problem for many academics is that mainstream academic knowledge is heavily influenced by a western paradigm; this view then has an influence on the pedagogical methods developed by academics. When these western pedagogical methods are not working for ethnically diverse students this has contributed to the academics’ feelings of helplessness and frustration, as evidenced in interview F7. In the view of Ladson-Billings (1995a) feelings of helplessness and frustration are borne out of that fact that educators are lacking in cultural competence. This is a view also shared by Jenks, Lee, & Kanpol (2001) who point out that most educators continue to display common teaching practices that fail to address the diverse learning styles of their ethnically diverse students.

Thus, this research proposes that the challenge for many academics within this scenario is to overcome their frustrations and not allow them to affect the expectations they have of students of diversity and to display higher levels of cultural competency. In addition to this, Jenks et al., (2001) are of the view that academics need to refocus their energies and address issues of equity and excellence, which many educators may seem to perceive as non-issues. For many academics this may mean putting to one
side their own personal beliefs, behaviours and prejudices (Gay & Kirkland, 2003) and developing a rapport with an emphasis on student communication and engagement to overcome this. Developing a rapport for many academics was a responsibility which they fully tried to develop:

“It is how you communicate to your students, how you make them feel, how they are part of the teaching, how you view them after the teaching”. (F12)

“I think you’ve got the responsibility of giving them something that sets them up for the rest of their lives” (M3)

“I force them, with jokes and punishments” (F14)

“My personality is not naturally to be open and extrovert but as a lecturer I have to encourage those introverts to speak up and share experiences” (F22)

“As academics we need to have risk as part of our teaching” (F12)

As discussed earlier in the research there is an emphasis by many academics on developing rapport and engagement with their students. While Nieto (1999) argues that kind words are not enough and advocates the need for affirmative action, research also suggests that good teachers are approachable, genuine and humorous, this can be via jokes, ice breakers, personalities etc. (Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, & Saville, 2002; Schmeichel, 2011).

Buskist et al., (2002) analyse the view of high expectations from another perspective and argue that high quality teachers use their unique personal strengths to engage students in the teaching and learning process and are able to alter their teaching style and tailor their teaching tactics based on their environment. Buskist et al., (2002) define four key characteristics that are implemented by educators who can develop rapport:
• (a) Instil in their students a desire to learn
• (b) Help their students actually learn something about the subject matter
• (c) Help their students discover that what they are learning is interesting
• (d) Demonstrate to their students that learning in and of itself is enjoyable

The four characteristics of Buskist et al., (2002) frame teaching and high expectations through the lens of passion, responsibility and student engagement. This approach broadly fits within the view of this research and underlines the importance of creating engaging learning experiences and classroom interactions (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999). Tisdell (2009) takes this view further and argues that engagement as an experience should not just stop within the classroom but needs to be viewed as a spiritual process that connects multicultural content with the learner on a deeper level.

Within this research, staff and student interaction is very much classroom based and expectations are built on pastoral care and student engagement with very little spiritual interaction, this view was presented within this theme by six different academics as outlined in Figure 9.5:
Within this theme the views of the academics focussed primarily on pastoral support and student engagement. Here Bhatti (2011) talks about creating engagement through the process of social equity and justice. However, to create a process such as this requires risk, interview F12 talked a little bit about risk and was vocal in their views about this subject, however the majority of research suggested that academics tend to ‘play it safe’ (Gay, 2000; Sabry & Bruna, 2007), create pedagogy that they are comfortable with (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006) which affects their expectations of their students (Rubie-Davies et al., 2006).
9.4 Agent of Change

In the final sub-theme of moral responsibility this research investigates and explores the view of Villegas and Lucas (2002) who argue that educators are “moral actors whose job is to facilitate the growth and development of other human beings” (p. 24). Banks (1995) views this as a noble pursuit and refers to these academics as “transformative” because they help students to challenge current mainstream paradigms, findings and theories. In creating pedagogy that helps students to challenge mainstream paradigms, there is, in the view of this research, a certain amount of risk; this advocates a movement away from a traditional western dominated pedagogy (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004) towards a more culturally responsive approach (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Ngambi, 2008; Nieto, 1999; Schapper & Mayson, 2004). To illustrate this view and to identify the key aspects of this sub-theme Figure 9.6 outlines the key nodes:
Figure 9.6 Key Influences for Agents of change
Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue that risk should be a fundamental part of teaching, they argue that when academics undertake risk as part of developing a culturally responsive style then academics are displaying their commitment to act as ‘agents of change’ on behalf of their students. Villegas and Lucas (2002) define ‘agents of change’ as academics that go past the traditional pastoral support and extramural relationships and make success happen; this is similar to the ‘transformative’ academic concept as discussed by Banks (1995).

Villegas and Lucas (2002) and Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) argue that success and achievement can only happen if there is a moral dimension of education that guides educators in the development of their vision of education. Hence numerous researchers (Durden et al., 2014; Rubie-Davies et al., 2006; Schmeichel, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) suggest that ‘agents of change’ need to build relationships with their students that allow them to overcome challenges that are hierarchical and bureaucratic in nature. ‘Agents of change’, in the view of Villegas and Lucas (2002) have a moral obligation towards the students they teach, these obligations place them in a unique position to influence and develop their students in a positive way. However, in this research, some academics felt that making a difference in their students’ lives was becoming difficult:

“In previous years I could spend time with my students, get to know them on a personal level and then give them the very best support I could provide.” (M19)

“Education should be about an end product, but because it's got so many do’s and don'ts, you can’t do this, you can’t do that, why not?” (F7)

“One of the frustrations is that you do need to change things and you need to mix things up a little bit but it's not always possible, that's the problem” (M16)

This data hints at some of the pressures and stresses many academics face in their working lives, this is discussed in more detail in later chapters but this research
proposes that increased stress and pressures on academics affects their ability to meet their moral obligations, this is implied quite heavily in the quote from F7. Stress within this environment is a very real phenomenon, Kinman (2001) and Skaalvik & Skaalvik (2009) argue that professions that involve high levels of personal interaction, such as educators, experience some of the highest levels of job-related stress. These stress levels thereby impinge on academic moral responsibility. Interview M16 touches on this briefly and refers to organisational bureaucracy as frustrating, whereas interview M19 is referring to time pressures as the major problem, which again can be attributed to organisational bureaucracy.

These challenges, pressures and stresses have led many academics to feel that there has been a clear and consistent erosion of quality time spent with their ethnically diverse students. This has led many academics to have feelings that their moral responsibility towards these students is also being affected:

“I think you've got to build a relationship with them, I think you've got to show you are willing to listen and you are available and that is one of my big criticisms about the way we deal with things now, you don't have time to do this.” (F21)

“Traditionally you had a much more personal relationship with students, however the numbers were different, the courses were a lot smaller.” (M4)

“Indian students in particular they expect a much more personal relationship with you, that you are on demand and that you are available 24/7.” (F22)

Here the data suggests that there is a substantial negative shift in the quality of staff and student interaction. It can be argued that academic moral responsibility is being undermined by time and institutional pressures, which undermines student interaction and engagement which is vital to academic achievement (Reyes, Brackett, Rivers, White, & Salovey, 2012; Rubie-Davies et al., 2006). This research identifies a
clear degradation in the quality of the interaction, this is a view also shared Johnson, Crosnoe, & Elder Jr (2001) and Reyes et al., (2012) who suggest that if there is degradation in the quality of interaction this can affect student achievement. Interview F22 discusses an interesting concept by proposing that many ethnically diverse students want to have a pastoral relationship with their educators but in many cases this is not reciprocated. Johnson et al., (2001) argue that in general culturally diverse groups are less embedded in schools and have a “less close” relationship with their educators.

In the view of this research there are multiple elements that can be blamed for this degradation, Rynes & Quinn Trank (1999) and Singh (2011) blame this degradation on institutions having a substantial and strategic focus on obtaining external funding to the detriment of their teaching and learning processes. In situating this discussion within UK Business Schools there is also the view of Mowday (1997) who argues that competitive pressure between Business Schools has increased to the detriment of pedagogy and the learning environment.

For academics to become agents of change for ethnically diverse students they need to face up to some of the challenges identified. For many this may mean that educators need to develop cross-cultural competencies to develop empathy between educator and student (Jenks et al., 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; McAllister & Irvine, 2002). One method for developing empathy is discussed by Houser (2008) who talks about educators taking the ‘cultural plunge’, he defines this as intense exposure to social and cultural settings in which the educators’ norms are clearly in the minority, McAllister and Irvine (2002) argue that this type of intense approach towards developing teacher empathy is essential in promoting critical consciousness and multicultural understanding.
In closing, Houser (2008) mentions that many of the educators who undertook the cultural plunge “demonstrated increased empathy and identification with others as a result of their social interactions and personal reflections”, this echoes the work of Nieto (1999), Gay (2002), McAllister and Irvine (2002), Howard, 2003, Rubie-Davies et al., (2006) and Durden & Truscott (2013). Therefore this research argues that being an agent of change requires compassion and empathy. As part of our preliminary research, as documented by Jabbar & Hardaker (2013) one academic agreed with this view:

“We need to show some compassion to our students otherwise we are in danger of becoming a faceless organisation that hides behind its policies and procedures” (M5)

In visualising this data, the views of six different academics were considered. The majority view was one of frustration and stress. Within this theme it was clear that interview four had the loudest voice as shown in Figure 9.7:
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Figure 9.7: Loudest Voices for Agent of Change
In the view of this research, no interview had a dominant voice, only interview M4 was one of the few educators encountered as part of the data collection who fitted into the definition of being an agent of change as defined by Villegas and Lucas (2002). Interview M4 displays the qualities of an agent of change and outlines that the increase in bureaucracy leaves many academics fearing for the experience of their students. Developing moral responsibility has many challenges and issues, and for many academics juggling the various elements is a difficult task which leads to an increase in pressure and stress (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Guppy & Rick, 1996; Kinman & Jones, 2003; Kinman, 2001).

9.5 Chapter summary

In closing this section the research has identified three themes within moral responsibility. The research concludes that educators face many challenges before they can fully discharge their responsibility towards their ethnically diverse students. In investigating the concept of moral responsibility this research has investigated the work of numerous respected authors who outline the creation of interactive experiences within the classroom (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999) to develop moral responsibility. Other researchers highlight the importance of academic passion (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Vallerand & Houlefort, 2003) and high expectations (Rubie-Davies et al., 2006) in developing empathy and achievement. What the research does suggest is that academics need to recognise that many international students require additional personal, academic and emotional support to succeed academically. This research expands on this to include the notion that academics and Business Schools need to have a moral responsibility towards students of ethnic diversity, and this needs to be acknowledged in the form of policies and procedures acknowledging that ethnically diverse students learn
and engage in ways that are different from the implicit western norms (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006).

9.5.1 Closing of the loop

In closing the loop for this theme the research suggests that many academics try to cultivate passion for their students but in many cases this is not appropriate, with a focus on pastoral support as opposed to high academic expectations. In addition, those academics who have tried to engage and support their students feel they are being held back due to time pressures and stress alongside bureaucracy and meddling middle management. Hence in closing the loop for this chapter Table 15 outlines how the objectives identified at the start of the chapter have been met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>In meeting the challenges of this objective the research argues that Business School academics need to have passion for the students they teach. When academics are passionate about their subjects this helps students to engage within the teaching, and also helps academics to define their role within higher education pedagogy and develop high expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>In meeting the challenges of objective 3 this research argues that academic perceptions and attitudes need to change in relation to how they develop pedagogical content and how they perceive students. This may mean that in many cases that some academics need to engage with content outside of their comfort zone and embrace pedagogical methods that they may not be comfortable with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Achievement of objectives for Pillar 3
Moral responsibility is a complex theme with multiple sub themes and elements that academics need to be comfortable with to support and teach ethnically diverse students. This research’s findings and contribution to knowledge is discussed in more detail in the conclusion chapter.
Chapter 10
Cultural bridging (Pillar four)

10.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines some of the major discussions around the key theme of cultural bridging. Cultural bridging is pivotal to the discussion of culturally responsive teaching; it embodies the ideal of understanding background culture (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; Nieto, 1999) and developing this culture in the classroom (Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The early part of this chapter focuses on the work of Turner (2006) who identifies in her work that ethnically diverse students in Business Schools have a challenge to overcome cultural and international differences between what they know and what they are expected to learn. The process of cultural bridging is based on the premise that academics should have the skills and confidence to help ethnically diverse students build bridges between their pre-existing knowledge and what they are expected to learn (Banks & Banks, 1995; Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). To do this effectively, research emphasises the need for academics to understand both the student and the subject matter they teach (Banks & Banks, 1995; Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In order to investigate these issues further, this theme intends to meet the following objectives:

- **O2**: To analyse current methods and techniques in pedagogy development for ethnically diverse international students.
- **O3**: To investigate academic perceptions and attitudes in the creation of pedagogy for students from an ethnically diverse background.
- **O4**: To investigate the Climates of Learning created by higher education institutions for ethnically diverse home and international students.

For a detailed mapping process of the objectives please refer to Table 11.
In order to structure and develop this chapter in depth, this research identifies four dominant themes within cultural bridging, these are outlined in Figure 10.1 - Key themes of cultural bridging. In helping to frame this chapter, the research takes the view that academics are essential for supporting and scaffolding pedagogy for students of ethnic diversity. Firstly the research acknowledges that culture has a valuable part to play in the development of pedagogy; rather than ignore culture, the research argues that this should be central part of the pedagogy and curriculum; hence the first theme identified is the use of culture as a vehicle for learning. The second theme suggests that culture can only be utilised if students trust the academics who teach them, hence the need to use cultural background knowledge to create intercultural engagement that encompasses multiple interactions and listening perspectives between educator and student. Thirdly the research suggests that academics need to recognise students as capable learners and utilise cultural capital to understand student capability and attitudes and how this can be utilised to construct and promote knowledge within the classroom. The final theme discusses the importance of academics developing teaching and pedagogy that has been adapted for multiple cultures and applying it to different contexts and individual scenarios, the research refers to this section as cultural adjustment.
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At this stage, the research makes the key differentiation between cultural bridging and cultural consciousness even though as concepts they are both closely related. The research suggests that cultural bridging is about implementation, and cultural consciousness is about awareness. While there is a distinct difference between the two concepts, the techniques employed in creating culturally responsive pedagogy are similar. As discussed earlier, Kirkland and Gay (2003) propose the use of self-reflection and critical consciousness as key tools in analysing internal behaviour and beliefs. In the view of Kirkland and Gay (2003) and Howard (2003) these tools are imperative for improving the process of cultural bridging and educational opportunities for ethnically diverse students in the classroom to help develop tangible meaning. With this differentiation in mind, the research now discusses the four key themes of this concept as identified within the research.

