

Comparative and International Education Éducation comparée et internationale

“We Just Try to Work With the Needs in Front of Us” How Teachers in Secondary Schools Enact Ontario’s International Education Strategy « Nous essayons simplement d’adresser les besoins qui se présentent à nous » Comment les enseignants des écoles secondaires appliquent la Stratégie d’éducation internationale de l’Ontario

Nancy Bell and Roopa Desai Trilokekar

Volume 50, Number 2, 2022

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1092019ar>
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5206/cieeci.v50i2.13982>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

University of Western Ontario

ISSN

2369-2634 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Article abstract

The Ontario government’s International Education Strategy (2015) establishes goals for international education and the hosting of international students in Ontario schools. Using a critical policy lens, we focus on teachers as key to enacting these policy objectives in local contexts. The article presents findings from four focus groups of Ontario teachers working in schools with large international student cohorts. We found teacher participants were generally unaware of a broader vision or strategic goal for the presence of these students in their schools. They found it difficult to meet the needs of this growing cohort, and they faced this challenge with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Factors that influenced their enactment included personal background and education, as well their ability to collaborate and work in contexts with a professional ethos. Overall, teachers expressed a desire for more information, support, and professional development, including opportunities for collaboration, with regard to educating international students in their schools.

Cite this article

Bell, N. & Desai Trilokekar, R. (2022). “We Just Try to Work With the Needs in Front of Us”: How Teachers in Secondary Schools Enact Ontario’s International Education Strategy. *Comparative and International Education / Éducation comparée et internationale*, 50(2), 51–67.
<https://doi.org/10.5206/cieeci.v50i2.13982>

Copyright (c) Nancy Bell, Roopa Desai Trilokekar, 2022



This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

August 2022

“We Just Try to Work With the Needs in Front of Us”: How Teachers in Secondary Schools Enact Ontario’s *International Education Strategy*

Nancy Bell
York University
nancybell@idirect.com

Roopa Desai Trilokekar
York University
rdesaitrilokekar@edu.yorku.ca

Recommended Citation

Bell, N., & Trilokekar, R.D. (2022). “We just try to work with the needs in front of us”: How teachers in secondary schools enact Ontario’s *International Education Strategy*. *Comparative and International Education/Éducation comparée et internationale*. 50(2). 51-67. <https://doi.org/10.5206/cieeci.v50i2.13982>

“We Just Try to Work With the Needs in Front of Us”¹: How Teachers in Secondary Schools Enact Ontario’s *International Education Strategy*
« Nous essayons simplement d’adresser les besoins qui se présentent à nous » : comment les enseignants des écoles secondaires appliquent la *Stratégie d’éducation internationale de l’Ontario*.

Nancy Bell, York University

Roopa Desai Trilokekar, York University

Abstract

The Ontario government’s *International Education Strategy* (2015) establishes goals for international education and the hosting of international students in Ontario schools. Using a critical policy lens, we focus on teachers as key to enacting these policy objectives in local contexts. The article presents findings from four focus groups of Ontario teachers working in schools with large international student cohorts. We found that teacher participants were generally unaware of a broader vision or strategic goal for the presence of these students in their schools. They found it difficult to meet the needs of this growing cohort, and they faced this challenge with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Factors that influenced their enactment included personal background and education, as well as their ability to collaborate and work in contexts with a professional ethos. Overall, teachers expressed a desire for more information, support, and professional development, including opportunities for collaboration, with regard to educating international students in their schools.

Résumé

La *Stratégie d’éducation internationale* du gouvernement de l’Ontario (2015) établit les objectifs pour l’éducation internationale et l’accueil des élèves internationaux dans les écoles de l’Ontario. En utilisant une optique de politique critique, nous soulignons le rôle clé des enseignants dans l’application de ces objectifs politiques dans des contextes locaux. L’article présente les résultats de quatre groupes de discussion composés d’enseignants de l’Ontario travaillant dans des écoles avec de grandes cohortes d’élèves internationaux. Nous avons constaté que les enseignants qui ont participé n’étaient en général pas au courant d’une vision globale ou d’un objectif stratégique concernant la présence de ces élèves dans leurs écoles. Ils ont éprouvé de la difficulté à répondre aux besoins de cette cohorte croissante et ont relevé ce défi avec divers degrés d’enthousiasme. Parmi les facteurs qui ont influencé leur mise en œuvre, nous pouvons citer leurs antécédents personnels et leur formation, ainsi que leur capacité à collaborer et à travailler dans des contextes avec une éthique professionnelle. Dans l’ensemble, les enseignants ont exprimé le souhait d’obtenir davantage d’informations, de soutien et de développement professionnel, y compris des possibilités de collaboration, en ce qui concerne l’éducation des étudiants internationaux dans leurs écoles.

Keywords: international students, international education, secondary education, policy enactment, critical policy, culturally responsive pedagogy, linguistically responsive pedagogy

Mots clés : étudiants internationaux, éducation internationale, enseignement secondaire, application des politiques, politique critique, pédagogie sensible à la culture, pédagogie sensible à la langue.

¹ Quote from focus group participant.

Introduction

In 2019, the year before the pandemic, Canada became the third most popular destination for international students (El-Assal, 2020). That year, 638,280 international students held study permits including 80,830 who were enrolled in K–12 schools (Government of Canada [GoC] 2021). Almost half (38,525) of those K–12 students were studying in Ontario (GoC, 2021). The numbers represent a dramatic increase in the last two decades in all sectors of education. In response to the increased recruitment of international students at this level and increasing interest in international education (IE), the Ontario government released Ontario’s *K–12 International Education Strategy* (hereafter referred to as “the *Strategy*”) in 2015 (Government of Ontario [GoO], 2015). The *Strategy* is intended to provide “an integrated, coordinated approach to international education” including the provision of “high-quality programs and service for international students” (GoO, 2015, p. 1). It also targets the internationalization of the curriculum and learning environment, a goal for which the presence of international students is a “valuable resource,” and thus, their integration and engagement should be fostered by schools and boards (GoO, 2015, p. 22). While classroom teachers necessarily play a part in realizing several of the *Strategy*’s targets, ironically, their experiences and perceptions are largely missing from the document. Scholarly research and public discourse on the internationalization of education in Canada has also been silent on the role of K–12 teachers in international education.

