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Abstract

The International Organization for Migration’s *World Migration Report* (2020) estimates the number of migrants worldwide to be approximately 272 million. In an era of demographic scarcity and globalisation-driven uncertainties, asylum seeker, migration, and refugee re-settlement programs are now a worldwide phenomenon. Major English-speaking, immigrant-receiving countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America (USA) face associated educational, political, and social repercussions.

Rumbaut and Ima (1988) introduced the term ‘Generation 1.5’ in relation to a distinct cohort of immigrant youth, English as second language (L2) learners studying in San Diego, California in the USA. This term signifies learners neither part of the first generation in an immigrant-receiving country, nor part of the second generation of children born in that country. North American-based research finds these learners are generally not fully proficient in either their first language or their L2. While typically possessing well-developed basic interpersonal communicative skills, learners are less skilled in terms of the cognitive academic learning proficiency levels that are essential for academic achievement. Additionally, they may lack discrete language skills, the rule-governed areas that include grammar, phonology, and spelling. However, the crucial academic L2 variables relate to immigrants’ age-on-arrival and length of residence in their host countries.

In Australian tertiary education, the implications of having increasing numbers of university students meeting this learner profile remains under-researched. This study investigated how six participants meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile managed their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based, public university in Western Australia over an academic year. This arts-informed study used an interpretivist paradigm, with symbolic
interactionism as the theoretical position, and grounded theory (GT) methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Semi-structured, in-depth interviews and written responses to research questions comprised the major data-generation methods. Data analysis used GT open, axial, and selective coding in conjunction with memo-writing and Resource Journal commentaries. The iterative process of data analysis and literature access that included arts-informed, non-technical, and technical material collectively informed the study findings.

As the ‘grounded theory’ driver, ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ dominated the data findings, within which the core category, the Academic Highway Journey, and the five major categories were identified. These major categories comprised academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems. In using an astronomy metaphor, the core category or newly-discovered planetary force has five major categories or satellite systems orbiting within its sphere of influence. These GT-generated components resulted in developing the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory (the Theory). This Theory explained how the research participants, in ‘misframing’ their Academic Highway Journeys, managed the barriers, breakdowns, and breakthroughs experienced along the way.

Making an original and important contribution to Australian-based Generation 1.5 learner research, study findings highlighted major pedagogical policy, program, and practice implications. As evidenced in this study, high school is no longer considered the educational ‘finish line’. The participants in this study, either as high school graduates, university preparation courses attendees, or as having limited, formal L2 instruction, were inadequately prepared and supported during their academic journeys. Paradoxically, for these participants, university acceptance and course enrolment were conflated with having the L2 academic resources necessary to succeed educationally. In an increasingly uncertain and unstable globally connected and interconnected world, major immigration-destination countries such as Australia must urgently address the Generation 1.5 learner area as a significant impact of increasing demographic scarcity.
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Basic interpersonal communicative skills. The language ability associated with conversational fluency. The first of three language proficiencies in relation to English as second language (L2) learners (Cummins, 2008, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative competence</td>
<td>The ability to recognise and produce authentic and appropriate language appropriately, correctly, and fluently in any situation (i.e. actional, discoursal, linguistic, socio-cultural, and strategic competencies) (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>Common underlying proficiency. The range of skills and metalinguistic knowledge that a learner can draw upon when working in another language (Cummins, 2008, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACA</td>
<td>Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals is an illegal immigration amnesty initiative introduced in the United States of America in 2012 (Becerra, 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLS</td>
<td>Discrete language skills. The rule-governed areas that include grammar, phonology, and spelling that may develop in isolation from CALP. The third language proficiency in relation to L2 learners (Cummins, 2008, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>English for Academic Purposes programs focus on improving academic language proficiency in terms of meeting the reading and writing demands of tertiary institutions. (Hamp-Lyons &amp; Heasley, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation 1.5</td>
<td>A distinct category of English as second language (L2) learners. These learners are neither part of the first generation in an English-speaking, immigrant-receiving country, nor part of the second generation born in that country (Rumbaut &amp; Ima, 1988).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher education is an alternative term for university-level education used in relation to tertiary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlanguage</td>
<td>The variety of a language that is produced by a non-native speaker that impacts to varying degrees on L2 acquisition (Swan &amp; Smith, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration, affiliated with the United Nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First language (i.e. the home or native language) of the English language learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>English as the second language. This term is used in preference to other terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Needs analysis in relation to developing L2 programs (Brindley, 1989).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>This term means non-native speaker of a language. This term relates to second language acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>This term means native speaker and refers to the primary language learned from early childhood as their first language. This term relates to first language acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, an intergovernmental body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Self-actualisation. The fifth and ultimate level in Maslow (1943) hierarchy of basic, psychological, and self-fulfilment needs. SA is equated with achieving one's full potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Self-transcendence. The capstone level above and beyond Maslow's (1943) five-tiered motivational hierarchy of human needs (Koltko-Rivera, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>Technical and Further Education. TAFE courses include vocational courses as well as courses designed to bridge the gap between high school and university, providing important theoretical and practical experience in several fields of study for students of all ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Tertiary education is the third level of the Australian education system, with primary as the first, followed by secondary. TE is the most used term when referring to university-level education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

Introducing the Thesis

A ‘performance’ may be defined as all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants. Taking a particular participant and his performance as a basic point of reference, we may refer to those who contribute the other performances as the audience, observers, or co-participants. The pre-established pattern of action which is unfolded during a performance and which may be presented or played through on other occasions may be called a ‘part’ or ‘routine’. (Goffman, 1959, pp. 26-27)

This chapter raises the curtain on a qualitative study performance that uses grounded theory (GT) methodology to investigate, understand, and answer the central research question: How do participant students who meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile manage their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based, public university in Western Australia over an academic year? In setting the scene for a study performance that is staged over seven chapters, it is important to note that the Generation 1.5 term was first introduced by Rumbaut and Ima (1988). This term referred to a distinct category of English as second language (L2) learners, immigrant refugee youth in San Diego, California, in the United States of America (USA). The authors describe these learners as being neither part of the first generation in an English-speaking, immigrant-receiving country, nor part of the second generation of children born in that country. While subsequent research has introduced a variety of designations for these learners (Harklau & Siegal, 2009; Walters & Auton-Cuff, 2009), given its origins and the continuing impact of global migration flows (International Organization for Migration [IOM], 2020; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2018), the Generation 1.5 term is considered the most appropriate one to use in this study.

Australia is recognised as one of the world’s major English-speaking, immigration-destination countries (OECD, 2017, 2018; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017). As children and
young people represent a significant proportion of legal and illegal asylum seeker, migration, and refugee flows worldwide (IOM, 2020; OECD, 2018), they will meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile as they begin their host country educational journeys. However, immigrants arriving between the ages of 12 and 14 enter the educational ‘danger zone’ when commencing their high school studies. Accordingly, these young people may have inadequate time in which to bridge the cognitive academic learning proficiency (CALP) gap between themselves and their peers for whom English is generally their first language (L1) (Harklau, 2003; Roessingh, 2008; Roessingh & Kover, 2003; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a). This consideration is critical given research indicates that high school is no longer regarded as the educational ‘finish line’ in rapidly changing global societies (Harklau & Siegal, 2009). Paradoxically, research also indicates that many Generation 1.5 high school graduates are inadequately prepared in terms of the CALP-underpinned critical thinking skills and the L2 academic literacy skills necessary in tertiary education (Allison, 2009; Crosby, 2009; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011). Consequently, these learners tend to commence university studies with distinct and differing L2 learning and literacy patterns that do not align with the traditional, “institutionally constructed” student profile (Roberge, 2009, p. vii). Given immigration is principally driven by the quest for greater economic, educational, political, religious, and social opportunities that collectively provide safety and stability (OECD, 2018; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017), this study explores how the participants managed their L2 academic demands and responsibilities. As part of investigating this under-researched area (Harklau, 2003; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b), greater understandings as to how participants’ home country experiences and their parents’ expectations influenced their L2 future-self goals and visions (Dörnyei, 2009) were sought.

Having introduced the central research question and the context to the study area, the importance of the Generation 1.5 learner profile and the research problem are now discussed. The aims of the study and an overview of the research design, methodology, and
methods used to achieve these objectives are introduced. The significance of the study is discussed, with details of the thesis structure concluding the chapter.

**An Overview of the Generation 1.5 Learner Profile**

Having its beginnings in language proficiency research undertaken by Cummins (1979, 1981, 1984), the Generation 1.5 learner profile is multidimensional. In aligning with this profile, learners are generally not fully proficient in either their L1 or their L2 (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). While typically possessing well-developed basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS), this cohort of learners are less skilled in CALP (Roessingh et al., 2005). Essentially, BICS are necessary for everyday communication situations that include business transactions and conversational needs (Harklau, 2003). However, in decontextualised academic situations, these learners require well-developed CALP and the higher-order cognitive skills that include analysis, integration, reasoning, synthesis, and the ability to generalise and transfer skills (Cummins, 1981, 1984, 2005, 2008, 2011; Harklau, 2003; Roessingh & Kover, 2003; Roessingh et al., 2005; Singhal, 2004). In terms of discrete language skills (DLS), this third language proficiency (Cummins, 2008) includes the critical rule-governed areas of grammar, phonology, and spelling that may sometimes be learned in isolation from the developing CALP levels. Consequently, students who meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile are characterised by dissimilar and diverse affective, attitudinal, behavioural, cognitive, and motivational strengths and weaknesses that have long-term L2 learning and literacy implications. In turn, these L2 difficulties and discrepancies have significant across-life domain impacts (Gall et al., 2000; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012b).

**The Research Problem**

While more than three decades have passed since Rumbaut and Ima (1988) first introduced the Generation 1.5 term, the L2 educational situation facing these learners
remains under-recognised and under-researched (Allison, 2009; Louie, 2009; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). More recently, this term has become associated with over one million unauthorised immigrants or ‘dreamers’ who arrived in the USA as children with their families (Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012). These children met the Generation 1.5 learner profile. Since the introduction of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy in 2012 under the then Obama Administration, those affected are now adults, their lives in limbo, and facing possible deportation under the present Administration (Lauby, 2018). This immigration example serves two major purposes. Firstly, it demonstrates that illegal immigration is an increasingly important international phenomenon that is politically and socially damaging and divisive across multiple life domains (Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Fargues, 2011; Lauby, 2018; OECD, 2017; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017; Rudolph, 2003; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). Secondly, when considered in conjunction with Australian-specific legal and illegal migration flows and humanitarian programs (OECD, 2017, 2018; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017), the prevalence of Generation 1.5 learners in educational environments will increase over time (Barron, 2011; McBrien, 2005; OECD, 2018).

Accordingly, this study investigates how the participants manage their L2 undergraduate courses over an academic year. However, as part of investigating this insufficiently-researched area (Harklau, 2003; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b), greater understandings as to how participants deal with their pre-and post-immigration experiences are critical. These understandings extend to the participants’ L2 future-self roles and norms in terms of Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological framework for human development that comprises micro-, meso-, exo-, macro-, and chronosystem influences and transitions over the life course.

**Pre- and Post-Immigration Factors**
As a key English-speaking, immigration-destination country (OECD, 2017, 2018; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017), Australia has two immigration programs. The first program includes skilled migrants and those with family connections in Australia, while the second is a humanitarian program that includes asylum seekers, refugees, and people in similar situations (Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017). With a population of 25.3 million people (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2019), it is important to note that over 7.5 million immigrants have settled in Australia since 1945 (Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017). In the current era of demographic scarcity and globalisation-driven uncertainties, the United Nations’ migration agency’s IOM-produced World Migration Report (2020) estimates the number of migrants globally to be approximately 272 million. Accordingly, children will represent a significant proportion of legal and illegal asylum seeker, migration, and refugee flows and re-settlement programs worldwide (IOM, 2020; OECD, 2018; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017). As Roberge (2009) explains, immigrant families’ arrival experiences are influenced by the situations that initiated their home country departures. In keeping with these considerations, Roberge highlights the importance of acculturation and identity formation in making cross-cultural adjustments. For students aligning with the Generation 1.5 learner profile, dealing with identity-related transitional processes involves navigating and negotiating safe passage between multiple worlds of cultural change and difference (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). However, Roberge (2009) points out that these processes may be difficult for immigrant children who have little or no home country memories. As these transitions involve the individual and their academic, cultural, economic, family, and social domains (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Gall et al., 2000), the complexities become more evident when creating and using hybrid or hyphenated identities (Roberge, 2009; Rogers-Sirin et al., 2014; Sirin & Fine, 2007).

In the Australian context, as an acknowledged multicultural country (Counted, 2019), these culturally-challenging and complex self-identity conflicts can include identifying as an African-Australian, a Chinese-Australian, and a Muslim-Australian. Research reveals that
Generation 1.5 learners may experience discrimination and marginalisation in their L2 schooling from their peers and teachers in terms of ethnicity and race (Yosso, 2005) and cultural-linguistic ties (Raphael & Au, 2005; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Kover, 2003; Yosso, 2005). The issue of experiencing and dealing with microaggressions (Yosso et al., 2009) in the form of assaults, insults, and invalidations are also relevant. However, it is important to note that these cultural, educational, and linguistically-influenced social journeys are situated within prevailing global economic, political, and religious impacts that influence migration flows (OECD, 2017, 2018; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017). Dealing with these transitional passages (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) are key to making and managing multiple across-domain host country adjustments (OECD, 2018). As these transitional processes include navigating and negotiating ‘worlds-on-the-move’ (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a) and tertiary educational pathways, the need for Generation 1.5 learner research is paramount (Cummins et al., 2012; Garnett, 2012; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b).

Transitioning to Tertiary Education

In search of greater across-life domain opportunities in their host countries (IOM, 2020; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017), immigrants identify education as a key post-immigration driver (OECD, 2018). With regard to the tertiary education outcomes for Generation 1.5 learners, Louie (2009) discusses the high-risk issues that include mobility and social advancement in relation to both individuals and ethnic groups. Importantly, Rumbaut (2005) discusses education as a key determinant in shaping an individual’s socio-economic trajectory. In reporting on USA-based research findings, Rumbaut points out that low levels of education contribute to “diminished occupational and economic success”, creating a “spiral of cumulating disadvantage and downward mobility” (p. 1083). Accordingly, Louie (2009) advises that in relation to the USA schooling system, further Generation 1.5 research is crucial in developing immigration-related educational knowledge. The Canadian educational systems are facing similar issues (Cummins et al., 2012; Garnett, 2012;
Gunderson et al., 2012; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). As a significant immigration-receiving country, Rumbaut's pedagogical findings have relevance for Generation 1.5 learners studying in Australia.

Accordingly, if these learners are to achieve their true academic potential (Gunderson et al., 2012; Maslow, 1943), they require L2 learning and literacy support during their educational transitions. With this support in place, graduating from university with developed cultural, economic, and social capital resources (Bourdieu, 1986) increases their educational and intellectual capital (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b), crucial considerations in across-life development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Gall et al., 2000; Thoits, 2012). While capital in all its forms takes time and effort to develop, these complex and convertible resources have the capacity to positively transform people's social world functioning (Bourdieu, 1986). Consequently, further research is vital if Generation 1.5 learners studying at the tertiary level are to feel welcomed and worthy in their host countries (Witkowsky et al., 2016).

**Study Aims and Research Approaches**

Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less travelled by,
And that has made all the difference.

**The Aims**

While there is North American-based research examining the pedagogical needs of Generation 1.5 learners studying in tertiary environments (Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b), there is little Australian-based research. To date, the researcher has been unable to locate any Western Australian-based research in this learner area. Accordingly,
using GT methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), this study aimed to fill the identified educational research gap by knowledge-building and developing substantive theory that investigates and explains how six undergraduate students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile managed their tertiary education over an academic year. In relation to developing substantive theory, Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 174) consider this theory as evolving from the “study of a phenomenon situated within one particular situational context”. In focusing on how participants 'manage' their academic studies, primary importance is placed on the social meanings that these learners attach to the world around them and how they respond to them (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Importantly, this socially-produced knowledge is constructed through negotiation between the participants and researcher, and remains specific to the phenomenon being investigated (O'Donoghue, 2019). Explanatory in nature, the study aims to draw attention to the Generation 1.5 learner situation, linking the sequences and consequences of social actions, behaviour, interactions, and responses (O'Donoghue, 2019) in managing their undergraduate university studies.