10.2 Culture as a vehicle for learning

The first theme as part of this chapter is a discussion around the use of student culture as a vehicle for learning that has an emphasis on student-teacher relationships, and learning occurring based on new classroom experiences (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999). Within this context of new experiences, cultural bridging is a very interpretative process, whereby learners use their prior knowledge and beliefs—which they store in memory as mental structures—to make sense of new inputs and experiences (Glasserfeld, 1995; Piaget, 1977). In addition to this, Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue that learning is a process by which students generate meaning in response to new ideas and experiences they encounter in school.

In order to visualise this data around the use of culture as a vehicle for learning Figure 10.2 outlines the key elements of this theme as identified within the collected data. The data suggests that currently there is an emphasis on getting to know students
and trying to understand the background from which they have come. There is also some movement towards the creation of pedagogy that allows for the modification of curricula to better suit students from different cultures.
Figure 10.2 - Key nodes that influence Culture as a vehicle of learning
Figure 10.2 illustrates the notion that student culture and background should be seen as a resource for learning. In the view of Villegas and Lucas (2002) students are a resource that should be utilised within the learning process, they argue that to “overlook this resource is to deny children access to the knowledge construction process” (p. 25). In the view of Villegas and Lucas (2002) adopting this type of approach will require educators to re-conceptualise their view of learners, they give the example of the conventional “empty vessel” metaphor where the learner yields to the image of a “builder” who is constantly striving to construct meaning. Similarly, the traditional belief that knowledge resides, intact, outside of the learner gives way to an understanding that information that is external to the student becomes knowledge for him or her only when he or she gives meaning to it.

However Schmeichel (2011) takes a slightly different view of culture as a vehicle for learning and identifies the concept of “difference = deficit”. Schmeichel (2011) explains the concept of “difference = deficit” in more detail and argues that in the past there has always been “The belief that children of different racial groups were inherently different from each other rested on the assumption that white, middle class behaviour and attitudes were typical or normal” (p. 214). Numerous research (Giroux, 2004; Ngambi, 2008; Schmeichel, 2011; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006) suggests that a distinction is made that Western education is the norm, and all other views are seen as the “other”. By making this distinction between different groups and identifying white, middle class behaviour as the ‘norm’, this becomes a major issue in the achievement of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds (Modood, 2006; Richardson, 2008). Schmeichel (2011) continues to mention that this distinction of the “norm” has implications across the student-educator relationship “The interactions between teachers who expected ‘the norm’ and students who were not ‘the norm’
were described as problematic, and as contributing to the academic failure of the
students of colour”. Hence there is a scope within the research to redefine the ‘norm’
in trying to help educators bridge the gap between what is the perceived ‘norm’ and
student background and experience (Banks, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Y. Turner,
2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Sabry and Bruna (2007) take a different perspective to the “difference =
deficit” model of Schmeichel (2011), and argue that issues of difference can be
attributed to ‘cultural mismatch’ theory, which they define as academic failure which
is viewed through the lens of the ‘gap’. The ‘gap’ is defined as the differences
between home and school cultures, not as a result of genetic or cultural inferiority.
This notion is based on the argument that many educators develop perceptions based
on negative stereotypes and distorted facts perpetuated by popular culture and popular
media (Kellner, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999; Sabry & Bruna, 2007).
This view is supported by Schmeichel (2011) who discusses this in more detail and
gives an example taken from Gordon & Wilkerson (1966) “when an educator
understands how the disadvantaged differ from themselves and from the students they
may have previously taught, the educator becomes aware of the degree to which their
own middle class values inhibit their positive perceptions of and relations with these
children” (p. 57). During the data collection process there was one academic who did
try to minimize the gap between student’s previous knowledge and what they were
supposed to learn:

“I do provide a lot of pastoral care, because I not only help them try to bridge
the gap between college and University, I also try to sort out any problems they
have, it doesn’t matter whether it’s academic or personal.” (M5)
However this narrowing of the gap was underpinned by a lot of pastoral support (Kinman, 2001; Rubie-Davies et al., 2006), which the research has already identified as a method that takes a lot of time and passion (Day, 2004; Vallerand & Houfert, 2003) which is a contributing factor to academic stress (Kinman, 2001; Thorsen, 1996). In supporting this view, Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue that different strategies can be employed to narrow the gap as long as educators view students as capable learners who continually aim to achieve.

In order to develop an approach to address ‘cultural mismatch’ theory or the ‘difference = deficit’ model, Banks (2008) and Black Black (2010) discuss four approaches that have grown out of the way educators teach their students of diversity:

- **The Contributions Approach** – Within this approach the focus is on specific cultural elements such as heroes, holidays, folk tales, food, and clothing while leaving the core curriculum unchanged (Black, 2010). Within the data collection stage, this research suggested that this approach seems to be one of the most popular approaches with white teachers (Banks, 2008; Halagao, 2004), this is primarily due to the fact that it provides a quick fix to a lack of multicultural material and awareness. This research agrees with the views of Banks (1995), Villegas and Lucas (2002), Banks (2008) and Black (2010) who argue that the contributions approach somewhat attempts to acknowledge and recognise diversity, but provides only a superficial understanding of other cultures and often glosses over real conflict or issues of power and injustice.

- **The Additive Approach** – This approach advocates the addition of specific units of study, which are added to the curriculum without changing its structure (Nieto, 1999). In many cases this additional content is very piecemeal and only added to specific parts of the curriculum; this research
refers to this as a ‘bolt on’ approach. In the view of Black (2010) this approach allows teachers to add ethnic content to the curriculum, but this is done from a White-dominant perspective.

- **The Transformation Approach** – In the third approach described by Banks (2008) and Black (2010) the focus is on making a change to the school curriculum and encouraging students to view concepts and issues from a variety of perspectives. Black (2010) argues that this approach is effective in helping students to develop critical thinking skills but does require substantial curriculum revision, in-service training, development of appropriate materials and introduction of policies and procedures that support ethnically diverse students.

- **Social Action** – Black (2010) discusses social action as an approach that is based on the transformation approach. This method of multicultural education teaching is designed to facilitate student exploration of multiple perspectives by having them make informed decisions and take actions. Black (2010) argues that this approach is effective in helping students develop a sense of empowerment and political efficacy and improves critical thinking and decision-making skills, very similar to the work of Gatimu (2009) where the student is seen as a producer of knowledge. However Black (2010) cautions that within this approach there is still a great deal of upheaval. It requires the revision of the curriculum and in some cases it may cause conflict within the school or community.

To investigate these four approaches in more detail and their role within culture as a vehicle for learning, this research maps the collected data against the four approaches. The main advantage of undertaking this process is it allows the ability to explore and
understand current pedagogical approaches that are widely used by Business School academics, and this allows the researcher to understand academic perspectives and beliefs in relation to their students. This is discussed in detail in Table 16.
Table 16: The four successive approaches of Banks (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four successive approaches (Banks, 2008)</th>
<th>Academic responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Contributions approach</td>
<td>“On Friday afternoon teaching we need to accommodate for people wanting to go for prayer time” (F12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We would have show and tell, where people from different cultures would bring something” (F2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I accept that from a cultural perspective this is how you learn and so this is how I’m going to give you the information and I might sort of re-devise the topics” (F11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I will actually avoid doing a particular subject for example Israel. […], I just stay away from specific topics, which is probably wrong, I just don’t know enough about it.” (F7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I would allow them to discuss in Cantonese in their groups as long as the feedback was in English, but I had to be careful as you were not allowed to do that.” (F9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I tried to learn some Urdu, not the serious stuff, but little bits of stuff and they kind of respond to that, so I know when they are swearing and I can give as good as I get, in those terms, even though I don’t, I could do, but it breaks the ice.” (M5)

“What I try to do is make every student present themselves I ask them to say something interesting or funny about their culture, about their country so the others are much more relaxed so just to break all the stereotypes types and just to break the language barrier.” (F6)

“I think it’s really good to have an accent and have a foreign name as well, especially at the Masters level the students feel very much at home with me.” (F14)

“A lot of the time will use examples from my own life about when things worked and when things didn’t work and that does seem to work”(M18)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>The additive approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“With my Chinese students I say ‘listen, if you think it’s wrong, say it’s wrong’, it’s a new concept to them” (M5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“In the skills module in the final year, they do personal reflection about themselves, but they still mess about” (F8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I make them think it through in order for them to understand that that comment was unsuitable or inappropriate for what we were discussing.” (F13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Quite often our students would say we’ve gone through a personal journey on this, that is of essence in any degree you challenge your own beliefs, where you are and how your views on the world” (F12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I am a massive believer that these students need to have some kind of UK induction before they even think about picking up a pen, before they even think about going around the library and reading books.” (F7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>The transformation approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>The social action approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: The four successive approaches of Banks (2008)
The mapping process showed some surprising results, it was fascinating to see that the majority of academics interviewed, in this case fifty five percent, developed an approach that was either a contribution based approach or an additive based approach (Banks, 2008; Black, 2010). In the view of this research, this portrays academic behaviour within higher education as ‘reactive’ to the changes in pedagogy, teaching and the environment around them. This ‘reactive’ approach is defined as an action taking place after the event has occurred with little planning or foresight, this was also defined earlier as a ‘bolt on’ approach to teaching and is based on elements of the deficiency based approach as discussed within the ‘cultural mismatch’ and ‘difference = deficiency’ concepts (Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Schmeichel, 2011).

This ‘reactive’ or ‘deficiency’ orientated approach looks at student background, culture and experience as outside of Western ‘norms’ (Schmeichel, 2011). The research in Table 16 agrees with the work of Black (2010) who argues that these types of approaches are superficial and pay lip service to diversity education. Apart from one academic in quote M3 the majority of the academics interviewed did not discuss any aspects of the Transformation or Social action approaches. Hence this research theorises with the support of Tomalin (2007) that this is because academics have not received the necessary training and support and are worried about creating pedagogy that is outside of their comfort zone.

There are differing views on how best to prepare teachers for this complex task of utilising culture as a vehicle. Notable authors such as Cushner & Brennan (2007), Walters, Garii, & Walters (2009) and Santoro (2013) suggest that direct interaction and multiple perspectives of engagement and experience with ethnically diverse students is one such way to develop an understanding of difference and diversity. They argue that such different experiences can challenge educators to go
past what they know and to reflect on the experiences and try to piece together as mentioned by Dantas (2007) “the interconnectedness with their own students’ lives and school opportunities” (p. 76). Another perspective proposes that when educators are exposed to a new culture this has transformative potential because it “evolves from a confrontation with a new culture into an encounter with the self” (Banks, 1995; Brown, 2009). Finally Santoro (2013) cautions against taking academics too far out of their comfort zone, as this can be counterproductive, because their discomfort can become a hindrance to what otherwise should be a learning experience.

In visualising the data in Figure 10.3 there are a lot of voices who articulate a cross spectrum of opinion about how to best approach the use of culture as a vehicle for learning. There was not one dominant narrative, and there seem to be a lot of academics doing “what feels right” as opposed to what is best practice.
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Figure 10.3 Strongest voices for Culture as a vehicle for learning
Hence the use of the four approaches of Banks (2008) and Black (2010) allows the research to identify areas of potential conflict and unrest. It is clear to see what areas need addressing and in which of the four approaches the educators need support in developing a transformative curriculum. In creating an approach that is focused on using culture as a vehicle for learning, this research suggests that there needs to be a gradual evolution towards transformative and social action orientated approaches. A key aspect of this move in the view of Banks (1995) is the role of educators in developing new perspectives that are based on the background knowledge of ethnically diverse students (Cushner & Brennan, 2007; Walters et al., 2009) and creating a curriculum content that challenges the assumptions of mainstream academic knowledge (Banks, 1995, 2008; Black, 2010; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Y. Turner, 2006).

10.3 Intercultural engagement

The second theme in the development of cultural bridging is the concept of intercultural engagement. This research defines this as an acknowledgement that within a culturally responsive curriculum there is a need not only to embrace multicultural perspectives (Durden et al., 2014; Waistell, 2011) that are inclusive, but also to embed cultural diversity at its core, not just through internationalising content (Banks, 1995, 2008; Black, 2010), but through interaction and listening (Turniansky, Tuval, Mansur, Barak, & Gidron, 2009). This signifies a shift away from the additive approach towards the transformation and social action approaches (Banks, 2008; Black, 2010). This is supported by Waistell (2011) who outlines that cross-cultural encounters do occur on globally culturally diverse campuses but the problem is the nature and extent of engagement. In order to discuss these concepts in more detail, Figure 10.4 outlines some of the key areas that require further discussion.
Figure 10.4 – Key Nodes that influence academic Intercultural engagement
Figure 10.4 illustrates some of the key nodes that make up intercultural engagement, within this theme there is an emphasis on building trust and helping students to integrate into UK higher education. As part of this emphasis, engagement is a key element in the creation and maintenance of trust. To create engagement Villegas and Lucas (2002) and Gay (2002) argue that academics need to take an interest in their students and they need to engage students in questioning, interpreting, and analysing information in a multicultural context that is meaningful to them. This is further discussed by Schmeichel (2011) who challenges the mainstream view of academic knowledge. Schmeichel argues that in order for academics to develop higher levels of engagement and thereby develop intercultural engagement then there needs to be an improved understanding between educators and students.

In essence, the views of Villegas and Lucas (2002) and Schmeichel (2011) underpin the idea that intercultural engagement in the classroom requires content that is meaningful to the student, but also requires the student to trust that the academic has their best interests at heart (Finn & Voelkl, 1993; Rubie-Davies et al., 2006).

