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Abstract
Globalization has brought both risks and opportunities to the sustainability of diverse language communities and has fostered new and increasingly dynamic linguistic identities. Global languages have emerged as a means of international communication. Alongside this comes the subsequent threat to many indigenous and minority languages, and the uneven distribution of power across different language groups. This article attempts to reflect on how learning about this politicization of language can be embedded into curriculum in the Australian university context. It argues that there is a need for teaching to go beyond understandings of language as a cultural artifact and communication tool and into the broader social and political consequences of language policy, practice and power. It further suggests that pedagogical engagement with language politics is especially significant in Australia’s tertiary environment, which is ostensibly dedicated to the internationalization of curriculum yet persistently resistant to deep engagement with language difference. Drawing on the author’s own experiences in teaching language politics in an Australian university as a case study, the study uses processes of pedagogical observation and reflection to provide some suggestions for other educators hoping to integrate sociopolitical issues into their LOTE curriculums or into other programs. It finds that collaborative learning approaches can be highly effective in facilitating a deep exploration of the global-local intersections of language difference and language change.
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Introduction
The intensification of global processes has brought to light increasing complexity around language and power in varied local and global contexts. Contestations abound in post-colonial, multi-lingual countries such as South Africa and India about the role of colonial and native languages in government and education and the political and social consequences
of language policy and planning. The need for a global language as the communication tool of increasingly globalized business and trade continues to be debated, with extensive discussion on English’s de facto position as the world language, and what role this plays in new forms of both cultural imperialism and cultural hybridity, through the rise of various ‘World Englishes’. Supranational spaces such as the UN and the EU struggle to balance full acknowledgement of the languages of their various member states with the bureaucratic and financial hurdles to functional multilingualism. Re-emerging nationalisms, some successionist, often coalesce around language difference, such as the ongoing divisions between Flemish and French speaking regions in Belgium and the calls for autonomy in Francophone Canada. In the US, which has no official national language, periodic calls from conservative groups for ‘English Only’ policies in both schools and the public sphere are entrenched within deeper debates about immigration, pluralism and race. The revival of indigenous languages is achieving success in countries like Wales and New Zealand, but the value of this revival is still heavily contested in both political and public debate.

As a powerful marker of identity as well as a communication tool, language policies and practices intersect with larger discussions about the dispersion of power amongst disparate groups in global, national, regional and local contexts. Ramanathan usefully defines ‘language politics’ along these lines, as ‘the complex ways in which language policies around bi/multilingualism get connected to ‘local’ facets on the ground; i.e. how language policies become social practices...how they connect to larger political ideologies; and how they reinforce existing social stratifications’. Haarman in turn defines it as dealing with ‘the regulation of languages, their status and social functions’. This paper deals in fact which both ‘language politics’ and ‘the politics of language’ in the broader sense of the situatedness of language use and language functions as embedded within social and political contexts and having social and political consequences, encompassing policy and regulation as well as social practice and the intersections between them. Both terms are therefore used in this paper very broadly to refer to all aspects of the political and social consequences of language diversity both within and across various global, national, regional and local forms of community. ‘Language diversity’ or ‘language difference’ is defined in this paper in its social, rather than linguistic sense—it is used to describe a social context in which speakers of different languages or different varieties interact with one another. Discussions of language politics deal with language not merely as a communication tool or marker of a specific cultural or national identity, but as a dimension of social and political structure that is inherently tied to the dynamic power differentials that exist across social groups. While various aspects of language politics have been widely researched by academics of politics, sociology and sociolinguistics, engagement with pedagogies of language politics within university education seem scarce, particularly in the Australian
university environment. This article thus aims to open a dialogue on how ‘language politics’ can be effectively brought into classroom discussions and curriculum. It uses a reflective case study of classroom practice and curriculum design to argue that a collaborative learning approach can effectively engage diverse groups of students with the concepts of language politics. I will firstly outline why I think the teaching of language politics has a place in Australian university curriculum. Then I will outline particulars of my class and course that I am utilizing as a case study in this paper, and discuss the methods of observational and reflexive practice that were employed in the research. I will then explore my observations on what worked well in classroom discussions and curriculum design, in terms of what seemed to further to a certain extent Giroux’s objective of pedagogy as a process of engagement that involves the exploration of learners’ own biographies and identities as a means to promote an understanding both self and other in a global context. That is, I will analyse the teaching and learning moments that seemed to enable students to engage in a dialogue that challenged previously held normative assumptions about language, and promoted understanding of the underpinning power relationships. I argue mainly that collaborative learning approaches that foregrounded students’ own experiences and facilitated peer directed interactive learning encounters were often the most successful in this regard. To conclude, I will discuss what these observations could mean for other teachers and for a general approach to teaching and learning of language politics as part of broader strategic visions for an internationalized curriculum.