The Research Approaches: Where the Action Is…Adaptations, Chance-Taking, Consequentiality, and Fatefulness

With an implicit focus on process, social interaction, and knowledge-building and production (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015), this approach is indicative of qualitative research that is positioned within an interpretivist paradigm (O'Donoghue, 2019). Aligning with this paradigm is the theoretical position of symbolic interactionism that is based on Blumer’s (1969) three premises. The first premise considers that people act towards things and other people on the basis of the meanings these things and people have for them. In turn, the second premise contends that people attribute symbolic meanings to things and people through a continuous process. The third and final premise asserts that the meanings associated with objects and situations result from the interpretations individuals give them. Accordingly, in qualitative research, participants attribute meaning through a process of
social interaction (Punch & Oancea, 2014), revealing “the perspectives behind empirical observations, the actions people take in light of their perspectives, and the patterns which develop through interaction of perspectives and actions over particular periods of time” (O’Donoghue, 2007, p. 20).

In taking the research road less travelled, using a rejuvenated GT methodology based on Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) rigorous, well-established framework (O’Donoghue, 2019) was a bold decision that worked well in praxis. The aim to maximise the significance of the study was threefold in approach. The first approach required collecting data about human behaviour in one specific, Perth-based university environment, while the second considered contextual sources of meanings. The third approach involved identifying how and if these meanings changed over time (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2011; O’Donoghue, 2007; Punch, 2005, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Collectively, this approach aimed to develop substantive theory generated directly from Generation 1.5 “participants’ aims or intentions, their strategies, what they see as being significant for them, the reasons they give for their activity, and what they see as the expected outcomes of their activity” (O’Donoghue, 2007, p. 49) over the one-year study period. As Geller and Greenberg (2009, p. 94) point out, understanding the issues that are unique to a particular educational environment assists “individuals, families, schools, and support agencies develop the type of plans and services that can truly support the transition to adulthood”. Well-placed to develop substantive theory, this GT study investigates “patterns of action and interaction” between individuals and their situations, rather than developing “theory about individuals” (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 278).

In drawing on an arts-informed research and writing praxis (Leavy, 2017, 2019a, 2019b), a further example of taking Robert Frost’s road “less travelled by”, this decision “made all the difference” (Lathem, 1975, p. 105). This directional research difference was validated in terms of exploring and making positive study adaptations; acknowledging and
benefiting from chance-taking; learning from and respecting consequentiality; and valuing fatefulness or serendipitous findings (Goffman, 1969). With three rounds of interviews and written responses to research questions as the data-generation methods, writing memos and maintaining the researcher’s Resource Journal provided non-technical literature resources (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In turn, GT analysis used open, axial, and selective coding processes, with findings informed by accessing arts-informed, non-technical, and technical literature. Creswell (2007, p. 208) describes these analytical processes as using “corroborating evidence” from a range of different sources to “shed light on a theme or perspective”. In discussing the reciprocal coding and meaning-making relationships within GT studies, Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 143) emphasise its importance in terms of bringing process to data analysis, describing it as “the linking of sequences of action/interaction as they pertain to the management of, control over, or response to, a phenomenon”. With a sample size of six participants in this study, Punch (2005, p. 51) reports that for some qualitative strategies “there is no predetermined sample size”, explaining that in GT studies “theoretical sampling – successive sampling of data guided by the theoretical trends emerging from the analysis – guides the work”.

Researcher Positioning: From the Original Study Idea to Script-Generating, Producing, and Staging the Performance

Choosing a research problem through the professional or personal experience route may seem more hazardous than through the suggested or literature routes. This is not necessarily true. The touchstone of your own experience may be more valuable an indicator for you of a potentially successful research endeavour. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, pp. 35-36)

The Backstage Situation

In adopting and appropriating Goffman’s (1959, 1974) dramaturgical model and its phraseology in the backstage situational approach in this study, positionality and theoretical
sensitivity were important considerations. With private English for Academic Purposes (EAP) tutoring experience with domestic and international university students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile, the researcher is ‘well-grounded’ in the technical literature in this area. This ‘groundedness’ in the literature, along with the researcher’s personal perspectives, professional experience, and on-going interaction with the study data, constitutes Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) three sources of theoretical sensitivity. In relation to positionality, Bourke (2014) notes that in attempting to remain objective, researchers must always be watchful of their subjectivities. However, in terms of the associated power dynamics implicit in the researcher role, Frost (2016) discusses positionality as being the “perspectives influenced and formed by the mix of social and political identities taken up or ascribed to a researcher” (p. 179). Ascribed identity statuses are determined at birth, including age, gender, nationality, sexual orientation, and sexuality (Marcia, 2002). However, achieved identity statuses are gained over life course development (Frost, 2016).

When conducting EAP tutoring sessions (Hamp-Lyons & Heasley, 2006), the researcher in an educator role used Brindley’s (1989) three needs analysis (NA) orientations to determine the students’ holistic L2 academic requirements. In terms of the first Brindley NA orientation, language proficiency, EAP assessments concurred with Canadian-based research (Roessingh & Kover, 2003; Roessingh et al., 2005; Roessingh et al., 2011). These assessments signposted students as having: (i) under-developed critical thinking, organisational, and planning skills; (ii) limited overall L2 written communicative competence; (iii) an inadequate understanding of the importance of the L2 academic reading and writing connection: (iv) insufficient or no previous instruction and practice in using reading comprehension and writing composition skills, strategies, and techniques; and (v) insufficient exposure to recursive writing process instruction and practice that involves researching the topic, drafting, revising, editing, and version control (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrell, 1995; Cummins, 2008, 2011; Nation, 2009; Raphael & Au, 2005; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b). Importantly, EAP writing
assessments revealed that students' written compositions were predominantly 'knowledge-telling’, providing information on a topic available to them through their existing knowledge. With under-developed 'knowledge-transforming' skills that involve obtaining and integrating additional information to create 'new' knowledge in academic contexts, these L2 writing difficulties were exacerbated during time-constrained assessment processes such as examinations (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Crosby, 2009; Harklau, 2003; Kellogg, 2008). These EAP assessments recall Bourdieu’s (1986) capital construct, along with Yosso’s (2005) aspirational, familial, linguistic, navigational, resistance, and social components in the cultural wealth model. Consequently, lacking educational, learning, and literacy capital resources lessens the likelihood of L2 learners achieving academic success (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a). As a result, the ability of these learners to compete in increasingly globalised Western economies that are driven by communication and technology, creativity and innovation are appreciably reduced and at-risk (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a).

Students’ psychological-humanistic dimensions represent the second Brindley (1989) NA orientation. Through interview and EAP assessment processes, the educator developed an understanding of students’ subjective needs, their strengths and weaknesses in terms of their affective, attitudinal, behavioural, cognitive, and motivational attributes (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995; Dörnyei, 2005, 2009, 2014). These insights and understandings highlighted the importance of the social capital pressures that informed and influenced students’ learning and literacy capital resources (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a). These pressures included feeling part of the university student community and meeting the L2 expectations of the academic discourse community (Brindley, 1989; Forrest, 2006; Goldschmidt & Miller, 2005; Harklau, 2003; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a; Thonus, 2003; Vasquez, 2007). However, it is important to note that in the process of developing more positive psychological-humanistic attributes, students are working towards realising specific L2 academic goals, the third Brindley (1989) NA orientation. These goals involved achieving their L2 future-self aspirations and visions (Brindley, 1989; Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009), along with meeting the
expectations of their families and L1 communities (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a; Thonus, 2003). However, the most crucial social capital pressures revolved around being the first person in their family to attend university and feeling pressured by self, families, and their L1 communities to achieve academic success (Thonus, 2003). In discussing Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecology of human development theory, Gable (2006, p. 130) considers a person’s course in life is shaped by “the levels of influence imposed through the interplay among individuals, family, school, peer and community factors”. Additionally, Gable discusses the greatest impact on a person’s life stage trajectories as being their “participation, through the course of everyday activities, in ongoing and enduring interactions with those around them” (p. 130). Accordingly, it is these life-shaping affective, behavioural, cultural, linguistic, and social impacts, influences, and interactions that this study sought to understand. With a demonstrated backstage understanding of the Generation 1.5 learner situation as the original study idea, the next section discusses the researcher’s position in terms of script-generation, production methods, and staging the performance.

**The Frontstage Situation**

I shall be concerned only with the participant’s dramaturgical problems of presenting the activity before others. The issues dealt with by stage-craft and stage management are sometimes trivial but they are quite general; they seem to occur everywhere in social life, providing a clear-cut dimension for formal sociological analysis. (Goffman, 1959, p. 26)

Goffman’s (1959, 1974) dramaturgical model, with its innovative and inventive linguistic phrasing, situated the original study idea that was developed and grounded in empirical data, contextual and theoretical Generation 1.5 learner realities, and literature resources. This backstage positioning now moves to the frontstage situation. In focusing on delivering a study performance, production matters included overcoming the researcher’s ‘stage fright’ (Scott, 2007) and dealing with data-production methods, script-generation, and staging requirements (Goffman, 1959; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In this study, the story line
framing and grammar components took centre stage. This framing was influenced by the ‘what-matters-to-the-participants matters-to-the-researcher’ mantra (Goffman, 1959, 1969, 1974). Consequently, the data generated through dialogue and discourse drove the study findings. In line with an arts-informed research praxis (Leavy, 2019a, 2019b), the dramaturgical model and academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems’- influenced performances (Goffman, 1959, 1967, 1971) established the participants as the protagonists in this study. In revealing the narrative plot and subplots that were driven by the L2 academic dreams and goals embedded in participants’ academic journeys, the scenes and the settings for the unfolding, high-stakes life and learning performances were reconstructed. In doing so, the sequence of causal past, present, and future-self drivers, together with the cyclic actions and interactions, responses and repercussions experienced during the participants’ academic journeys were examined and explored. In this study production, the researcher’s role as the original scriptwriter transitioned to that of script manager, study producer, and performance director. As the script manager, frontstage management involved data-generation methods, GT analytical and coding processes, and literature access that informed study findings, story lines, and theoretical development (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Scripting that used arts-enriched frames of reference was an emergent innovation. Included in aesthetically coherent, creative, and credible ways, these placements delineated the data discoveries that delivered the findings that developed the substantive theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Leavy, 2009, 2017).

Throughout these production stages, the researcher as the study producer and the performance director, gave theatrical and theoretical vibrancy, voice, and veracity to the participants’ empirically-influenced storied-journey accounts developed over the study period. In writing for the study performance reviewers as the audience, this integral component in the production involved adopting a ‘writerly’ stance (Barthes, 1970/1974) that valued a self-reflexive praxis (Tracy, 2013). However, the reviewer’s degree of receptiveness and responsiveness to this production resides on a continuum that can never be assumed or
presumed. In conveying the depth and detail of the study performance, the seven production chapters in this thesis provide the audience with an aesthetically-scripted, experientially-enriched, and theoretically-supported reading review journey. This dramaturgical direction was aligned with and attuned to the Goffmanian view of life as a series of staged performances in which “everything is shifting, fragmentary, performed, and perspectival” (Hancock & Garner, 2014, p. 167).

As Charmaz (2014) points out, research is never a neutral act, a consideration that highlights the importance of positionality (Frost, 2016), self-reflexivity (Tracy, 2013), and theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). However, it is considered that the researcher’s worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978), having the ability to examine the worlds we live in and make meaning-making connections, contributed positively, pragmatically, and professionally to the study performance and production. In developing a distinctive arts-informed research and writing praxis (Leavy, 2017, 2019a, 2019b), the imaginative, innovative, and intuitive ‘spark’ emboldened and empowered the study flame. Burning brightly, this flame discovered, illuminated, and spotlighted the multiple layers of meaning-making and the magnitude of this Generation 1.5 learner study.

**Study Significance: Addressing Inconvenient Truths**

The dreamers and DACA situation in the USA (Lauby, 2018) is indicative of immigration-influenced, Generation 1.5 learner-related tertiary education issues confronting Western governments (Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012; Lauby, 2018). In exploring Western Australian-based participants’ L2 academic expectations and experiences, the study findings cast light on many ‘inconvenient truths’ in the Generation 1.5 learner area. The term ‘inconvenient truths’ (Gore, 2006) is used as a Nietzschean-like aphoristic marker (Phillips, 1993) that supports a call-to-action (Gore, 2017) in terms of educational change.
Accordingly, this study makes substantial and original contributions to knowledge concerning this distinct cohort of L2 learners with their diverse learning and literacy needs. Firstly, developing substantive theory in an area where no such Australian theory presently exists, provides unique insights and understandings as to how the participants managed their undergraduate tertiary studies in the Perth-based campus of a public university. Secondly, given educational policy decisions, program design, and pedagogical practices are best made when informed by evidence-based research (Bharuthram, 2012; Sam, 2000; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b; Harklau, 1998; Sternberg, 1998; Vincent & Idahosa, 2014), the study findings provide several layers of educational significance. In an ideal Generation 1.5 learner world, these findings contribute to discussion, decision-making, and strategic planning that actions and prioritises the holistic L2 needs of these learners at whatever age they begin their host country educational journeys (Cummins et al., 2012; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a). With the critical age-on-arrival and length of host country residence factors in mind (Roessingh, 2008; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a), along with the realities of high school graduates contemplating tertiary level studies (Harklau & Siegal, 2009), these findings are significant. This study significance calls for secondary schooling policy, program, and pedagogical practice changes (Cummins at al., 2012; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012b), a further inconvenient truth.

Thirdly, these findings also generate insights into the awareness, ability, and capacity of tertiary institutions to provide the necessary L2 academic learning and literacy transitional support that these learners require to successfully navigate and negotiate their undergraduate studies (Arkoudis, 2019; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). Given the continuing impact of combined migration and humanitarian programs in major immigration-destination countries such as Australia (OECD, 2017, 2018), the study findings are substantial. As a result, there are consequences in terms of the Australian Government policy directions aimed at improving university access and transitional pathways for students from diverse cultural, educational, linguistic, and social backgrounds (Arkoudis, 2019;
Subsequently, these policy directives provide Australian State and Territory tertiary institutions with challenges in terms of delivering L2 learning and literacy support programs that address the changing university student demographic profile in which inadequacies and inequalities currently abound (Arkoudis, 2019; Barron, 2011; Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012; Betts, 2009; Harklau & Siegal, 2009; Flahaux & De Haas, 2016; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Kicinger, 2004; McBrien, 2005; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017; Productivity Commission, 2019; Roberge, 2009; Sharp et al., 2013; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012; Witkowsky et al., 2016).

Collectively, these study findings and theoretical alignments are significant in terms of addressing long-standing, Generation 1.5 learner inconvenient truths (Harklau, 2003; Roessingh, 2008; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). As research indicates, these learners are at greater risk of failure in tertiary institutions that ‘assume’ their undergraduate students have the ‘expected’ independent learning and literacy proficiencies necessary to manage cognitively-challenging and complex academic reading and writing demands (Arkoudis, 2019; Harklau, 2003; Raphael & Au, 2005; Productivity Commission, 2019; Roessingh & Field, 2000; Roessingh, 2004; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b; Witkowsky et al., 2016). In highlighting substantial inconvenient educational truths, the lack of targeted and timely L2 academic literacy support dominates as a major learning disconnection (Arkoudis, 2019; Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Productivity Commission, 2019). If Generation 1.5 learners are to achieve the degree conferral and identity status that drives their L2 future-self aspirations and host country opportunities and possibilities (Allison, 2009; Bharuthram, 2012; Brindley, 1989; Dörnyei, 2005; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b; Vincent & Idahosa, 2014), educational action rather than rhetoric is needed.
Conclusion

Under the mantle of a highly individualist and intuitive, imaginative and innovative arts-informed research and writing praxis (Leavy, 2017; 2019a, 2019b; Tracy, 2013), this concludes the first of seven thesis chapters. Collectively, these seven chapters create a theatrical and theoretical stage for the study performance production. To recall, this Western Australian study sought to investigate and understand how participant students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile manage their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based, public university over an academic year. Accordingly, this chapter introduced the learner term and profile, the research problem, the aims, and the significance of this study. In order to achieve these objectives, overview information on the research approach used in this study was provided.