When this was discussed as part of the data collection it was clear that one particular academic expended a lot of time and energy in building intercultural engagement and trust:

“Part of the job is getting them to trust you, getting them to trust that what you are giving them is worthwhile.” (M3)

Another academic in relation to this was asked how this was developed within the learning process, he replied:

“When you get a bunch of Asian guys together, it sounds really bad but all they like doing is showing off and trying to outdo each other and it becomes a little hard to control, so you keep them apart.” (M5)
Here we have two correlating views, both academics have tried to develop engagement for their students; one has tried to develop an integrated scaffolded approach while the other academic has tried to use engagement as a method of control, making the assumption that “Asian guys” need additional care and support as they have trouble controlling themselves. Both academics attempt engagement and student participation but to differing purposes. Finn and Voelkl (1993) argue that some engagement is better than no engagement at all; they suggest “it is not participation or identification that constitutes a problem for educators, however, but nonparticipation and dis-identification” (pg. 250).

Thus, the challenge for many academics is developing this trust via student participation and identification. Finn and Voelkl (1993) emphasise the importance of engagement, which in their view is important enough to be viewed as an individual construct, because it may be possible to manipulate student engagement to avert some of the negative consequences for students of ethnic diversity. Within this research it was clear that the development of participation and engagement can take many forms:

“I tried to learn some Urdu, not the serious stuff, but little bits of stuff and they kind of respond to that, and they say ‘hey hang on a minute he’s actually tried to learn a bit of what we are trying to say’ and they have that bit of respect.” (M5)

“You need to be honest with them, if its good, say it’s good otherwise tell them well you could have done a lot better”. (M3)

“I also learned how to approach various students in different ways and it teaches you a lot of respect, I guess. It’s hard to explain”. (F6)

“It’s a bit about getting to know the students, work with them and it's not about comparing them.” (F12)

This section of the research there was an interesting occurrence, there seems to be an
underlying suggestion that good engagement is built on respect; students need to have respect for their academics otherwise engagement becomes an issue. When this phenomenon was discussed in more detail:

“I try and help build people’s confidence, for them to be able to recognise their qualities and skills and experiences” (F9)

“Not all of them take the experiences, not all of them grasp the opportunities that you put there, some of them don’t even have an appreciation that there’s an opportunity there and you’ve just got to do your best.” (M3)

“The tendency I think is if there is not enough let’s call it collegiality.” (M16)

The research found that many academics tend to focus on developing student confidence in the early stages; as the course progresses and students confidence levels increase then students tend to have higher levels of respect for their academics. This type of approach requires academics to develop a respect for cultural difference and ethnic diversity (Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Santoro, 2013).

Again there is an emphasis on the role of trust within this theme, Erickson (1987) argues that “it is essential that the teacher and students establish and maintain trust in each other at the edge of risk… To learn is to entertain risk” (pg. 344). Within this phenomenon this research argues that it is essential for academics to employ a multitude of techniques to engender engagement. This does indicate a possible risk for the students who are now within an educational system with which they are not totally comfortable (Ngambi, 2008; Y. Turner, 2006), and also for the academic who has to step out of his comfort zone (Santoro, 2013). Hence this research suggests that risk is an essential element of intercultural engagement (Smyth, 2006; Waistell, 2011).
This research argues that intercultural engagement involves trust and confidence, which is underpinned by academics embracing multicultural perspectives in the creation of pedagogy. Within this research it was identified that academics tried to incorporate the use of language (Ahmed, 2007; Nieto, 2009), student experience (Leese, 2010; Shaw, 2009) and achievement (Reyes et al., 2012) to create a diverse curriculum and pedagogy.

Vita (2001) agrees with this principle and argues that through the use of multiple techniques and learning styles academics are exercising the ability to develop teaching that is appropriate for ethnically diverse students and thereby developing higher levels of engagement with their students. Therefore good practice can take on multiple methods. Waistell (2011) builds on the idea of cultural engagement and argues that the development of intercultural pedagogy needs to be inclusive and appreciate cultural diversity. In practice Waistell (2011) argues that academics need to develop interaction and listening skills, not just ethnically diverse and international content to create context and depth.

While the view of Vita (2001) is not without merit, especially in relation to multiple teaching and learning styles, this research suggests that it is appropriate to take the approach of Waistell (2011) and argues for the need to develop context for intercultural engagement. This context can be developed through the work of Gay (2000) who argues for the need to create a platform of engaged interaction underpinned by academic depth and qualities, when this was discussed with the academics:

"I think they've also got to trust your integrity, I think they've got to know that if you tell them something’s good then they know it’s good because you have said it
is” (M3)

I think I just treat everyone with respect and trying to find out what makes each of my students unique and if that’s their strength it doesn’t matter what their areas of development are.” (F12)

“I try to find out a little bit about them and they talk in front of the rest of the class, who they are and where they are from. People think it’s easy to see Chinese students as Chinese, but China is such a big country.” (M18)

“I’ve made the mistake of saying, what are you doing, put your phone away to actually find out that putting their phone away was actually a bad idea because they understood nothing. So now I try to be more accepting” (F20)

Within the research it was clear that the academics interviewed placed a lot of emphasis on the importance of developing a relationship based on academic integrity and knowledge-based trust. In relation to this, Smyth (2006) argues that it is through the creation of relationships that influence the choices students make and in many cases these choices are reflected in their pedagogical relations with academic staff. Smyth (2006) further continues that to have relationships based on integrity and respect it is imperative for educators and students to establish and maintain trust. This came out quite clearly in the research above with an emphasis based on creating platforms and climates for learning based on listening and interaction (Waistell, 2011; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004). All the academics were very vocal about this point, there was a clear direction and many of the voices, as shown in Figure 10.5, emphasise respect, trust and integrity in creating engagement.
Figure 10.5 – Loudest voices for Intercultural engagement

Figure 10.5 outlines the key voices within this theme. Interview M3 within this theme was dominant with a focus on the students trusting him and his practice. Here the research agrees with the dominant view and in closing this theme argues that good practice must, therefore, translate into the usage of a variety of teaching styles which address each side of each learning dimension at least some of the time (Felder, 1993). In the view of this research this is a key aspect of this theme, helping to reach and engage all students while enabling them to stretch their repertoire of learning styles at their own pace (Smyth, 2006). Therefore, this research proposes that within this research there is a strong case for moving towards a multi-style teaching approach specific to business and management education, especially in multicultural settings, which is based on mutual respect, trust and confidence.
10.4 Cultural adjustment

In the development of this theme the research identifies the issue of cultural adjustment. This is defined as trying to understand the phenomenon of student integration within UK higher education Business Schools. This theme is made up of two key views, which help to focus on education, and not on society in general. Firstly, the research considers the view of Yamazaki and Kayes (2004) who discuss the concept of ‘cross-cultural adaptation’, which they define as an interaction between person and culture. Secondly the research considers the view of Gu & Maley (2008) who discuss the concept of ‘intercultural adaptation’, which is defined as a willingness to suspend belief in one's own meanings and behaviours, and to analyse them from the viewpoint of the others with whom one is engaging. These two definitions are essential in helping to identify the key nodes for this theme outlined in Figure 10.6.
Figure 10.6 Key nodes that influences academic cultural adjustment
Figure 10.6 emphasises the importance of integration within UK higher education Business Schools. Hence within this theme the research underpins integration within cultural adjustment, this as a concept is underpinned by cross-cultural adaptation (Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004) and intercultural adaptation (Gu & Maley, 2008). In defining cultural adjustment in this manner the research argues that for students to adjust to higher education life they need to adapt to UK culture, climate and academic conventions (Turner, 2006).

Many academics argue that students, while in the UK, do not take the issue of integration seriously, with one interviewee commenting:

“They just spend too much time speaking their own language, the Chinese students in particularly are very guilty” (F22)

This is a problem that has been identified by many academics; Mintzberg & Gosling, (2002) advocate the need for students, and in some cases academics, to take issues of integration seriously by immersing themselves in different and challenging cross-cultural situations. However, to do this successfully Yamazaki and Kayes (2004) propose that ethnically diverse students need to develop cross cultural adaptation skills, and attempts have to be made that encourage cross cultural learning between student and academic. This however is not always easy, with many students who do study in different countries experiencing a considerable amount of stress involving both confrontation and adaptation to unfamiliar physical and psychological experiences and changes (Gu & Maley, 2008).

Dehler, Welsh, & Lewis, (2001) suggest that for Business Schools the process of cultural adjustment and adaptation is a particular challenge for diverse students. This is due to current UK academic conventions, rules and regulations that very much favour a Western dominated curriculum and a Western learner, within this scenario
students from ethnically diverse backgrounds struggle to grapple with UK academic conventions and they struggle to work within Western epistemological and pedagogical assumptions (Pittman, 2007; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006). This was also investigated further:

“International students always get a shock from the culture and the different education system” (F17)

“If something is not timetabled, they don’t do it, any classes on cultural awareness or on improving English they won’t do, they don’t see it as being a part of their core studies.” (M18)

“Part of the problem I guess is that I don’t know how far they have adjusted to everything about the culture but also the educational system” (M19)

“Students aren’t prepared to look out of their own culture and they might only get involved in things that they see as culture relevant to themselves.” (F2)

The research suggests that students struggle to bridge the gap between their previous learning experiences and a Western pedagogical environment. Yamazaki (2005) calls this an education shock; students are overwhelmed and therefore they struggle to integrate.

This research corroborates the work of Yamazaki (2005) and Turner (2006) by arguing that current teaching and learning mechanisms stem from a UK cultural pedagogy that is alien to many students who emanate from non-Anglo cultures (Earwaker, 1992; Y. Turner, 2006). Exacerbating these issues, many of the pedagogical concepts are based on implicit ‘post-imperial’ assumptions within underlying UK pedagogical frameworks that construct one-way flows of learning benefits from the university to the ethnically diverse international student rather than more reciprocal learning cultures (Humfrey, 1999).
This phenomenon of not taking integration seriously is then compounded due to ethnically diverse students not recognising the importance of attending classes which have been designed to help them to understand the pedagogical divide and differences and induct them into higher education proper, as mentioned in M18 “if something is not timetabled they won’t attend”. This research identifies these as key barriers within the process of cultural adjustment which if not managed properly, can lead to negative interactions between academics and students. This research suggests that academics have already observed negative behaviour but are unaware of its causes and the consequence:

“A lot of them do live in groups with their own backgrounds, which lead you to question to what extent they are integrating” (M18)

“International students are not actually prepared to spend time to get to know a lot of students from different backgrounds and things” (F2)

This research argues that the cause of this issue revolves around negative interactions and difficulties in adjusting to a new environment and climate (Nieto, 1999; Oberg, 2006; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006) consequently, this has led many ethnically diverse students to withdraw into their own support groups where they feel comfortable, this is a common symptom of culture shock (Oberg, 2006; Vita, 2001). Culture shock is just one of the particular stresses faced by ethnically diverse students, other stresses include role shock (Minkler & Biller, 1979), education shock (Yamazaki, 2005), language shock (Oberg, 2006) and learning shock (Gu & Maley, 2008). These stresses mainly occur in the early stages of their course where many ethnically diverse students struggle to integrate into UK higher education Business Schools (Hultberg, Plos, Hendry, & Kjellgren, 2008; Leese, 2010).
Each of these stresses has been identified at some point within the research. In the view of interview F2 this is an inherent problem with all ethnically diverse international students, implying that they are not ready to fully integrate and happy to stay in their own groups. This is not something that this research agrees with; this research argues that poor support in adjustment has led primarily to the culture shock element of the stresses identified above. Oberg (2006) argues that the above behaviour is typical of students who are in a culture shock, Oberg argues that many ethnically diverse international students feel weak in the face of cultural conditions which they feel are impassable and it is within this scenario that students then turn to their peer groups for support. While this may be irritating, Oberg (2006) argues that academics should be patient, sympathetic and understanding. It is evident therefore that academics need support and guidance in providing an environment where preconceptions can be laid to one side and students can be helped to culturally adjust in a more responsive manner.

While academics and institutions identify that there are issues of cultural adjustment, very little is done pedagogically in developing an environment that facilitates the process of cultural bridging:

“Part of the problem that I guess I have is that I don't know how far they have adjusted to everything about the culture, but also the educational system.” (M19)

“They come in and they’re only really getting used to the culture around them, by Christmas they’ve lost three months because they are up in the middle of the night ‘Skyping’ their friends because they are still living on China time.” (F7)

“You’ve got to get used to your environment, get over quirky things about the fact you can cross the road at Pelican Crossings and that the shops are different that the money is different, everything.” (F7)
“One of the BIG differences I think is the sort of British attitude towards alcohol and socialising. International students were made to feel less welcome or less part of the cohort if you like because they didn’t do that sort of socialising to the same extent as the British students” (F22)

Here the research identifies that in addition to adjusting academically to UK standards and conventions (Turner, 2006) many foreign students are perceived to be struggling to adapt to the local customs and society. Gu and Maley (2008) argue that the “experience of a different living style and the confrontation of contrasting traditions, values and expectations can be emotionally and psychologically challenging”. This research supports this view and argues that within cultural adjustment, students face academic and local hurdles, and for many students they are uncomfortable about how they fit into this new spectrum.

In the view of Syed, Azmitia, & Cooper (2011) students from an ethnically diverse background need to have a sense of belonging and a clear sense of self during the early parts of the research. This research argues that this is not happening early enough for the students to adjust to their new study climates, as this research suggests it can take up to three months before academics can assess student academic capability. Hence in order to minimise the issues of culture shock, Yamazaki and Kayes (2004) advocate the need for an accelerated induction that helps students from diverse backgrounds acclimatise quicker. This is a view supported by Leese (2010) who argues that current inductions do not adequately support students from an ethnically diverse environment due to a format that is erroneous and in some cases can make the problem worse due to poor induction design which leads to information overload:
“A lot of them come up and say well we didn’t know, but I know for a fact that most tutors if not all, have to emphasise that during induction, but most of them they are not switched on, there’s too much going.” (M4)

“The first year is the crucial year to support the students, if you look at the dropout rates it suggests there is something else that we could have done” (M2)

“I’m not certain that we fully take into account the different needs of people from other cultures and I’m thinking about outings and things we do” (M3)

“Chinese students and smaller ethnicities find it extremely difficult to interact with other students at the beginning of the course” (F6)

The data indicates that the early parts of the course are critical and any induction at this point in the student life cycle should be designed as a process not a one-off student event (Leese, 2010).