Literature review: the political dimensions of language diversity

There has been a great deal of theoretical work, notably by scholars such as Pennycook and Phillipson, on the political dimensions of language diversity and language change in a rapidly globalizing world, particularly on the implications of the dominance of English. This literature often explores the political nature of language education in the abstract but provides little empirical focus on actual pedagogical direction. This is Newfields’ warranted critique of Pennycook: that the idea of a pedagogy of language politics is left in the abstract. Without a genuine discussion of teaching methodology, of what curriculum should look like and how teachers can bring it to the classroom, these theoretical discussions lack pedagogical foundation.

The research that does consider education and language politics in empirical depth is mostly limited to studies of non-native English speakers learning English as a second language. The role of political approaches to language in English dominant environments, or in interactions between native and non-native speakers or monolingual and bilingual students within the same classroom are not often addressed, despite the fact that cultural and linguistic diversity are a fact in many classrooms around the world, and particularly in Australia. There has, however, been some work on the role
of politicized curriculum in teaching languages other than English to native English speakers. Largely, this literature reveals the absence of political curriculum in foreign language classrooms in the West.

As Shanahan\textsuperscript{14} states, the pedagogical environment of university language teaching in countries like the US and Australia now tends to fall into two camps: the camp that emphasizes communicative competence (which tends to instrumentalize language as a communication tool) and the camp that emphasizes exposure to culture, primarily through literature. While the study of culture through literature can lead to discussion of inequality and power, various studies reveal that foreign language study often does not adequately address issues on justice, rights and equality.\textsuperscript{15} The ‘essentialist’ or ‘object’ view of culture as static and depoliticized is often argued to be a barrier to teachers and students engaging with language on a critical and political level.\textsuperscript{16}

Reagan and Orson\textsuperscript{17} are among the few who engage with the idea of a pedagogy of foreign language teaching that engages with cultural and linguistic difference through interdisciplinary approaches and issues-based understandings. They also foreground the concept of language rights as human rights, as something that students need to engage with through case studies of the real issues faced by diverse language communities. However, Reagan and Orson fail to adequately address how these issues should be introduced into the classroom. Graney’s\textsuperscript{18} critique of Reagan and Orson is apt in that it highlights that their work often only posits that students’ awareness of issues should be raised, rather than really interrogating how teachers can put this into practice. The article is an attempt to begin this discussion of how language rights and language politics can be brought into curriculum and classroom contexts in a tertiary environment. Shin and Kubota ask ‘how might one envision and practice a more linguistically and culturally responsive education in the post-colonial and globalized schools of today?’\textsuperscript{19} This article reflects on this question within the specific context teaching the politics of language in a multicultural tertiary classroom in Australia.

**Research context: multiculturalism and monolingualism in Australian education**

Discussions of language politics are especially significant in a cultural environment like Australia, which is ostensibly multicultural yet persistently monolingual. While language difference exists in daily life, and language rights are recognized to an extent through the provision of translating and interpreting services, the public sphere is almost wholly monolingual, and non-native English speakers are marginalized in a variety of subtle and overt ways.\textsuperscript{20} Increasing focus on skilled migration programs that insist on English language competency furthers the divide. Rapid assimilation to English language norms are considered desirable for all migrants and refugees. Acceptance of language variation is limited and legitimacy is generally only granted to standard forms of English. For example, Aboriginal Englishes remain frequently derided as ‘bad English’ in spite of the linguistic
classification by academics of Kriol and other types of Aboriginal English as dialects in their own right.\textsuperscript{21} Research in English-speaking universities has further shown that language prejudice can be common amongst native English speaking students towards their non-native speaking peers\textsuperscript{22} and that there is little evidence of students from both English and non-English speaking backgrounds critically questioning the use of English as the medium of instruction.\textsuperscript{23} Academic staff and academic institutions in Australia have also been shown to treat international students in terms of their perceived linguistic and cultural deficits, rather than to value their bilingual and intercultural capabilities.\textsuperscript{24} Australian university students therefore, despite various interactions with diversity, still exist in a social and academic environment in which standard English remains largely hegemonic. They are seldom called upon to think critically about this status quo, particularly if they carry the privilege of being native English speakers.

