

---

# ***The question of professional ethics in TESOL: Hospitality as an (im)possible demand?***

---

**ALEX KOSTOGRIZ**

*Monash University*

*Abstract: 25 years ago, TESOL in Context published a paper on the ethics of TESOL. In this paper, Alan Williams, who was the ACTA Councillor and Policy Committee Convenor at that time, reminded the professional community of some moral predicaments in teaching English to others. On the one hand, he recognised the “productive and socially worthwhile” work that most TESOL educators do in providing access to the dominant variety of English language (e.g., SAE), thereby empowering the speakers of other languages and dialects to become socially mobile. On the other hand, Williams argued that the effective teaching of English to others can also lead to their disempowerment due to the alienating effect of assimilation on cultural and linguistic identities of learners. Over the years, this dilemma has received due attention from some leading educators and researchers in the field who have attempted to address the access paradox from a critical-pragmatic perspective (Janks, 2004, 2010). This article returns to the question of access paradox in TESOL, arguing the primacy of the ethical in professional practice. In particular, it draws on ethics as hospitality in thinking about the ethicality of professional ethics to problematise the possibility of socially-just language and literacy education in multicultural conditions.*

*Keywords: English language education, teacher professional ethics, hospitality, justice*

## **Introduction**

For some time now, sociocultural and socially critical approaches to English language education in Australia have been concerned with two broad political models of education. The first model is informed by a *redistributive* justice perspective on language education. It is concerned with the provision of equitable access to dominant cultural and linguistic resources for all students. From this perspective, Standard Australian English (SAE) is

perceived as a form of cultural capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) that confers social status and power within the national economy of practices, and hence its centrality in the national and state curricula. The prescriptive teaching of SAE, therefore, can be seen as the redistribution of the cultural-linguistic capital to the students who have been allegedly denied access to it and who have been socially disadvantaged. The second model draws on a *recognitive* justice perspective on language education. It recognises the value of cultural-linguistic differences in/for learning and advocates the inclusion of diverse cultures, literacies and identities into English teaching. The recognition of diversity is perceived as a productive resource for everyday classroom learning, as well as a source for innovation in meaning-making.

Both models can be justified from the point of view of social justice (Fraser, 1997, 2000). For instance, justice claims for the redistribution of dominant language and literacy across all the schools of the nation are based on the idea of socio-economic empowerment through education. That is, students' access to dominant linguistic resources can enhance their capabilities to function in society, as well as contributing to the social mobility of marginalised groups. Justice claims for the inclusion of multiple cultural-linguistic resources in the curriculum are based on the recognition of difference as a way of fostering the egalitarian society. That is, a just society cannot be built through education that devalues and assimilates cultural-linguistic diversity. These two perspectives on justice in English language education, however, are partial unless they take the issue of power and domination seriously.

It is important to recognize that the redistribution of cultural-linguistic capital alone does not guarantee better jobs or equal participation in the socio-economic life of the nation. Dominant language and literacy have always played a dual function of reproducing dominance through assimilation and gate-keeping through differentiation. As Freire once said, "merely teaching men [sic] to read and write does not work miracles; if there are not enough jobs for men able to work, teaching more men to read and write will not create them" (Freire, 1972, p. 25). At the same time, the recognition of difference often takes "the form of calling attention to, if not performativity creating, the putative specificity of some group and then of affirming its value" (Fraser, 1997, p. 160). Such essentialisation of cultural differences can lead to the stigmatisation and valorisation of others, rather

than to the construction of intercultural spaces for learning in which differences meet to enrich each other. Clearly, redistributive and recognitive models face different challenges in creating conditions for achieving economic and cultural equality through language education. The challenges are related to the operations of power in broader society and in schooling, more specifically. One way of addressing such challenges is to find a way of transcending this dualism of perspectives on economic and cultural forms of injustice, as neither alone is sufficient in addressing cultural-linguistic domination and relations of power.