Using a critical lens in this paper, we explore the role of educators as policy actors who enact international education policy at the micro level. We explore their enactment in response to competing epistemologies and ideological forces operating both inside and outside the education arena (Davis, 2014; see also Ball, 1993, 2015; Levinson & Sutton, 2001; Menken & Garcia, 2010; Ozga, 2000; Reichert & Torney-Purta, 2019). Through focus groups in four secondary schools across the province, we examined the everyday experiences of teachers who encounter, support, and educate a growing number of fee-paying students from abroad in their classrooms. We posed the following research questions:

1. How do teachers, as policy actors, enact the education of international students in Ontario?
2. Which factors influence their enactment of international student education in Ontario schools?

Background and Literature Review

Increasingly countries are investing in national strategies on international education. In addition to universities, K–12 schools are now adopting an international focus in their mission statements (Engela & Siczek, 2018). This same trend is observable in Canada with both the federal and provincial governments announcing international education policies (Tamtik et al., 2020). Of concern, for the purposes of our paper, is the increase in the number of international students in the K–12 sector and the associated development of policies, legislation, and strategies across the country. Federally, the government oversees the regulation and administration of study visa permits as well as guidelines and approval of custodianship for minors. At the provincial level, British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec have distinct K–12 policies while other provinces, like Alberta and Manitoba, have combined K–12 and postsecondary international education policies. School boards from across the country have come together under the aegis of the Canadian Association of Public Schools–International (CAPS–I), a non-profit association of 128 publicly funded school districts/boards that collectively market Canada as a destination and advocate at the federal level (CAPS–I, n.d.). In Ontario, the Ontario Association of School Districts International (OASDI) plays a similar role. In addition, each school board has its own policies and strategic objectives

with regard to IE. These policy efforts reflect a rise in the importance of IE and underscore the ways in which international education policy work is taken up by “a diverse set of actors” (Trilokekar & El Masri, 2020, p. 263).

Scholarly studies of this phenomenon are limited. Macro-level research has revealed a tension between economic imperatives and social benefits with a rising focus on economic rationales for international education (see for example, Engela & Siczek, 2018). A similar finding was reported in British Columbia (Cover, 2016; Fallon & Poole, 2014; Poole et al., 2020). In a comparative study of Manitoba and Ontario, Trilokekar & Tamtik (2020) drew attention to how international education policy has served as a “legitimizing mechanism” for an activity that has contributed substantial revenue to the publicly funded boards of education (Trilokekar & Tamtik, 2020). At the micro level, a small number of studies have highlighted the challenges faced by the cohort of international students in Canada, including language proficiency, social isolation, and cultural adaptation (Kuo & Roysircar, 2004, 2006; Popadiuk, 2009, 2010). Schecter & Bell’s (2021) recent participatory action research project found similar challenges and emphasized the importance of caring and empathetic teachers and nurturing relationships in supporting this cohort of students.

Ontario’s *Strategy* strives to “enrich the learning environment for all students to develop global competencies, including exposure to multiple cultures and languages” (GoO, 2015, p. 1). International students are positioned as adding value to the learning environment; however, their social integration requires “a deliberate commitment on the part of board and schools” (GoO, 2015, p. 11). Furthermore, proficiency in English or French is cited as “the most significant barrier to successful integration” (GoO, 2015, p. 22). Trilokekar and El Masri (2020) noted that such challenges can only be overcome through the efforts of teachers with experience and training in working with diverse classrooms. Reichert & Torney-Purta’s research (2019) has highlighted the importance of teacher preparation and development programs, given that teachers’ beliefs directly and indirectly impact teaching-related decisions and the quality of students’ learning. Nevertheless, the *Strategy* falls short of addressing a noted deficit in teacher education.

A mismatch between an increasingly culturally, linguistically, and racially diverse student population and a predominately White middle class teaching force has persisted in North America (Guo et al., 2009; Merryfield, 2000; Rego & Nieto, 2000; Zhao, 2010). Further, given the dominance of English language learners (ELLs) amongst the international student population, it is difficult to separate the need for teachers who are sensitive to intercultural issues from the need for those who are skilled both in teaching English as a second language (ESL) and supporting ELLs in content areas. Despite robust theoretical and empirical support for culturally responsive and multi/plurilingual pedagogies (Lucas & Villages, 2013; Lucas et al., 2008; Schecter & Cummins, 2003; Van Viegen Stille et al., 2016), studies have shown that many teacher candidates (TCs) feel “inadequately prepared” to teach this cohort (Faez, 2012; Webster & Valeo, 2011; see also Portolés & Martin, 2020 for similar research in Europe). Webster and Valeo (2011) found that teachers wanted more training in language acquisition and suggested that effective teaching training programs must include an emphasis on “a cohesive systemic change including theories of language activity, (and) diversity issues” (p. 109). Further, the need for teachers to have opportunities to “explore and experiment with multilingual teaching and learning strategies” has been highlighted (Van Viegen Stille et al., 2016, p. 499).

In addition, formal international experiences are often encouraged for teacher candidates (Cushner & Mahon, 2002; Merryfield, 2000). However, studies have shown that these experiences do not always encourage a critical analysis of power structures in systems of education abroad or at home (Larsen & Searle, 2017; Savva, 2017; Santoro, 2014; Sieber & Mantel, 2012; Trilokekar

& Kukar, 2011). It is worth noting here that sharing and developing Ontario education expertise, specifically through opportunities for educators to work abroad and gain exposure to “new practices and pedagogies,” is highlighted in the strategy, but support for these initiatives is placed in the hands of school boards (GoO, 2015 p. 5).

In short, despite policy discourses that tout a commitment to intercultural engagement, a focus on global competencies, and support for language acquisition, teacher education programs in Ontario have struggled to incorporate practical and theoretical instruction in how to achieve these goals. Additionally, while some programs and opportunities have provided teachers with various intercultural perspectives and understanding of linguistic and cultural diversities, none have addressed the needs of international students specifically. The situation has established a gap between the more aspirational aspects of the *Strategy* and the reality in schools and classrooms where the linguistic development and cultural integration of international students are attended to by classroom teachers.