In working with literature resources throughout the study performance and thesis production, the next chapter, Chapter 2, reviews this material. The first section discusses the contextual, technical literature that positions and justifies investigating the study topic. The second section examines the theoretical literature that includes arts-informed, non-technical, and technical information that frames and informs the study findings, story lines, and theory development processes. Chapter 3 discusses in detail the interpretivist approach that uses symbolic interactionism, GT methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and interviews and written responses to research questions to generate study data. As part of this discussion, the researcher’s refreshed GT coding and analytical processes that evolved in line with an arts-enriched writing praxis are examined. In demonstrating the strengths of this praxis, Chapters 4 and 5 lay the foundations for developing substantive theory. In creative, evocative, and provocative ways, these chapters provide the researcher-reconstructed narratives of the six participants in this study. These narratives represent the participants’ journeys from pre-immigration through to their L2 future-self projects and learner profiles.
Building on these theoretical foundations with their dramaturgical framings, socially-situated learning performances, and self-presentations (Goffman, 1955, 1959, 1969, 1971, 1974), Chapter 6 covers theoretical development. Discussed in depth, this chapter introduces, examines, and models the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory that is empirically and aesthetically-supported, inductively-constructed, and theoretically-positioned. Chapter 7 concludes the qualitative study production. In doing so, the aims, findings, outcomes, and its justifications are discussed. In considering the implications and limitations of the study performance, this final stage showcases future research directions. Collectively, this thesis production is designed to evoke and invoke Generation 1.5 learner change and to “bear the lightning of possible storms” (Foucault, 1994, p. 323).
Chapter 2
Words, Works, and Worlds: Reviewing the Literature

What intrigues us as a problem, and what will satisfy us as a solution, will depend upon the line we draw between what is already clear and what needs to be clarified. (Goodman, 1983, p. 31)

The debate and division surrounding literature use in grounded theory (GT) studies has been an on-going methodological dilemma since Glaser and Strauss published *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (1967). As introduced in the previous chapter and discussed in Chapter 3, this study uses the researcher’s rejuvenated GT approach that is based on Strauss and Corbin (1990). Ramalho et al. (2015) refer to this methodology as the ‘evolved’ GT that followed the classical or traditional 1967 version. However, in keeping with the view that some methodological boundaries should not be broken, the researcher’s 2020 GT version remained faithful to key Strauss and Corbin (1990) components. These components included accessing literature throughout the study, using systematic analytical strategies such as the constant comparative method, and not ‘forcing’ the data to impose the researcher’s preconceptions (Jones et al., 2014). Importantly, the GT foundation of being process-orientated in exploring the sequences and outcomes of situational actions, activities, and interactions in the research area continued (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Accordingly, the researcher had an on-going ‘dialogue-with-the-data’, with literature providing a secondary resource in the evolving theory. As Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 55) advise that using “a variety of other materials” in GT studies supplements the interview data, the researcher introduced a third literature type. Augmenting the established non-technical and technical literature categories, using arts-informed resources aligns with Eisner’s (1997, p. 4) contention that the arts provide alternative forms of data representation and “new ways of seeing and saying”. Under the umbrella term of arts-based research (Leavy, 2017), this approach and its variants can be used across-disciplines and throughout the qualitative research processes. While the researcher’s ethical responsibilities (Tracy, 2013),
positionality (Frost, 2016), theoretical sensitivity considerations (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and adherence to research quality standards (Tracy, 2013) will be discussed in Chapter 3, these considerations also extended to literature use. Given the researcher’s influential, interpretive role and ‘voice’ throughout the research processes, this factor is unequivocally acknowledged (O’Donoghue, 2019; Punch & Oancea, 2014). However, as Ramalho et al. (2015, Conclusion section) make clear, “it is not a “researcher’s free” quality that ensures the groundedness of a theory, but rather the researcher’s active, ongoing, and deliberate commitment to prioritize the data over any other input”.

In line with the contentious role of literature in GT studies (Birks & Mills, 2011; Buckley & Waring, 2009), there is another problematical issue. This issue concerns when a review should be conducted, what areas of existing literature should be accessed, how extensive the review should be, and to what extent literature should be used during GT research (Dunne, 2011; Thornberg & Dunne, 2019). However, the researcher’s informed, justifiable, and pragmatic decision to use literature throughout this study was underpinned by Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) advice that:

All kinds of literature can be used before a research study is begun: both in thinking about and getting the study off the ground. They can also be used during the study itself, contributing to its forward thrust. In fact, there should be some searching out of the literature (but not just technical) during the research itself, an actual interplay of reading literature and data analysis. So, in effect, we read and use published materials during all phases of the research. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 56)

Along with these considerations, a further factor in the decision-making processes involved the knowledge-building and value-adding possibilities implicit in using arts-informed literature (Leavy, 2017, 2019a, 2019b). In working wisely with the literature throughout the study performance, this chapter comprises four sections. The first section, the Contextual Literature Review, provides an outline of the available, extant material accessed as a requirement in the researcher’s doctoral candidature and confirmation processes (Dunne,
The second section, the Theoretical Literature Review, discusses the arts-informed, non-technical, and technical information used during data analysis, story line, and theory development. This literature use continued until the researcher’s doctoral examination and acceptance procedures (Dunne, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The third section discusses the researcher’s arts-informed research and writing praxis, while the fourth and final section provides the conclusion.

**Contextual Literature Review: Exploring and Situating the Study**

Start with the question itself. Observe carefully and systematically, questioning what you normally take for granted. Separate your observations or other data from your impressions. Apply different perspectives, including a micro-level frame and a broad, macro-level frame. (Leavy, 2019a, p. 144)

Providing an outline of the researcher’s engagement with the extant technical literature, this first review stage introduces, discusses, and evaluates information from a range of disciplines that collectively “focuses on a similar topic or question to that of the researcher” (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017, p. 9). As Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 48) advise, technical literature includes research studies and “theoretical or philosophical papers characteristic of professional and disciplinary writing”. This literature review approach encapsulated Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological systems theory that comprises five levels of influence, micro-, meso-, exo-, macro-, and chronosystems that affect people’s development (Eriksson et al., 2018). Collectively, this approach to literature use situated the central research question: How do participant students who meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile manage their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based, public university in Western Australia over an academic year?
The Generation 1.5 Learner Profile

Rumbaut and Ima (1988) introduced the Generation 1.5 term to identify a distinct cohort of immigrant, English as second language (L2) refugee youth in the United States of America (USA). Subsequently, research investigating the educational needs of these students generated various descriptors that include: emergent or insipient bilinguals in the process of L2 learning; functional bilinguals who continue to use non-standard forms of English in their writing; language minority students; non-traditional L2 learners; parachute kids; third culture kids; and transnationals (Harklau & Siegal, 2009; Roberge, 2009; Singhal, 2004). Importantly, Roessingh and Kover (2003) discuss the construct of bilingual semilingualism, a situation in which the developing L2 comes at the expense of a diminished first language (L1) or both language systems. Roessingh and Kover point out that the level of L1-L2 impact is typically dependent on the individual’s age-on-arrival in the immigrant-receiving host country and the length of residence in that country (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a). In acknowledging Rumbaut and Ima’s (1988) pioneering research, the term Generation 1.5 is used in this study.

Complex and multifaceted, this Generation 1.5 learner profile had its origins in the theoretical language proficiency research undertaken by Cummins (1979, 1981, 1984). Typically, these learners are not fully proficient in either their L1 or their L2 (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). As Cummins (2008, 2011) advises, while these learners characteristically have well-developed basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS), they are less skilled in cognitive academic learning proficiency (CALP). As CALP is crucial for academic learning achievement, these learners may also lack the third language proficiency, discrete language skills (DLS) that comprise the rule-governed areas such as grammar, phonology, and spelling (Cummins, 2011). Cummins makes the conceptual distinction between BICS or ‘surface fluency’ and CALP or ‘deeper’, abstract-linguistic knowledge in relation to learners with an immigrant background. The first learning continuum involves the
observable BICS cognitive and language processes that include comprehension, knowledge, and application practices that inform grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. The second learning continuum involves the non-observable, beneath the surface CALP processes that use analysis, evaluation, and synthesis to inform functional and semantic meaning. In addition, the iceberg model provides the common underlying proficiency (CUP) construct that enables the “transfer of cognitive/academic or literacy-related skills across languages” (Cummins, 1984, p. 22). As Schleppegrell (2009) points out, for Generation 1.5 learners, grammatical knowledge is crucial in terms of organising and structuring ideas and information, making appropriate language choices, and constructing meaning in a whole-of-text approach. Figure 2.1 below illustrates this complex L1-L2 learning model.

Figure 2.1

_Cummins’ Iceberg Model_

Note: This figure illustrates Cummins’ (1984) BICS, CALP, CUP, and DLS constructs within the iceberg model. This image is reprinted from Google: https://www.google.com.au/search?q=cummins+surface+calp+diagram&tbm=isch&source=iu
In discussing the linguistic transfers that are dependent on socio-linguistic situations, Cummins (2005) outlines conceptual elements that comprise metacognitive and metalinguistic strategies, pragmatic language use, phonological awareness, and specific linguistic elements. Collectively, the BICS, CALP, and DLS components that are associated with L2 proficiency are framed and informed by variables that include: educational policies, procedures, and program structures; interlanguage considerations (Swan & Smith, 2010); and L2 pedagogical practices and impacts (Cummins, 1984, 2008; Cummins et al., 2012; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a). In relation to the evolving interlanguage continuum, Swan and Smith (2010, p. ix) describe it as a “variety of a language that is produced by non-natives” that impacts to varying degrees on L2 acquisition. However, as mentioned, the crucial L2 academic variables relate to immigrants’ age-on-arrival and the length of residence in their host countries (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a). Accordingly, children arriving between the ages of 12 and 14 face increased pressures to bridge the L2 linguistic and literacy gap necessary for L2 academic achievement (Cummins et al., 2012; Harklau, 2003; Roessingh, 2008). Importantly, research indicates that many Generation 1.5 high school graduates are inadequately prepared to meet the demands of tertiary education (Harklau & Siegal, 2009 Thonus, 2003). Consequently, these Generation 1.5 learners tend to commence university studies with distinct and differing language and literacy patterns that do not align with the traditional, “institutionally constructed” university student profile (Roberge, 2009, p. vii).
Considering that immigrant families’ arrival experiences are informed by the situations that triggered their home country departures, Roberge (2009) disputes the view that immigrant children readily adapt to the cultural and linguistic situations within English-speaking, immigrant-receiving host countries. These children, Roberge points out, may experience considerable psychological and social challenges such as anxiety, cognitive and emotional stress, depression, discrimination, inter-generational value conflicts, and undertaking greater family responsibilities than their native-born counterparts. Research also suggests that many Generation 1.5 learners may experience discrimination and marginalisation in their L2 schooling from peers and teachers in terms of cultural-linguistic ties and race (Raphael & Au, 2005; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Kover, 2003). Accordingly, Roberge emphasises the importance of acculturation and identity formation in meeting these challenges and making positive across-cultural adjustments.

In terms of the identity negotiation processes, Sirin and Fine (2007) acknowledge the complexities associated with hybrid concepts of identity and hyphenated self-identities. However, immigrants' worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978) and liminality construct-driven transitional processes (Stenner, 2018a) collide when dealing with the consequences of managing self-identity conflicts (Rogers-Sirin et al., 2014; Sirin & Fine, 2007). Collectively, this collision is likened to living on fault-lines in worlds that are fractured and fragmented by difference and discrimination, by multi-faceted national and international influences, and by personal and social life upheavals (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Sirin & Fine, 2007; Zolberg, 2006).

In a New Zealand-based study, Szabo and Ward (2015) consider commitment as the crucial component that enables immigrants to positively reconstruct their identities. Motivationally-driven, this commitment involves a willingness to consider available options and make informed decisions. These findings reflect Dornyei’s (2003, 2005, 2009) L2 motivation model, along with affective learning research (Buissink-Smith et al., 2011) that
considers the revised Krathwohl et al. (2002) taxonomy of educational objectives.

Importantly, the cognitive elements in the Krathwohl et al. (2002) framework demonstrate the individual’s degree of intention and preparedness to contribute positively, neutrally, or negatively in the learning domain (Ainley, 2006). In turn, this immigrant ‘intentionality’ and ‘preparedness’ suggests parallels with the willingness-to-communicate construct that Dörnyei (2003) describes as a multi-layered paradigm. This model includes inter-group attitudes, linguistic self-confidence, and motivation that is strongly associated with goal setting, language-learning strategies, task management, and developing L2 communicative competence (Dörnyei, 2003). Collectively, these considerations support the construct of identity commitment (Szabo & Ward, 2015). However, it is important to note that these cultural, linguistic, and racially-influenced identity considerations are set against a backdrop of prevailing and pervasive global economic, political, and social barriers and influences (Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017).

Global Forces, Impacts, and Influences

With asylum seeker, migration, and refugee re-settlement programs currently viewed as global phenomena (Barron, 2011; Betts, 2009; Fargues, 2011; Kicinger, 2004; McBrien, 2005), major English-speaking, immigrant-destination countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the USA face associated economic, educational, political, and social implications (Karlsen, 2016; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017; Rudolph, 2003). These implications are demonstrated by the on-going USA situation in which potentially 1.76 million unauthorised immigrants arrived as children with their families. These illegal USA immigrants are now adults, the majority of whom live in California, Florida, and Texas (Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012). Referred to as ‘dreamers’ or ‘DREAMers’, this term has its origins in the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM Act) of 2010 that was designed to provide these immigrant children with a pathway to citizenship (Barron, 2011). While this legislation has been introduced into the USA Congress in several
forms since 2001, it has not been ratified. In the absence of supporting legislation, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) amnesty initiative that was modelled on the DREAM Act, was introduced by Executive Order during the Obama Administration in 2012 (Barron, 2011; Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012). Living their lives in limbo, these undocumented immigrants face an uncertain future as the DACA initiative remains under review.

The G20 Global Displacement and Migration Trends Report (2017) issued by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) acknowledges the challenges faced by member countries in terms of significant rises in legal and illegal asylum seeker and refugee flows that peaked in 2015 and 2016. This OECD report also acknowledges increased global mobility and resultant growth in skilled migration and the number of international students accessing tertiary education. Importantly, the World Migration Report (2020) by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) estimates the number of migrants to be almost 272 million globally. However, Taylor and Sidhu (2012) draw attention to distinctions that need to be made between economic migration and forced migration flows. Flahaux and De Haas (2016) consider that economic migration is well-accepted and recognised. However, in terms of forced migration and displacement patterns that include environmental degradation, military conflicts, nationalism, and political and religious tensions, Flahaux and De Haas explain the situational determinants and differences. The authors contend that these drivers have become conflated with asylum seeker and refugee flows, generating negative community implications and inferences by way of government and media reporting. However, this reporting appears to contrast with government policy and program initiatives that promote business and skilled migration, along with recruiting full-fee-paying international university students (Flahaux & De Haas, 2016; Taylor & Sidhu, 2011). However, irrespective of migration program entry, legal or illegal, the young people arriving in Australia will meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile.
National Implications Resulting From Global Forces, Impacts, and Influences

In highlighting the USA immigration-generated DACA example, it draws attention to the international phenomena of demographic scarcity (IOM, 2020; Zolberg, 2006). Accordingly, these immigration patterns have significant educational policy, program structure, and practice implications for other major English-speaking, immigrant-receiving countries (Barron, 2011; Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012; Fargues, 2011; Harklau & Siegal, 2009; Kicinger, 2004; McBrien, 2005; OECD, 2017; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a). Australia has two immigration programs. The first program targets skilled migrants and those with family connections in Australia, while second focuses on humanitarian programs that include refugees and people in refugee-like situations (Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017). In December 2019, Australia had a population of 25.55 million people (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2019). Of this figure, over 7.5 million people were migrants, representing 29 percent of the total population. In 2019 alone, 553,000 people had immigrated to Australia and 45,800 settled in Western Australia (WA). Of all migrants coming to Australia, approximately 15,000 were aged between 10 and 19, and of these, 11,000 were aged between 15 and 19, the age that would make them likely to access university within one-to-three years. Accordingly, in WA in 2019, these ABS statistics would equate to approximately 1,250 young people in the Generation 1.5 learner age range, either in high school or about to start university. This data indicates the scale of the educational problem for Australia, and in turn, for WA.