Furthermore, the role of languages other than English (LOTE) in Australian education environments supports a thesis of English hegemony. In fact, as Nakahara and Black assert the very expression ‘LOTE’, which is commonly used across the Australian academic and social policy sector, ‘constructs such languages as Other with respect to an expected English norm’.\textsuperscript{25} National curriculum strategies around LOTE in the secondary sector tend to be depoliticized in that they are often placed within a neoliberal economic framework—such as the much publicized push for the learning of Asian languages as Australia’s trading relationships with Asian economies came into political focus in the 1980s and 1990s.\textsuperscript{26} Moser points out the irony that the drive for an internationalized curriculum in institutional rhetoric has failed to take into account the core role of language.\textsuperscript{27} Over the last twenty years, most Australian universities have sought to be global in orientation. This has primarily involved recruiting high numbers of international students, but also establishing offshore branch campuses, encouraging outbound student mobility through a range of study abroad, exchange and placement options, and various strategic pushes to ‘internationalize’ curriculum across diverse programs.\textsuperscript{28}

However, as Martín has shown, the structural changes wrought by the economic rationalist turn in Australian higher education, while encouraging market-driven internationalization, have debilitated language departments, which are generally considered to be in dire straits in terms of enrolments and funding.\textsuperscript{29} The university in which I teach is perhaps somewhat of an exception, in that the languages discipline remains relatively healthy in terms of enrolments and budget. Languages at RMIT are supported by strong International Studies and International Business programs that encourage language study as part of core curriculum. Languages are also complemented by a strong Translating and Interpreting program. Languages are, however, still largely under recognized in strategic documents relating to RMIT’s internationalization strategy and vision of a
Local–Global passport’ for graduates. As such, RMIT provides a fertile environment for reflections on the teaching of language politics. Like most Australian universities, its strategic vision foregrounds an internationalized curriculum. It contains students who have exposure to foreign language study but are still embedded within a broader framework of English hegemony.

**Research methods**

The reflections in this article on teaching language politics come from my own observations of the process of designing and teaching an elective course at RMIT called ‘English in Global Perspective’ over two semesters. The data analysed consists of three main sources: my own reflections on curriculum development, which were recorded as notes both during the planning and teaching of the course; my observations of the everyday practice of the classroom, which were recorded in a journal after each class; and feedback from students across both informal/formative and formal/summative feedback processes, encompassing student comments, student emails, and the official Course Evaluation Surveys undertaken at the end of semester.

**Case study**

While nominally housed within the International Studies undergraduate program, the course was an open elective which meant it could be taken by any student from any discipline in the university. The student cohort in the first semester the course was taught comprised of six international students and thirty-seven Australian citizens, while in the second semester there were fifteen international students, two exchange or study abroad students and thirty-two Australian citizens. In both semesters, several of the Australian citizens were from migrant or refugee backgrounds. While the majority of the students were studying the Bachelor of Arts (International Studies) degree, across both semesters there were also three students from the Bachelor of Business (Marketing), five from the Bachelor of Business (Accounting), three from the Bachelor of Social Science (Policy and Research), three from the Bachelor of Communications (Journalism), two from the Bachelor of Social Science (Psychology) and one from the Bachelor of Social Science (Legal and Dispute Studies). When surveyed in class, all the students had some experience in speaking or learning a language other than English. All of the Bachelor of Arts International Studies students had previously studied or were currently studying a language at RMIT as part of their degree.

When I inherited this course it primarily took a basic and introductory linguistics approach, through expounding historically how English has spread to its position as a language of international communication, and exploring different varieties of World Englishes across Kachru’s schemata of inner, outer and expanding circle countries. While power and privilege were only tangentially explored in the original course, I wanted to adapt the curriculum to make them the central focus, and to expand into a
multidisciplinary perspective that looked critically at the hegemony of global English from a variety of perspectives. The foundational theoretical concept of English hegemony (and its various critiques) would be used to explore issues of language rights as human rights, language education, language policy and planning, and the role and status of dialects, hybrids, and minority languages in a variety of global and local contexts in which English is spoken and taught. Readings and curriculum content were chosen to address a wide variety of national, local and global contexts, with a focus on the intersections between the global and the local. Case studies were frequently used as the jumping off point for explorations of theory. For example, Karmani’s discussion of oil, Islam and English in the Gulf allowed theories of global political economy and religion to be explored in relation to language, and a number of readings, images and videos on the ‘English Only’ movement in the USA were presented to open discussion on the intersections of language policy with race, class and nationalism. While a sociolinguistics approach was the disciplinary basis for the course, readings and resources were interdisciplinary and encompassed cultural studies, literary studies, policy and planning, ethnic and racial studies, education, political science and international business.