Theoretical Framework

Our theoretical orientation reflects a critical turn away from a traditional, top-down view of policy as a formal text or a government directive towards an emphasis on the fluid and often contested reality of policy as both a process and a practice (Ball, 1993, 2015; Davis, 2014; Levinson & Sutton, 2001; Ozga, 2000). Education and language policy scholars in this tradition have posited that, while formal policy texts often reflect dominant discourses, their production and enactment involve “negotiation, contestation or struggle between different groups who may lie outside the formal machinery of official policy-making” (Ozga, 2000, p. 113).

Various actors are involved in all levels of education policy-making, including legislators, bureaucrats, school administrators, and teachers, but the latter are often at the bottom of the hierarchy in official policy discourse (Ellison et al., 2018). We argue, as have others in educational and language policy studies, that teachers are key actors who interpret, negotiate, and enact both explicit and covert policies (Menken & Garcia, 2010, p. 1; see also Ellison, 2018; Levinson & Sutton, 2001). In local contexts, with competing policy objectives, (often) limited resources, and multiple demands on their time, teachers often enact policies in ways that are unintended by those who pen official texts and directives (Levinson & Sutton, 2001).

In enacting policies, teachers are influenced by their individual identities as well as contextual factors (Ball et al., 2012; Menken & Garcia; 2010). Coburn (2001) argued that they make sense of policy through collaborating with colleagues using a filter of their own worldview. Ball et al. (2012) maintained the agency of teachers while bringing attention to contextual factors that constrain and enable their enactment. They identified four relevant dimensions of context: professional (e.g., values, teacher commitments and experiences, and policy management in schools); material (e.g., staffing budgets, buildings, technology, and infrastructure), situated (e.g., locale, school histories and demographics), and external (e.g., degree and quality of support, expectations from the broader policy context). Within these complex contexts, teachers act as both “receivers and agents of policy” and have often been overlooked in traditional studies of implementation that have tended to focus on administrators and school leaders (p. 49). In an attempt to clarify teachers’ roles, Ball et al. (2012) proposed eight typologies or *policy positions*, which are not fixed or mutually exclusive. These roles are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1
Policy Actors and “Policy Work”

Policy Actors	Policy Work
Narrators	Interpretation, selection, and enforcement of meaning
Entrepreneurs	Advocacy, creativity, and integration
Outsiders	Entrepreneurship, partnership, and monitoring
Transactors	Accounting, reporting, monitoring/supporting, facilitating
Enthusiasts	Investment, creativity, satisfaction, careers
Translators	Production of texts, artifacts, and events
Critics	Union representatives: monitoring of management, maintaining counter discourses
Receivers	Coping, defending, and dependency

Note. Source: Ball et al., 2012.

Given the interplay of constraining and enabling contextual factors and the individual perspectives and values of policy actors, “enactments are messy, incomplete and a form of interpretation and intersubjectivity in action” (Maguire et al., 2015, p. 487). In our study, we maintained this focus on teachers as policy actors and sought to uncover the roles they play, and the contextual factors that influence them, in enacting the education of international students in four public schools in Ontario.

Methodology

To address the exploratory nature of our research questions, we conducted a qualitative study comprising four focus groups, purposefully selected from two urban boards in Ontario. Both boards had been recruiting international students for over 20 years, were founding members of CAPS–I and OASDI, and had administrators who were involved in developing the *Strategy*. In one board, international education was managed through a nonprofit corporation that worked closely with the board, while the other had a department within the existing board structure.

The schools we chose had relatively similar situated contexts. All were urban schools with linguistically diverse populations of approximately 1,000 students and had international student cohorts ranging from just under 100 to 130. As for their material contexts, although one inner-city school was housed in a much older building than the other three, they had similar staffing structures and supports.² Nonetheless, the four focus groups yielded rich and nuanced data.

Our focus groups included three to six teachers and lasted from 1 hour to 90 minutes. The participating teachers included 15 females and three males; 13 were White and five were racialized. The participants taught a variety of subjects including ESL, English, math, history, civics, science, and guidance. They ranged from beginning teachers to those with 20 years of experience. Their

² We intended to include a third board that was not part of OASDI and was situated in a less urban context. However, escalating labour action, including rotating one-day strikes across the province, and the onset of the global pandemic disrupted our plans.

backgrounds and experiences were varied, with a handful having lived, taught, or studied abroad. Several spoke more than one language, including a couple whose first language was not English and who had immigrated to Canada. All of them had received their teacher education in Ontario. Table 2 summarizes the profiles of our focus group participants.

Table 2

Focus Group Participant Profiles

Name*	Subjects taught	Years of Experience
School 1	Large urban school board, outer suburbs, large ELL population	
Brianna	History, Family Studies, Social Science	20
Helen	History, Art	24
Ara	Geography, History, Social Science, English	8
Layla	ESL, History, Social Science	20
Elizabeth	French, History	14
Zara	English, History, Social Science	15
School 2	Large urban school board, IB program, suburban, large ELL population, French Immersion, multiple languages taught	
Sonja	ESL teacher & curriculum lead	5
Allysa	Chemistry, Biology, junior Science, IB and regular stream	17
Eve	ESL C,D,E	1
School 3	Smaller urban board, inner city	
Joe	Drama	7
Sam	ESL, Japanese, Bus. English, Academic English	15
Steve	English/ESL	22
Serena	English/Guidance	22
Liz	English/Drama	18
School 4	Smaller urban board, suburban, French immersion	
Pat	English, History (for ELLs)	2
Andrijana	English, History (for ELLs)	26
Victoria	Learning support, Math, & ESL	24
Eva	Math, Business	19

* All names are pseudonyms.

Our focus group format enabled participants to listen to and build upon others' perspectives and experiences, while allowing us to probe for clarification and extension of the discussion into areas we did not anticipate (Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Morgan, 1997; Teddlie & Tashakorri, 2009). Data were transcribed and analyzed using coding and thematic analysis. (Braun & Clarke, 2019). The focus group transcriptions were read and reread separately by the two researchers and independently marked and coded to discover conceptual categories. The themes that emerged from our inductive analysis were grouped according to the relevant objectives of the *Strategy*.