In moving the discussion forward, this research identifies the need for rigorous inductions, this research advocates the introduction and development of ‘integrated environmental inductions’ to support the process of cultural adjustment. This proposal is based on the research collected within this theme and also on the accumulated research of Hultberg et al., (2008) and Leese (2010) who agree that the process of induction should be appropriate and stimulating and should include opportunities to develop social cohesion and key skills. This research argues that higher education institutions need to move away from having a focus on bureaucratic policies and procedures that many diverse students do not adequately grasp.

In summarising this theme, the research outlines in Figure 10.7 that many academics contributed to this discussion. There was not one clear dominant narrative but they did feel that current induction processes are inadequate for ethnically diverse students.
Therefore this research proposes that within this theme, cultural bridging as a perspective can help academics to develop the use of ‘integrated cultural environmental inductions’ to help students avoid issues of culture shock and to help them to develop key academic and social skills that help them to make connections with their existing knowledge and the knowledge they are supposed to learn. This then helps them to make the transition and integrate into UK higher education Business Schools quicker and easier.

Figure 10.7 – Strongest voices for cultural adjustment
10.5 Student capability and attitude

In the previous theme this research identified that many diverse students had issues in adjusting to UK higher education. In following up this discussion within this theme the research takes the discussion further and argues that many Business School academics have negative perceptions about culturally diverse student capability and attitudes, which affects achievement and integration. The key nodes for this theme are outlined in Figure 10.8.
Figure 10.8 Key nodes that influence academic perceptions of student capability
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Figure 10.8 outlines the varying pressures placed on academics in the creation of a fair climate underpinned by the relatively recent reality of tuition fees. There has been a subtle shift in how students from diverse backgrounds are now perceived in UK higher education Business Schools, Habu (2000) writes that the internationalisation of education has created “an international recruitment market in which some higher education institutions view students in financial terms and not as members of a scholarly community” (p. 43). There is a feeling within the international student community that in many cases students are only recruited by the HEIs to make money (Habu, 2000). This is a view shared by Tomalin (2007), who puts forward the notion that many higher education institutions have motivations which are heavily influenced by financial incentives due to higher fees and increasing financial security, this she argues is to the detriment of ethnically diverse learners.

These issues are just the tip of the iceberg; it is all too easy to lay the blame at the student’s inability to grasp academic conventions and to culturally adjust within Western education, as discussed in the previous chapter, without academics and institutions really understanding their own continuous negative attitudes and perceptions (Modood, 2006; Richardson, 2008; D. G. Singh, 2011). This research identified multiple negative attitudes and perceptions:

“There is a significant minority of female Muslim students who seem quite childish; some of them tend to behave almost like thirteen or fourteen year olds” (M1)

“We have had issues with certain groups of students talking and using mobile phones and they are ethnic minority students” (M4)

“Asian guys are always trying to show off to the fairer sex, but they’re not very fair at all.” (M5)
At this stage the research starts to take a slightly sinister turn, where it argues that academics try to offload issues of guilt (Lawrence, 2005) onto the student by suggesting that in many cases ethnic minority students do not want to learn, or are unmotivated to learn. Van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, & Holland (2010) argue that ethnic minority students face negative perceptions across the globe, and in discussing the work of Stiefel, Schwartz, & Gould Ellen, (2007) have suggested that educators may have differing expectations with regard to ethnic minority students as a function of attitudinal differences on behalf of the academics, which lead to negative perceptions. This was an intriguing part of the research and the researcher thus attempted to drill down into specific motivational attitudes that academics held about their students:

“It’s very noticeable amongst Asian girls, they tend to be a bit giggly and stupid and fool around and they don’t appear to be that interested or that motivated for them it’s more like they are on a shopping trip to Next or something.” (M1)

“I have heard Asian guys say I only want to get a degree so I can get married, this is from the Asian side, I can marry a better girl if I’ve got a degree.” (M5)

“They (Chinese students) say that they feel so much more freedom here, it's scary, but maybe that’s why they do like to hide away a little bit, because here you can do what the hell you like in the UK basically.” (F17)

Here there are obstacles in the way of efficient cultural bridging which potentially highlights that academic prejudices are never far from the surface. In trying to understand this behaviour, Baldwin, Buchanan, & Rudisill (2007) report that educators perceive ethnically diverse students as lacking in intelligence, unmotivated, difficult to work with, and apt to cause discipline problems. All these issues are represented within our sample and relate quite closely to our discussion in Pillar 1 – Cultural Consciousness. In addition, research suggests many educators do not hold high
expectations for and often blame their ethnically diverse students and the students’
families for their low achievement (Baldwin et al., 2007; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999), this
is illustrated in quotes M1 and F17 where the academics imply that in their home
countries students are suffocated and hence need the West to save them.

While delving deeper into the phenomenon of the perceptions of student attitude
the research recognised that some academics compounded the issue of negative
perceptions by espousing negative views about student skills, especially in relation to
the use of language. Nieto (1999) develops this further and argues that language is seen
as a major issue. Many educators view languages that are not perceived as ‘mainstream’
either with grudging acceptance or outright hostility:

“I think if they were able to speak the language I wouldn’t have the issues that I’m
having.” (M4)

“On the other hand, language right now is the barrier” (F6)

“So you know she’s translating and she’s gone to the thesaurus and replaced
words, and what she meant by occupation, she’s put something else and you think,
no it doesn’t mean that. I said to myself, when I’m here I should speak English,
when I’m somewhere else then I should speak my own language.” (F14)

This was always an emotive part of the interview, language as a skill was discussed
quite a few times by the majority of the academics. During the research process it was
identified that often language was discussed from two particular viewpoints, firstly
academics viewed language as an obstacle to integration hence they viewed it as a threat
that should be eradicated, secondly they viewed language as a deficiency that needed to
be remedied which required additional work in another class.

What was clear was that minimal allowances were made within class for
individuals who did not have English as their mainstream language, and in many cases
they were penalised for this. Oberg (2006) and Gu and Malley (2008) argue that a lack of language skills at the early stage of their course falls under the category of culture and language shock and forms part of the various cultural issues that students have to face. Though this does not suggest that the language barrier does not exist, on the contrary, Gu and Malley (2008) view this as a key element in the failure of communication.

The language barrier and the lack of knowledge place academics under a lot of pressure and stress to help these students achieve minimum achievement aims. In the research there is clear evidence that rather than help students build their knowledge base and create an environment of achievement and learning, many academics are taking the easy route and are ‘dumbing down’ the content:

“In the past many of our home students have been held back by some of the international students and to some extent I can understand that because we’ve had to sometimes pitch it at a level or speak slightly lower for people who don’t understand.” (F10)

“When I started I did a lot of difficult things, by the time I finished I had to lower my pitch really, make it easier.” (F14)

“Sometimes there is subconscious tendency to maybe to dumb it down for them to help them which has problems for me around that.” (M21)

“It seems like in trying to get rid of the bad practice they are ‘dumbing’ down the good practice, which doesn’t always go down well.” (M18)

“In the end as an academic how many times do you take complaints? I started to feel bad. I thought there was something wrong with maybe what I do, so I made the content easier.” (F14)

This part of the research identified a combination of multiple issues that lead to academics losing trust in students’ capabilities and therefore delivering an educational
experience that has a focus on reactive as opposed to proactive measures. In the view of this research, when academics view ethnically diverse students with poor skills as obstacles (Oberg, 2006), and hold low expectations (Rubie-Davies et al., 2006) and negative perspectives about their capability (Baldwin et al., 2007) then this leads to ethnically diverse students having issues of dependency, which this research views as reactive. In the view of Bingham & O’Hara (2007) and Leese (2010) these issues leave many students struggling to become ‘autonomous’ learners, and that therefore they should not be ‘spoon fed’ which this research equates to ‘dumbing down’.

Within this theme the data analysed the views of multiple academics who all had their own opinions of student capability. Figure 10.9 outlines that there was no single strong narrative over the others, but there was a clear indication of the dumbing down of content within UK higher education.

![Strongest voices for Student capability and attitude](image-url)

Figure 10.9 – Strongest voices for student capability and attitude
In closing this theme, this research takes the view that when academics dumb down content they are in fact disassociating themselves from any ‘blame’ for student failure or withdrawal by locating the problem within the student (Lawrence, 2005). This is primarily borne out of the issue of self-preservation. Smith (2007) details the tensions around institutional targets for ‘bums on seats’ and the ongoing move to increase participation in HE. The research within this theme suggests that some of the academics interviewed had low expectations of their students’ skills and capability and due to pressure from the institution adjusted their materials to help them pass; these low expectations significantly impacted on their learning experience.

10.6 Chapter summary

In closing this section the research has identified four themes within the pillar of cultural bridging. This research proposes that within the implementation and development of cultural bridging there is a fine balance between structuring support for ethnically diverse students around their background and history or developing dependency (Leese, 2010). The increased pressure from organisations that focus on revenue further undermines this balance and has led academics to focus on ‘bums on seats’ (Smith, 2007) as opposed to student learning (Leese, 2010). This research argues that by upsetting this balance, institutions are rejecting the notion that students from diverse backgrounds are capable learners. Turner (2006) argues that when academics reject student capability, this has a serious impact on the student experience and ultimately a rejection of the UK orientation to learning. This perception goes against the very essence of culturally responsive teaching.
10.6.1 Closing of the Loop

In closing the loop for this theme this research proposes that academics and institutions should place an emphasis on valuing the knowledge and background experiences of students from diverse backgrounds as tools in teaching them more effectively. This research argues that allowing the background knowledge and experiences of students into the classroom would go some way towards nullifying student obstacles around cultural adjustment and improving intercultural engagement. Through understanding, academics can better appreciate student background and motivations and provide content and pedagogy that is appropriate, not dumbed down. Hence in closing the loop for this chapter Table 17 outlines how the objectives identified at the start of the chapter have been met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>In meeting the objectives of this research it was found that current pedagogical practice is very fixed and rigid with little or no thought taken to make pedagogy suitable for non-Western learners. Therefore this research proposes that academics need to move towards a multi-style teaching approach which is specific to business and management education, especially in multicultural settings where it is based on mutual respect, trust and confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>In meeting the challenges of this objective, this research argues that pedagogy development varies heavily based on academic perception. This research also identified that on the whole academic perceptions towards students of ethnic diversity are mixed, with many academics having negative perceptions. These negative perceptions influence the way academics create and develop pedagogy. Therefore this research proposes the need for academics to develop pedagogy which embeds positive attitudes and high expectations as part of its core curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In meeting the requirements of objective 4 this research argues that institutions place excess pressure on academics to recruit large numbers of students without providing the resources to adequately support and scaffold cultural bridging strategies. This pressure leads to academics recruiting students for financial reasons, which leads many academics to deploy pedagogies of dependency.

Table 17: Achievement of objectives for Pillar 4
Chapter 11
Higher Education Curriculum (Pillar five)

11.1 Introduction

This chapter analyses the results from the research under the fifth and final pillar of the HE Curriculum as identified by Jabbar and Hardaker (2013). Within this chapter, the research explores the potential role of the Higher Education organisation in the development and support of an educational climate for students of ethnic and ethnic diversity. In the view of Nieto (1999) and Gay (2000) the organisation has an essential role to play in creating a learning climate which is underpinned by policies and procedures which support and maintain the development of culturally responsive education. A climate of culturally responsive teaching and learning is essential for supporting the pedagogical innovations of academic staff (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006), providing academics with guidance on relevant learning resources (Ngambi, 2008), and supplying the scaffolding and support (Durden, 2008; Leese, 2010) academics require for delivering culturally responsive teaching.

In order to investigate these issues further, this chapter intends to meet the following objectives:

- **O1**: To explore the role of the Business School Academic and the higher education institution in the development of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students.
- **O4**: To investigate the Climates of Learning created by higher education institutions for ethnically diverse home and international students.

For a detailed mapping process of the objectives please refer to Table 11.

In framing the discussion within this chapter, the research starts by defining the campus climate as “current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the
institution and its members” (Hurtado et al., 1999, p. 5). Nieto (1999) and Gay (2002) suggest that current institutional perceptions are negative and disadvantage students from an ethnically and culturally diverse background.

In order to investigate this perceived campus climate, the research conducted as part of this these identifies three themes that dominate within the HE Curriculum. The first theme investigates the role of the institution in creating policies, procedures and a curriculum, which is conducive to the climate of learning. This climate is discussed and explored within the context of academic pressure and how this affects the ability of academics to teach ethnically diverse students. The research then makes the argument that there is an implication that institutional pressures refocus the priorities of academics away from teaching and research quality, towards fiscal responsibility and revenue generation; this manifests itself in the consumerisation of higher education, this is outlined in Figure 11.1:

![Figure 11.1: Key themes of HE Curriculum](image)

### 11.2 Climate of learning

The first theme in this chapter starts by looking at the view of Nieto (1999) who argues, “School conditions and climate, in conjunction with the attitudes and beliefs of educators that undergird that climate, can foster or hinder learning” (p. 3). Here Nieto
makes a link between academic beliefs and perceptions and how they affect school condition and climates, this can either be positive or negative. Hurtado et al., (1999) agree with this but also add that the conditions and climate in many educational organisations are heavily influenced by its heritage and history, which continues to shape current institutional culture, policies, procedures and practices. This also continues to influence the ways in which educators teach, and the types of policies and procedures they are asked to implement.

In taking the views of Nieto (1999) and Hurtado et al., (1999) this research suggests that the climate within higher education is influenced by history, privilege and tradition, which continue to influence current academic staff and also the development of policies and procedures for ethnically diverse students. In the view of Turner (2006) this is highly advantageous for the Western learner. In order to visualise the data around the climate of learning, Figure 11.2 outlines the key elements of this theme as identified within the collected data.
Figure 11.2 – Key nodes that influence a climate of learning
Figure 11.2 outlines a mixture of views with many of the elements showing that academics have a wide range of concerns in relation to the higher education climate, ranging from work pressures to staff diversity training. This research suggests that there should be a challenge to the status quo with Nieto (1999) and Gay (2000) advocating the use of a culturally responsive approach which moves away from what Freire (2000) refers to as a “banking model of education which treats students as empty bank accounts in which deposits are made towards a model of education that is equitable” (p.58). A traditional banking model of education only serves to reinforce educational climates which benefit the dominant group, and should be viewed as an oppressive tool used to dehumanise students by denying them the right to become fully human (Freire, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Y. Turner, 2006).