In searching for an alternative political framework in teaching English to others, Janks (2010) has explored the paradox of providing access to the dominant variety of English language (see also Janks (2004) for a more detailed discussion of the “access paradox”). In her view, if language educators provide all the students, irrespective of their social, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, access to the dominant discourses and cultural resources, they contribute to the reproduction of domination. Equally, if socially and culturally different students are denied such access, language educators would maintain and increase the students’ marginalisation, particularly in conditions where the dominant language variety is used to mark differences and to gate-keep access to higher education and high-end jobs. In addressing this paradox, Janks (2010) has advocated a critical approach to English language education that goes beyond the provision of access to develop students’ critical consciousness. Young people should be aware of how discourses operate in society so that teaching the dominant variety of language does not contribute to reinforcing dominance or other forms of injustices. This approach provides several critical orientations to language education that enable students (and teachers) to interrogate complex relationships between language and power through a critical inquiry into such processes and notions as domination, access to socially valued goods, identity and difference, and design of textual representations.

Furthermore, Janks (2010) argues that the critical orientations to domination, access, difference and design are crucially interdependent. For instance, domination is maintained through the production and consumption of discourses in which their users (listeners, speakers, readers and writers) are positioned in certain ways. Power, in this way, is exercised to create or reinforce certain cultural, social and political values and institutional practices to influence, shape and determine the desires and actions of people (e.g., power as “cultural hegemony”

in Gramsci, 1971). Therefore, it is important to build critical language awareness for students to know how discourses of power are constructed and what linguistic choices are made to produce inequitable social relations or particular desires.

From this point of view, the critical orientation to accessing dominant discourses and text types can lead to the empowerment of students. Rather than reproducing domination and misrecognition of differences, the critical orientation to language education is conducive to establishing relational parity among students and teachers in their joint contestation of dominant discourses and practices. In such classroom environments, power can be redistributed to students and experienced by them as their transformative capacity to imagine or achieve more equitable outcomes. In doing so, students who experienced various forms of “Othering” can be empowered through their participation in the deconstruction and reconstruction of dominant representations. Difference and design, in Janks’ (2010) work, provide precisely such critical orientations to language education that encompass the idea of productive, rather than oppressive, power. That is to say, productive power is the capacity to act in concert on the world (Arendt, 1969). In education, its origin can be found in participatory learning activities in which differences are recognised and resources provided by difference are harnessed for learning. Productive power, therefore, corresponds to the collective ability of students to draw upon alternative textual and cultural resources they use in everyday life, in their authentic diversity. These resources provide a foundation on which students can articulate alternative perspectives on dominant discourses, generating the creative energy that is necessary both for their work on textual design and for the production of new meanings.

Janks (2010) argues that these different and yet interdependent orientations to domination, access, difference and design are important for the political project of critical language and literacy education. This project is fundamental to ameliorating redistributive and recognitive injustices that are related to the unavoidably partial selection of curriculum resources and text for learning and to the choice of teaching approaches, classroom activities and modes of assessment. Hence, recognising the political nature of these choices, Janks asks the questions of who decides and how the decisions are made. These questions prompt us to consider multiple levels of decision-making (e.g., state, institutional and individual) and, in turn, to approach justice in English language education as a contextually nested issue in which

the local agency of teachers is influenced by broader political and institutional contexts. It is this nested character of justice that I would like to explore further in this article, before turning the discussion to ethics in the professional practice of TESOL or, more specifically, to the question of hospitality that is offered to others in English language education and to hospitality as justice.

### **TESOL, politics and justice**

Integration of redistribution and recognition to address the “access paradox” in English language education has been attempted so far as a political project of raising critical awareness. Language educators, who make their living by teaching English to others, generally have first-hand experiences of (in)justice and often find themselves in the role of advocates for English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D) students. However, they also experience some of the difficult questions concerning the relationship between their standards-based accountability and ethics, what is and what is ought to be, what is deemed to be good for EAL/D students and what is just for them. The politics of educational decision-making in local contexts is often contradictory insofar as professional practices are influenced by broader political contexts and relations of power. For instance, in their quest for educational effectiveness, policy-makers in Australia have implemented a number of measures to increase the quality of teaching and teachers’ accountability for learning outcomes. These reforms have significantly affected school systems and the profession, including the transformation of educational governance practices, teacher professionalism, curriculum, assessment in/of schools and social relationships.