With these Australian immigration patterns in mind, there are significant educational policy and program implications that align with mainly North American-based research findings (Gunderson et al., 2012; Harklau & Siegal, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b). Firstly, there are consequences in terms of Australian Government policy directions aimed at improving university access pathways for non-traditional students from diverse cultural, educational, linguistic, and social backgrounds (Sharp et al., 2013).
Secondly, these policy directives provide challenges for the tertiary institutions operating in various States and Territories. These challenges include having appropriately-structured tertiary programs in place that address the changing, non-traditional university student demographic profile (Harklau & Siegal, 2009; Roberge, 2009; Sharp et al., 2013), along with ensuring that pedagogical practices are rigorous and targeted. Thirdly, learning and literacy support is paramount for Generation 1.5 learners. As research indicates, these learners are at greater risk of failure in academic discourse communities that assume all students have the ‘expected’ independent learning skills, strategies, and techniques that are necessary to meet academic reading and writing demands (Productivity Commission, 2019; Raphael & Au, 2005; Roessingh, 2004; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b).

**Educational Implications**

As the previous discussion on global and national economic, educational, political, and social factors demonstrates, increased immigration trends represent significant educational implications. As Rumbaut (2005) makes clear, education is a key determinant that shapes individuals’ socio-economic trajectories in major English-speaking, immigrant-receiving countries. Importantly, Louie (2009, p. 35) discusses the educational “high stakes” issues that include social advancement and mobility in relation to both individuals and ethnic groups. Bearing in mind that over three decades have passed since Rumbaut and Ima (1988) first identified this cohort of L2 learners, the academic barriers facing these students remain under-recognised and under-researched (Allison, 2009; Louie, 2009; Roberge, 2009). Crucially, Roessingh and Douglas (2012a, p. 81) contend that education provides the learning capital that enables immigrants to compete in globalised economies driven by “technology, communication, and innovation” and the heightened need for educational and intellectual capital. Given these economic impacts and influences, Roessingh and Kover (2003) explain that immigrants, especially those arriving between the ages of 12 and 14, face significant CALP-related educational challenges and “must work hard to beat the
academic time clock” (p. 8). However, Roessingh et al. (2005) make the distinction between these learners and native speakers (NS), pointing out that developing CALP is a “long and uneven process”, one in which L2 learners “are continually chasing a moving target in their effort to close the gap between themselves and their NS classmates sufficiently to compete academically: many, if not most, never do” (p.4). Harklau and Siegal (2009) highlight the growing sense of educational urgency in the USA. This urgency, Harklau and Siegal contend, is significant in relation to tertiary studies given “high school can no longer be the educational finish line for most students, including language minority students” (p. 25).

With English considered the international language (Canagarajah, 2006), having a high level of L2 proficiency provides pathways that contribute to increased economic, educational, and employment opportunities (Czura, 2016). In recognising the diverse educational needs associated with these L2 learners, Vasquez (2007) highlights the social identity issues in language-learning environments as significant considerations. As Roessingh and Douglas (2012a) make clear, immigrant parents tend to have high tertiary education expectations for their children. Accordingly, immigrant children must deal with social capital pressures that include meeting self, significant ‘other’, and L1 community expectations. Similarly, Thonus (2003) explains that these self and social identity pressures include being the first person in their family to become literate in any language, complete high school, and attend university.

However, in relation to the academic learning and social capital pressures (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a) facing Generation 1.5 learners, meeting these academic pressures requires core L2 proficiencies in terms of form and function (Brindley, 1989; Hinkel, 2003, 2004; McKay & Brindley, 2007). Given the typical learner profile for this cohort of L2 learners, the CALP-underpinned academic reading and writing skills are underdeveloped but crucial to educational achievement (Hinkel, 2004, 2006, 2013). An overview of the key L2 academic drivers, reading and writing areas, and skill sets are now provided.
According to Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002, p. 4), developing academic literacy requires a "complex set of skills (not necessarily only those relating to the mastery of reading and writing) which are increasingly argued to be vital underpinnings or cultural knowledge required for success in academic communities". In relation to developing academic literacy, research indicates that Generation 1.5 learners typically lack reading comprehension skills, strategies, and techniques (Nation, 2009, 2014). Subsequently, difficulties arise in terms of learners distinguishing between informal L2 verbal and written registers and those required when undertaking L2 academic writing tasks (Celce-Murcia & Yoo, 2014; Hinkel, 2004; McKay & Brindley, 2007; Myles, 2002; Thonus, 2003). In lacking sufficient familiarity with L2 writing composition processes (Hinkel, 2004; Nation, 2009), these learners may be unaware of the importance of the before, during, and after writing skills, strategies, and techniques that include undertaking research, brainstorming, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading (Crossman & Pinchbeck, 2012; Crosthwaite, 2016). However, in working towards developing L2 academic skills, Roessingh and Kover (2003, p. 9) explain that Generation 1.5 learners may have experienced marginalisation in their primary and secondary education due to perceived minority status. In addition, Roessingh and Kover explain that these marginalised learners may have been steered towards non-academic, vocationally-orientated pathways rather than academic studies. In discussing the relationship between marginalisation and literacy development, Raphael and Au (2005, p. 207) indicate that students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds tend to receive "a great deal of instruction in lower level skills and little instruction in reading comprehension and higher level thinking about the text". Consequently, Raphael and Au consider that this “weak” instructional approach, frequently influenced by educators’ lowered expectations for this cohort of learners, limits students’ opportunities “for higher education, employment, and overall advancement in society” (p. 208). Murie and Fitzpatrick (2009) point out that Generation 1.5 learners’ sense of
‘connectedness’ to the academic discourse community is an important component in fostering academic literacy and learning engagement, improving reading-to-writing skills, and developing communicative competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995; Dörnyei, 2003). As Murie and Fitzpatrick (2009) suggest that this connectedness appears integrative in nature, Dörnyei’s (2003) process model of L2 motivation affords an important contribution to developing and improving L2 academic literacy and learning engagement.

**Meeting Academic Reading Demands**

Reading is one of the most critical skills that students must master to be successful educationally, occupationally, and socially. Students’ educational success depends on their abilities to read and critically analyze information presented in textbooks and other classroom materials. (Graham & Hebert, 2011, p. 710)

Despite reading being one of the most important L2 academic tasks (Hinkel, 2013), many students entering tertiary education lack the comprehension skills, strategies, and techniques that enable them to meet the demands of the academic discourse community (Bharuthram, 2012). Importantly, Farrell (2009, p. 9) describes reading strategies as abilities that readers use to “make sense of what they read and what they do when they do not understand a passage”, advising that instruction increases readers’ tactical knowledge of the reading process and of situations in which to use the most appropriate approaches. As Nation (2009, p. 1) notes, academic success is underpinned by effective reading strategies that focus on “meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, language-focused learning, and fluency development”. In turn, Gardner (2005) explains the importance of motivation in terms of its affective, behavioural, and cognitive components, while Krathwohl (2002) points out the importance of Bloom’s revised taxonomy. This taxonomy comprises cognitive processes and knowledge dimensions. The former involves remembering, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating, and creating, while the latter comprises factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive skills (Krathwohl, 2002). Given the complex language-
learning requirements associated with reading comprehension, Cummins (2008) highlights the importance of CALP in terms of the higher-order, critical thinking skills that include synthesising, integrating, and reasoning, along with the ability to generalise and transfer knowledge (Cummins, 1984, 2005, 2011; Harklau, 2003; Krathwohl, 2002; Roessingh & Kover, 2003; Roessingh et al., 2005; Singhal, 2004). However, in acquiring the ability to ‘read-to-learn’, Cummins (2011, p. 142) explains that as “academic language is found primarily in printed text rather than in everyday conversation”, reading is a complex cognitive undertaking that underpins academic learning and learning achievement (Paris, 2005). In relation to Generation 1.5 learners, it is important to consider that learners from diverse socio-cultural backgrounds bring with them varying levels of educational achievement, a range of life experiences, and “different needs and academic potential” (Nel et al., 2004, p. 95).

In acknowledging the cognitive challenges implicit in reading academic texts, Gallagher (2011) discusses the complexities facing L2 learners. These learners must understand register, interpret textual meaning, determine the author’s point-of-view and writing purpose, and understand how these factors inform more sophisticated grammatical, lexical, and syntactical constructions. Importantly, the learners must recognise how the text is constructed at the sentence, paragraph, and whole-of-text level. As Hinkel (2006) advises, understanding the message in different types of genre and responding appropriately, requires communicative competence in all four L2 skill areas. While efficient reading requires a combination of both top-down and bottom-up processing, Spack (cited in Scarcella, 2003, p. 23) argues that without higher-level cognitive processing proficiency, readers’ “ability to interpret and analyze their reading is compromised”. As research indicates that the reading load for first-year university students is extremely challenging, to meet the expectations of the academic discourse community, these learners require effective reading comprehension strategies (Afflerbach et al. 2008; Bharuthram, 2012; Farahzad & Emam, 2010; Huang & Nisbet, 2014; McKeown et al. 2009). These views align with Bharuthram (2012) in that a lack
of reading comprehension skills negatively impacts on L2 academic and learning performances. In relation to the important reading and writing connection, educators advise students to read widely and write daily (Gallagher, 2014; Knapp & Watkins, 2005).

**The Reading and Writing Connection**

Farahzad and Emam (2010) note that L2 learners require the academic literacy skills and strategies that equip them for ‘reading-for-writing’. As the authors explain, reading and writing skills are “natural partners” (p. 596) and parallel processes, while Breeze and Sajgalikova (2012) refer to them as one model of integrated language skills, the other being listening and speaking. Collectively, these language skills support L2 learners in developing the actional, discoursal, linguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, and strategic communicative competencies that are necessary for academic success (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995; Hinkel, 2006). However, in managing and mastering the reading-for-writing demands, Generation 1.5 learners face the cognitive complexities associated with L2 academic writing conventions. According to Hinkel (2004), these learners must demonstrate effective writing techniques that feature alliteration, assonance, and the rule-of-three principle in persuasive writing, together with making lexical choices that include nominalisations, reporting verbs, and synonymy. This cohort of L2 learners must also be cognisant of what constitutes plagiarism and understand how material from published sources is acknowledged and included in academic texts (Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009). In writing for the reader, learners must understand the functions of discourse markers, hedging, and signposting within academic writing (Hinkel, 2004; Scott & Nagy, 2009). It is important to note that Brown (2007) discusses L2 learners’ evolving interlanguage continuum in terms of ultimately achieving communicative competence. In addition, Achugar et al. (2007) discuss L2 reflective literacy skills developed through deconstructive textual analysis and responding critically when examining language choices. Underpinning these linguistic skills is engagement in the complex meaning-making processes associated with academic reading-
related writing tasks. As research indicates that L2 students lack appropriate instruction and practice in developing reading-to-writing skills and strategies (Hinkel, 2004; Myles, 2002; Nation, 2009), developing the CALP levels necessary for successful tertiary studies is difficult and demanding in terms of the effort and time requirements (Allison, 2009; Cummins, 2008; Roessingh & Kover, 2003; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b).

**Meeting Academic Writing Demands**

Writing well is not just an option for young people—it is a necessity. Along with reading comprehension, writing skill is a predictor of academic success and a basic requirement for participation in civic life and in a global economy. (Graham & Perin, 2007, p. 3)

Given the importance of having well-developed reading and writing skills, Roessingh and Douglas (2012a) consider these L2 learning capital proficiencies provide the educational and social capacity necessary to compete in increasingly globalised Western economies. However, Roessingh and Douglas (2012a, p. 84) argue that developing the CALP resources necessary for academic success can be a “long and gradual process”. As Harklau (2003) points out, for this cohort of learners’, academic writing difficulties may result from a lack of prior instruction in academic genres and limited exposure to authentic writing tasks. These difficulties are exacerbated by having insufficient text-based discussion concerning rhetorical conventions, schemata, and writing purpose (Knapp & Watkins, 2005). Importantly, Grabe and Zhang (2013) indicate that a considerable challenge facing L2 learners in academic environments is having a suitably specific, descriptive lexis that is ideally underpinned by an 8,000-9,000 word-family vocabulary. This view is strengthened as Nation (2014) highlights the cognitive challenges associated with learning the most frequently used 9,000 academic words and using them appropriately in writing practice. Consequently, a high degree of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995) is necessary if L2 learners are to develop the abilities, knowledge, and skills that effectively cover integrated academic
reading and writing tasks (Farahzad & Emam, 2010; Nation, 2014). In line with research, the ability to complete these tasks may be compounded by students’ inability to engage in learning and literacy processes that require a problem-solving approach to academic reading and writing demands (Forrest, 2006; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011).

In relation to L2 learners being ill-equipped to meet academic discourse community expectations, Hinkel (2004, p. 18) describes this unpreparedness in terms of providing written work that fails to demonstrate “knowledge and familiarity with course material”. As Generation 1.5 learners typically have strong, conversational language skills referred to as BICS, Hinkel (2003, 2013) points out academic writing may also include the grammatical and syntactical constructions that the individual uses in spoken and conversational discourse. Hinkel (2004) explains that these shortfalls aligned with L2 undergraduate writing survey findings that found students: were unable to organise writing that introduced major and supplementary ideas that were supported by appropriate references; had a generalised inability to use appropriate vocabulary; lacked the skills to demonstrate a command of suitable Standard English language in terms of grammar, phrasing, punctuation, and spelling; and had inadequate skills in constructing the complex syntactical constructions that are expected in academic writing. With these learning considerations in mind, Barkaoui (2007) emphasises the importance of providing supportive teaching and learning environments that are conducive to encouraging and engaging L2 writers. This approach has continuing relevance as Hinkel (2013) advises that academically-bound L2 learners require explicit, instructional activities that use authentic texts and tasks that assist in developing more complex and sophisticated grammatical, lexical, and syntactical structures. Given the importance of iterative practice, Gallagher (2011) explains that developing writers need exposure to exemplar academic texts that provide constructive, collaborative opportunities for daily reading, textual analysis, discussion, and subsequent writing opportunities. However, given the collective L2 learning and literacy complexities associated
with the Generation 1.5 learner profile, educational transition and survival in university settings is equally challenging.

**Educational Transition and Survival Measures**

The previous section outlined four core L2 academic reading and writing-related proficiencies crucial to tertiary education success and which Generation 1.5 learners invariably lack. However, there are two educational survival measures that would benefit these learners. The first is needs analysis (NA), a targeted and systematic approach designed to develop L2 academic learners’ abilities. The second is university-provided academic support that is intended to strengthen and support L2 learners. An overview of these measures is now provided.

**Supporting Academic Survival: The Importance of Needs Analysis**

Given the well-established L2 limitations typically associated with the Generation 1.5 learner profile (Harklau, 2003; Harklau & Siegal, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b), NA is imperative. The Brindley (1989) framework, developed specifically for L2 learners, examines three key orientations. The first orientation establishes learners’ current L2 proficiencies, while the second determines the learner’s psychological-humanistic dimensions that include affective, attitudinal, behavioural, cognitive, and motivational strengths and weaknesses. The third area investigates the learner’s specific L2 goals that may include developing the CALP levels necessary for academic success. When discussing these NA orientations, McKay and Brindley (2007) highlight the importance of having a systematic process in place that precedes language assessment decisions and subsequent program design. Importantly, West (cited in Cowling, 2007, p. 427) refers to NA as identifying “what learners will be required to do with the foreign language in the target situation, and how learners might best master the target language during the period of
training”. As Dudley-Evans and St John (1998, p. 126) explain, the NA aim is “to know learners as people, as language users and as language learners; to know how language learning and skills learning can be maximised for a given learner group; and finally to know the target situations and learning environment”. However, as research indicates, Generation 1.5 learners are characteristically inadequately prepared for the challenges and demands of academic studies (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Crosby, 2009; Hinkel, 2004; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b).

**Undermining Academic Survival: Learning Support Disconnections**

In relation to the L2 academic literacy inadequacies of many Generation 1.5 learners navigating tertiary education (Ainley, 2006; Buissink-Smith et al., 2011; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011), Goldschmidt and Miller (2005) discuss the unpreparedness of many tertiary institutions and teaching staff who may have little understanding of the complex L2 academic difficulties facing these students. Additionally, Davison (cited in Goldschmidt & Miller, 2005, p. 14) advises that there is “little or no acknowledgment in pedagogic practice that the [second language] learners lived for most of the day in another language and another culture”. Davison also points out that “no matter how sympathetically viewed [these students] were assumed to be on a continuum of conformity to some yet unobtained ‘native-speaker hood’…”. While these observations were made in relation to North American college situations involving Generation 1.5 learners, Australian research (Arkoudis et al; 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019) confirms the unawareness and unreadiness of many tertiary institutions to provide these students with accessible and appropriate L2 learning and literacy support.