However, any move towards a climate of learning that minimises and eradicates the barriers described above can be seen as threatening by the dominant group. In the view of Avery and Thomas (2004) the role of diversity education calls into question the power and privilege that society has conferred upon a select few groups of people within the dominant group. When this power is questioned, reactions can be manifested in various ways. Avery and Thomas (2004) mention that these select groups question the legitimacy, intent or utility of the diversity curriculum, which can, in the view of (Gallos & Ramsey, 1997), lead to resistance through anger, silence, avoidance or passivity. This is not a new phenomenon and is something that Nieto (1999) has discussed extensively. She suggests that for the meaningful development of climate, and to challenge this power and privilege, a simple change in pedagogy and curriculum is insufficient, there needs to be a change to school policies, procedures and practices to confront head on the instruments of oppression.
The proposed fundamental shift advocated by Nieto (1999) is very much a top down approach that identifies a clear requirement for Business Schools to undertake a significant cultural shift in how educational organisations operate and conduct themselves. Business Schools need to do more than just rely on specific strategies, and also consider the need to create specific climates for learning (Nieto 1999). This was discussed during the interview process:

“I think the organisation, has the face it wants to present and that is one that is student friendly, it engages and is student focussed.” (M3)

“In terms of our Chinese students we (the organization) did not adequately recognise what they needed, what support or what problems they faced and the achievement of those students was really quite poor” (M19)

“I don’t think institutions really understand about getting students to engage with it. They tend to think of students as something that passes through, rather than something that should belong for life” (M3)

“We have promised them the world and then it seems to be a scramble around with the support services that we have within the University for international students” (F7)

“This Institution is very slow to adapt to change, like most institutions” (F20)

“This organisation seeks to portray a happy learning environment, where you can succeed if you work; we have all the facilities here to do so etc, etc, etc and that kind of stuff” (M5)

Here the research implies that many academics perceive their educational institution’s climate to be very support structure based, the majority of their responses revolve around the structural support provided by institutions. This focus on extra services and support could be in reaction to what Woodall, Hiller, & Resnick, (2014) refer to
as the consumerist pressures typical of a highly marketised environment. Any reputable universities which accept large numbers of ethnically diverse international students recognise that they have a responsibility in the area of student support and should set out to meet those students’ needs (Humfrey, 1999; Y. Turner, 2006; Woodall et al., 2014). There was however some cynicism about this approach to meeting student needs, with some academics clearly feeling that the organisation’s marketing was portraying an untrue picture of what was actually happening on the ground. They argued that the organization is cynical in its marketing and portrays a picture of harmony which panders to a culture of consumerism (Lomas, 2007; Molesworth et al., 2009).

The rate of change is, however, slow with academics arguing that institutions are very slow to adapt to changes in the student body. This rate of change was also reflected in the academics interviewed who felt that current policies and procedures were sufficient within this climate, the research tried to get past the support structures discussion and develop deeper depth:

“It is now better than it was, I think it is important to provide support mechanisms across quite a wide range and really understand what these students want” (M19)

“It is a friendly environment, the staff, the students, the whole environment is quite good, the confusing part I think is probably caused by the high staff turnover” (F17)

“Everybody’s really accessible, so everybody knows where the staff offices are and things” (F2)

The responses reinforced the previous discussion with many academics feeling that they worked in an environment with robust policies and procedures that were built to
help students. What this research does suggest is that no real consideration is given to meaningful change as discussed by Nieto (1999), and there was no real appetite to change the perception of an unequal climate (Hurtado et al., 1999). Blame or praise is apportioned to support systems that support the status quo of current policies, procedures and power structures (Avery & Thomas, 2004; Freire, 2000; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Y. Turner, 2006). This focus on continuing to develop robust and efficient support systems does not address the fundamental issues of policy change, which continue to exacerbate issues around social justice and equality (Black, 2010; Nieto, 2000).

There is an issue of avoidance here, a sweeping of the problems under the carpet, Nieto (2000) argues that educational institutions are well versed in avoiding these questions which go to the very heart of what education in a fair and just society should be. If anything, the focus on change is diminishing as institutions exert more centralised control over academics, increasing the levels of bureaucracy and minimising the ‘wiggle’ room for academics to create a climate of learning (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Schapper and Mayson (2004) argue that this increased focus on centralisation has led to the rise of managerialist ideology that confers power into the hands of a few university managers. The side effect of this type of ideology is that the increasing power of university managers has created a demoralised and alienated academic workforce which operates within a climate of resentment and resistance, even among those academics who have become academic managers and who have benefited from managerialist policies (Bellamy, Morley, & Watty, 2003; Chandler, Barry, & Clark, 2002; Schapper & Mayson, 2004; Shain & Gleeson, 1999). In the view of Schapper and Mayson (2004) managerialism has centralised decision making, increased workloads, fragmented work tasks and diminished academic autonomy by
alienating academics from the decision-making structures within universities, thereby affecting the ability of academics to be responsive to the needs of their ethnically diverse students:

“The problem is that over time there is more and more bureaucracy, there is less and less discretion [...] it's much more of a directed job” (M19)

“I think over the years as I've seen it evolve and change I now don't feel valued and I don't think I'm alone in that, [...] it's all about central control” (M21)

“There are more rules about how long a piece of coursework should be [...] rules, rules, rules” (M18)

In visualising the data in Figure 11.3, the research identifies some key voices that discuss multiple narratives. Firstly the research suggests that academics expect the burden of student support to be carried centrally, as this research suggests, this is a process that is already taking place and it could be argued that academics have been conditioned to think like this. Secondly, academics do not feel that they have the autonomy to create pedagogy that is suitable for ethnically diverse students due to centralised control. Within this research there is the suggestion that climate of learning creation for ethnic minority students requires a new focus with additional central support.
However, as highlighted in this research, for many academics this will be a challenge; as the level of managerial control grows there are tighter relations between central administration and university department; this places additional pressures on academic staff to achieve targets (Meyer, 2002).

11.3 Academic pressures

In the previous theme this research discussed issues around support structures, central support and managerialism. This theme intends to discuss these concepts in more detail by investigating and exploring the pressures surrounding academic members of staff. This pressure is increasing with Meyer (2002) arguing that
academia is being urged to adopt corporate values which often fit unfavourably within a university environment, Meyer (2002) refers to these values as “corporatisation”. This process of corporatisation is placing excessive pressure on academics and is leading to a demoralised and alienated academic workforce (Schapper & Mayson, 2004).

In the view of this research “corporatisation” is closely linked to the internationalisation of higher education, which has in the view of Turner (2006) created a lucrative market which is essential for the financial viability of many higher education institutions. Habu (2000) agrees with this view and argues that the creation of the international recruitment market has led many higher education institutions to view culturally diverse international students purely from a financial perspective and not as members of a scholarly community. This research speculates that this has led to many higher education institutions becoming corporations that provide products and services. In developing this discussion further Figure 11.4 outlines some of the key elements within this theme.
Figure 11.4 – The key nodes that outline academic pressures
Figure 11.4 gives an overview of some of the key pressures that academics face in higher education. The research suggests that there are a variety of issues afflicting higher education: the creation of an international recruitment market (Habu, 2000), strictly negotiated achievement and recruitment targets (Meyer, 2002), and a huge focus on financial viability (Turner, 2006).

This is a view that has changed drastically over time. Original research conducted within this area describes academic work as highly satisfying (Sales & House, 1971) and relatively stress-free (French, Caplan, & Van Harrison, 1982). However, the makeup and environment of higher education has changed; a lot of these perceptions are based on the assumption that factors such as autonomy, role clarity and tenure protected academics from the job characteristics and working conditions usually associated with occupational stress: e.g. lack of job control, time constraints, role ambiguity and job insecurity (Thorsen, 1996). This is a view also shared by (Tytherleigh, Webb, Cooper, & Ricketts, 2005) who argue that universities no longer provide the low-stress working environments they once did, they are now dominated by continuous restructuring, use of short-term contracts, external scrutiny and accountability, and major reductions in funding.

Kinman & Jones (2003) are of the view that this increase in pressure and expectations has led to a drop in academic morale, while student cohort numbers and the pressure to develop research increases. This places additional pressures on academics to adequately meet the requirements of ethnically diverse students:

“At the moment I am feeling very stressed, feeling pressured, quite a demanding role.” (F12)

“This is not a friendly organisation, my colleagues have left, five hundred posts have gone in three years and I have lost forty colleagues since 2011” (F14)
“This has been a really tough year for me [...] We have been really understaffed I’ve been kind of thrown in at the deep end” (F9)

“The volume of work which is really heavy to the point where sometimes I have to walk fast to get to my destination quicker” (F10)

Here the research highlights the issues, challenges and stresses many academics face as part of their working life. Thorsen, (1996) and Kinman, (2001) support the research at this stage and argue that the most significant sources of pressure are related to: lack of opportunity for promotion and advancement; poor communication; lack of opportunity and support for scholarly activity; and onerous administrative duties.

Many academics feel like they are losing control of their workload and feel undervalued. In the view of Makin, Cooper, & Cox (1996) individuals who perceive that they can control their environment are less likely to suffer stress. Guppy & Rick (1996) also identify a strong correlation between job control, and job satisfaction, psychological and physical health, and low levels of perceived pressure. The research suggests that as academic morale decreases, many academics feel disconnected with the organisation they work for. Winter & Sarros (2001) argue that increased student numbers and the general ethnic diversity of students, alongside new teaching plans and curriculums with tight unrealistic deadlines have left many staff feeling disconnected from their institutions and unwilling to exert extra effort on their behalf.

These drastic changes to academic working conditions are affecting the student experience of culturally and ethnically diverse students. This research supports the work of Thorsen (1996), Kinman (2001), Winter and Sarros (2001) and Tytherleigh et al., (2005) who all state that academics are becoming increasingly stressed and in many cases are struggling to meet their excessive workloads. This has
led to academics feeling that the workload was no longer about the student experience but about financial gain:

“It becomes a numbers game, but numbers means it becomes a financial gain.” (F10)

This seems to be trend that will become commonplace in the near future. As Thorsen (1996) suggests many university lecturers and researchers now experience similar pressures to professionals in other large organisations; this view links back to the work of Meyer (2002) and the role of internationalisation, centralisation and corporatisation in adding to these stresses.

As the student teaching and learning experience deteriorates due to academic pressure (Kinman & Jones, 2003; Kinman, 2001) this research suggests that unchecked admission of ethnically diverse students is also one of the main areas adding to this pressure:

“It's hard, because you've got a lot of them and you don't have the time for pastoral care” (F20)

“Well because of the flippin workload, other commitments, there’s too many students” (M3)

“With the workloads that academics have I've kind of been thinking romantically about how better being a farmer was” (F22)

“They can do everything else instantly, so why not contact me instantaneously, we are expected to be available at the click of a button” (M19)

In drilling deeper into this phenomenon, the research identifies that academics are struggling to maintain a healthy work-life balance. This is discussed in detail by interviews M3 and F22 who state that for many academics the excessive workloads
have become a hindrance to their work-life balance. This problem is further exacerbated, in the view of Doyle & Hind (1998), because these excessive workloads compromise an academic’s ability to keep up to date with their subject, carry out research, develop student support and have adequate preparation time. Hence in taking this view Kinman (2001) argues that it is unsurprising that many academic staff find it difficult to maintain clear boundaries between their work and home life. Kinman (2001) argues that for many academics the home is a natural extension of the workplace which is blurring the boundaries of a work-life balance which academics are finding difficult to resolve.

This research clearly shows that 95% of the academic staff interviewed suffered under excessive workloads and time limitations, which has led to tensions between research, teaching and administration. This tension leads to academics feeling overwhelmed and helpless in their promotion prospects and job control (Guppy & Rick, 1996; Kinman & Jones, 2003; Makin et al., 1996; Tytherleigh et al., 2005; Winter & Sarros, 2001). This tension mainly affects the academics’ ability to control and develop research. This is a view supported by Narayanan, Menon, & Spector (1999) and Kinman (2001) who argue that while many of the stressors reported by university staff are also reported in most types of employment, for example, time pressures, excessive workload, lack of resources and role overload, there are specific tasks that are exclusive to education, such as carrying out research, writing for publication and teaching students.

This research constantly identified profound tension between teaching and research and some academics felt a certain level of resentment that this was allowed to happen by centralised management; academics felt that in many cases they no longer had autonomy over their workload:
“If you’re really big in some research you’ll get promoted, if you’re just teaching you won’t” (M1)

“There is a conflict between research, admin and teaching” (F8)

“I think the University want more and more staff to be returnable from the REF so they give pressure; they give stress to the staff” (M15)

“Researchers who begrudgingly teach are not good teachers” (M16)

“So the pressures are coming, one is the teaching duties and two is the research, our publication” (F17)

“The intention as far as I can make out is to raise the research profile and that somehow improves the reputation of the University and that somehow enables it to do something else” (M19)

Interestingly this lack of autonomy manifested itself in two ways, firstly academics resented the fact that teaching was not seen to be as valuable as research, hence some academics mentioned that for career progression and reputation, research was the main track at the expense of all others, this was mentioned by the vast majority of staff we interviewed. Secondly it was clear that many academics felt they were being forced to develop research (Kinman & Jones, 2003) even though they had minimal interest in this area.

Increased workloads have led to a lack of resources and time for developing quality research. Kinman and Jones (2003) argue that the pressure to publish quality research places academics under greater pressure to increase their research output; if they cannot meet these requirements they are judged harshly on their publications both internally and externally, and are thus less likely to be retained, employed or promoted on this basis. While the demands of the job have escalated, it appears that levels of support and other resources have declined. This has led to huge issues
around the work-life balance with many academics believing that they have no alternative but to work long hours, often during evenings and weekends (Kinman & Jones, 2003).