Scope and limitations

This article does not attempt to provide generalizable empirical data on teaching language politics. Its more modest aim is to use my own experiences as a reflective case study in an exploratory sense. The emergent themes and ideas brought forward in these reflections may lead to further research and thinking into pedagogy and practice. This pedagogical reflection on the teaching of language politics seems appropriate as previous research and discussion on language politics in Australian higher education curriculum are scarce, despite strategic moves to internationalize curriculum and produce globally competent graduates. The discussions may provide some ideas for tertiary educators in languages and in other disciplines as to how concepts of language politics could be introduced in their classrooms. In the following discussion and analysis sections, I will outline the collaborative learning encounters, both structured and unstructured, that from observation and student feedback seemed to be most effective in engaged students with language politics.

Discussion and analysis

Collaborative learning is based on Bruner’s view that ‘learning should be participatory, proactive, communal, collaborative, and given over to the construction of meaning’, and is generally conceived of as arising from constructivist notions of pedagogy and the movement towards student centered learning. In terms of classroom practice, collaborative learning tends to involve the promotion of student talk and the sharing of ideas with peers, and the involvement of students in small group work and problem
solving. It is based on the notion of learning occurring primarily between students with the teacher in a facilitator role. While the English in Global Perspective course also contained more traditional teacher-led content delivery, my analysis of the observational data and student feedback clearly showed that collaborative learning encounters throughout the course were the prime means through which deep understandings of language politics were formed.

**Personal biographies of language and learning**

The first aspect of collaborative learning that seemed to achieve the aims of the course was the utilization of students’ own linguistic backgrounds and personal narratives within the context of a multicultural classroom. This approach is akin to what Bell refers to as one of the core processes of internationalization in Australian universities, the creation of ‘a multicultural environment of directed student interaction’. It draws on Giroux’s concept of a critical pedagogy as a process of engagement that involves the exploration of learners’ own biographies and identities as a means to promote an understanding both self and other in a global context. Students’ biographies of language use and language learning through their families, formal education and travel provided rich experiences through which the theoretical themes of the course could be explored and reflection on power and privilege could be realized. Sometimes personal narratives served a pragmatic explanatory purpose, in illuminating or clarifying technical or theoretical concepts. One such example came from two students who came from Macedonian backgrounds. Linguistic concepts such as code-mixing and code-switching were new to the majority of students, and were difficult for many to grasp through the readings. However, when the students spoke about how they change the type of English they use depending on whether they are within or outside the Macedonian community, and how English and Macedonian are mixed in different ways when they communicate with different generations within the community, these concepts became much clearer to all students. Impromptu role plays of how the students would greet and talk to Macedonian and non-Macedonian friends became an engaging and unexpected learning tool.

Another example of personal narrative and experience that raised awareness of the intersections between language and politics was a discussion of the naming practices of international students in the class. All of the Chinese international students had ‘English names’, which they stated that they preferred to use in Australia. Korean and Japanese international students, however, did not attempt to Anglicize their names. The Anglicizing of the names of Chinese international students raised compelling questions for the class which allowed them to explore both the embeddedness of English hegemony and resistances to it in a personal context. The Chinese students recounted how they had been told in China that Westerners would not be able to pronounce their names. Many had chosen an ‘English name’ when
they first began to learn English, which was an experience that Western students could relate to, having chosen ‘German names’ or ‘French names’ in primary and high school language classes. The difference was however, that Australian students’ ‘language learner’ names were not used outside of the context of the language classroom. One international student shared how she had reverted back to her Chinese name after several years in Australia, wanting to maintain a Chinese identity. Other Chinese students were adamant that despite wishing you use English names while in Australia, their identities remained completely Chinese, and explained how the English names they had chosen often related to their Chinese names in either sound or meaning, creating a stronger identity connection to the name. Australian students with migrant backgrounds could also relate to the Anglicization of names, as their Eastern or Southern European grandparents had been encouraged to Anglicize both their first and family names when they arrived in Australia after World War II.