Research Findings

Based on previous studies (Trilokekar & El Masri, 2020; Trilokekar & Tamtik, 2020), we were not surprised to find that the teachers in this study expressed little to no awareness of Ontario's *Strategy* or how international education fit into their own board's strategic orientation. They knew that the students brought necessary funds to their board but were not aware of a bigger picture from a policy perspective. In the absence of explicit policy directives and without dedicated training or resources, these teachers enacted the educational, social, and intercultural programming that comprised the IE experience in their schools. In the following section, our findings are organized with reference to the policy objectives outlined in the *Strategy*. Within these policy categories, we summarize the major themes that emerged from our discussions. Due to the small size and limited number of our focus groups, we do not attribute quotations to individual teachers to maintain their anonymity.

Excellent Educational Programs: Supporting the Development of Language Proficiency International Students Are English Language Learners: "We Don't Differentiate"

The *Strategy* cites lack of English (or French) proficiency as a major barrier to the integration of international students (GoO, 2015, p. 22). The teachers in our focus groups clearly perceived that this was a high priority and largely equated international students with ELLs. As one teacher stated, "Usually they know and but all of them are ELL's obviously but there is a mix of new immigrants and refugees and international students—a real, broad cultural spread in the backgrounds." Another commented:

Your research is about international students, and we keep weaving it in with ELL's, because they are in a variety of places. But they are not really easily—as classroom teachers, we are not pulling apart where they are from. *We are just trying to work with the needs in front of us* [emphasis added]. We don't differentiate.

Indeed, discussions about English proficiency dominated most of our conversations. As one teacher concluded, "Every single teacher needs to know how to teach an ESL student." In the participants' efforts to address these challenges, we saw evidence of collaboration and innovation. Both schools from the smaller board spoke of professional learning circles where teachers from multiple disciplines were working together to develop strategies to help ELLs by providing supports beyond the mandated accommodations. One school was beginning to package mandatory core courses with more "language-friendly" options, such as geography and outdoor education. One teacher recalled support she received from more experienced colleagues in her school when teaching an accommodated history course for the first time. In another school, an instructional coach (a position that no longer existed) had helped a teacher organize a book club. Another school offered bridging literacy courses to help prepare ELLs for senior-level English courses.

The Need for Resources and Support Despite the supports mentioned above, teachers expressed strong feelings about insufficient assistance for both ELLs and their teachers. Many seemed overwhelmed by the demands placed upon them, comparing the situation to the "wild, wild west." In one school, teachers believed that support for ELLs was actually decreasing, even though the numbers of international students was on the rise:

I feel like we almost had more resources before than we do today, even though our population has increased, because 7 years ago you wouldn't have an ESL student in your regular history class. ... So, the support we have for the ESL, including visa students is disappearing, right?

Another described the levels of support in the past:

when I taught it (ESL AO) 10 years ago, I had a translator in the room with me, which worked brilliantly. I haven't had that over the past 3 or 4 years. Like they would literally stand beside the person and um, translate and do a presentation. And I would say a word and she would say the word in English. The translator would tell her what that meant in Mandarin. It worked really, really well.

One teacher expressed frustration at the perception that “there is a push to get rid of all sheltered ESL courses.” Similarly, another said,

I am teaching ESL History which would typically have ESL E students. And now they have changed it to where it is ESL C., and they are having so many difficulties, have no background and um, a more efficient student would be an ESL E student. But I have C's. So that is totally out of my comfort zone.

Another asked,

What do you think I should do on a basic level? ... Are they allowed to take pictures of the text knowing that it comes up straight in Mandarin? Literally you take pictures of the text and it translates right away and they are just reading it. Should I accept that or not accept that?

Teachers in one school acknowledged using assessment tools developed by the Ministry of Education but commented that these tools are challenging to use, especially “when you are not a teacher who is working with language predominantly.”

Overall, teachers expressed a desire for more training and better support for working with ELLs. Most of our participants had taken a basic Additional Qualification (AQ) course in teaching ESL, but none of them had had any formal training in teaching or supporting ELLs in their Bachelor of Education (BEd) program. Most participants saw this as an oversight, as verbalized by one teacher who said, “It is absolutely shocking that there is not a course for ESL or Special Education for every teacher to take. It makes you a better teacher.”

Excellent Educational Programs: Encouraging Cultural Engagement

The *Strategy* suggests that schools should encourage interaction between international and domestic students and integrate the perspectives of international students into classes. The teachers in our groups had varying perspectives on the diversity—both academic and social—those international students bring to schools, and they enacted a corresponding range of pedagogical responses.

Encouraging Social Interaction Based on feedback from our focus groups, it would appear that the social integration of international students with their domestic peers is not being realized to any significant degree. International students “tend to congregate with each other. Like if you go to the cafeteria at lunch there are the Chinese, the Brazilian, the Colombians.” Another teacher commented,

I see it in the classroom still that, you know, you have the groups: there are the Chinese, there are the Filipinos, there is the South Asians. [There is] less mixing in the hallways. In the classroom, it is controlled environment so you can get them to work together.

Teachers at one school felt that this situation was exacerbated by a “skewed demographic,” with most students coming from Asia. They saw this as problematic, as they explained,

because most of our students are from China. And that means that the students who are not from China are even like more shrunk down in the class. ... and so those students who already feel like anxious in a class they feel even more invisible.

For some teachers this was concerning from a language learning perspective as well; they feared that too many students from one country in a class led to an over-reliance on first language. As one teacher said, “The stronger ones translate for the weaker ones. And they are just not working.”

The *Strategy* suggests that activities to assist intercultural interaction should be “supported and facilitated by educators and teachers” (GoO, 2015, p. 23), but teachers were not sure how to make this happen: “And how does that work? How do you support that kind of intercultural friendship piece?” Another commented, “I don’t think that the Canadians are really keen or interested in trying to, and I have told many of them like this is a great opportunity. Like you can meet people from all over the world.” Another lamented, “Our international program is so big now that we can’t have, like, it is impossible to organize like a buddy system. It’s just too hard.” Supports for these programs are lacking. Several participants spoke of clubs that were initiated and one school had an itinerant “multicultural liaison officer,” but there were no exemplary stories of intercultural social integration—inside or outside class.