In particular, the auditing of schools through mandated literacy and numeracy tests (e.g., NAPLAN) and the establishments of internal control or self-monitoring mechanisms (e.g., performance measures) have impacted on how teachers make decisions about what and how they teach and how they perceive and relate to students (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2011). This political context demands new ways of “teaching by numbers” (Taubman, 2009) and treating students as numbers (i.e., scores). It demands schools to demonstrate outcomes and/or service quality that would appeal to both parents and students as customers of education, “as shoppers on the education market” (Biesta, 2004, p. 239). In this sense, the current call for greater accountability is not just another add-on to educational practices, but can be seen as constitutive of the practices themselves. When people start

perceiving each other as objects, rather than subjects, as things that can bring profit or as objects of profitable transactions, both teachers and students become disempowered and vulnerable. In the conditions of distorted human relations and data surveillance, there is no authentic freedom in teaching and learning; the one that can provide a serious alternative to neoliberal practices of compliance and performativity.

It is not surprising, therefore, that teachers find it difficult to resist the accountability measures that have already redefined what it means to be a teacher today. Schools find themselves in a political situation, where they must contend with external bureaucratic mandates to maintain a successful school profile on the *MySchool* website or to improve it. At the same time, the practices of managerial accountability have been reshaping teachers' understanding of what counts as education, undermining any sense of their political engagement in what it ought to be (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2011). This is because standards-based reforms have acquired the meaning of the permanent "state of emergency" (Benjamin, 2006), in which it is almost impossible to be consciously and critically aware of injustices that these reforms create in teaching and assessing the non-English Other. Sooner or later one makes one's adjustment to the culture of accountability and its side-effects. This presents a major challenge to the very possibility of regaining the democratic potential of the ethical in TESOL – i.e., professional responsibility for EAL/D students – through the political. Hence, the challenge today is not only to look at the covert consequences of neoliberal reforms for the professional ethics of EAL/D teachers, but also at what is politically possible in the current context to teach ethically. In a word, the current conditions of teaching require a new model of the political that is more closely tied to the ethical.

Historically, however, the political and the ethical in TESOL have been separated and, moreover, the political has played a central role in shaping this field of education. From teaching English to colonial subjects to the education of migrants and refugees, TESOL has been informed by the politics of Othering. This involves, in the first instance, an articulation of who the learners are and their representation as the Other who is different from and in opposition to the norm (e.g., the normative Self as the native speaker of English). According to de Beauvoir (1949), the Other is not just constructed as different but, more often than not, as negative, inferior or abnormal. Research in TESOL, for example, has demonstrated various forms of negative Othering,

ranging from racialised and Islamophobic representations (Rich & Troudi, 2006), to the essentialised and distorted representations of ESL/EFL learners based on the East-West dichotomy (Kubota, 1999), and to the negative labels of L2 learners as “lazy”, “spoiled” or “cheaters” that emerge from the misunderstanding of cultural differences (Ahmadi, 2015). Research has also demonstrated that the representations of the Other are not bound to classrooms or the local; representations are first and foremost extralocal and, as such, reveal broader political trends and articulations.

In this regard, one can argue that Othering operates at three levels of political articulation – individual/relational, organizational/institutional and state/national. As Badiou (2015, p. 401) argues, “a politics consists in the pursuit of objectives, in the articulation of the people, the organizations, and the State.” For example, the people may have different, sometimes radically different, perceptions of others. Depending on the degree of the Other’s perceived difference from the normative Self, the identity of the Other can be constructed across multiple axis of representations – racial, cultural, linguistic, socio-economic, geographic, and so on. These representations come to mediate local practices of inclusion and exclusion, acceptance and discrimination. Over time, such representations acquire a status of ideological tendencies insofar as they are representative of particular beliefs and ideas that are linked to and enacted in the social and cultural practices of people. In turn, political parties and organizations use these tendencies in their struggle for political power, thereby shaping the politics of the State (Badiou, 2015). In this way, the politics of Othering is the politics of representation at various levels of articulation – “the articulation of the people, organizations, and State proceeds via the idea of *representation*” (Badiou, 2015, p. 402, italics in original).

In the parliamentary democracy such as Australia, tendencies of articulating the value of the Other are organized at various levels of representation. More specifically, the tendencies, objectives and public actions of people with regard to migrants and foreigners are represented by organizations and political parties through the Federal and State election processes. Political parties, then, draw on these tendencies in their election programs and their candidates, if elected, represent these tendencies in the State. That is, as Badiou (2015, p. 402) argues, “the party is the representative link between the people and the State.” At this point, it is important to notice that the subsequent policy-making by a ruling party can only draw on incomplete articulation of

tendencies among the people because it does not represent all of them. As a result, different articulations, represented by the opposition, can create ruptures or disrupt continuity and consensus. The political history of Othering in Australia is reflective of such political ruptures and contradictions that have furnished the stage on which struggles over redistribution and recognition played out in cultural, economic and educational spheres.