Amid these discussions of the personal decisions made by people moving into new language contexts, students were quite quickly able to understand the structural influence of English hegemony, as well as to appreciate individual agency in fashioning hybrid identities or resisting English hegemonic norms. It also created a deeper understanding of difference within the two identity groups of ‘local’ and ‘international’ students. Local students were able to better understand the distinct cultural experiences of individual international students, and the international students commented in reflection that they had been previously unaware of the diversity present within the families of students who were visibly ‘white’.

Ortega (1999) has noted the double standard that exists between bilingualism in native English speakers and bilingualism in immigrant and indigenous communities.36 While the former is a marker of socioeconomic success, the latter is routinely seen as socially problematic. In a similar vein through the sharing of personal language learning narratives, students were quite quickly able to recognize how native English speaking students learning a second language were seen to be academically elite, whereas NESB students in the class (some of whom were multilingual) were often framed in terms of their deficits in English in the Australian academic context. After interactions with international students and discussions on these themes in class, local students often recognized and rejected these prejudices in themselves. Native speaker students who had studied overseas in non-English speaking contexts were also able to personally relate to being linguistically ‘other’ in academic contexts, but were also able to note that as native speakers of what is widely regarded as the prestige language of international communication, they were still privileged in comparison to minority language speakers in English dominant contexts. Australian students who had studied in Europe, for example, noted that European classmates were keen to speak English with them, which contrasted starkly to the isolation experienced in Australia.
by many of the Asian international students. Through these discussions, the marginalization of non-native English speakers was made apparent to native speakers in very powerful ways.

Students with refugee backgrounds also shared personal language biographies that linked language change and language learning with global economic and political inequalities, as they discussed the languages they lost and learnt as means of communication and survival in journeys through their home villages, refugee camps and the Australian education system. Marginalized and fluid identities were also made apparent in these biographies as students discussed the conflicting desires within refugee communities to retain community languages while gaining access to social and economic mobility through English. The impact of national security agendas and economic policies were also connected to the language learning options that were presented to Australian students within the education system, as older students could distinctly recall the shift from a focus on European languages to Asian languages that occurred in Australian high schools during the 1980s and 1990s. Through the sharing of experience and the linking of experience to theory, students were able to acknowledge and accept linguistic diversity, but also to comprehend the inseparability of individual biographies of language with dominant political systems of power.

**Student led interactive workshops**

While the use of students’ personal biographies as a learning tool occurred in a relatively unstructured way through class discussion, content and activities in class were also purposefully designed to incorporate contributions from students as part of the curriculum. This was intended to create a sense of ownership over curriculum and the opportunity for peer mediated learning. As part of assessment, each week a different group of students was assigned the task of creating interactive activities for the workshop based on the week’s themes. Student groups were also asked to contribute readings around the topic which were posted in the online learning space. This allowed students to creatively engage with theories or concepts through peer mediated, interactive learning, and to choose case studies of languages, communities, policies and issues that were of most interest to them. Student groups found resources and created activities that often lead to very interesting and productive discussions. There were many examples across the two semesters of student led discussions that really opened up engagement with the politics of language difference, sometimes in unexpected ways. In one class, the student group who had designed the workshop had wanted to show the class video clips of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) or Ebonics in use. However, the most frequently occurring clips on search engines such as YouTube and Google Video tended to be mockeries of African American vernacular speech patterns, intended to be humourous but often with implicit or explicit racist and
classist overtones. The difficulty in finding genuine and non-racist examples of AAVE in online videos was in itself a window for student led class discussion on the perception and status of AAVE both within the US and in the global media.

Another stand-out example of successful collaborative and reflective learning through the group workshops was a role play activity organized by one group based around the Delhi Commonwealth Games, which were about to commence at the time the class was run. In groups, students were assigned roles such as the Commonwealth Games organizing committee, representatives for athletes and support staff from different language groups, global media representatives, and local community groups. They were asked to construct a policy statement on how language use and communication would function at the Games. The context was established as complex due to the multilingual nature of Indian national society, the contested role of English as the de facto lingua franca of international athletic events, and the difference between local Indian Englishes and perceived international standards. Heated debate ensued on whether the Games needed a lingua franca, whether all participants had a right to hear and see information presented in their native language, and what budget and human capital capacity the event actually had to provide the necessary language services. This role play activity, which was entirely conceived, organized and led by students, brought the theories and issues of the course into practical focus, as it helped students to understand the practical and logistical challenges of aiming for linguistic equality in the context of a multi-national and multilingual event. The input of students from diverse disciplinary backgrounds was also very beneficial to learning in such activities, as students added perspectives from disciplines such as business and marketing that allowed the group to consider policy from grounded as well as theoretical perspectives.