This research implies that these additional pressures, rather than having a positive effect on publication output, student support and experience, can have a negative effect on the quality of teaching and research. This view is supported by Kinman and Jones (2003) who in their research identified issues that many academics “felt rushed”, and had their “personal priorities compromised”, additionally, many interviewees felt that overwork and lack of time compromised the quality of their work:

“I don’t think potentially that we do enough for our students, and again is it because we don’t have the time and the resources” (F2)

“The institution is now too bureaucratic. It’s removing the opportunities for people like me to engage with students as individuals” (M3)

“There is so much work and they tighten up turnaround times, they’ve reduced feedback time from four weeks to three weeks.” (F10)

“I think we are at the stage now where we are driven by the quality systems as opposed to developing them” (M21)

“We’ve got pressures now from the university with everything that’s kicking off, we are required to do a hell of a lot more than just teaching” (M4)

“I would just like a bit more time... there is just so much bulk and sometimes I’d like time to prepare” (F10)

The issue of “lack of time” is a reoccurring problem (Kinman & Jones, 2003; Kinman, 2001; Tytherleigh et al., 2005), all the extra pressures and extra workload
demands with minimum resources place many academics in a difficult position where they feel that the quality of their teaching, and also pastoral support, is compromised for their ethnically diverse students. In the view of Molesworth et al., (2009) the marketization of British higher education has resulted in some sections becoming pedagogically limited.

Of the themes investigated thus far within this theme, many academics were very passionate about how their lives and the lives of their students were being affected by the demands being placed on them by their institutions. In identifying the main voices within this theme there was a cross section of views all agreeing with the view that the pressures in higher education were increasing with the support diminishing. Figure 11.5 below outlines that there was a cross variety of voices within this theme, by far the theme with the most respondents:

![Strongest voices in Academic pressure](image)

Figure 11.5 – Strongest voices within academic pressures
These voices reinforce the findings of this research that pressures are affecting the way academics support and respond to students of ethnic diversity, nearly all the academics interviewed felt this pressure in one way or another. In the creation of a higher education curriculum the environment created by the institution is very much centrally controlled with set targets, aims and objectives with very little autonomy for academics. There is increased pressure to publish with minimal actual resources provided.

This problem in the view of this research is exacerbated by the fact that many organisations encourage academics to view their students as “customers”, changing the teaching dynamic from a transfer of knowledge to a product. This view is supported by Molesworth et al., (2009) who argue that traditionally academics were seen as the purveyors of knowledge who had the skills and capabilities to potentially transform the undergraduate student into a scholar, but in our consumer society such ‘transformation’ is denied and ‘confirmation’ of the student as consumer is favoured.

11.4 Consumerisation of higher education

In this theme the research identifies and investigates the notion that many organisations now view ethnically diverse students primarily from the perspective of financial viability. In the view of this research it is apparent that funding is replacing the quality of teaching as a priority, such a policy suggests that the discourse around the current higher education (HE) market promotes a mode of existence where students seek to ‘have a degree’ rather than ‘be learners’ (Molesworth et al., 2009).

This view is also supported by Marginson & Considine, (2002) who argue that for many universities a key strategy in developing competitive advantage involves creating universal, generic and commodified mass education programmes, which are driven, supported and financed by market forces with an emphasis on cost
minimisation. In the view of Welch (2002) and Kinman & Jones (2003) this kind of strategic approach cannot adequately serve the diverse needs of international student groups. Schapper and Mayson (2004) argue that the effect of these changes on academic work is profound. Academic autonomy, control and support is lost or marginalised as courses are developed and marketed centrally with little thought or foresight about the actual student experience.

In order to visualize this better, Figure 11.6 outlines the key nodes that helped to identify the consumerisation of higher education as a key theme within this research:
Figure 11.6 Key nodes that outline the consumerisation of H.E.
Figure 11.6 outlines the key nodes which show how academics perceive the role of the organisation in creating a climate of consumerisation in higher education. Academics argue that this subtle shift has changed the expectations of ethnically diverse students who now increasingly view themselves as customers and thereby expect the same rights as a consumer and view knowledge as a product:

“It's treating students as a customer, value for money. They are not coming to the lectures and they want lecture notes to be on Blackboard to make the decision whether to come or not” (F14)

“It seems strange to talk about higher education in terms of service and consumers, even anecdotally when speaking to students there is a massive change in focus; I’ve paid my money give me my degree” (F11)

“I think universities like any organization has to change approach and become streamlined and efficient in its provision” (F12)

“I think a good number of students feel if they end up with a mediocre degree they have not received fair value. They think that they’ve been sold or they bought a poor product […..] What I try to do is emphasize you are buying an education and the onus is on you to take advantage of that.” (M19)

This was an emotive issue with many academics reporting an increased level of expectation and consumer-like behaviour. One academic lamented that this type of consumerist behaviour was now commonplace and the acquisition, retention and utilisation of knowledge was now no longer a priority:

“I say to them if you are interested in knowledge stay. I also ask why are you here? and I find that the ambition and aspiration it's not there.” (F14)

This view is also supported by Beaty, Gibbs, & Morgan (1997) who argue that universities are primarily there to cater for the needs of students who have an intrinsic
motivation in the subject they study, and not for the provision of products. In the view of Molesworth et al., (2009) the process of marketization undermines and weakens the role of universities as purveyors of knowledge, they argue that in the case of vocational institutions particularly, it can be all too easily eradicated.

This research argues that students place a monetary value on a degree, this is a trait of consumerisation (Kinman & Jones, 2003; Lomas, 2007). In the view of Lomas (2007) and Molesworth et al., (2009) many universities have embraced this concept of consumerisation by constantly discussing the idea of ‘value’; they argue that all too readily HE institutions have “reduced a degree to an outlay that appears to secure future material affluence rather than as an investment in the self”. This is a self-defeating prophecy, with Woodall et al., (2014) arguing that as universities continue to provide ‘value’ then this consumer-like behaviour will increase with students demanding more value from the organization in which they study.

This research identified that Business Schools, in a drive to become financially stable, are now starting to increasingly accept the admission of students from an ethnically diverse background without providing the initial proper care (Y. Turner, 2006), this encourages academics to view them as “customers”:

“University students are becoming like traditional customers they are going to want to value for money and they are going to complain” (M18)

This focus on the students as consumers also places in jeopardy the concept of culturally responsive teaching. It could be argued that now the focus will change towards the ‘culturally diverse customer’, with the implication being that the expectations of Business School climate and support will change to one of customer services as opposed to meaningful support and integration. This research suggests that the notion of the ‘culturally diverse customer’ is already starting to appear and now
these students feel a certain level of entitlement to a degree – due to the high level of fees that they pay, their expectations have now changed (Durden and Truscott, 2013).

“I see students more predominantly with non-white ethnic backgrounds who have the attitude, I have paid for this, where is my degree?” (F22)

Here the research corroborates the work of Woodall et al., (2014) who argue that the perception of ethnically diverse international students towards a UK higher education degree has changed, with many ethnically diverse students linking the value of their degree to the quality of the degree obtained.

Carù & Cova (2003) argue that when there is a financial transaction then this is the catalyst for the manufacturing of a student experience. Molesworth et al., (2009) support this view and argue that the qualities of consumerisation are inevitable, they argue that, as students build on their “experiences in commercial marketplaces and their confidence as customers”, these experiences allow them to carry the same attitudes over to areas such as education.

However the downside to such marketization is that there is pressure to market and sell the ‘product’ to as wide an audience as possible, and therefore there is pressure to make sure that the product is ‘sold’ (Molesworth et al., 2009). This then implies that institutions will drop entry requirements to accommodate more students, hence sacrificing student quality for revenue:

“At this university sometimes we can’t meet our standards, so I think we sacrifice the quality of the students to get more students to come, that’s why we have very poor quality students” (M15)

“I think maybe because the university tries to recruit more international students and faster” (F17)
“When the bottom line is if the institution doesn’t make enough money and isn’t viable then it’s not going to exist” (F11)

“Because of the financial pressures coming in that actually puts a different perspective on your work” (F12)

There seem to be multiple issues here but essentially all support the view of Kinman and Jones (2003) and Schapper and Mayson (2004) who argue that higher education is now a business, which is at the mercy of market forces. These market forces place pressure on academics to make decisions that they are not necessarily comfortable with and in some cases at odds with what is best for their students. In order to satisfy these market forces, academics make decisions to increase revenue, in this scenario, as discussed above, this means the dropping of admission criteria and a drive towards increased student numbers and funding (Lomas, 2007). In this research academics perceive this as a natural market force phenomenon which is essential for the viability of the institution; this requires institutions to continue focusing on marketing and student retention activities and in some cases the closure of departments and courses for reasons of financial viability (Lomas 2007).

In this theme the research outlines clear tensions between academics and the way organisational climates which are constructed by institutions. Research suggests that increased pressure from central departments heavily influences academic integrity, student learning and teaching quality (Kinman & Jones, 2003; Molesworth et al., 2009; Woodall et al., 2014). In reaching this conclusion, the research took the view of eight different academics who each felt passionately about the consumerisation of higher education. The size of the voices is outlined in Figure 11.7 and as shown, there is no dominant strong narrative from one specific interview:
In closing this theme and taking into account the views of the academics in Figure 11.7, it is clear that many academics feel that they are unable to teach to the quality they are accustomed to. This research argues that this stems from unclear strategic organisational priorities, which place international student funding over teaching quality and student experience. This focus on funding creates an environment where ethnically diverse international students are seen as an “income” stream as opposed to learners.

11.5 Chapter summary

The research ascertains that Business School organisations that are sensitive to ethnically diverse students, need to allow academics time to support and understand cultural hegemony and ethnic diversity. From the research, it is clear that this time is not
available as academics are required to do so much more than just teach; their workloads have increased and their time with students has drastically decreased. There has also been an increase in a multitude of unique pressures in relation to teaching and research. All these extra pressures take away from the student focus and many international students can become lost in the fog of ever growing student numbers.

11.5.1 Closing of the Loop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1</strong></td>
<td>In meeting this objective this research advocates the need for higher education institutions to change their perceptions of ethnically diverse students. This will require a move away from thinking about international students as “income”, to perceiving them as motivated seekers of knowledge. Nieto (1999) argues that ethnically diverse students should be placed at the heart of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4</strong></td>
<td>In meeting this objective this research argues that there is too much uncertainty and confusion in how to view students of ethnic diversity. This confusion and fog of uncertainty diminishes the climate created by the institution and reinforces the status quo of Western domination (Turner, 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Achievement of objectives for Pillar Five

In order to provide a strategic direction and to minimise issues of confusion and uncertainty, this research proposes the creation of a higher education curriculum wherein academics are given the time, support, space and resources to create a
classroom climate that is supportive of students from different ethnically diverse backgrounds and cohesive programs and practice. While this may be an obvious statement, this research differentiates it from previous arguments by arguing that this climate should not be centrally controlled and should allow academics autonomy in creating learning that is best for the students, not what is best for the organisation. In recommending this approach, the research concurs with the views of Gay (2000), Villegas and Lucas (2002) and Gay and Kirkland (2003) who argue that academics should have the confidence and support of their institutions to practice modifying curriculum content, instructional strategies, and learning climates to make them more responsive to cultural and ethnic diversity.
Chapter 12
Findings

12.1 Introduction

*Educators need to understand that achievement or lack thereof, is an experience or an accomplishment. It is not the totality of a student’s personal identity or the essence of his or her human worth. Virtually every student can do something well.*  
*(Gay, 2000, p. 1)*

Phenomenology is not an approach that is designed to demonstrate cause and effect relationships, it is used to investigate the nature of a particular phenomenon and describe how it is lived by the subject. It was deemed appropriate for this thesis because the research wanted to identify the phenomenon of the lived experiences of Business School academics in the creation of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students. In attempting to understand these experiences this research adds to a growing body of literature that highlights the complexities and challenges faced by many academics in educating students from a ethnically diverse home and international background. As the role of these students in UK Higher Education Business Schools increases, this research proposes the development and implementation of culturally responsive teaching in the curriculum.

In order to evaluate this research in detail, it should be noted that this research differentiates itself from previous literature within this field due to the following key elements:

- The adaptation of a framework for teaching with a specific higher education Business School context *(Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013).*
- The identification of the key characteristics of culturally responsive teaching for UK higher education Business Schools to aid consistency and efficiency *(Table 3).*
• The investigation and placement of culturally responsive teaching within a higher education environment.

• This research is also one of the first to collect, record, maintain and store data through the cloud based system of Dropbox and iCloud (Beddall-Hill et al., 2011). This is an innovative approach, which highlights the role of technology and the Internet in the data collection process for security and efficiency.

These elements of differentiation will be discussed in detail further in this chapter in section 12.3. It is however important to note that in developing this differentiation the implementation of the five-pillar framework by Jabbar & Hardaker (2013) is essential in facilitating academic discussion and pedagogy design in the creation of culturally responsive teaching for UK higher education. Furthermore, in developing this chapter, at this juncture the research outlines all the voices as part of this thesis. Data was not just mined from one or two individual interviews; every single academic interviewed as part of this research had some input into the data process, as outlined in Figure 12.1 below.
To accurately explore the phenomenon, it was important to take into account the view of every single academic, this helped to reaffirm that no interviewee’s voice was lost in the narration of the data. Figure 12.1 highlights the fact that every single academic had a say as part of this research and while some had louder voices than others, every person’s views and experiences were considered essential in the exploration of the phenomenon. A beneficial side effect of the graph is the illustration of data saturation. Figure 12.1 highlights that as additional interviews were conducted no real new phenomena were emerging after interview 15. This in the view of the research can be attributed to data saturation, as nothing new was coming out of the research. This phenomenon was also discussed and mentioned within some parts of the reflexive diary (Appendix A).
12.2 Overview of findings

In developing the findings within this chapter, the research refers back to Table 11 – Mapping objectives onto pillars for structure. Thus far this research has highlighted the importance of developing pedagogy through the adapted theoretical Five-pillar framework of Jabbar & Hardaker (2013). The research will now present its key findings from these pillars within the context of the objectives.

12.2.1 Objective 1

To explore the role of the Business School Academic and the higher education institution in the development of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students.

In aiming to meet the requirements for Objective 1, Figure 12.2 outlines the key themes, which originated from the following chapters:

- Chapter 7 – Cultural Consciousness,
- Chapter 9 – Moral Responsibility
- Chapter 11 – HE Curriculum.
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All together there are six key themes which contribute to the achievement of this objective. The key initial finding for this objective is that Business School academics and higher education Business Schools need to recognise that academics need to be comfortable with the notion that they cannot teach what they do not know and whom they do not know (Gay, 2000; Villegas and Lucas, 2002). Hence the findings as part of this research suggest that initially the role for many academics in developing pedagogy is to view ethnically diverse students as capable learners and expect them to achieve (Nieto, 1999). Academics will need to develop their role to one of understanding the students, their heritage, and background, and must develop empathy and engagement.