From the White Australia policy to the current program of Pauline Hanson's One Nation, the view of the Other as a stranger has been persistent. Notwithstanding differences and changes in objectives, this broader conservative tendency has rested on the premise of cultural purity and essentialism in attaining the national community of sameness. This vision of the Other entails a typically modern design of dealing with difference through exclusion and the national order-making. As Bauman (1991, p. 63) once put it, "the [modern] national state is designed primarily to deal with the problem of strangers." It does this by using two strategies – anthropophagic (assimilation) and anthropoemic (exclusion). Both strategies have been central to the conservative process of nation-building as imagining sameness by homogenising differences or expelling strangers beyond the borders of managed and manageable territory. Needless to say, English language and literacy education has been seen by the political Right as an ideological tool in managing differences because, if strangers are products of certain cultural or social upbringing, they are amenable to reshaping through some sort of explicitly normative education. Assimilation in this view becomes a criterion of belonging and provides a basis for redistributive claims through accessing the dominant language. The redistributive justice claims are done at the expense of recognition.

At the same time, the recognitive claims of the Other have been progressively acknowledged as Australia shifted from the post-war policy of "populate or perish" to the abolishing of the White Australia policy and the current times of hyper-globalisation. Although the perceptions of the Other have been informed largely by its economic utility, increasing migration and cultural diversity demanded a political shift from assimilation to recognition. Thus, the value of the Other has been measured primarily in economic terms, depending on the capabilities and skills that are in demand. In this way, economic priorities have established a political dimension of setting the procedures for the inclusion and exclusion of others, as well as creating political

platforms for representing claims for redistribution and recognition. Education is just one of those political platforms through which capabilities and skills are built to address broader concerns about redistribution and recognition. The goal is to ensure the parity of participation in the socio-economic and cultural life through education that prepares appropriately skilled and entrepreneurial citizens and workers who are able “to take advantage of opportunity and to face the challenges of this era with confidence”, as well as who are Asia literate and who appreciate and respect social, cultural and religious diversity (MCEETYA, 2008). While this responsibility for achieving educational goals has been accepted by school sectors, the broader public tendencies of dealing with the Other remain polarised in this country and elsewhere.

Today, the mass migration of strangers, according to Bauman (2016), has led to the rise and popularity of the New Right politicians who blur the distinctions between immigrants and terrorists in the public discourse, mandating further restrictions on refugees and security measures to protect “us” from “them.” Dealing with humanitarian crises in this way, as Bauman argues, has led to a “globalization of indifference.” Fuelled by the media discourses of moral panic and fear, strangers are met with hostility by societies that are highly individualised and feel existentially threatened. In an individualised society, the “uncertainties of human existence are privatized” (Bauman, 2016, p. 59), so that individuals feel increasingly vulnerable in how to respond appropriately both to strangers and to the imperatives of the “society of performance.” When strangers are constructed by the discourses of fear and performance imperatives by the logics of markets, this can only generate insecurity, depression and failure. It is then problematic to call for common responsibility for the education of young people, as the Melbourne Declaration does, in the society that is increasingly uncertain about how to interact and relate to the Other in conditions that effectively make these intersubjective processes and “reasonable decisions” morally indifferent (see the concept of “adiaphorization” in Bauman, 2016).

Faced with a situation where teaching is constantly judged by the management and the public, it can be difficult for teachers to look inside themselves in order to feel confident about the rightness of the decisions they make in their efforts to meet the needs of the young people in their care. Indeed, how can they be

confident about language education that recognises the diversity of students and its contribution to intercultural understanding, when schools find themselves in the societal milieu that denies refugees basic human rights and dignity or that assesses the value of others only by their capacity to deliver economic results? It is important in such conditions to *turn to ethics*, acknowledging that any teaching practice mediated by political discourses is blind without ethics. In the noble pursuit to educate the Other, to empower and to make a difference, ethics begins to haunt us with the demand for a more scrupulous criticism of what language education ought to be. In the professional pursuit of social justice, it is not sufficient to turn to the professional codes of ethics as a guide for classroom decision-making. Rather, this kind of decision-making should start from questioning the ethicality of professional ethics or from what puts us in the position of making a decision about how to respond to others and what norms or values to choose (cf. Nancy, 2002).