The true value of the workshop assessments was the opportunity given to students to contribute their own case studies, examples and class activities. It was often the student led activities or resources that really challenged students assumed knowledge about the role of language in the world. According to the students, some key assumptions that were challenged were the idea that one language equals one culture, that languages are nationally bound, and that bilingual capabilities always conferred privilege. Discussions allowed students to explore the relationships between the languages that they speak and study and the other languages.

**Conclusions**

As Shin and Kubota have stated, ‘language education is embedded in sociopolitical and economic relations of power and hence plays a key role in the construction as well as the transformation of inequality between the privileged and the underprivileged.’ However, as the literature reveals, there is a dearth of genuinely pedagogical discussion on how language
education can be transformative, rather than reinforcing of the status quo of linguistic power and privilege, especially in contexts such as Australia, in which multicultural and multilingual student cohorts interact with an institutional framework that largely still supports the hegemony of English. I argue that a broader understanding of ‘language education’ itself is appropriate, in which language study is reframed as more than progressing towards communicative and cultural competence in a foreign language. It should also represent a broader cross-disciplinary engagement with the politics of language that will give students nuanced abilities to engage with the political and social consequences of language difference in a wide variety of globalized and localized social and professional contexts. This should, in practice, converge with the general trend towards the internationalization of curriculum with Australian universities. International curricula can be defined in terms recommended by the OECD as ‘an international orientation in content, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally/socially) in an international and multicultural context, and designed for domestic students as well as foreign students.’ I therefore argue that alongside communicative competence in foreign languages, students experiencing international curricula also need some grounding in the political and social aspects of language difference and language use, particularly if they are not only to be able to ‘perform’ professionally and socially in international and multicultural contexts, but to perform ethically, responsibly and critically. While the OECD’s definition doesn’t highlight the ethical and critical aspects of internationalized curriculum, as Edwards and Usher (2000) note, the impact of globalization on curriculum and pedagogy is often discussed in terms of enabling the engagement of learners as global citizens or workers, and this involves engagement with global values and social justice. Rizvi and Walsh further see internationalization at Australian universities as promoting ‘values of globalism and intercultural understanding as fundamental to the management of the student diversity that has now become a conspicuous feature of Australian universities.’ As such, deeper understanding of language difference should enable students to engage with diversity within the classrooms, as well as equip them to equitably deal with language difference in the global workforce.

In this paper, I have reflected on my own teaching practice as a means to open a dialogue on how an engagement with language politics could be achieved in an Australian university context. Through examples of successful practice within my own classroom, I have argued that a collaborative learning model allows students to come to an examination of their own linguistic privilege in different contexts; recognize and respect difference among classmates from different language backgrounds; and generally understand complex language situations around the world. Rather than a teacher-led curriculum, contributions and collaboration from students in terms of their own biographies of language, mobility and learning, and their ownership of class resources and classroom activities
often provided the richest learning experiences. As Rizvi and Walsh argue, what is needed in internationalized curriculum is ‘a practical understanding of how difference can be both self-ascribed and constructed by others to deal with it; how students construct their identities and how it might be possible for curriculum to critically engage with their contingent and relational character.’  

This is, in essence, what the course examined here attempted to do, using language as the point of difference. However, these observations still leave many questions as to the applicability of these techniques in different contexts, and how such approaches could be embedded more firmly into teaching and learning strategy.

In terms of the feasibility of this kind of pedagogy taking a more prominent role in Australian university curriculum, there are several points to consider. Firstly, within already crowded disciplinary curricula, and in an increasingly resource poor teaching environment, is there room for a pedagogy of language politics in language departments and in other disciplinary environments? Are tertiary teachers equipped and willing to engage with these ideas and methodologies? Could these approaches actually function in more monocultural classrooms? And where should such learning be placed in a disciplinary sense—does it belong within or alongside foreign language study, or should it be part of a broader process of curriculum reform towards an ‘internationalized curriculum’? A great deal of further research is required before these questions can be adequately answered. However, I believe my own experiences show that a pedagogy of language politics is both possible and valuable to students as global learners.

Shanthi Robertson is the Program Director of the Bachelor of Arts International Studies and a researcher in the Globalism Research Centre in the School of Global Studies, Social Science and Planning at RMIT University.
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