Cultural Differences: Curriculum and Pedagogy Teachers from all schools commented on subject-specific cultural differences in curriculum expectations and pedagogical approaches. For example, a math teacher said, “For sure that some of our international students do very well in math. There is a bit of an international language of mathematics.” However, students struggled with language-based problems and found the curricular emphasis on metacognition unfamiliar and challenging. As described by another teacher:

[They have a] very different way of learning and of understanding math. They don’t see, like, our curriculum requires us to explain our steps and show our process. And that is not valued in some of the cultures where they have come from ... So, there is a lot of pushback about being evaluated on process in their math classes. It’s like, I got it right. And I don’t know why they’re docking me. Why do I need to write down my steps this way? ... So, the students are very frustrated. And the teachers are frustrated.

Similar challenges were described by humanities and social science teachers. One English teacher, who worked with senior-level students, explained that international students have different attitudes “and the concept of analyzing literature simply isn’t happening in their original countries.” The teacher explained, essay writing format in Colombia, Mexico, and Spain is very specific and different, “but I think the thing that what we are talking about actually encourages critical thinking and original thinking.”

Discussions on academic cultures were often couched in a discourse of deficit. One teacher went as far as to characterize the difference by saying that some international students come “from where they are still using, you know, punishment. They cane them or whatever. And it is mostly memorize and regurgitate. They are not tasked with thinking independently or critically or creatively.” Others spoke of how international students are “more reluctant to participate. At least in class they are quieter and that may be because (they believe) it is something you are not supposed to be, out there with all of the attention.” Many teachers stressed how international students need to adapt, change, and fit into a Canadian system that they implied is better and more advanced. As one teacher explained, “It is really hard to shape their mentality.” Another suggested that international students should be required to take a course on creativity and critical thinking, which she saw as a skill that is lacking in the international student population.

The Use of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy A few teachers were reflective about the cultural responsiveness of their teaching methods and materials. They suggested simple things like translating materials and changing the names that are used in word problems, “so that it is not all, you know, Bill and Jane. That has been one of the things that has been pointed out to me just, you know, it is Mohammed, and that can just relieve some anxiety.” Several stressed a need for greater flexibility in assessment, including one who said they “felt like a bully” for asking a student to respond to a process question when they knew that the student understood but could not articulate the answer in English. Others suggested a need for more flexible assessment methods. Still another noted the irony that North American teachers claim to value critical thinking and creativity, but at the same time ask students to memorize grammatical rules. Another suggested, “They need a completely different history that focuses on literacy” and is less “Canada-centric.”

In fact, a more reflective tone came to dominate the discourse in one school. Here, teachers discussed how controversial subjects could “come right up—boom, boom, boom,” and some teachers felt they did not have the necessary skills or experience to navigate these conversations in a culturally sensitive way. As one teacher said,

So, I am clueless. I don’t know how to govern that conversation. And I don’t think that I can just trust the news media here. I have no idea how to govern that issue in a civil way ... even though the stakes could be high ... I mean stakes right now are high between the Canadian and the Chinese government. So, is it a matter of, as a teacher, you just stay quiet? Or is it a matter of knowing more about the issues at hand? You know what I mean?

On one hand, “We are saying we want to expose them to the critical thinking that is one of the key strands” but on the other hand, teachers “don’t mean to pinpoint a kid that comes from another culture and say that you are responsible for everything that your culture has done” and “you want to be able to respect the diversity and respect the individual.” Teachers noted that it was a “herculean task” to understand the history and philosophy of all the cultures in their classroom, and they worried about the inherent racism in assuming that students “represented” a culture or national group. One teacher reflected on the possibility of encouraging students to “go against the main grain” through provocative conversations that challenged some dominant Eurocentric ideals.

Intercultural Mindsets: Individual Experiences and Professional Training While discussing these intercultural issues, teachers did reflect on how their own backgrounds, experiences, and training may have prepared them for this work. One teacher, an immigrant to Canada, stated,

I came on my own as well; my family is not in Canada. Although I was older than them, right, but ... I often volunteer the information just so I can build up a rapport with them. And they feel kind of included, right? Like they are not alone.

Others spoke of how “travel definitely helps because then you have that perspective a little bit broader to draw on.” One teacher described how personal experience can create empathy for students:

when I think about the students in my class, you know, if they are from Japan, I know what you were thinking with regards to this class [because of her several years of experience teaching in Japan], but I have no idea what this student from Somalia is thinking because I don’t know much about their school experience. And maybe that would be something that would be helpful in professional development to actually have an idea of. And you have to do it very sensitively but to really see what that’s like.

Several teachers echoed the need for professional development that addressed the backgrounds and orientations of the international students at the school. One teacher said, “What I

think is interesting is that none of our professional development has ever addressed anything to do with international students.” Although teachers spoke of ongoing, in-school training on cultural diversity, they felt that it was very broad: “I mean it is all about the anti-discrimination and prejudice training that still needs to keep going,” but they said, more specific “professional development around those academic differences and philosophies would help a lot. That would [be] interesting ... and very, very useful for us.” Regardless of their individual perspective on difference, it was clear that all of the teachers felt that they needed more support, more training, and more opportunities to collaborate with each other in order to successfully integrate international students into the classroom.

High Quality Programs for the Care, Safety, and Well-Being of International Students

The Impact of Isolation The Ontario Ministry of Education’s objective of providing for the “safety, care and well-being of students” (GoO, 2015, p. 23) rests primarily with boards, custodians, and homestay providers; teachers also have a role to play in supporting the mental health and well-being of these students. Although this was not the main focus of our discussion, teachers did identify particular challenges their international students face. In every focus group, the emotional toll of being away from home and in the care of guardians/homestays was noted. One teacher expressed concern for a student, for whom “there was no one really there to make sure that he was sleeping at regular hours, um, getting things done that he needed to, eating properly.” Another offered: “They [international students] are up all hours of the night playing video games or talking or going out because their friends at home in China are awake when we are supposed to be asleep,” and as a result, “this kid is always sleeping in my class and not really taking anything in whatsoever.” One teacher said, “I am really worried about the emotional (lives of students). They need somebody caring to be at home with, right?” Another teacher cited concerns about students’ self-care: some “don’t have enough like, um, stuff for themselves, like to take care of themselves. Like to wash themselves, toothpaste. Stuff like that as well. Proper clothing. Many of them come not prepared for cold Canadian winters.”