**Contextual Literature Review Summary**
Positioning the Generation 1.5 learner study involved accessing technical literature that with reason and rigour situated the contextual research (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017). This literature review approach used Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological framework for human development that comprises five environmental systems (Eriksson et al., 2018). Social interaction within these systems included: immigration and identity development factors; global economic, political, and social influences; and Australian Government policy impacts and future directions. In terms of the educational implications, this cohort of Generation 1.5 L2 learners require support in developing literacy and learning engagement that enables them to meet academic reading and writing demands. Targeted, NA-like programs that meet their diverse L2 academic learning and literacy requirements are imperative (Brindley, 1989; McKay & Brindley, 2007). Importantly, these students require foundational support to develop, enhance, and maintain positive affective, behavioural, and cognitive information processing system skills that maximise L2 language-learning outcomes and academic survival (Buissink-Smith et al., 2011). As L2 reading and writing skills are crucial to achieving academic success (Farahzad & Emam, 2010), these students require learning and literacy opportunities that identify the functional and structural components of scholarly texts (Hinkel, 2004, 2006; Scott & Nagy, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b). However, having welcoming teaching and learning environments (Barkaoui, 2007; Witkowsky et al., 2016) are necessary if students are to develop the L2 academic skills and strategies that are essential for educational transition, survival, and academic success (Crosby, 2009; Celce-Murcia et al., 1995; Celce-Murcia & Yoo, 2014; Gallagher, 2011, 2014; Harklau, 2003; Molina & Manasse, 2015; Nation, 2014). In determining the “what of the study” (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017, p. 12), this outline of the Contextual Literature Review addressed the central research question and situated the key factors affecting Generation 1.5 learners managing their undergraduate academic studies. Given Ravitch and Riggan (2017) consider that “theoretical frameworks clarify the why and the how” of a research study, this second stage of the literature review provides that clarification. As Goodman (1978, p. 7) explains, making sense of the world we live in is multifaceted, considering that “Much but by no means all
worldmaking consists of taking apart and putting together, often conjointly…combining features into complexes, and making connections…”.

**Theoretical Literature Review: Ways of Worldmaking**

Challenge your assumptions. Value every discipline without privileging any. Value experiential or lay knowledge…Bring in voices from the relevant literature, looking for synergies or dissonances, because the sum is bigger than the parts. Context matters: how pieces of information sit in relation to another creates meaning. Reality can never be fully captured, but we can do our best to interpret and represent it. (Leavy, 2019a, p. 144)

This second section of the review outlines the three types of literature, arts-informed, non-technical, and technical, that the researcher accessed in developing the theoretical framework that facilitated “the forward thrust” of the study without “becoming a captive of any of them” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 56). As the researcher’s primary purpose was to build substantive theory, literature was a secondary source of information that informed the data findings and writing stages in the study (Birks & Mills, 2011). This demarcation demonstrates the dynamism of the researcher’s interplay between iterative data analysis processes and literature access. In working with literature, the researcher’s pragmatic and praxis-positioned approach informed the theoretical interpretation of the data findings. To recall, the researcher set out to investigate how participants meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile managed their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based, public university over an academic year. Accordingly, in tandem with the data-generation methods, analytical processes, and study findings, the researcher engaged with literature that informed decision-making and theoretical thinking. Importantly, this approach created and forged innovative and instinctive relationships between the study findings and the available literature. As the researcher developed the story line and substantive theory, concurrent literature-related priorities included using theoretical sampling techniques and maintaining theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Paralleling these activities, memo-writing and Resource Journal-
keeping provided non-technical literature, the analytical tools that informed the researcher’s reflexive stance throughout the study (Tracy, 2013). This positioning was crucial during the iterative analytical and literature practices that dealt with the dichotomies of emergence rather than forcing the findings in generating theory (Birks & Mills, 2011). Collectively, these practices influenced the inductive and deductive interactions that exist in GT studies (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This study positioning required the researcher to “go back to the data or field situation and look for evidence to support, refute, or modify” analytical and theoretical thinking processes (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 148).

It is important to note that these knowledge-brokering and information-building processes provided the researcher with self-awareness and self-questioning opportunities (McGhee et al., 2007; Tracy, 2013) that reduced the literature-influenced tensions implicit in GT studies (Birks & Mills, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This pragmatic, ‘grounded’ approach delivered a theoretical dialogue-with-the-data that dismissed literature alone as delineating or devaluing the data (Ramalho et al., 2015). In relation to creativity, positioning, and privileging the data, the researcher generated “a rich, tightly woven, explanatory theory that closely approximates the reality it represents” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 57). Importantly, in adopting an arts-informed research and writing praxis, the researcher informed and added value to the study findings, exploring and evaluating existing knowledge and creating innovative ways of communicating, connecting, and constructing new knowledge (Eisner, 1997; Leavy, 2011, 2017, 2019a, 2019b). In answering the study’s central research question, Patricia Leavy’s (2019a) novel Spark was instrumental in highlighting the importance of qualitative research practices that make the crucial connections between the arts and social sciences. Interweaving concept mapping, critical thinking, interdisciplinarity, literature reviews, and problem-solving components in the novel’s story line, Leavy (2017) calls for innovative research approaches. Accordingly, this study represents the researcher’s individual and idiosyncratic interpretation of an arts-informed research and writing praxis.
The Literature Informing the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory

This section provides an overview of the arts-informed, non-technical, and technical literature that was crucial throughout the iterative, inductive data-generation and analytical stages in this Generation 1.5 learner study. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, in the final selective coding stages, these processes become increasingly abstract, with literature resources that includes memo-writing and Resource Journal-keeping as non-technical material providing conceptual and theoretical alignments that inform the researcher’s analytical and interpretive thinking (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Accordingly, accessing literature resources throughout the study contributes to story line development, the culmination of being ‘grounded’ and ‘immersed’ in the data and recognising the ‘emergent’ substantive theory, the aim of all GT researchers (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

As the emergent ‘grounded theory’, participants’ ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ approaches to tertiary education dominated the study findings. Using the metaphor of a journey, the Academic Highway Journey was established as the GT core category, the major force that influences and is influenced by its five major categories: academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems. Given the positioning of the Academic Highway Journey as the key substantive theory driver, a range of interrelated journeys operated and overlapped between the systems. In being gravitationally and inextricably influenced and interconnected, these systems were empirically-based, analytically and inductively-developed (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and theoretically-underpinned (Meadows, 2008). As the study findings demonstrated, the cognitive complexities inherent in participants’ actions and behaviours (Marcia, 2002) in their ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic journeys were systems-influenced by multiple factors in diverse and reciprocally-influenced ways (Meadows, 2008). Using GT data analysis, coding processes included the Goffmanesque approach to situational analysis in asking “What is it that’s going on here?” (Goffman, 1974,
For the researcher, questioning the *what*, *why*, *when*, *where* and *how* of the emerging findings was enhanced by accessing arts-informed, non-technical, and technical literature (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017). This approach clarified and informed the participants’ patterned, behavioural responses in their academically-situated events that explained the relationships and synergies that existed between the constituent five-system structures (Kim, 2002; Mele et al., 2010). Importantly, implementing a systems-thinking approach generated a multidimensional frame of reference that demonstrated the researcher’s commitment to working synergistically with data findings and literature resources in examining the factors that influenced participants’ Academic Highway Journeys (Ng et al., 2009). Set against a backdrop of scarce L2 academic literacy, coping mechanisms, and effective decision-making resources (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013), Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical metaphor and Collins’ (2000) situational inequality highway journey metaphor were crucial technical literature alignments that validated study findings. Importantly, these theoretical alignments enhanced story line development (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Collectively, the iterative and inductive processes of data analysis and literature access developed substantive theory, the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory.

*The Self under Siege*

It seems that there is no interaction in which the participants do not take an appreciable chance of being slightly embarrassed or a slight chance of being deeply humiliated. Life may not be much of a gamble, but interaction is. (Goffman, 1959, p. 236)

dramaturgical metaphor with its focus on the multiplicity of rituals, roles, and rules in micro-level social interactions and identity performances resounded within the data findings and in the resultant Theory. As Goffman (1959, 1971, 1974) compares social life to complex theoretical performances for self and significant ‘others’, the study’s empirically-based core category, the Academic Highway Journey and its five major satellite systems’ influences were well-supported theoretically given literature access throughout the study (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009; Goffman, 1959, 1967, 1969, 1971, 1974; Koltko-Rivera, 2006; Maslow, 1943; Meadows, 2008). Collectively, these self-identity performances (Goffman, 1959), intersectionality factors (Collins & Bilge, 2018), and literature alignments and discoveries were reconceptualised in this study, laying the theoretical foundations for the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. In making the agency, identity, and order linkages between the participants’ L2 future-self aspirations (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014) and their self-actualisation (SA) aligned academic journeys, Goffman (1971) considers the self as constantly under siege. While Goffman (1971, p. 328) describes public life as being like a “battlefield”, Kim (2002, p. 61) refers to public places as a “cutthroat battle zone”. In accordance with the learning systems’ findings, the battle motive informed the relationships between participants’ identity and impression management experiences (Goffman, 1959, 1971). Skirmishes included L2 academic systems’ literacy clashes and collisions, along with learning support conflicts and confrontations (Arkoudis et al., 2019) throughout their journeys.

**Identities and Roles: Perspectives, Practicalities, and Processes**

Performers often foster the impression that they had ideal motives for acquiring the role in which they are performing. That they have ideal qualifications for the role, and that it was not necessary for them to suffer any indignities, insults, and humiliations, or make any tacitly understood ‘deals’, in order to acquire the role. (Goffman, 1959, p. 54)

While seeking to realise their full, unique academic potential and SA-like academic aspirations (Maslow, 1943), participants navigated on-going highway journey barriers and
breakdowns. Dealing with immigration as a life-changing event (Segal, 2002), the legacies of
the past had across-domain impacts and implications (Ko & Perreira, 2010; Rogers-Sirin et al., 2014) as participants negotiated role-identity and selfhood issues (Davis, 2014; Dockery et al., 2019). In keeping with the metaphor of the Academic Highway Journey and Goffman’s
(1959) dramaturgical metaphor, there were multiple impacts and injuries, catastrophes and
casualties along the way. In being unable to manage their learning ‘traffic’ challenges and
demands, the combined effects of time scarcity and an abundance of L2 difficulties
undermined the participants’ progress in becoming independent, proficient, and self-
regulated L2 learner drivers (Hinkel, 2004; Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013; Zimmerman, 2002).

As Goffman (1959) and Scott (2015) discuss, dealing with ‘stage fright’ (Scott, 2007) and
anxiety in delivering successful academic learning performances requires progression from
‘backstage’ course knowledge to ‘frontstage’ assessment presentations. For example, one
participant experienced self-blame, self-doubt, and lowered self-worth, while another felt
shamed and stigmatised (Goffman, 1963a; Morrice, 2013), constants throughout their
academic journeys. In another example, for the two Asian-born participants in this study, the
model minority myth (Shih et al., 2019) and Goffman’s (1955, 1967) ‘face’ and face works
concepts, along with meeting self, family, and L1 local community audience expectations
(Czura, 2016; Leong & Kim, 2011; Scott, 2007; Zhang et al., 2011) were crucial academic,
coping, identity, and learning systems’ findings. However, for another participant, the
migratory grieving processes (Casado et al., 2010; Parkes, 1965) experienced through home
country cultural losses were paralysing in terms of their on-going academic, coping, identity,
immigration, and learning systems’ impacts. In contrast, for two participants, study findings
were theoretically supported in that negative pre-and-post-immigration factors (Morrice,

In confirming their ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ highway journeys, participants implicitly
acknowledged their inadequate CALP levels while explicitly referring to their L2 academic
reading and writing difficulties. Paradoxically, acceptance and enrolment in a “reinventive
institution" (Scott, 2015, p. 203) was conflated with the conferral of the L2 academic abilities necessary to succeed in their SA-aligned highway journeys (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Maslow, 1943). In revisiting Goffman’s (1961) concept of the total institution, Scott (2015, p. 203) describes reinventive institutions as places “to which members voluntarily commit themselves in pursuit of self-transformation, improvement and identity reinvention”.

However, as the findings indicated and the literature informed, reinventive institutional enrolment without targeted and timely academic literacy support does not result in educational opportunity for this cohort of L2 students (Arkoudis, 2019; Hand et al., 2013; Harvey & Mallman, 2019). Consequently, in terms of achieved university student identity status (Marcia, 2002) and the student impostor syndrome (Bothello & Roulet, 2019), impacts included losing ‘face’, being ‘found out’ as a ‘fraudulent’ student, and being ‘unmasked’ (Strauss, 1977) for misrepresentation in the academic discourse community (Goffman, 1955, 1959, 1974; Leong & Kim, 2011; Zhang et al., 2011). Accordingly, these findings indicated crucial coping, identity, and learning systems’ impacts throughout participants’ reinventive, Academic Highway Journeys (Scott, 2007; 2010, 2015). In association with intersectionality (Collins & Bilge, 2018), Stenner’s (2018b) liminality construct likens people’s life journeys to managing and manoeuvring between multiple worlds or “spheres of activity” (p. 51). As Stenner explains, in transitioning from one world or sphere to another, an individual may become ‘stuck’ in their between-world transitions. This situation is referred to as a liminal hotspot (Stenner, 2018b). These considerations, in conjunction with Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical alignments, found narrative and theoretical voice in terms of participants ‘stalling’ en route when managing their academically-influenced, liminal hotspot conflicts (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In failing to function at full cognitive capacity, participants’ academic journeys were undermined by counter-productive decision-making that damaged learning performances and disrupted L2 self transitions and transformations (Antonovsky, 1980; Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013; Scott, 2010, 2015; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). As the findings demonstrated, participants’ SA-associated (Maslow, 1943) Academic Highway Journeys were reinventively-positioned
Consequently, situationally-triggered stress depleted participants’ available coping systems’ resources (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013), exacerbated existing L2 academic and learning systems’ difficulties, and hampered their identity systems’ efforts to reshape their future-self aspirations and identities-on-the-move (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014).

**Framing Participants’ Worldmaking Experiences**

I assume that when individuals attend to any current situation, they face the question: ‘What is it that’s going on here?’ Whether asked explicitly, as in times of confusion and doubt, or tacitly, during occasions of usual certitude, the question is put and the answer to it is presumed by the way the individuals then proceed to get on with the affairs at hand. (Goffman, 1974, p. 8)

In identifying, defining, and interpreting concepts and categories in the data findings, Goffman’s *Frame Analysis* (1974) was an integral component in making sense of participants’ academic, worldmaking experiences. As Goodman (1978) contends, worldmaking is a complex cognitive undertaking that is founded differently and constructed in diverse ways as people endeavour to manage the worlds they live in and make meaningful connections. With the participants’ study findings representing key academic journey events, experiences, and perspectives, frame analysis made the linkages between the barriers, breakdowns, and breakthroughs that typified their identity-shaping, coping and learning systems’ performances (Scott, 2007, 2015). These linkages acknowledged participants’ situational rituals, roles, and rules that were negotiated through self and significant ‘others’ communicative actions and reactions. As supported in the study findings, these performances were impression management strategies and problem-solving approaches (Goffman, 1959). In turn, these crucial self-identity narratives or scripts (McAdams & Guo, 2015) were intended to rework the participants present L2 selves in order to reconstruct their future L2 selves (Dörnyei, 2014; McAdams, 2018; Maslow, 1943). Importantly, these study findings demonstrated the importance of the iterative interplay that existed between data analysis processes and literature access. Using Goffman's
dramaturgical model (1959) and frame analysis (1974), the researcher identified the key theatrical performers in participants’ academic journeys, along with the settings and stage props, the anxieties implicit within the plots and sub-plots, and the denouement in terms of academic success or failure over the year-long journey. As the study findings indicated, and as subsequent literature access confirmed, Greco and Stenner’s (2017, p. 148) liminality construct was equally informative in the participants’ performances. As participants’ academic journeys were marked by “events of becoming” and “troubled becoming” that required active self-management for transitional and transformational growth, being ‘stuck’ in their becoming transitions represented a major liminal hotspot issues (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In line with Goffman (1959, 1967, 1971, 1974), the researcher ‘framed’, defined, and interpreted participants’ specific events and incidents, ‘bracketed’ the subsequent levels or sequences, and ‘keyed’ in the transitions necessary for progression from one highway journey stage to another (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b).