### **Professional ethics as hospitality**

Teaching is a relational practice that entails establishing and maintaining of relationships between teachers and students. As Margonis (2004, p. 45) argues, “any learning – any relationship between an individual and subject matter – occurs within a context of human relationships.” This context, from a traditional perspective on teacher professionalism, is distinct from everyday encounters in ordinary life and, as such, implies a set of relational principles and norms that are specific to the profession. Teaching standards and codes of ethics are usually used to legitimise the principles and norms to which the profession should adhere in relation to students, requiring teachers to be trustworthy in performing their duty to deliver education to those who lack it. In this respect, professional standards and codes of ethics can actually prove to be a valuable resource, allowing teachers to point to a shared set of values and beliefs which they can use to justify their decisions. However, in the context of large-scale reforms and high-stakes testing, teachers’ capacity to make just decisions in response to the felt needs of young people and to maintain caring relations with them has been undermined.

This is because, in conditions of external accountability, teachers are made solely and primarily responsible for numbers (in the form of test scores). It becomes impossible to discuss professional ethics as a pedagogical act in the world of numbers

for this world is indifferent to the everyday life of teachers in schools, their decision-making about what and how to teach, and their situated sense of responsibility for students (Kostogriz, 2011; Kostogriz & Doecke, 2011). The world of numbers recognises teachers as a workforce – a collective subject that is both the “cause of” and “accountable for” learning outcomes (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2013). As such, the external accountability measures elude other effects on learning that are distributive and recognitive in their nature, such as the under-provision of school funding and the misrecognition of social and cultural diversity in the performance-driven systems of schooling. This, in particular, impacts on schools that have large numbers of EAL/D students. External accountability makes learning environments in these schools culturally, linguistically and relationally poorer because it deflects attention from the ethical dilemmas that teachers face in their professional practice. Moreover, it reduces professional ethics of teachers to a set of performance standards to be demonstrated by teachers as an accountable subject, rather than as a justice-affirming responsiveness to the sociocultural identities of students and their needs. This situation invites us to question the ethicality of professional ethics by turning away from subject-focused accountability and to Other-based responsibility.

Other-based responsibility presupposes an encounter – the meeting of the Other face-to-face (Levinas, 1969) – that defies the reduction of difference to its abstract representations from a position of indivisible and unlimited power of self-identity. Ethics in proximate encounters with the Other arises from an event of encounter that is unpredictable and singular in its occurrence. This encounter between self and Other is a primordial “source of all knowledge and reflection, and thus looms up as the origin of subjectivity itself” (Eagleton, 2009, p. 227). Hence, from this relational standpoint, the ethics of “knowing your students and how they learn” is not about making a pedagogical decision on the basis of some general principles, but rather is about one’s ability to respond to the call of a student in a particular situation. For at this level of responsiveness there are no normative codes of conduct that will unfailingly enable a teacher to make the right decision. As Levinas (1989, p. 83) puts it, the Other in its pure vulnerability that is signified by its “face” “summons me, calls for me, begs for me, and in so doing recalls my responsibility, and calls me into question.” The face of the Other is above all a language or, as Levinas (1985, p. 87) put it, “the face speaks.” In

this sense, acting ethically is played out fully only when my self-mastery is breached in relation to this particular student in this particular encounter – in an intersubjective event in which the Other (i.e., the student) commits me to being-for-the Other by its sheer co-existence. This obligation is a kind of “proto-ethics” in which justice is tantamount to ethical responsibility for Other, which calls to me to respond and to welcome it.

The way in which Other-based ethics transforms our understanding of justice and responsibility can be clearly seen in Derrida’s work. In his genealogical exploration of Levinas’ concepts of “welcome” and “face”, Derrida (1997, p. 21) points out that “hospitality becomes the very name of what opens itself to the face, or, more precisely, of what ‘welcomes’ it.” What it means to ethics is that “hospitality” challenges us to think about the Other as a gift that simultaneously enriches our understanding of how to act ethically and puts us under the obligation to say “welcome” and open our doors regardless of who the Other may be. Derrida (2000, p. 77) argues that the monad of our home has to be hospitable in order to be considered as home – “let us say *yes to who or what turns up*, before any determination, before any anticipation, before any *identification*” (emphasis in original). This would be an absolute hospitality that requires an unconditional welcome to a foreigner or a stranger without asking them for reciprocity. In this sense, unconditional hospitality transcends law or justice as rights. However, in the Western cultural and political history, hospitality as a concept and ethics has inevitably been associated with conditionality framed by the laws (rights and duties) that the guest should abide to, as well as by the laws that differentiate and exclude. Conditional hospitality is extended to some but not others.