“Just This Kind of Like Strangers to Us” Staying up late and playing video games are not activities restricted to international students, but reaching out to custodians who often don’t live with students, or parents who live on another continent, can be challenging. While some resources are available to bridge that gap, most teachers felt the level of support was inadequate. Only one school had a permanent in-school guidance counsellor whose role was to support international students. Perhaps because of this limited support, and certainly in reaction to it, teachers believed they did not have enough knowledge, collectively or individually:

Like where do they live, who are they living with, what was their experience from their home country? Like there is no time built in for that, in our curriculum in the classroom. Um, there is no effort on the part of the administration to kind of give us time to work through that because it is so important to know. Because we like to find out that information about our domestic students, but the international students are just this kind of like strangers to us. So, finding out that type of information would be very helpful.

In three schools, teachers felt that the specific emotional needs of international students were not sufficiently addressed in professional development workshops on mental health. As one teacher expressed, “I feel like there is a huge gap where they are not addressing mental health of international students.”

Discussion

How Teachers Enact Policy: Receivers and Enthusiasts

In attempting to make sense of the various roles these teachers played with respect to policy enactment, we turn back to the typologies outlined in Table 1. Ball et al. (2012) identified eight policy positions that can be taken up by teachers—some with more agency than others. We placed our focus group participants primarily into two, sometimes overlapping, categories of receivers or enthusiasts. We believe this underscores the implicit way policy is enacted in the absence of explicit policy directives. As one teacher said, “We just try to work with the needs in front of us.”

Receivers tend to “manage, cope and sometimes struggle while looking for guidance” (Ball et al., 2012, p. 63). Many of our participants seemed overwhelmed by the increase in the number of international students and ELLs in their schools. They were working hard to support these students and were vocal in their desire for more information, guidance, and resources to better understand and meet their students’ needs. However, they did so in the absence of a bigger picture. Perhaps because of this, several teachers struggled to move the conversation beyond subject-specific challenges—how to assess students on a history exam, how to teach process steps—another characteristic of policy receivers (Ball et al., 2012).

Furthermore, in the absence of a broader perspective, the teachers’ enactment focused largely on addressing students’ language proficiency (or deficiency). This attitude manifested itself in concerns that students clustering together with others from the same country would use their first language to translate and help each other out—a practice encouraged in current multilingual pedagogical theory (Garcia & Otheguy, 2020; Van Viegen Stille et al., 2016). This focus on language was linked to a tendency to homogenize international students with all English language learners, illustrated by the statement “we are not pulling apart; we don’t differentiate.” Such attitudes suggest that these teachers had not been informed of nor reflected upon a broader intercultural agenda for the presence of these students in their classrooms.

On the other hand, there were some teacher comments, practices, and ideas that gestured towards role of the “enthusiast or influencer”—policy actors who embody “policy in their practice and are examples to others” (Ball, et al., 2012, p. 59). These teachers wanted to encourage greater interaction between domestic and international students although they were not sure how to do that. We encountered teachers who seemed open to inherent possibilities and desired to “make enactment a collaborative process” (Ball et al., 2012, p. 60). They spoke of creative, innovative, and positive teacher collaborations across departments and disciplines and reinforced the value of resources and time to explore and experiment in order to create more linguistically and culturally responsive classrooms.

While enthusiast voices emerged in each group, the role was most dominant in one school. Here we witnessed a lively discourse about the “contradictions and limitations of critical literacy” as it plays out in a linguistically and culturally diverse classroom. These teachers collectively and enthusiastically reflected on the difficult conversations around politics, histories, and geographies of difference that come about from having students from around the globe in their classrooms. They found these conversations challenging but exhibited a willingness “to grow and develop themselves through creative policy work” (Ball et al., 2012, p. 59). They were, in fact, engaging with critical pedagogy, which encourages self-reflection on teacher identities, perspectives, and belief systems and engages in the politics of difference (Trilokekar & Kukar, 2011).

Given the limited number of participants in this exploratory study, we cannot say categorically that the other roles posited by Ball et al. (2012) do not exist in these schools. However, in our conversations, we did not hear much evidence of the other roles posited by Ball et al. (2012). We suspect that the role of the interpreter, one who selects policies for enactment, may be

performed beyond the school by those who recruit and place international students. We did not see or hear of a “translator”—one who provides vision for IE in the school—although some of the enthusiasts might assume that role if they were given more agency to take on a leadership role. Similarly, some of our enthusiasts could, in a more enabling context, assume the role of “entrepreneur” who “challenge[s] ingrained assumptions about practice” and creates new policy (Ball et al., 2012, p. 54). In one school, a guidance counsellor tasked with supporting international students might be considered a “transactor.” Her role seemed to be facilitating through the timetabling, tracking, and monitoring of international students, a role that had the potential to become an entrepreneur, narrator, or translator. However, in the absence of school-wide discussions about the intent or purpose of the IE initiative, these roles do not seem to have been taken up locally. Similarly, we did not find teachers who actively took up the position of “critic,” in the sense of one who offers a “principled and political” critique, but this position may well emerge if the broader discourse about the international education policy objectives was introduced into these contexts (Ball et al., 2021, p. 61).

Influencing Factors: Individuals vs. Contexts

How do we account for the subtle differences we saw with respect to these policy actors? As noted above, critical policy research that focuses on policy enactment has highlighted both the agency of individual teachers (Coburn, 2001; Davis, 2014; Menken & Garcia, 2010) and the enabling and constraining features of contexts (Ball et al., 2012). Both factors appeared to be at play here. A few teachers in all four schools described personal experiences (having immigrated to Canada) or professional experiences (teaching in other countries) that made them more empathetic or broadened their perspective. These teachers brought unique perspectives to their work, but they also made sense of their work through collaboration with their colleagues and expressed desire for more opportunities to build communities of practice (Coburn, 2001). However, they seemed constrained by lack of resources, time, and support for this creative work.