However, this research suggests that developing empathy and understanding is not without its own unique challenges and obstacles, it requires academics not only to be passionate about the subject they teach, but also whom they teach (Gay, 2002; Houser, 2008). The development of high expectations in this role is difficult when many academics perceive themselves to be lacking in knowledge of other cultures and backgrounds (Tomalin, 2007). Hence in order to overcome this issue, Sabry and Bruna (2007) emphasise the importance of personal and professional development, with personal development being designed to kindle student and content passion.

Within this objective, this research finds that many academics, when creating pedagogy, base it on misunderstanding (Turner, 2006) and ignorance (Tomalin, 2007) underpinned by institutional pressures (Tytherleigh et al., 2005). These institutional pressures are mainly viewed from a financial lens and can, in the view of this research, become an obstacle in the development of pedagogy and also become a factor in the development of an unequal climate. This is because higher education is now viewed as a
commodity that is heavily linked to and influenced by various market forces, which are now commonplace in UK Business Schools. These market forces place excess pressure on academics and institutions to continually focus on revenue at the expense of teaching quality (Meek, 2000; Molesworth et al., 2009; Woodall et al., 2014). Higher education has now become an environment where the focus is on ‘bums on seats’ (Smith, 2007) as opposed to student learning (Leese, 2010), and thus rejects the notion that students from diverse backgrounds are capable learners by dumbing down content.

12.2.2 Objective 2

To analyse current methods and techniques in pedagogy development for ethnically diverse students.

In aiming to meet the requirements for Objective 2, Figure 12.3 outlines the key themes, which originated from the following chapters:

- Chapter 8 – Resources
- Chapter 10 – Cultural Bridging
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In assessing the findings for Objective 2, the research data stems from Chapters 8 and 10. In analysing current methods and techniques to develop pedagogy, this research found that there were differences in the development of pedagogy and understanding. This research has found that the creation of pedagogical practice, resource design and curriculum development is predominately reactive (Banks, 2008; Black, 2010), this is defined by Banks (2008) as an action taking place after the event has occurred, with little planning or foresight, this is also described by this research as a ‘bolt on’ approach to teaching. This reactive approach is dominant within UK higher education Business School curriculums. In the view of this research, this can be attributed to academics having not received the necessary training and support (Sabry & Bruna, 2007) leading to a culture of “safety first”, this is where academics are worried about creating pedagogy that is outside of their comfort zone and hence making mistakes about culture from a position of ignorance (Tomalin, 2007). Good pedagogy must be underpinned by good practice which must be easily translatable into a multitude of teaching styles that are inclusive and engage all students, while enabling them to stretch their repertoire of learning styles at their own pace (Ngambi, 2008; Smyth, 2006).

In moving towards the creation of culturally responsive techniques and pedagogy within this objective, it was found that one method to foster engagement and diffuse tension is through the creation of resources that are validating and affirming and the use of culture as a vehicle for learning (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This research advocates the need for multiple approaches to the creation of pedagogy (Jenks et al., 2001; Nieto, 1999; Sleeter, 2001) and resources (Ngambi, 2008; Stein, 2000). However, again current methods and techniques indicate that the development of multiple approaches to pedagogy is hindered by the lack of confidence many academics have in creating resources that are responsive to student needs (Maeroff, 1988). This lack of
confidence leads academics to be uncomfortable with creating and designing resources that do not conform to a current western pedagogical framework (Turner, 2006).

In moving away from a western framework and responding to current methods and techniques in pedagogy development, Nieto (1999), Gay (2000) and Villegas and Lucas (2002) suggest that it is not enough just to say one or two words in a student’s language and assume that this is enough to move towards having culturally responsive resources; this is neither fair on the student or consistent across the institution. The findings within this research indicate that more needs to be done to create a consistent approach that has the support of the institution. Consistency is a problem that this research has identified as a major issue in the creation and development of culturally diverse resources. Hence in order to address consistency as an issue, this research proposes some key constructs of culturally responsive teaching that are highlighted in Table 3 as a benchmark in the development of consistent pedagogy based on a validating and affirming perspective.

12.2.3 Objective 3

*Investigate academic perceptions and attitudes in the creation of pedagogy for students from a ethnically diverse background.*

In aiming to meet the requirements for Objective 3, Figure 12.4 outlines the key themes which originated from the following chapters:

- Chapter 7 – Cultural consciousness
- Chapter 8 – Resources
- Chapter 9 – Moral responsibility
- Chapter 10 – Cultural Bridging
In assessing the findings for Objective 3, the research data stems from Chapters 7, 8, 9 and 10; this objective was very broad in its findings and it covered a lot of elements and themes. The main research findings within this objective indicate that within higher education it is important for academics to have positive views and a good understanding of their students. The data identified some pockets of good practice, but the majority held negative academic stereotypes and negative perceptions (Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006), which served to cloud academic understanding. The data collected in Table 12 underpinned by the work of Kumaravadivelu (2003) reinforces the view of this research, that in many scenarios academics associate culturally and ethnically diverse students with negative stereotypes.

These negative stereotypes predominately involve academics viewing students from culturally ethnic diverse backgrounds as having poor skills (Oberg, 2006) with academics holding low expectations (Rubie-Davies et al., 2006) and negative views
about their capability to achieve (Baldwin et al., 2007). It was found that these negative perceptions lead academics to “dumb down” content and materials (Leese, 2010; Shaw, 2009) in a desperate effort to get students to pass. In the view of this research this desperation is a mechanism that allows academics to disassociate themselves from any “blame” for student failure and are hence lay the blame on the student (Lawrence, 2005) and their skills (Oberg, 2006).

These stereotypes and negative perceptions further exacerbate the process of pedagogy creation and academic understanding by emphasising the notion that academics feel that many of their culturally ethnic students lack the skills to engage with higher education fully, and hence they regard previous student educational experience as irrelevant. As Gay (2000) mentions, every student can do something well, and Nieto (1999) argues that to ask students to disregard their home cultures is to ask students to ignore a part of themselves. These negative views solidify the perception that trying to understand student backgrounds is a superfluous task, which gets in the way of teaching and engagement. This is a vicious circle, with this research arguing that if student understanding is not fostered this will lead to the tensions between student engagement and academic understanding further crystallising academic perceptions and attitudes.

It was found that not every academic has these hardened views; this research found that there was a vocal minority who had positive academic perceptions and attitudes and developed pedagogy that was inclusive, open and equal. It was found that the key characteristic linking this vocal minority together was passion for their students (Gay, 2002; Nieto, 1999), a passion for teaching (Day, 2004) and a passion for understanding student needs (Higbee, Lundell, et al., 2007). This research has previously acknowledged that passion is not just about caring for the student, it is about
having high expectations and viewing students as capable learners with a focus on the individual not on the homogeneous group (Gay, 2002; Nieto, 1999). Having passion for their students requires academics to acknowledge that culturally and ethnically diverse students require additional personal, academic, and emotional support to succeed academically, a one size fits all notion of education is not appropriate or conducive to achievement (Modood, 2006; Richardson, 2008; Tomalin, 2007; Y. Turner, 2006).

12.2.4 Objective 4

*Investigate the Climates of Learning created by higher education institutions for ethnically diverse home and international students*

In aiming to meet the requirements for Objective 4, Figure 12.5 outlines the key themes, which originated from the following chapters:

- Chapter 7 – Cultural consciousness
- Chapter 10 – Cultural Bridging
- Chapter 11 – HE Curriculum
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Within this objective the key findings indicate that the climate of learning created by the higher education institution is critical for how ethnically diverse students learn and how Business School academics teach. This research argues that over the last 10-15 years there has been a substantial increase in academic pressures (Kinman & Jones, 2003; Kinman, 2001; Shaw, 2009) and a substantial decrease in academic morale (Kinman & Jones, 2003; Tytherleigh et al., 2005).

The increase in pressure and low morale creates a climate that is now very target-orientated with excessive managerial control being exerted centrally, and excessive expectations in relation to research and a lack of autonomy over workflow. Meyer (2002) argues that these tighter controls and an increase in bureaucracy puts pressure on academics to achieve targets, sometimes affecting the way that academics support and respond to students of ethnic diversity. This research found that many academics were happy to develop research but no additional time or resources was allocated to this task; this was exacerbated by an increase in teaching load with higher student numbers (Tytherleigh et al., 2005).

What the research findings suggest is the increasing and encroaching impact of marketization on higher education Business Schools, and the culture and climate of the students as “customers” (Lomas, 2007; Schapper & Mayson, 2004) is for some academics a difficult concept to comprehend. This did not sit well with many academics who felt uncomfortable with this term, as it forced them to re-evaluate the concept of teaching from knowledge transfer, to knowledge as a consumable product. Hence the focus on knowledge as a consumable product becomes a foundation for other undesirable side effects, academics are now under pressure to make decisions that are financially motivated as opposed to what is best for their students, this is evidenced within this research by the view that many academics and institutions are lowering
admission criteria (Higbee, Lundell, et al., 2007) to increase student numbers and funding. The findings indicate that many institutions place academics under pressure to accept students who may not be ready, dumb down content, drop admission criteria and focus more on market forces such as marketing, retention and financial viability. This type of approach creates a culture and climate where international and ethnically diverse students are seen as an “income stream” as opposed to capable learners.

12.3 Contribution to Knowledge

Culturally responsive teaching is a wide field with multiple authors each adding something new and unique to the literature. However there are a few respected authors (Banks & Banks, 2009; Banks, 1995, 2008; Gay, 2000, 2002; Halagao, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; Nieto, 2009, 1999, 2000) who have heavily influenced the direction and implementation of this area of research. The contributions identified in this section are based on the work of said authors and their work has been the basis for the exploration and investigation of culturally responsive teaching in UK higher education.

12.3.1 First Contribution

In identifying a gap within the literature, the research develops a contribution that investigates the role of culturally responsive teaching in UK higher education Business Schools. This is further discussed within the context of studying the role of academics in creating pedagogy, their perspectives and attitudes and the climate created by the higher education Business Schools. This gap was identified through the investigation of previous literature, which had a focus on elementary, middle and high school education (Gay, 2000, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Nieto, 1999; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) with no real depth or focus on higher education.
This research then further developed this gap by investigating the current mechanisms employed in developing pedagogy, teaching and climate. This research outlines a clear future direction that involves merging institutional financial perspectives and merging teaching for ethnic and ethnically diverse students.

This contribution argues for an evolutionary view which involves working with staff and institutions to develop climates and environments of learning that support ethnically diverse students. This differs from the work of Nieto (1999) who argues for the implementation of wholesale policies and procedures that challenge the status quo, but aligns itself with the view of Sabry and Bruna (2007) who argue for support and professional staff development.

**12.3.2 Second Contribution**

The second contribution to knowledge put forward by this thesis is the implementation of culturally responsive teaching through the unique lens of the five-pillar framework (Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013). This framework has been specially designed and adapted for use within higher education Business Schools; it provides a clear outline on the key issues that surround culturally responsive teaching and its implementation within higher education, including institutional climate and curricula. This focus on the HE curriculum differentiates it from other frameworks within this field of research, primarily the five essential elements of Gay (2002) and the six salient characteristics of Villegas and Lucas (2002).

**12.3.3 Third Contribution**

The third contribution to knowledge proposed by this research is the identification and introduction of key constructs within culturally responsive teaching for Business Schools (Table 3). Numerous authors (Connor et al., 2004; Durden &
Truscott, 2013; Modood, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) continue to highlight the many inequalities that are faced by students of culturally ethnic diversity. Through the use of the constructs and with the development of good teaching that is clear and consistent, these inequalities can be minimised. The constructs in Table 3 are designed to be an equitable benchmark for academics to create teaching which is validating and affirming within higher education. There is potential within these constructs to challenge issues around the difference-deficit model as proposed by Schmeichel (2011) and allow academics to plan and develop teaching and relationships that are consistent and contribution based (Banks, 2008; Black, 2010).

12.3.4 Fourth Contribution

The fourth contribution to knowledge proposed by this research is the development of a more responsible approach towards culturally responsive pedagogy. Within this research it is clear that currently many higher education institutions have a very passive attitude towards managing ethnically diverse students. One of the key contributions within this thesis is the recognition that Business Schools have a responsibility to develop pedagogy and climates that are responsive to the needs of ethnically diverse students, hence this research proposes the move towards culturally responsible teaching. Figure 12.6 outlines the structure and evolution of the five pillars towards a responsible approach:
The development of such an approach will require an adjustment to the standardised approach to mass education in order to meet the diverse needs of culturally and ethnically diverse students. In view of this, Vita (2001) mentions the need for organisations to emphasise adapting their teaching style to their students’ learning style.

In meeting these requirements at this stage the contributions to knowledge within this research outline a vision for a culturally responsible teaching framework that advances these notions and proposes an approach that is based on developing a teaching style that is not only responsive, but also responsible for the educational needs of students.
12.3.5 Fifth Contribution

The fifth and final contribution of this research is the implementation of an innovative approach to data collection. This research employed technological solutions such as the cloud (Dropbox and Evernote) for the recording, saving, taking of memos and backup of recorder interviews and memos. Evernote and Dropbox are tools specifically developed for online cloud synchronization of content. Evernote is a note-taking tool that allows for the storage of traditional and multimedia content. It has been developed for flexible content that can take many shapes including written notes, pictures, videos, and sound recordings. Its usefulness within this research was the flexible storage of multiple types of data which could then be tagged and stored for convenient searching at a later date. The vast array of note-taking methods made Evernote the perfect choice for memoing. Dropbox is an online storage tool which allows for the storage of files and documents in what is referred to as “cloud storage”. Cloud storage refers to a network of virtual servers generally hosted by third parties, allowing access to and from multiple devices at any given time. The audio recordings were automatically stored in Dropbox to examine at a later date. This alleviated the problem of relying too heavily on the physical device’s storage capacity (Beddall-Hill et all, 2011).