In this regard, hospitality for Derrida (1999, p. 70), is constituted by an *aporia* – a doubt as to what to do with foreigners and strangers that arrive at our doorsteps:

If... there is pure hospitality, or pure gift, it should consist in [the] opening without horizon, without horizon of expectation, an opening to the newcomer whoever that may be. It may be terrible because the newcomer may be a good person, or may be the devil; but if you exclude the possibility that the newcomer is coming to destroy your house – if you want to control this and exclude in advance this possibility – there is no hospitality. ... For unconditional hospitality to take place you have to accept the risk...

The aporia of hospitality is to be understood here as an ethical dilemma that has profound implications for relations between states, states and their citizens with a migration background and refugees, as well as for intersubjective relations in a variety of social practices (e.g., in education). In all these cases, hospitality interrupts one's sense of self, be it a collective self or an individual one. By insisting on unconditional hospitality, Derrida clearly appeals to one's responsibility to the Other that is primordial and that is selfless. At the same time, unconditional hospitality is an (im)possible ideal that would require complete trust in the host-guest relationship when the unknown guest is invited to come into my home, and more so to take place in me and also to take my place. The problem with the ideal of pure hospitality is that in so doing the host loses its capacity to host. The only possible hospitality is a conditional one, where we are selective in our invitations, we can impose norms and we may expect an invitation in return. Yet, notwithstanding this contradiction the ideal of unconditional hospitality is necessary for giving inspiration and aspiration for the conditional one. In this sense, hospitality as ethics involves the intense experiences of making decisions in-between the unconditional and the conditional in welcoming the Other to come to the space or place of my habitation.

Such a decision-making, as an ethical experience, is influenced by how the welcoming subject (Self) is perceived in the intersubjective encounter with the Other and turns around the facticity of reason and the facticity a demand from the Other (Critchley, 2007). The fact of the Other can be perceived as secondary to the fact of reason. Immanuel Kant, in his essay on *Perpetual Peace* (1795/2005), outlined the notion of hospitality that is grounded in the fact of reason and respect to law. In this view, hospitality is limited by the conditions that restrict the freedom of the Other both before and upon its arrival to a particular state. Even though the stranger has the right to come, her/his visitation is regulated by law and, in this regard, hospitality, too, is circumscribed by law. Kant insisted on conditional hospitality because he believed that without these conditions hospitality could turn into violence (cf. Derrida, 1999). We can say therefore that the host has a monopoly in defining who can come and what one should become if one's entry is permitted. That is to say, a decision to welcome is deduced from the principle of *ipseity* – a position of indivisible, unshaken and

unlimited power of self-identity – from which the Other is perceived and through which the master can impose unity on plurality and stasis on change, thus wrapping diversity in a totality of conditional hospitality.

However, if the facticity of a demand of the Other is recognized as primary in face-to-face encounters, then the Self – a decision-maker – is a split subject whose autonomy is called into question. Extending a welcome to the Other, from this position, is a precondition of the plurality of subjects in a particular space, be it a city, a home or a classroom. It is a precondition of responsibility within the already given spaces of co-being in which the Other appears in front of us as a source of our ethical response (Levinas, 1987). These spaces of co-being become then spaces of possibilities for hospitable experiences in which the Other interrupts our Self as a master or a host. This presupposes the recognition of the Other as a gift in a relational asymmetry of “an impatient master awaiting his guest as a liberator, his emancipator” (Derrida, 2000, p. 123). Intrinsic to the idea of the host as the split subject is that it becomes an object in the transposition of the guest and the host. The question is therefore whether, or to what extent, the host is prepared to give up one’s mastery over the space and see the Other as equal. Insofar as the question of hospitality as ethics prevails in multicultural conditions, it is difficult to reconcile the notions of power and responsibility, as well as between the conditional and the unconditional, unless relations between the Self and the Other are dialogical.