Consequently, ‘learner driver’ academic journeys, together with university student identity and learning systems’ performances resulted in participants ‘misframing’, misreading, and mismanaging their academic situations (Goffman, 1959; Scott, 2015). Whether presenting as “sincere” or “cynical” undergraduate university student performers (Goffman, 1959, p. 28), the participants were miscast in their L2 academic identity role. As Goffman (p. 236) makes clear, “If we are caught out in a misrepresentation we feel deeply humiliated”. Accordingly, participants’ identity and sense-of-self issues came into play as a result of violating the academic discourse community rules (Goffman, 1959). While only three of the six participants remained in the study over the academic year, findings confirmed that all highway journeymen and journeywomen demonstrated “inadequate dramaturgical direction” (Goffman, 1959, p. 60). However, in delivering their L2 academic, identity, and learning systems’ performances, participants lacked the resources required to improve and sustain dramaturgical discipline (Scott, 2015) and performative regulation as willing members of a reinventive institution (Goffman, 1961; Scott, 2010, 2015). It is
important to recall that this cohort of L2 learners tend to commence university studies with distinctive and divergent language and literacy patterns that do not align with the traditional university student profile (Roberge, 2009). As the findings unfolded, and in accordance with Goffman’s dramaturgical, metaphorical, and framing constructs, it emerged that participants were miscast in their student roles, subsequently misdirecting, misframing, misreading, misrepresenting, and mismanaging their academic journeys (Goffman, 1959, 1974). Importantly, Goffman’s (1974) frame analysis construct guided the researcher’s interpretations of the participants’ five systems’ influences that emerged from the study. For instance, the academic, coping, identity, and learning performance missteps and mistakes in participants’ ‘going to uni’, ‘being a uni student’, and ‘messing-it-up’ frames were manifest (Goffman, 1959, 1974). However, the findings also indicated ‘laminated’ framing (Goffman, 1974) in terms of the multiple layers of ‘disconnection’ in participants’ interactions with teaching staff (Hand et al., 2013). This framing included ‘academic guidance mishandling’, ‘learning support disconnection’, and ‘learning support scarcity’ (Hand et al., 2013).

Collectively, these study findings are discussed in the participants’ stories in Chapters 4 and 5, along with theoretical discussion in Chapter 6 that illustrates the extent to which participants’ transitional performances and processes influenced their L2 future-self aspirations, goals, and visions (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Goffman, 1959, 1974; Stenner, 2018b).

Reconstructing Identities-on-the-Move

In a highly globalized world, where more than 200 million people are living as international migrants (OECD, 2013), continuously confronting and negotiating the demands of at least two different cultures, there is a growing need to understand how cultural transition affects the identity of immigrants and explore the factors that can potentially contribute to the development of a positive and coherent immigrant identity. (Szabo & Ward, 2015, p. 13)

Identity matters. Whether positively, neutrally, or negatively framed, identity systems’ impacts were crucial for all participants during their Academic Highway Journeys. The literature on immigrant identity is extensive (Dockery et al., 2020; Lee, 2019; Roblain et al.,
Paradoxically, while providing multiple perspectives within identity research, the associated complexities and contradictions are heightened (Lee, 2019). In discussing identity, immigration, and well-being, Phiney et al. (2001) refer to identity development in terms of a continuum that encompasses assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalisation-related variables. Given the findings in this study captured the complexities of these variables, Phiney et al. (2001, p. 505) discuss an interactional model that “takes into account the culture, identity attitudes, and preferences of the immigrants, the characteristics of the place of settlement, and the interaction among these factors”.

These theoretical considerations align with Dörnyei’s (2003) process motivation model developed from an L2 perspective. This three-stage model informed the participants’ academic journey findings in that the first component comprised pre-actional, choice motivation in relation to setting goals, expressing intentions, and undertaking actions. In the second stage, actional, executive motivation was necessary in performing learning-related responsibilities, assessing their achievements, and attempting to develop self-regulated learning. In the third stage, post-actional motivation involved making causal connections, developing strategies, and making plans. However, with Dörnyei’s three motivational stages in mind, and as the study findings demonstrated, maintaining the highway journey momentum was adversely influenced by on-going academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems’ influences. In considering critical thinking and motivation as crucial components in “action competence” (Mogensen, 1997, p. 429), this viewpoint calls to mind the L2 communicative competence framework (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995) that includes actional capabilities that match communicative intent with the appropriate linguistic form. As the participants sought to positively reconstruct their L2 identities through their academic journeys, Szabo and Ward (2015) consider commitment as the crucial component.

In keeping with the extensive volume of immigrant identity research, Lee (2019) discusses the merits of bicultural identities. Viewed as a bonus and a boon rather than being
The author examines integrated, bicultural identities and the blurring of the sense-of-belongingness boundaries that exist between immigrants' home country and host country attachments. Similarly, Chen and Padilla (2019) highlight the benefits of bilingualism as a component of bicultural identity. However, as evidenced in study findings and demonstrated in participants' storied-journey accounts in Chapters 4 and 5, identity issues are complex, complicated, and contrarily experienced in terms of positive, somewhere in-between, and negative affective orientations. As Davis (2014, p. 500) emphasises, “the self is made up of multiple identities” that collectively shape people's experiences, perspectives, and social relationships “through the lenses of the identities they hold”. As Goffman (1959, p. 243) explains:

The self, then, as a performed character, is not an organic thing that has a specific location, whose fundamental fate is to be born, to mature, and to die; it is a dramatic effect arising diffusely from a scene that is presented, and the characteristic issue, the crucial concern, is whether it will be credited or discredited. (Goffman, 1959, p. 243)

Given the participants misframed their L2 academic learning performances and situations (Goffman, 1959, 1974), Davis (2014, p. 518) calls for a performative and presentational balance between the ideal and the authentic “selfing processes”. In drawing attention to the influences of overlapping social system staging, networking performances, and theatrical properties (Goffman, 1959), there are alignments in the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. As the concept of selves has evolved over time, Dörnyei (2009, 2014) outlines the historical contexts in developing the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self that were evidenced in the data findings and influential in story line and theoretical development. However, in reconstructing participants' ‘identities-on-the-move’ in their reinventive highway journeys (Hand et al., 2013; Scott, 2010, 2015), these systems-influenced journeys were experienced differently and in distinct and diverse ways. As participants sought to manage and reshape their L2 self-identities in ways that connected with their future-focused visions (Dörnyei, 2003, 2009, 2014), their past immigration experiences continued to influence and
impact on their present academic journey realities (Arkoudis, 2019; Dockery et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019).

**The Motivational Capacity of Future-Self Guides and Visions**

The learner has a desired future self-image... The future self is sufficiently different from their current self... The future self-image is elaborate and vivid [original emphasis]. People vary in the vividness of their mental imagery, and a possible self with insufficient specificity and detail may not be able to evoke the necessary motivational responses. (Dörnyei, 2014, p. 9)

Participants’ SA-aligned academic journeys were crucial study findings when viewed through the prism of Dörnyei’s (2009) L2 motivational self system. As Dörnyei (p. 25) points out, “Language learning is a sustained and often tedious process with lots of temporary ups and downs”, demonstrating the importance of reconceptualising L2 learners’ motivation as part of their self-systems. Importantly, Dörnyei (2009, 2014) discusses motivational movement to the ideal L2 self or to the ought-to L2 self, with the learners’ current L2 learning experiences as the situation-specific educational environment that influences and informs identity systems’ development. Participants’ actions towards their ideal L2 self-states involved having a vision for reducing the gap between the present and the future, while being motivated to activate learning plans. As Dörnyei (2014, p.12) explains, “the vision of who they would like to be become as second language users seems to be one of the most reliable predictors of their long-term intended effort”. As the study findings demonstrated, having an L2 future-self vision (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014) was implicit in participants’ ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic journeys that were underpinned by their cultural, family, personal, and pre-and-post immigration systems’ influences. For those participants orientated towards Dörnyei’s ought-to L2 self, the main motivators involved surviving and avoiding failure rather than being actively achievement-focused. In wanting to reduce identified L2 proficiency gaps but without undertaking any meaningful action planning, the ought-to L2 participants felt obligated to do well in order to meet family and L1 community expectations (Conroy et al.,
Importantly, for ought-to L2 selves, adopting a defensive, cognitive stance was designed to reduce psychological tension and restore stasis (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013).

However, as the study findings revealed, meeting the academic journey demands as either ideal or ought-to L2 selves (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014) was problematical. For the ideal L2 selves, these difficulties involved adopting a growth identity mindset (Dweck, 2012), having a self-regulatory learning approach that reduced literacy gaps (Zimmerman, 2002), and improving their L2 academic skills (Brindley, 1989). These learners also required an awareness of the micro-situational norms, roles, and rules that are inherent in L2 academic learning environments (Collins, 2000; Goffman, 1959, 1974). Importantly, understanding the motivational factors embedded in L2 future self-guides that drive harmonious and realistic outcomes is essential (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Dweck, 2012). However, for the ought-to L2 selves, the main considerations related to avoiding negative outcomes with significant ‘others’ in mind, irrespective of whether these views conflicted with their own. In terms of developing optimal future self-guides, Dörnyei’s (2003) L2 process motivation model with its pre-and post-actional cognitive drivers play crucial roles. However, as Dörnyei (2009) explains, creating, strengthening, and sustaining these guides or visions requires collaborative learning partnerships between the students and the teaching staff. In alignment with Dörnyei’s (2009) L2 motivational self system, Hand et al. (2013) discuss reframing, reshaping, and resituating educational possibilities for students dealing with multiple, interconnected across-life domain demands, highlighting the need for improved access, equity, and inclusion in L2 academic learning situations (Witkowsky et al., 2016; Yosso, 2005).

*Scarcity Begets Scarcity: Why Having Too Little Means So Much*
We have treated abundance as merely what happens when scarcity is absent...There are times when a psychology of abundance kicks in. And what makes the psychology of abundance so intriguing is that it seems to have in it the seeds of eventual scarcity. (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013, pp. 232-233)

As Mullainathan and Shafir (2013) explain, having a scarcity of resources presents significant challenges in terms of human cognition. Consequently, scarcity captures and compromises people’s cognitive capabilities. This scarcity construct erodes people’s functioning in terms of attentional, executive control, and working memory resources that are limited in capacity and capable of producing a range of systemic and counter-productive cognitive and behavioural reactions (Zhao & Tomm, 2018). In this study, scarcity begets scarcity (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). As the findings acknowledged participants’ under-developed CALP resources, this scarcity demonstrates why having so little means so much in terms of successfully completing their Academic Highway Journeys. Accordingly, scarce CALP resulted in participants’ making cognitive compromises and trade-offs that were detrimental to effective planning and coherent decision-making. Importantly, time scarcity underpinned these impacts, undermining participants’ functional ability to deal with the associated academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems’ influences. In line with the ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ theoretical driver and the astronomy metaphor, scarcity issues generated gravitational fields of “radiating and rotating metrics” (Wagh & Muktibodh, 2008, p. 1) that exerted negative influences in other systems (Meadows, 2008). With the academic, coping, and learning systems in mind, these metrics were empirically and theoretically supported in terms of participants’ under-developed CALP (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a), their L2 learning support disconnections (Harvey & Mallman, 2019), and their difficulties in accessing timely teaching staff guidance (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Hand et al., 2013; Harvey & Mallman, 2019). In many respects, discussion on immigrants’ managing multiple ‘worlds-on-the-move’ (Zolberg, 2006) and transitional influences (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) parallels the participants’ coping, identity, and immigration systems influences that underpinned their L2 academic and learning systems performances. This situational
comparison is made in terms of the tensions that exist between these concurrent force systems that are intersectionality-influenced (Collins & Bilge, 2018). For reinventive institutions such as universities (Scott, 2010, 2015), the participants in this study represented willing members ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ in their Academic Highway Journeys. However, the financial implications for these reinventive institutions are considerable and the mixed marketing messages are concerning (Bunce et al., 2017; Snowden & Lewis, 2015). By way of contrast, participants’ L2 future-self aspirations (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014), along with their associated identities-on-the-move and ‘bird-on-the-wing’ academic drivers, were multi-systems influenced and relentlessly pursued in the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. However, while the participants are ‘wanted’ as fee-paying ‘customers’ (Bunce et al., 2017), study findings demonstrated, and the literature supported, that they were not welcomed and worthy beyond the reinventive institutional enrolment procedures (Arkoudis, 2019; Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019). This situation recalls the wisdom of Friedrich Nietzsche’s words and the worthiness of having a ‘why’ in life that enables people to endure almost any ‘how’. This arts-informed reference supported the story line and theory development in that the reinventive institution’s student portal provided, as part of a scattergun marketing approach to academic literacy support, a learning system that ‘failed’ this cohort of L2 students (Arkoudis, 2019; Arkoudis et al., 2019; Hand et al., 2013; Harvey & Mallman, 2019).

The Liminality and Scarcity Connection: Framing Across-System Journey Impacts

Disciplined social systems which once seemed so stable and internally coherent are increasingly emphasising transience…The idea of hotspots of permanent liminality resonates with these diagnoses of late modentity…Liminal hotspots constitute an endemic feature of societies characterised by permanent liminality. (Greco & Stenner, 2017, pp. 161-162)
The construct of liminality (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) was crucial in framing the multiple interrelationships that existed between and within the academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems. In magnifying the Academic Highway Journey impacts and influences, systemic breakdowns were demonstrated by study findings as participants ‘gave way’, abandoned, and exited earlier than scheduled due to unmanageable liminality hotspot issues (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) and a pervasive L2 academic scarcity mindset (Dweck, 2012; Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). In turn, contributing systems’ influences included: inadequate coping mechanisms (Antonovsky, 1980; Lazarus & Folkman, 1987); a triad of learning support disconnections (Arkoudis et al., 2019); and academic situational inequality (Collins, 2000; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Morrice, 2013). Accordingly, of the six participants in this study, two withdrew without notice, one of whom withdrew from university after failing his semester one units. A third participant withdrew after failing her semester one and two courses, leaving three who remained in the study and ‘survived’ their academic journeys. This result recalls Gonzales and Vargas (2015) in relation to the USA ‘dreamer’ situation with undocumented, immigrant college students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile. In describing the “fault lines of inequality that closely track those of race and immigration status” (Gonzales & Vargas, 2015, p. 35), there are counterparts with this Western Australian study. Importantly, Gonzales and Vargas examine the plight of “early exiters” (p. 43) from the USA educational system. The authors discuss the difficulties inherent in these students bridging the liminality-influenced transitional gaps between identity-focused, L2 future-self aspirations and gaining acceptance and a sense of belongingness in their academic discourse communities. Importantly, the USA dreamers and the Western Australian participants are pursuing the great American and Australian dreams respectively (Becerra, 2019). However, immigration status is the crucial difference, as dreamers are “not legally present” (Becerra, 2019, p. 848). These theoretical considerations are explained in Chapter 6 in terms of the model that positions the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory in a revised Maslow (1943) hierarchy of human needs.
Experiencing liminality involves ambivalence, dealing with constant change and transition, instability, and the uncertainty that typifies today's post-modern societies (Czura, 2016; Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In relation to academic and identity systems, the Generation 1.5 learner profile evokes a sense of dealing with the impacts of ‘laminated’ framing (Goffman, 1974), along with liminality hotspot dilemmas and ironies (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). Accordingly, participants must deal with being ‘stuck’ in the CALP transition that is crucial to their academic success (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). In turn, this liminal hotspot impedes participants’ post-immigration transitioning (Stenner, 2018b) and their L2 future-self aspirations, goals, and visions (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014). As Greco and Stenner (2017, p. 150) report, liminal “rites are transitional, and thus emphasise paradoxical “betwixt and between” qualities in which the rules and conventions usually at play in a circle of activity are temporarily suspended, enabling new beginnings”. Accordingly, given increasing worldwide asylum-seeking, immigration, and refugee patterns (Morrice, 2013; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017) and worlds-on-the-move influences (IOM, 2020) in a period of demographic scarcity (Zolberg, 2006), these study findings were confirmed in the literature. As Stenner (2018b, p. 53) points out, an individual’s liminality and hotspot transitioning zone difficulties “pale into insignificance next to those multitudes facing the seemingly endless transitions of migration, permanently suspended between ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’; or those facing the now routinely permanent ‘wars against terror’…”.

Stenner’s liminality construct and being ‘stuck’ in transitional areas recalls Goffman’s (1959, pp. 31-33) identity-underpinned role performance continuum: “While we can expect to find natural movement back and forth between cynicism and sincerity, still we must not rule out the kind of transitional point that can be sustained on the strength of little self-illusion”.