12.4 Limitations of this Study

As with most research studies, there are strengths and weakness, for example there is no single correct way to interview people (Oppenheim, 1992), as there are no right or wrong methods (Silverman, 2013). Every research study has limitations, in the case of phenomenology, while it is an approach that allows for the collection of rich, detailed, in-depth data it is also an approach that can become tainted by issues of researcher bias and sampling bias which could affect the reliability and validity of the
data (Cohen et al., 2007). In addition, the implementation of a purposeful and snowball sampling strategy can also affect the quality and bias of the sample which can impact on the outputs of the data.

When designing an interview sample, the researcher needs to continually bear in mind that the approach chosen does have its own limitations (Ritchie et al., 2003). For this research, the purposeful and snowball sampling strategies were chosen. The main limitations of these approaches are they can be self-selecting and can allow for a certain bias in the composition of the sample. This is also true to an extent in relation to snowball sampling, here again the sample may contain close friends of previous participants who may therefore feel obliged to be interviewed even if they feel uncomfortable in doing so. Problems of sampling representation can also be found within gatekeeper bias. Gatekeepers are those individuals who must be approached and respected (Ahern, 1999) and through whom entry is gained to the wider sample (Groenewald, 2004). It is important to acknowledge that gatekeepers may have their own reasons for recommending some academics for this research and for omitting others.

In addition, further limitations can also be identified within the interview process. As Oppenheim (1992) mentions, trying to illicit an answer from a respondent is like trying to catch a particularly elusive fish, hence it is easy for the participants to become influenced by the demeanour of the researcher and the types of questions that are put forward to them. In scenarios such as this, the respondent can modify their answers to what they think the researcher wants to hear, and thereby taint the data. Hence in trying to minimise these issues and be consistent in the interview style and strategy, this research took the view of Boyce & Neale (2006) and developed a clear interview protocol with rules that guide the administration and implementation of the
in-depth interviews (See chapter five). While in-depth interviews can be extremely effective in exploring the lived experiences of Business School academics, this must be tempered by the fact that they are extremely time consuming. There is a large amount of data to collect over the period of 60-90 minutes and while transcribed data can record what was said, it is difficult to capture facial expressions, tone, and pitch of the words and the body language of the academic. These subtle nuances can all impact on meaning in one way or another. Again, to minimise this limitation, a second recording method known as memoing (Beddall-Hill et al., 2011; Creswell, 2011; Groenewald, 2004) used to record this non-verbal communication. This process was supported by the implementation of a reflexive diary (Ahern, 1999; Etherington, 2004) to minimise researcher influence during the data collection process. This diary can be found in appendix A.

Finally this research identifies limitations around the use of template analysis for analysing the data. Template analysis has the advantage of being an approach that is highly flexible that can be adapted and modified depending on the focus and the needs of a particular research study (Brooks et al., 2015; King, 2004). However this is a relatively new approach compared to IPA, grounded theory, or thematic analysis and hence there is a lack of literature on the topic leaving the researcher unsure if the process has been conducted properly. During the research, this insecurity did lead to tensions in the mind of the researcher about the validity of the a priori template and also the utilisation of the five pillars within template analysis.

In order to minimise these limitations, the five pillar framework was published in a 2* peer reviewed journal for additional validity and recognition. In addition, the a priori template was based on identifying the key elements of peer reviewed academic journals (Table 2 and 3); these codes were then discussed with the academic supervisor
to ascertain their validity. It was only after this exhaustive iterative process of developing codes based on the literature and cross checking with a second opinion, that a code was then attached to the a priori template. This process of iteration and the development of a template went through three processes of iteration (Figure 6.2) with additional validation from the supervisor, which allowed for the creation of a manageable template which was not too simplistic to prohibit any depth of interpretation, or too complex to be manageable (Brooks et al., 2015; King, 2004, 2012).

12.5 Areas for further research

During the course of this research a large amount of data was collected that led to the researcher having to make some very difficult decisions on what to discuss in more detail and in which direction to take the research. It is clear that this research is only a starting point, a first step in trying to understand the phenomena of culturally responsive teaching within higher education.

Firstly, within this thesis the five pillar framework was primarily used as a heuristic, a guidance tool in helping academics create pedagogy on the lives of their students. In expanding this research going forward the framework has the potential to be developed as a calculative device which can measure academic pedagogy development and advise on best practice. In addition, there were two other areas of research that the researcher would have liked to have developed further, firstly the role of technology in developing culturally responsive teaching, and secondly how culturally responsive teaching can be developed to support different religious groups.

As discussed throughout this research, culturally responsive teaching is by its very nature about inclusivity, validation (Gay, 2000), and affirmation of background experiences and heritage (Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Hence as a
pedagogical approach, culturally responsive teaching encourages students to develop meaning and understanding of situations and scenarios based on their own life experiences (Nieto, 1999). The use of technology within culturally responsive teaching can allow students to build their own knowledge representations and meanings at their own pace within an environment where they feel comfortable (Traxler, 2009). Stein (2000) also touches on the use of technology within the development of multimodal pedagogies as a mechanism to transform what students of diversity know, remember, sense, feel, and believe into meaningful content and knowledge. Hence this is one strand in which academics can utilise technology to further develop engagement and meaning within culturally responsive teaching for use with students who are technically literate.

Another strand of further development is the use of culturally responsive teaching for religiously diverse students. During the research process this was not apparent immediately, but after careful reading through of the data it was identified that some of the interviewees were talking about the engagement, meaning, experience and backgrounds of individuals from different religions, especially British Muslims. Research on this topic is very scarce and where it is relevant it has either been overtly political (Mirza et al., 2007; Modood, 2006) or looks at the experiences of British Muslims in secondary schools (Bhatti, 2011; Sabry & Bruna, 2007). The discussion of religion within culturally responsive teaching would open the door for a discussion concerning creating a proactive model of school-community action.

12.6 Recommendations

The main objective of this research was to try and understand the lived experiences of Business School academics in the creation of pedagogy for ethnically diverse students, hence the research was based on an interpretative approach with a
phenomenological method. While this allows for a rich dataset, it is not appropriate for making generalised recommendations. However, during the research process specific elements of good practice were found that could enhance the implementation of culturally responsive teaching in UK Business Schools. Hence this research in developing its recommendations seeks to support the recommendations of others with specific findings from the collected research.

In developing these recommendations the research organises the recommendations into four distinct areas, these are; Inclusion in the Classroom (Groenewald, 2004; Y. Turner, 2006), Assessment that is validating and affirming (Durden, 2008; Gay, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), Professional development (Gay, 2000, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Sabry & Bruna, 2007) and Institutional best practice (Nieto, 1999; Sleeter & Grant, 2006; Sleeter, 2001).

1. **Inclusion in the classroom**

*Recommendations:*

- Scaffold learning in student background and culture.
- Provide learning experiences that are meaningful based on student background and history.
- Academics to treat all students equally, and through a process of critical reflection allow students to identify discriminatory behaviour.
- Academics to share ownership of culturally diverse resources that are co-produced with students.
- Allow academics to undertake overseas visits.
- Academics to undertake staff training that allows them to identify a plurality in ways of thinking and knowing.


Discussion

In discussing these recommendations, this research acknowledges that developing teaching that engenders inclusion is challenging. The recommendations listed above advocate the need for a method of teaching that encompasses multiple styles, approaches and perspectives. Interviews 3 and 12 outline this issue and the academics within those interviews discussed the importance of creating pedagogy that students can relate to and believe in. This concept relates somewhat to the work of Turner (2006) and Ngambi (2008) who both talk about scaffolded learning for attainment and creating culturally diverse resources.

Scaffolded learning done well opens the door for academics to create additional interactive experiences within the classroom (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999). To develop these interactive experiences from a practical perspective would require cultural embedding – this is where academics are exposed to other cultures. Interview 18 discussed this in a lot of detail and argued that when academics are given the chance to teach in other countries and are encouraged to travel abroad and recruit students, then they have a better awareness of cultural differences and student difficulties. This is a novel approach and in the view of this research this type of exposure allows academics to be understanding of other cultures and backgrounds and facilitates the movement towards a multi-style teaching approach.

2. Assessment that is validating and affirming

Recommendations

- Develop an assessment style that acknowledges a plurality of ways of thinking, learning and behaving.
- Create group work activities that encourage collaboration between different ethnic and cultural groups.
- Provide challenging learning experiences underpinned by high academic expectations based on authentic assessment tasks.
- Develop tasks that encourage the discussion of relevant experiences and are based on a multitude of ethnic cultures and backgrounds. This could be done via a personal development portfolio, learning logs or peer review.

Discussion

In developing assessment that is validating and affirming academics need to develop assessment techniques that go against the current western dominated curriculum approaches (Banks, 2001; Joy & Poonamallee, 2013; Schapper & Mayson, 2004; Y. Turner, 2006). In moving away from this western approach the practical implementation requires the creation of multiple assessment approaches (Durden & Truscott, 2013; Stein, 2000) to support student attainment and achievement. This was evidenced in the research, for example, interviews 6 and 7 talk about modifying content to ensure discussions are inclusive and depth to make assessment relevant, and interview 5 talks about leniency in submission times if he finds students from diverse backgrounds struggling to integrate and cope with western style education.

What this research does recognise quite clearly is that assessment needs to support the requirements of ethnically diverse home and international students alongside home-based British students. Hence the focus is on developing teaching that has high expectations for all students, with challenging and authentic assessment and the use of personal development portfolios, learning logs (Creswell, 2011; Rose & Meyer, 2002; Traxler, 2009) alongside peer review (Avery & Thomas, 2004; Ladson-
Billings, 1995b; Rose & Meyer, 2002) that allows students to reflect on their experiences through the learning process.

3. Academic Professional Development

Recommendations

- Provide academics with specific training that specialises in educational ethnic diversity.
- Academics to continually reflect on the curriculum content and materials they utilise, and to be clear about their teaching philosophy.
- Academics to critically question current stereotypes in textbooks and curricular materials.
- Utilise overseas teaching and recruitment visits to build awareness of different cultures.
- Provide accredited culturally diverse pre-teaching staff development.

Discussion

Throughout the research many authors mentioned the importance of staff development in helping academics manage, support and react to cultural change (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Schapper & Mayson, 2004; Tomalin, 2007).

In the view of Tomalin (2007) academics welcome training that helps them to fill gaps in their knowledge; Sabry and Bruna (2007) argue that this training should be a very pro-active approach that is aimed towards eradicating stereotypes and policy mismatch. In the view of Nieto (1999), Gay (2000, 2002) and Villegas and Lucas (2002) training and self-reflection are essential for academics to develop awareness and understanding of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds, and also to critique stereotypes and recognise injustices. In developing a knowledge base for critique,
interview 17 discusses the importance of teaching students from other ethnic cultures, ideally going on recruitment visits in other countries. This knowledge base could be further developed in the view of interview 13 through the design and implementation of accredited educational courses either via the ABS or the HEA. Whatever approach is taken, the focus needs to be on viewing the training as a contribution to academic knowledge not a “bolt on” to what they already know.

4. Institutional best practice

Recommendations

- Employ academics from a wide range of backgrounds.
- Create policies and procedures acknowledging that ethnically diverse students learn and engage in ways that are different from the implicit western norms.
- Provide integrated academic inductions for new ethnically diverse students.
- Provide academics with resources to develop research strategies that encompass teaching for ethnically diverse students.
- Create a curriculum that is responsive to the needs of ethnically diverse groups.

Discussion

The five pillar framework identifies the role of the higher education institution as key in the experience, development and support of culturally diverse teaching. In the view of Nieto (1999), Turner (2006) and Richardson (2008) institutions are not doing enough to support students of cultural and ethnic diversity, hence Nieto (1999) argues that many institutions need to start from scratch to create policies and procedures that are validating and fair. Other authors (Lomas, 2007; Molesworth et al., 2009; Schapper & Mayson, 2004; Woodall et al., 2014) argue that many institutions now view students...
as financial income and no longer as students willing to learn, and hence have further commoditised higher education.

This research does not propose a revolution in higher education with the development of culturally responsive teaching as mentioned by Banks (1995) and Nieto (1999), this research recommends an evolutionary approach that supports academics in the creation of culturally responsive pedagogy. This may mean that institutions need to rethink how they view students and they may need to develop additional checks and balances in supporting students from diverse backgrounds. Hence from this research one of the key recommendations is the development of extended academic inductions, this is based on discussions with the majority of the respondents who argued that current induction mechanisms are full of bureaucracy (Kinman, 2001; Meyer, 2002) and information overload (Kinman and Jones, 2003) with much of the key information not fully registering with the students. Hence during this time academics want to spend more time with students from other ethnically diverse backgrounds and cultures so they can help them to fully acclimatise to higher education.

In addition to these strategies, UK Business Schools need to invest resources in revising curriculums (Gay, 2000; Housee, 2011; Nieto, 1999), policies and procedures (Durden & Truscott, 2013; Nieto, 1999) and staff development (Sabry and Bruna, 2007) and in coordinating teaching strategies that are designed for culturally ethnic diverse students. This is only the first part of the journey; the real challenge for many institutions is enthusing academic staff about the responsibility of developing culturally responsive teaching. For many organisations this may mean going through a period of soul-searching and rationalising its heritage and legacy (Gatimu, 2009) towards ethnically diverse students; for academics it may require developing a knowledge base and empathy (Villegas and Lucas, 2002) towards students of diversity.
12.7 Closing of the loop

Hence in closing the loop for this thesis the author of the research has developed a snapshot of all the key themes within the five pillars and the interconnectedness of the themes, this is represented in Figure 12.7.
Figure 12.7 – Overview of all influences and nodes across the five pillars of Jabbar & Hardaker (2013)
Figure 12.7 quickly brings together some of the key aspects of the research and outlines how each element of the five pillars is interlinked, it also outlines all the themes that have been discussed within the data chapters (Chapters 7-11) and how each theme and their nodes are influenced by and influence other themes and their nodes. In collating all the data and counting up the key nodes within themes it is interesting to note that some elements have higher influence than others, below the research outlines the 10 key themes:

- Engagement
- Previous educational experience
- Building trust
- Self-reflection
- Empathy
- Bureaucracy
- Passion
- Poor skills
- Attainment
- Student expectations

This research proposes that the above-identified elements are the most pressing issues faced by Business School academics in creating higher education pedagogy and are essential in creating culturally responsive teaching in UK higher education. While this is not an exhaustive list, it does outline the work required to make achievement possible, empowerment attainable and culturally responsible teaching achievable.