Returning to the question of professional ethics, hospitality in teaching practice demands a response to cultural-linguistic diversity of students so that they can both learn English and draw on their cultural resources in the classroom. For teachers, this means appropriating a place for themselves from which they can welcome the Other. This also means making a shift from the centeredness on the culturally dominant ways of seeing the world and other people to seeing these textual representations relationally and dialogically with others. Such a shift implies a transposition of teaching and learning into the space of intercultural dialogue in which the Other introduces me to what was not in me, affecting and transforming my consciousness and understanding of the world. In hospitable language education, students’ identities, values, texts, knowledges and meanings provide a “surplus of vision” that can enable teachers and students to recognize their own limitations, particularly the limits of worldviews. To welcome

the Other to language learning through a dialogue means, therefore, expanding my own horizon of meaning-making and intercultural understanding. This is a challenging pedagogical project as it demands the teacher to move away from the idea of managing differences through the regulation and validation of learning processes and rather to approach the teacher's role as a matter of responsibility - that is, as a matter of being able to respond to what culturally different students bring to the classroom and to a learning event. It is only then the issue of hospitable education has relevance for teaching in multicultural classrooms.

### **Conclusion**

The view of ethics as hospitality encompasses both the recognitive and the redistributive dimension of justice in education. For education to be hospitable and welcoming to the Other, it needs to be extended without the imposition of any condition for culturally different students to assimilate. Recognition requires a radical openness to difference, for hospitality implies that the Other be welcomed as a human being, not as the stereotyped Other. This poses a challenge to how one can recognise differences among human beings in the systems of schooling that continues to marginalise and exclude or homogenise and normalise. Ethical language education entails a restructuring of the symbolic order of misrecognition from a position of the (im)possibility of hospitality. Here, (im)possible does not mean that there cannot be hospitality in TESOL. Rather hospitality happens outside of the conditions imposed by standards-based reforms on teachers and outside the horizons of possibilities to teach the dominant variety of English and dominant cultural literacy without a recognition of other languages, literacies and identities of students. English language education presents particularly rich opportunities for unpredictable events of meaning-making through the "negotiation" of cultural differences. While standards-based accountability for learning outcomes demands the neutralisation of such events (e.g., through normative speaking/writing practices), hospitable language education calls to free the pure eventfulness of dialogical learning in multicultural classrooms. Hospitality is a condition for intercultural creativity in language learning and meaning-making.

As such, hospitable education implies the redistribution of cultural and linguistic resources in order to create rich opportunities for all to experience diversity and to draw on

multiple perspectives in learning. Redistribution does not only mean empowering EAL/D students through SAE but also through other cultural-semiotic resources that would enable students to participate in a genuine multi-voiced dialogue. This raises a question of how to make diversity and difference a productive force in meaning-making. Hospitable education requires a language teacher to skilfully navigate and coordinate alternative and competing discourses in the classroom in order to transform the conflict between differences into “rich zones of collaboration and learning” (Gutiérrez & Stone, 2000, p. 157). This task is challenging because it involves a “bottom up” perspective on the critical empowerment of students (and teachers), in which everyone takes responsibility for understanding and for critically reflecting on his or her own actions, desires and perspectives that might be similar to and different from others. This does not involve overwriting existing knowledge(s) and identities with the language of dominant culture, but rather instantiates literate and textual practices that can transform social relationships within multicultural classroom communities and beyond.

To conclude, the aim of this article is not to offer advice on how to teach other people’s children as an alternative view on professional ethics. Rather, its goal was to turn to the ethical as something that is prior to the politics of teaching English to its Others and, in so doing, to turn to the conditions of (im)possibility of ethics in the current moment of our education history. TESOL as a field of pedagogical practice has always been at the forefront of welcoming others to education on behalf of the powerful host. Hospitality is not only a way of questioning the professional ethics of TESOL; it is the ethicality of ethics itself. In shifting attention to the Other as an origin of our ethical response, hospitality signifies the experience of limits in language education. The pre-existing conditions of a welcoming power of the Self is in contradiction with the demand placed on us by the Other. As I have discussed, the challenge for TESOL is to radicalise hospitality beyond tolerance and to the point of a genuine welcome. This entails transcending the representations of others as Othering and recognising EAL/D learners as equal. Their arrival to schools challenges the power of the host to impose conditions on inclusion and, therefore, hospitality is on the side of EAL/D students. Hospitality demands recognition of their identities and literacies and creates opportunities for exchange of these cultural-linguistic “gifts” between the students and the teachers. For teachers, the experience of hospitality is also the experience of responsibility

for responding to the events of intercultural innovation and creativity in meaning-making. It is only then we can say that being hospitable to and responsible for the Other is the very possibility of justice in and through language education.