**Theoretical Literature Review Summary**

This knowledge-building theoretical literature framework acknowledged the researcher’s positioning in terms of a review that adhered to Strauss and Corbin’s (1990)
advice to use literature throughout GT studies. Accessing technical literature throughout the analytical processes enabled the researcher to consider the theories already known, explore those discovered, and make theoretical linkages that privileged the study findings and informed the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. This approach is in keeping with “the discovery of theory from data” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 1). Concurrently, non-technical literature in the form of researcher-generated memos and Resource Journal commentaries provided data from specific points-in-time that considered the implications of the findings and theoretical linkages. Given the arts-informed approach in this study, making literary connections and using references that aligned with analytical findings and technical literature discoveries facilitated knowledge-building and value-adding in the Theory (Leavy, 2011, 2019a, 2019b; Tracy, 2013). As the purpose of this study was to develop substantive theory, these literature-informed study contributions maximised the theoretical opportunities and possibilities in an ethically coherent, cohesive, and contemporaneous manner (Leavy, 2011; Tracy, 2013). This review approach is consistent with Dunne (2011, p. 120) in that literature from diverse disciplines provides “a theoretical reference point against which to compare the data”. Importantly, in focusing on the flow and “forward thrust” of the literature that informed the study findings, story lines, and theoretical development (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 56), these activities also extended to the researcher’s praxis. In working creatively with knowledge, an overview of the researcher’s praxis positioning is now provided.

An Arts-Informed Research and Writing Praxis: Working with Words, Works, and Worlds of Wonder

In giving ‘life’ to Generation 1.5 learners’ worldmaking, ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic journey experiences, the researcher heeded Patricia Leavy’s (2019a) rallying call in her novel Spark. Research methodology-based and sociologically-situated, Peyton, the novel’s central character, cautions against using “dinosaur thinking” (p. 99). Championing the cause to break through self-imposed comfort zone barriers, to be courageous in
exploring options, and to maximise opportunities in answering life’s questions, Leavy’s arts-informed message resonated with the researcher. In answering the central research question in this study, the ‘Spark approach’ reverberated and ricocheted in the researcher’s research and writing praxis. From study finding synergies through to making imaginative and innovative literature alignments that informed story line and theoretical development, the Spark approach informed the researcher’s individualistic, instinctive, and intuitive research and writing praxis. Carter Phipps (cited in Hunt, 2014, p. e993267-1) identifies a key cognitive concept that the researcher considered captured the life force of an arts-informed research and writing praxis:

An evolutionary is a broad category for a new type of thinker and way of thinking about the world. An evolutionary is informed by the radical knowledge that we live in a dynamic changing, evolving universe instead of a static, fixed, unchanging one. I say that evolutionary spirituality is evolution-inspired, future-oriented, and world-embracing.

Similarly, Goffman’s (1959, 1971, 1974) literary style with its structure, substance, and spirited research positioning was influential. Importantly, Goffman’s unconventional and unique use of language introduces Nietzschean-like ‘shock and awe’ writing approaches that use ‘words-as-weapons’ to maximise theoretical impact. For the researcher, Goffman’s approach highlighted the importance of privileging participants’ words and study findings in ways that were enhanced by using Leavy-spurred, arts-informed literary alignments. This engagement with Goffman’s words, works, and worlds of micro-social encounters and interactions found linguistic, theatrical, and theoretical voice in this study by using the metaphor of the Academic Highway Journey. As an analytical and conceptual tool, the researcher made cognitive connections and constructions, with leaps and linkages to literary leanings that fostered heightened understandings of the participants' Academic Highway Journey trials and tribulations. As a communication vehicle, the metaphor of the journey provided the researcher with a systematic way in which to accommodate and extend the
associated meaning-making processes that encompassed academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems’ impacts and interconnections.

Guided by Goffman’s semantic gymnastics and juxtaposition of dissimilar concepts and perspectives in unexpected ways, elements of this writing approach were adopted in this study. Enriching and enlivening the participants’ prosaically-situated social identity patterns (Scott, 2007, 2015) with creative and captivating literary connections (Leavy, 2011, 2017, 2019a, 2019b) became a signature strength in this study. To demonstrate this approach, the following example is provided. In construing the participants’ identified L2 future-self visions (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014) embodied and emboldened in their ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ driven, SA-conceptualised academic journeys (Maslow, 1943), the researcher used quatrain seven from the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*:

Come, fill the Cup, and in the fire of Spring  
Your Winter-garment of Repentance fling:  
The Bird of Time has but a little way  
To flutter—and the Bird is on the Wing. (In Main, 1889/1976, p. 154)

In acknowledging that time, like life is fleeting, reconciling the past and resolving the present (Frankl, 1992) was a recurrent refrain and reframe (Goffman, 1959, 1974) as participants managed their Academic Highway Journeys. In creatively aligning the participants’ sense-of-place and self with the ‘Bird of Time being in-flight’, Goffman’s (1959) theatrical metaphor with its settings, staging, and experientially-directed actions, cues, and evocative linguistic performances are recalled. These theoretical connections are in keeping with the data-derived bird-on-the wing coding concept that captured participants’ motivations to seek personal fulfilment, meaning, and purpose in their lives (Frankl, 1992) by completing their academic journeys. Giving support to this research and writing praxis, participants’ aesthetically-influenced, empirically-based, and theoretically-informed story lines are
provided in Chapters 4 and 5. In turn, these narrative identity reconstructions underpin the theoretical development discussion in Chapter 6.

While Leavy (2017, 2019a) leaning and Goffman (1959) generated, research and writing praxis influences also included the writings of psychologist Adam Phillips. Working with words to demonstrate the shades and subtleties of people’s behaviour in their psychological worlds, Phillips uses engaging and enigmatic literary references designed to captivate and challenge the reader. In displaying literary eclecticism, Phillips (1993, p. 83) cites the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein in that, “the way to solve problems you see in life is to live in a way that makes the problems disappear”. In drawing on poetry, Phillips presents a cognitively complex aphoristic marker with the words of the poet Randall Jarrell, “if I can think of it, it isn’t what I want” (p. 46). The researcher shared Phillips’ (1993, p. 150) worldview of wanting to write what will be “a pleasure to read” and Leavy’s (2017) arts-based study approach that highlights the evocative and provocative power of language and the ways in which words shape people’s worlds. As a result, the researcher put in place a principled, procedural, and purposeful research and writing praxis. With coherence and cohesion, the researcher sought to shape seamless and strong relationships between aesthetics and innovation, critical thinking and knowledge-building, and meaning-making and theoretical writing processes (Clayton, 2013; Leavy, 2011, 2017, 2019a, 2019b; Nolan, 2010). In adopting a Peytonesque-inspired praxis (Leavy, 2019a, p. 136), the researcher’s Spark approach had been ignited, recognising that, “some of those sparks contain entire worlds. Entire worlds of possibility and wonder”.

**Conclusion**

This chapter acknowledged the contentious nature of literature use in GT studies. In adhering to Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) advice to use literature throughout the study, the researcher developed a two-staged review structure that was reasoned in terms of
importance and rigorous in its systematic approach (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017). The first section, the Contextual Literature Review, used available technical material that explained and situated the what of the study. In turn, the second section, the Theoretical Literature Review, accessed arts-informed, non-technical, and technical literature, generating a framework that investigated the how and why of the study. Importantly, developing the theoretical framework influenced the research and writing praxis adopted in this study. Working constructively and instructively with literature that informed the data findings, the researcher identified the core category and the five major categories that contributed to storyline development and the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. Collectively, this approach to literature use addressed, situated, and answered the central research question: How do participant students who meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile manage their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based, public university in Western Australia over an academic year? As Dunne (2011, p. 115) indicates, “a literature review which ensues from the emergent grounded theory is essential not only for academic honesty, but in order to demonstrate how the study builds on and contributes to extant knowledge within the field”.

The next chapter introduces the research design, methodology, and methods used in this study. As the central research question determines, directs, and justifies the study approach, this chapter discusses the paradigm of interpretivism, the theoretical positioning of symbolic interactionism, and Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) GT methodology. With data-generation and analysis driving storyline and theoretical development, the researcher’s rejuvenated GT approach is examined. In developing ethically-underpinned theoretical contributions (Tracy, 2013), the measures taken to manage procedural, relational, and situational issues are discussed. This discussion also includes the importance of striving for excellence in research quality and contributing to knowledge generation and information transfer. Collectively, this third chapter, in keeping with Goffman (1959, p. 9), delivers research components that form “a framework that can be applied to any concrete social establishment, be it domestic, industrial, or commercial”.
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Chapter 3
Research Design, Methodology, and Methods

Much but by no means all worldmaking consists of taking apart and putting together, often conjointly: on the one hand, of dividing wholes into parts and partitioning kinds into sub-species, analysing complexes into component features, drawing distinctions; on the other hand, of composing wholes and kinds out of parts and members and subclasses, combining features into complexes, and making connections. Such composition or decomposition is normally effected or assisted or consolidated by the application of labels: names, predicates, gestures, pictures etc. (Goodman, 1978, p. 7)

The previous chapter discussed the role that arts-informed, non-technical, and technical literature played in this Generation 1.5 learner study. This cohort of learners are considered neither part of the first generation in an English-speaking, immigrant-receiving country, nor part of the second generation of children born in that country (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988). While typically having well-developed basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS), these learners have under-developed cognitive academic learning proficiency (CALP) levels crucial for English as a second language (L2) educational achievement (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). As the central research question investigates how participants meeting this learner profile manage their undergraduate studies over an academic year, this chapter discusses the research design, methodology, and methods used in this study. With these three components in place, “the operations by which data are broken down, conceptualized, and put back together in new ways" provide the “central process by which theories are built from data" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 57). In turn, these components were influenced by a fourth, the importance of meeting research quality standards that are ethically-underpinned in terms of procedural, relational, and situational practices and processes (Tracy, 2013). Collectively, these research components developed and delivered creative, credible, and critically-conceived and constructed study findings that were empirically-derived and theoretically-underpinned (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Tracy, 2013).
Research Design

Crotty (1998) discusses scaffolding or framing processes that provide researchers with direction, purpose, and stability when conducting qualitative social research. Importantly, O'Donoghue (2019, p. 7) explains the need for a logical, well-constructed “paradigm-guided” research plan that informs subsequent, systematic approaches in relation to the theoretical positioning, methodological considerations, and research methods best-suited to address the central research question. Accordingly, this study's research design encompasses the epistemological position or paradigm of interpretivism that “emphasises social interaction as the basis for knowledge” that is driven by the need for “understanding the meaning behind something” (O'Donoghue, 2019, p. 9). In turn, symbolic interactionism provides the theoretical positioning within this philosophical viewpoint of the social world (Crotty, 1998). With Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) grounded theory (GT) as the methodology, semi-structured, in-depth interviewing (Punch & Oancea, 2014) and written responses to research questions were the data-generation methods. As Creswell (2007) asserts, the research design moves beyond description in order to ground the study in the data provided by participants who are experiencing the phenomenon situated within a specific context. Collectively, this research design provided a comprehensive, rigorous, and systematic framework for discovering and developing theory that investigated “patterns of action and interaction” between the participants and their situations” (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 278).

Research Paradigm and Theoretical Positioning: The Interplay Between the Data and the Researcher

In focusing on how participant Generation 1.5 learners ‘manage’ their academic studies, primary importance is placed on the social meanings that these learners attach to the world around them and how they respond to them (O'Donoghue, 2019; Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). This worldview aligns with social ontology in terms of studying the social world and
analysing the entities and properties that arise from actions and interactions (Bryman, 2008).

In relation to the longitudinal aspects of research that are informed by interpretivism, symbolic interactionism, and GT methodology, O’Donoghue (2019) points out that central research questions using the words ‘cope’, ‘deal with’, and ‘manage’ seek to discover the perspectives that participants hold in relation to the particular research domain.

In terms of design justification, using an interpretivist research approach acknowledges and demonstrates: (i) the significance of participant-provided data; (ii) the importance of language and discourse in social actions and interactions; (iii) the self-reflective and meaning-making nature of the research process; (iv) how participants understand their immigration-influenced worldviews and worldmaking experiences; and (v) how knowledge is constructed through participant-researcher negotiation in the data-generation and analytical processes (Creswell, 2007; O’Donoghue, 2019; Punch & Oancea, 2014). With an implicit focus on process, social interaction, and knowledge production (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015), this study is situated within an interpretivist paradigm (O’Donoghue, 2019) that aligns with the theoretical position of symbolic interactionism. As a perspectival framework, symbolic interactionism is based on the following premises: that people act towards things and other people on the basis of the meanings these things and people have for them; that people attribute symbolic meanings to things and people through a continuous process; and that the meanings associated with objects and situations result from the interpretations individuals give them (Blumer, 1969). Accordingly, in qualitative research, participants attribute meanings through a process of social interaction (Punch & Oancea, 2014), revealing “the perspectives behind empirical observations, the actions people take in light of their perspectives, and the patterns which develop through interaction of perspectives and actions over particular periods of time” (O’Donoghue, 2019, p. 20). In discussing the researcher’s role, Creswell (2007, p. 248) describes it in terms of being “an interpreter of the data and an individual who represents information”, raising related issues that include “power, authority, and domination in all facets of the qualitative inquiry”.
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However, given the theoretical positioning used in this study, these issues are addressed. This is in keeping with the self-reflective nature of the GT approach that is “based on a researcher’s interpretations of non-quantifiable data” (Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 174).

With symbolic interactionism as the theoretical philosophy underpinning this research design, Crotty (1988) explains that this positioning informs GT, providing a pathway in which to consider, explain, and understand people’s actions, behaviour, interactions, interpretations, and reactions in their social worlds. Additionally, Crotty (1988, pp. 7-8) advises that these social actions are associated with managing “language, communication, interrelationships and community” issues, research processes that were crucial in capturing the participants’ perspectives in their L2 academic management situations. As a non-judgmental approach, symbolic interactionism involves the study of people in their natural environment, rather than using abstract forms or artificial experiments (Blumer, 1969; O’Donoghue, 2019; Woods, 1992), what Chenitz and Swanson (1986) consider as a theory about human behaviour. In exploring these perspectival considerations, Goffman’s dramaturgical model (1959) and frame analysis (1974) were important positioning considerations in terms of meaning-making (Goodman, 1978; Scott, 2010, 2015). While Woods (1992) describes perspectives as frameworks through which people make sense of their socially-situated worlds, Charon (2010, p. 11) discusses perspectives as ways that filter, organise, and structure worldmaking frameworks that comprise a person’s assumption, ideas, and values, providing “points of view—eyeglasses, sensitizers—that guide our perceptions of reality”. With these paradigmatic and theoretical positioning considerations in mind, and given GT provides a methodology that is reality-based (Collins, 2000; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), these components underpinned the study.
A grounded theory is one that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents...Therefore, data collection, analysis, and theory stand in reciprocal relationships with each other. One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 23)

In discussing the reciprocal relationships within GT studies, Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 143) emphasise its importance in terms of bringing process to data analysis, describing it as “the linking of sequences of action/interaction as they pertain to the management of, control over, or response to, a phenomenon”. In relation to these systematic procedures and techniques, Punch (2005, p. 153) describes this methodology as “a distinctive strategy for research which aims to discover or generate explanatory theory grounded in data”. In elaborating on these analytical advantages, Punch and Oancea (2014) point out that this methodology is compatible with the goals and assumptions associated with interpretivism and symbolic interactionism. In relation to theoretical development, Strauss and Corbin (1990, p.174) define substantive theory as that which “evolves from the study of a phenomenon situated within one particular situational context”. Accordingly, this theory inductively discovers and investigates the cyclical patterns of actions, behaviour, and interactions between individuals and their situations. Elaborating on this description, Strauss and Corbin (1994, p. 278) describe the resultant substantive theory as being “conceptually dense” in terms of having “many conceptual relationships”. Accordingly, this GT methodology was selected because it provides a rigorous, well-established way in which to collect data about human behaviour in specific, interactional environments and to consider contextual sources of meanings (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2011; O'Donoghue, 2019). These processes also examine how these meanings may change over time (Punch & Oancea, 2014). As a systematic procedural approach that investigates people's experiences, Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 31) discuss GT advantages in terms of meeting the criteria for “good” science that includes precision, rigour, significance, and verification.
It is important to point out that there have been several GT adaptations since the Strauss and Corbin (1990) GT version (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). The researcher also made coding and memo-writing revisions that evolved during the study. However, as a well-constructed, systematic approach with analytical, comparative, and inductive strategies and structures in place (Jones et al., 2014), GT retains its key defining characteristics. Importantly, the over-arching characteristic involves being process-orientated in exploring the sequences and outcomes of situational actions, activities, and interactions in the research area being investigated (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Accordingly, the researcher sought to understand participants’ experiences and perspectives in terms of concepts and categories emerging from data analysis that includes open, axial, and selective coding (Creswell, 2012). These coding processes use constant comparative approaches that compare data with data, concepts and categories, and category with category during the analytical stages. As GT research is concept-driven, theoretical sampling directs the data search, determines relevance, develops concepts and categories, and defines their inter-relationships and significance in the evolving theory (Bryant, 2013; Creswell, 2012). In keeping with Jones et al. (2014), memo-writing, the process that involved the researcher making connections in the data findings and providing “written records of analysis related to the formulation of theory” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 197), continued throughout the coding stages. In turn, exhausting the data identified the core category and the major categories, signalling theoretical saturation that informs the story line, the descriptive narrative that explains the core category in terms of theoretical development (Bryant, 2013; Creswell, 2012; Jones et al., 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Importantly, these key GT characteristics were situated within the researcher’s rejuvenated approach used in this study.