Still, the predominance of the enthusiasts in one school suggests the presence of a more enabling context. Here we return to Ball et al. (2012), who reminded us that “context” is a multifaceted concept with at least four dimensions—the external, material, and external settings and the professional culture of a school. At the broadest level, the schools we visited worked in very similar external contexts. Both school boards participate in a provincial policy context that prioritizes the recruitment of international students. The situated contexts of the schools we visited varied slightly, but not dramatically, from inner city to suburban, and their intakes were highly similar—diverse populations with large ELL cohorts and similar numbers of fee-paying students. Materially, the schools were subject to similar funding formulas and resources, although, no doubt, there might have been different allocations of resources at the local level.

This leads us to conclude the presence of a professional culture in the school with the high number of enthusiasts that was more aligned with the aspirational goals of the *Strategy* and, in fact, brought a critical orientation that might challenge some of the assumptions embedded within this policy. There seems to have been something in the ethos of this particular school that encouraged a positive predisposition to its diverse population and pride in being “very international.” Furthermore, the conversations here, collectively, seemed more reflective about the need to reframe pedagogical practices and encourage critical thinking—in both teachers and students.

Limitations of the Study

We acknowledge, that our findings do not present a definitive picture of how teachers perceive and enact their role with respect to international students. Broader investigation and discussion with

teachers across the provinces in a variety of contexts and boards is warranted. Our original intention was to conduct more focus groups, but this plan was disrupted by the pandemic. However, we believe the richness of the data we collected makes a worthwhile contribution to the emergent conversation. In addition, further research into the roles of other policy actors—including the students themselves—is warranted. Finally, we recognize that the global pandemic has disrupted the recruitment and education of international students, and practices may look different in the future. Still, the findings of this paper highlight issues that will be relevant to the changing context.

Conclusion

At the macro level, the government of Ontario prioritizes high quality care and education of the thousands of international students recruited to study in its public schools each year (GoO, 2015). It rhetorically supports the development of these students' English proficiency, encourages their engagement with their domestic peers, and pledges to ensure that their safety and well-being are attended to. However, in practice, the main (and, in some instances, the sole) activity that drives IE at the institutional level is international student recruitment (Stein & Andreotti, 2016; Trilokekar & Tamtik, 2020).

The presence of these students in schools, without much apparent local discussion about the broader goals of the province or the boards who are recruiting them, has contributed to a “policy as text” vacuum. This is highlighted, in the schools we visited, by the absence of translators, narrators, entrepreneurs, transactors, outsiders, and critics amongst those who ultimately enact the education of this cohort. While these roles may be fulfilled at other levels, at the micro level classrooms teachers are doing their best “to work with the needs” in front of them with varying degrees of enthusiasm, empathy, and frustration. In doing so, they are influenced by individual factors such as background and professional development experiences and the presence of collaborative and like-minded enthusiasts in their schools.

Despite their shared experience of Ontario's teacher education program, there were personal differences in how the teachers in this study approached their role. Clearly, some teachers felt overwhelmed by the growing numbers of international students. Others had a greater predisposition towards teaching linguistically and culturally diverse students and expressed greater empathy for the challenges their students face. All of them expressed a desire for more information, resources, and support. This commitment shown by teachers is important to note particularly in a context where, as Engel and Siczek (2018) suggested, current international education strategies do not allow for any possibilities of a “reimagined national space,” to enable support for more humanistic dimensions of education. We also found one group, where the professional ethos embodied an asset-based attitude to students and a greater propensity towards a reflective and critical pedagogy. While we did not see evidence of transformative policy work on behalf of individual teachers, we did see the presence of enthusiastic teachers for whom the opportunity to learn, reflect, and collaborate could result in a pedagogy that is meaningfully intercultural and responsive to the needs of diverse learners—perhaps beyond the intentions of the *Strategy's* authors. Building teacher education and teacher professional development on the “sensemaking” process that teachers engage with when faced with international education policy expectations is key, especially if the Ontario government and boards of education truly desire to achieve the aspirational goals of the *Strategy*, dissociating it from a strictly revenue generating activity (Engel & Siczek, 2018). The Ontario government would be well advised to promote greater awareness and provide better support, through faculties of education and board-level professional development opportunities, for teachers who enact the education of international students.

References

- Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 13(2), 10–17.
- Ball, S. J. (2015). What is policy? 21 years later: Reflections on the possibilities of policy research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36(3), 306–313.
- Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., Braun, A., & Hoskins, K. (2012). *How schools do policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. Routledge.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Thematic analysis. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in health social sciences* (pp. 843–860). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_103
- Canadian Association of Public Schools-International (CAPS-I). (n.d.). *Education in Canada*. <https://CAPS-I.ca/education-in-canada/>
- Coburn, C. (2001). Collective sensemaking about reading: How teachers mediate reading policy in their professional communities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 145–170. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3594127>
- Cover, D. (2016). The discursive framing of international education programs in British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 180, 169–201.
- Cushner, K., & Mahon, J. (2002). Overseas student teaching: Affecting personal, professional, and global competencies in an age of globalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(1), 44–58.
- Davis, K. A. (2014). Engaged language policy and practices. *Language Policy* 13(2), 83–100. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/10.1007/s10993-013-9296-5>
- El-Assal, K. (2020, February 20). *642,000 international students: Canada now ranks 3rd globally in foreign student attraction*. CIC News. <https://www.cicnews.com/2020/02/642000-international-students-canada-now-ranks-3rd-globally-in-foreign-student-attraction-0213763.html#gs.niubbf>
- Ellison, S., Anderson, A. B., Aronson, B., & Clausen, C. (2018). From objects to subjects: Repositioning teachers as policy actors doing policy work. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74, 157–169.
- Engel, L. C., & Siczek M. M. (2018). A cross-national comparison of international strategies: Global citizenship and the advancement of national competitiveness. *Compare*, 48(5), 749–767.
- Faez, F. (2012). Diverse teachers for diverse students: Internationally educated and Canadian-born teachers' preparedness to teach English language learners. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 35(3), 64–84. <https://journals.sfu.ca/cje/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/967>
- Fallon, G., & Poole, W. (2014). The emergence of a market-driven funding mechanism in K–12 education in British Columbia: Creeping privatization and the eclipse of equity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 29(3), 302–322.
- Garcia, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 32(1), 17–35.
- Government of Canada. (2021). *Facts and figures 2015—Immigration overview: Temporary residents overview, and the glossary of terms and concepts*. Canada-Study Permit Holders With a Valid Permit on December 31st by Province/Territory of Intended Destination and Study Level 2000–2021. https://www.cic.gc.ca/opendatadonneesouvertes/data/EN_ODP_annual-TR-Study-IS_PT_study_level_year_end.xlsx
- Government of Ontario. (2015). *Ontario's Strategy for K–12 International Education*. <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/policyfunding/strategyK12.pdf>
- Guo, Y., Lund, D., & Arthur, N. (2009). *My culture, your culture: What pre-service teachers say about intercultural competence* (PMC Working Paper Series: Working Paper No. WP04-09). <https://sites.ualberta.ca/~pcerii/WorkingPapers/Working%20paper%20-%20Guo,%20Lund,%20Arthur.pdf>
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. B. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Kuo, B. C. H., & Roysircar, G. (2004). Predictors of acculturation for Chinese adolescents in Canada: Age of arrival, length of stay, social class, and English reading ability. *Journal of Multicultural Counselling and Development*, 32(3), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2004.tb00367>
- Kuo, B. C. H., & Roysircar, G. (2006). An exploratory study of cross-cultural adaptation of adolescent Taiwanese unaccompanied sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(2), 159–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.00>