## References

- Ahmadi, Q. (2015). Othering in the EFL classroom: An action research study. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 1(4), 439-469.
- Arendt, A. (1969). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Badiou, A. (2015). Ethics and politics. *Philosophy Today*, 59(3), 401-407. doi: 0002066146
- Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and ambivalence*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2016). *Strangers at our door*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Benjamin, W. (2006). On the concept of history. In H. Eiland and M. Jennings (Eds.), *Walter Benjamin: Selected writings (4) 1938-1940* (pp. 389-400). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Biesta, G. (2004). Education, accountability and the ethical demand. Can the democratic potential of accountability be regained? *Educational Theory*, 54(3), 233-250. doi: 10.1111/j.0013-2004.2004.00017.x
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Critchley, S. (2007). *Infinitely demanding: Ethics of commitment, politics of resistance*. London, UK: Verso.
- de Beauvoir, S. (1972). *The second sex*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.
- Derrida, J. (1997). *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1999). Hospitality, justice and responsibility. In R. Kearney and M. Dooley (Eds.), *Questioning ethics* (pp. 65-83). London, UK: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (2000). *Of hospitality*. R. Bowlby (Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (2009). *Trouble with strangers: A study of ethics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the 'postsocialist condition'*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Fraser, N. (2000). Recognition without ethics. In M. Garber, B. Hanssen & R. Walkowitz (Eds.) *The turn to ethics* (pp. 95-128). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from prison notebooks*. Q Hoare and G. Nowell Smith (Eds. & Trans.). New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Gutiérrez, K. & Stone, L. (2000). Synchronic and diachronic dimensions of social practice: An emerging methodology for cultural-historical perspectives on literacy learning. In C. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.) *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 150-164). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Janks, H. (2004). The access paradox. *English in Australia*, 139, 33-42.
- Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Kant, I. (2005). *Perpetual peace*. M. Campbell Smith (Trans.). New York, NY: Cosimo Classics.
- Kostogriz, A. (2011). The future of diversity and difference: Can the national curriculum for English be hospitable? In B. Doecke, G. Parr and W. Sawyer (Eds.) *Creating an Australian curriculum for English* (pp. 201-214). Putney, N. S. W; Phoenix Education.
- Kostogriz, A. & Doecke, B. (2011). Standards-based accountability: Reification, responsibility and the ethical subject, *Teaching Education*, 22(4), 397-412. doi: 10.1080/10476210.2011.587870
- Kostogriz, A. & Doecke, B. (2013). The ethical practice of teaching literacy: Accountability or responsibility. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 36(2), 90-98.
- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1), 9-35. doi: 10.2307/3588189
- Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*. A. Lingis (Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1985). *Ethics and infinity*. R. A. Cohen (Trans.) Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1987). *Time and the Other*. R. A. Cohen (Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1989). *The Levinas reader*. S. Hand (Ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

- Margonis, F. (2004). From student resistance to educative engagement. In C. Bingham & A. Sidorkin (Eds.), *No education without relation* (pp. 39-54). New York: Peter Lang.
- MCEETYA (2008). *Melbourne declaration on educational goals for young Australians*. Melbourne, Vic: Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. Available at: [http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/\\_resources/National\\_Declaration\\_on\\_the\\_Educational\\_Goals\\_for\\_Young\\_Australians.pdf](http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf)
- Nancy, J.L. (2000). *Being singular plural*. R. Richardson and A. O'Byrne (Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rich, S., & Troudi, S. (2006). Hard times: Arab TESOL students' experiences of racialization and othering in the United Kingdom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 615-627. doi: 10.2307/40264548
- Taubman, P. (2009). *Teaching by numbers*. New York, NY: Routledge.

---

**Alex Kostogriz** is Professor in Languages and TESOL Education at the Faculty of Education, Monash University. He has previously held leadership positions at Deakin University and Australian Catholic University. Alex's research is based on sociocultural approaches to learning and teaching. Alex's current research projects focus on the professional practice and ethics of language teachers, teacher education and experiences of beginning teachers.

[alexander.kostogriz@monash.edu](mailto:alexander.kostogriz@monash.edu)

---