- Larsen, M. A., & Searle, M. J. (2017). International service learning and critical global citizenship: A cross-case study of a Canadian teacher education alternative practicum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 63(1), 196–205.
- Levinson B., & Sutton M. (2001). Introduction: Policy as/in practice: A sociocultural approach to the study of educational policy. In M. Sutton & B. Levinson (Eds.), *Policy as practice: Toward a comparative sociocultural analysis of education policy*. Ablex.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 52, 98–109.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M., Freedson-Gonzalez M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361–373.
- Maguire, M., Braun, A., & Ball, S. (2015). “Where you stand depends on where you sit”: The social construction of policy enactments in the (English) secondary school. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36(4), 485–499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2014.977022>
- Menken, K., & Garcia, O. (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. Routledge.
- Merryfield, M. M. (2000). Why aren’t teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of multicultural and global educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(4), 429–443.
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Ozga, J. (2000). *Policy research in educational settings: Contested terrain*. Open University Press.
- Poole, P., Fallon, G., & Sen, V. (2020). Privatised sources of funding and the spatiality of inequities in public education. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 52(1), 124–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2019.1689105>
- Popadiuk, N. E. (2009). Unaccompanied Asian secondary students in Canada. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 31(4), 229–243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-009-9080-6>
- Popadiuk, N. E. (2010). Asian international student transition to high school in Canada. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(6), 1523–1548. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol15/iss6/10>
- Portolés, L., & Martin, O. (2020). Teachers’ beliefs about multilingual pedagogies and the role of initial training. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 248–264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1515206>
- Rego, M. A. S., & Nieto, S. (2000). Multicultural/intercultural teacher education in two contexts: Lessons from the United States and Spain. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(4), 413–427.
- Reichert, F & Torney-Purta, J. (2019). A cross-national comparison of teachers’ beliefs about the aims of civic education in 12 countries: A person-centered analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 77, 112–125.
- Santoro, N. (2014). “If I’m going to teach about the world, I need to know the world”: Developing Australian pre-service teachers’ intercultural competence through international trips. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 17(3), 429–444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2013.832938>
- Savva, M. (2017). Learning to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students through cross-cultural experiences. *Intercultural Education*, 28(3), 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2017.1333689>
- Schecter S., & Bell, N. (2021). Supporting early study abroad students in Ontario: Case study of a collaborative action research initiative with changes happening underfoot. *Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 22(1), 4–26 <https://doi.org/10.33524/cjar.v22i1.535>
- Schecter, S., & Cummins, J. (2003). *Multilingual education in practice: Using diversity as resource*. Heinemann.
- Sieber, P., & Mantel, C. (2012) The internationalization of teacher education: An introduction. *Prospects*, 42, 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-012-9218-x>
- Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2016). Cash, competition, or charity: International students and the global imaginary. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, 72(2), 225–239.
- Tamtik, M., Trilokekar, R. D., & Jones, G. A. (2020). *International education as public policy in Canada*. McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Teddle, C., & Tashakorri, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Sage.
- Trilokekar, R., & El Masri, A. (2020). Internationalizing teacher preparedness: The missing link in Ontario’s *Strategy for K–12 International Education*? *Canadian Journal of Education*, 43(1), 170–196.
- Trilokekar, R. D., & Kukar, P. (2011). Disorienting experiences during study abroad: Reflections of pre-service teacher candidates. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(7), 1141–1150.
- Trilokekar, R. D., & Tamtik, M. (2020). A comparative analysis of K–12 international education policies of Ontario and Manitoba. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 193, 32–48.

- Van Viegen Stille, S., Bethke, R., Bradly-Brown, J., Gibertson, J., & Hall, G. (2016). Broadening educational practice to include translanguaging: An outcome of educator inquiry into multilingual student's learning needs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(4), 480–503.
- Webster, N. L., & Valeo, A. (2011). Teacher preparedness for a changing demographic of language learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 28(2), 105–128. <https://doi-org.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/10.18806/tesl.v28i2.1075>
- Zhao, Y. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A new imperative for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(5), 422–431.

Nancy Bell is a PhD candidate in the Faculty of Education, York University. Her research on international students, language learning, multilingualism and intercultural classrooms is grounded in her experience as a secondary ESL/English teacher. She is a sessional lecturer at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto.

Roopa Desai Trilokekar is associate professor (postsecondary education) in the Faculty of Education, York University. She comes to an academic career after 20 years of experience as a professional in the field of international education in Canada, India, and the United States. Her research focuses on international education policy, the nexus of international students and immigration policy, and the geopolitics of international education.