Given the arts-informed writing praxis adopted in this study, GT also provided a methodology that enhanced and welcomed the researcher’s inherent and acquired abilities to interpret, define, and work creatively with the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). However,
given the contentious positioning of literature within GT research (Birks & Mills, 2011; Bryant, 2013; Punch & Oancea, 2014), this component was discussed in the Chapter 2 literature review. Collectively, GT analysis and coding contributes to preparing trustworthy, data-derived substantive theory rather than creating a ‘fiction’ about the research area (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Having examined and justified the methodology selected and used in this research study, discussion now focuses on the methods chosen to address and answer the central research question.

**Methods: Data-Generation and Analytical Processes**

**Purposeful Sampling and Sampling Size**

Longitudinal in research design, understanding participants’ perspectives at the outset of their academic management journeys, and investigating how, why, and when these perspectives may have changed over an academic year were crucial. Accordingly, the two concurrent research priorities were purposeful sampling and theoretical sampling (O’Donoghue, 2019). Purposeful sampling targeted undergraduate students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile and experiencing the phenomenon being investigated. Accordingly, six participants agreed to take part in this study, with their subsequent academic journey data contributing to analysis, generating findings that were informed by literature resources, and developing story lines and theory (Creswell, 2007). Theoretical sampling was necessary as the study was theory-driven rather than probability-driven. As Hull (2013, p. 6) explains and justifies, GT research sampling methods “must cover the scope and the trajectory over time”. In this study, purposeful sampling captured participants’ diverse home country backgrounds and their correspondingly distinct and dissimilar pre-immigration and post-immigration experiences. Participants’ worldview-influenced decision-making processes (Goodman, 1978) and their disparate L2 learning needs and literacy
patterns (Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a, 2012b) were also established. Importantly, capturing the data contributed to what Tracy (2013, p. 230) refers to as the “rich rigor” research quality marker that includes sampling practices. Consequently, analysis of data-generating interviews and written responses to research questions were enhanced and informed by several variables. These variables included: (i) initial and evolving perspectives on immigrating to Australia; (ii) age-on-arrival and the length of residence in Australia; (iii) acculturation experiences; (iv) L2 educational factors that include instruction and practice, BICS and CALP implications, and first language to L2 transfer issues; (v) age during the study; (vi) gender; and (vii) cultural and socio-economic positioning.

As O’Donoghue (2019) reports, in some qualitative research there is no prearranged sample size, arguing that theory development is typically heightened and strengthened when developed and validated across a range of situations and variables. Additionally, Brinkmann and Kvale (2015, p. 140) advise that there is no “gold standard” in relation to the sampling size, arguing that in some studies, “the ‘less can be more’ approach” may be appropriate. Similarly, Punch and Oancea (2014) argue that it is preferable to have smaller amounts of high-quality data, rather than larger amounts of low-quality data. As the story lines in Chapters 4 and 5 and the theoretical development discussions in Chapter 6 demonstrate, the resultant data from the six study participants was thick and descriptive (Geertz, 1973), and high-quality (Boeijji, 2010; Brinkmann & Kavale, 2015). Consequently, study findings delivered “in-depth, contextual, and rich accounts” of the participants’ experiences and perspectives over time (Tracy, 2013, p. 249) that culminated in developing substantive theory. However, irrespective of sample size, the analytical rule in GT research is to “sample until theoretical saturation of each category is reached” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 188). In relation to the importance of this research outcome, Creswell (2007, pp. 126-128) refers to it as developing a “well-saturated theory”. In GT research, it is essential to make the distinction between theoretical sampling and theoretical saturation. In relation to theoretical sampling, the grounded theorist progresses from data analysis through to identifying categories.
through “sampling on the basis of the evolving theoretical relevance of concepts” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 179). However, as Jones et al. (2014, p. 81) point out, theoretical sampling may require “returning to existing participants, or going back to existing data to theorize more deeply. Thus, theoretical sampling is concept driven, not person driven”. Consequently, theoretical saturation is the outcome of theoretical sampling, arriving at that stage in the analytical process when “the researcher makes the subjective determination that new data will not provide any new information or insights for the developing categories” (Creswell, 2012, p. 433). As Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 188) assert, “Unless you strive for this saturation, your theory will be conceptually inadequate”. In this GT study, theoretical saturation was reached after the third round of data-generating interviews and written responses to research questions obtained over an academic year (Punch & Oancea, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

**Participant Recruitment: Wishing and Hoping…Thinking and Praying…Planning and Dreaming**

In this research, purposeful sampling functioned as a pragmatic, strategic tool designed to recruit undergraduate university students experiencing and dealing with the phenomenon being investigated. Accordingly, recruitment measures included liaising with academic learning support staff to identify potential participants and displaying promotional material in key university locations such as computer labs, learning support areas, and libraries. The researcher also worked with staff managing university preparation courses, as well as promoting the study on the student portal. While these recruitment measures generated many expressions of interest, six students formally agreed to participate in the Generation 1.5 learner study. Table 3.1, using the pseudonyms chosen by the participants, provides an overview of their demographic details. These pseudonyms were used
throughout the study to protect and respect participants’ privacy and confidentiality concerns (Tracy, 2013).

Table 3.1

Demographic Details of the Six Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Details</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daniel</strong>:</td>
<td>Malaysian-born, age-on-arrival in Australia, 14 years old; age during the project 22 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maria</strong>:</td>
<td>Serbian/Croatian-born, age-on-arrival in Australia, 16 years old; age during the project 27 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louisa</strong>:</td>
<td>Colombian-born, age-on-arrival in Australia, 32 years old; age during the project 33 years old. This was Louisa’s third immigration-related journey, with her first Generation 1.5 experience in the United Kingdom and her second in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Randy</strong>:</td>
<td>South Korean-born, age-on-arrival in Australia, 11 years old; age during the project 22 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rebecca</strong>:</td>
<td>Italian-born, age-on-arrival in Australia, 16 years old; age during the project 21 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sarah</strong>:</td>
<td>Afghanistan-born, age-on-arrival in Australia, 5 years old; age during the project 25 years old.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As GT research indicates (Creswell, 2007; O'Donoghue, 2019; Punch & Oancea, 2014), it is difficult to predict the exact number of participants required, and correspondingly, how much data is necessary to achieve theoretical saturation. While the first consideration applied in this study, the second was subject to dealing with the interview contingencies experienced during the study. These contingencies are explained later in this chapter.

Data-Generation: Interviews

The qualitative research interview attempts to understand the world from the subjects’ points of view, to unfold the meaning of their experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations... The research interview is based on the conversations of daily life and is a professional conversation. It is an inter-view,
where knowledge is constructed in the inter-action between the interviewer and the interviewee. (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, pp. 3-4)

**Interview Processes and Structures**

The one-on-one, synchronous interviews with study participants uncovered what McLeod (2003, p. 202) describes as an “archive of perspectives from different periods of time and vantage-points”, data that provided a “rich and comparative basis for understanding patterns of continuity and change in identity”. In addition, Alshenqeeti (2014, p. 39) discusses this data-generation method in terms of “eliciting narrative data that allows researchers to investigate people’s views in greater depth”. Adherence to these considerations is evidenced in the comprehensive story lines in Chapters 4 and 5 that provided the theoretical foundations that were extended in the Chapter 6 discussions. In acknowledging the importance of research interviews as the social production of knowledge, Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) emphasise the conversational complexities, the interrelationships in terms of context, linguistics, narratives, and pragmatics, and the significant logistical challenges. With interviews constituting the major data-generation method in this study, all participants completed the *Informed Consent Information* document prior to the commencement of the study. A copy of this document is provided in Appendix A. Consequently, semi-structured, face-to-face, individual interviews were scheduled at times that were convenient for the participants, and in settings where they felt comfortable talking about personal matters (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). In order to maximise data-generation, the researcher used the following questioning approaches: introducing and interpreting; following-up on responses and using prompts and probing investigation skills; specifying and structuring using direct and indirect approaches; and managing silences appropriately (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Using an iterative approach, three rounds of interviews took place during the 2018 academic year. The first and second interviews took place in semester one, allowing as much time as possible between interviews in order that the participants could reflect on their experiences. In turn, the third interview was held after the examination
period in semester two. However, only one participant accepted the opportunity of a fourth, optional interview in early 2019. This interview timeframe was designed to allow students some emotional distance between home events and university matters, allowing greater reflection on their undergraduate study experiences in the interim.

The interview duration ranged from the originally scheduled one hour through to over two hours with some participants. It is considered that these longer interviews demonstrated the rapport established with participants over the data-generation period. With audio recording considered an “enabling factor” in qualitative research (Thompson, 1996, p. 1), formal, written consent to record the interviews was obtained before the first session. However, verbal consent to recording, along with a brief overview of their rights in participating in this study, was obtained and recorded at the commencement of each interview. These recordings provided the researcher with multiple opportunities to listen to participants’ responses, ensuring that subsequent data analysis, coding, memo-writing, Resource Journal-keeping, and story lines were analytically-balanced in terms of precision, sensitivity, and verification (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These recordings also met qualitative research quality criteria in terms of maintaining procedural, relational, and situational ethics, along with establishing credibility and rigour in using the thick description and detail obtained through data-generation methods (Tracy, 2013). Given the iterative process of interviewing in three rounds, analysing the interview transcripts and the written research contributions before conducting the next round of data-generation was essential. In preparing interview protocol documents for the next round of data-generation activities, analytical memos were written, new questions were generated, and study areas that required further investigation were identified.

**Interview-Specific Frameworks**
As this empirical research was driven by questioning, it is important to recall O'Donoghue (2019) in that interview-specific investigations over an academic year sought to: (i) examine and explore the perspectives that these participants held in relation to starting their tertiary studies in terms of their aims, intentions, and strategies at the outset; (ii) identify patterns of actions, behaviour, and interactions in light of these perspectives; and (iii) recognise changes in the students’ perspectives as a result of their actions, behaviour, and interactions over time. Accordingly, each of O'Donoghue’s (2019) investigative considerations were broken down into more specific interview questions that had the greatest potential to engage participants in discussion (Punch & Oancea, 2014). While the objective was to encourage discussion across as wide a range of areas as possible, it is acknowledged that while some questions were unproductive and dropped, most were more productive and expanded (O'Donoghue, 2019). In accordance with the research design for this study, the guiding questions and interview-specific frameworks were underpinned by Blumer’s (1969) three principles of symbolic interactionism. Importantly, given the longitudinal dimension of the study, specific questioning discovered how participants’ original perspectives evolved over time as a result of social actions and interactions over the academic year (O'Donoghue, 2019).

An extract from the first round of interview questions is provided below, demonstrating the ‘unpacking’ processes and questioning prompts associated with the initial guiding question. This research question investigated the perspectives that the participants held at the outset of the undergraduate academic year being investigated:

- Perhaps you could walk me through what made you consider enrolling at university? What were the steps in this process?
- Could you talk to me about your decision-making stages?

Prompts: (i) the length of time looking at different universities and their courses; (ii) the important factors in making your enrolment decision; (iii) whether friends and family were asked for advice; (iv) whether contact was made with university staff, unit requirements, and study commitments; and (v) whether or not decisions were based on reading website content only.
In deciding to enrol, what were your reasons for picking this course?

Can you tell me about what you knew about the academic requirements and what you felt you needed to do in order to manage your studies?

Can you tell me about your expectations in relation to your enrolment choices?

In using this questioning structure, rich and thick descriptive data (Geertz, 1973) was generated, with subsequent analysis and literature access informing the findings, the storylines, and theory development. As Strauss and Corbin (1990) emphasise, the researcher’s procedural role is characterised by being aware of changing conditions that influence participants’ actions and interactions over time, along with noticing the actions and interactions that result from these changes. Cyclic in nature, analysing the repercussions of these actions and interactions was critical in being able to describe how these impacts generated new situations that informed subsequent actions, behaviours, and interactions.

Extracts from the interview framework documents for the second and third rounds of data-generation, both interviews and written responses to research questions, are provided in Appendix B.

**Interview Contingencies**

Over the study period there were significant data-generation challenges. These logistical challenges included one participant, Daniel, withdrawing without notice after the first interview. Another participant, Randy, while attending the second interview, advised that in failing his semester one units, he had withdrawn from his university course. While deciding to study online at another university, Randy agreed to continue with the Generation 1.5 learner study. However, he could not be contacted after providing this verbal agreement. In addition, two participants, Rebecca and Sarah, considered withdrawing from the study prior to the second interview, choosing instead to provide written responses to research questions. While challenging to the researcher, the data obtained in this question-and-
answer written format was a pragmatic compromise. Importantly, and irrespective of the inherent limitations, this alternative method generated substantial data contributions that possibly resulted from having greater time to reflect on the questions being posed. Additionally, their written responses drew attention to the academic L2 writing issues facing these participants. Of the two participants providing written responses to research questions, Sarah withdrew from the study and from the university after failing her course units in semesters one and two. Table 3.2 provides an overview of the participants’ involvement in the data-generation activities in this study.

Table 3.2

Research Participants and the Data-Generation Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data-Generation Round</th>
<th>Participant Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Data-Generation Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Daniel&lt;br&gt;Maria&lt;br&gt;Louisa&lt;br&gt;Randy&lt;br&gt;Rebecca&lt;br&gt;Sarah</td>
<td>All participants attended face-to-face interviews at the study site university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Louisa&lt;br&gt;Maria&lt;br&gt;Randy&lt;br&gt;Rebecca&lt;br&gt;Sarah</td>
<td>Interview&lt;br&gt;Interview&lt;br&gt;Interview&lt;br&gt;Written responses to research questions&lt;br&gt;Written responses to research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Louisa&lt;br&gt;Maria&lt;br&gt;Rebecca</td>
<td>Interview&lt;br&gt;Interview&lt;br&gt;Written responses to research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth (optional)</td>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>Interview.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to note that irrespective of the data-generation methods, both formats provided responses to questions that generated rich data contributions across a wide range of life domains. The next section explores how interviewing can lead to serendipitous opportunities that have the capacity to drive data-generation direction and analysis in new and unexpected ways.

**Interviews: Making Discoveries at the Intersection of Positionality, Serendipity and Wisdom**

The Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 31) GT methodology fosters creativity, described as enabling “the researcher to ask pertinent questions of the data and to make the kind of comparisons that elicit from the data new insights into phenomenon and novel theoretical formulations”. Highlighting the importance of being ‘immersed’ in the analytical processes and literature-informed study findings, it is considered that these GT strengths were informed by the researcher’s contributions that included positionality, serendipity, and wisdom (Copeland, 2019; Nutefall & Ryder, 2010). In relation to positionality, Bourke (2014, p. 3) discusses this construct in terms of the research space being one in which objectivism and subjectivism meet, the place in which having an awareness of subjectivities is paramount. However, the Strauss and Corbin (1990) alignment with positionality is addressed in terms of the three sources of theoretical sensitivity. The first source involves the researcher’s personal and professional experience, while the second acknowledges their ‘groundedness’ in the technical literature. Given the researcher’s on-going interaction during the data-generation methods and analytical stages, these procedural processes demonstrate the third source of theoretical sensitivity. As Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 42) point out, the theoretical sensitivity construct involves “an awareness of the subtleties of meaning of data” that calls on the researcher’s to make insightful connections, to have the “the capacity to understand, and capability to separate the pertinent from that which isn’t”. In many respects,
this GT construct parallels the sincerity research quality marker that includes researcher self-reflexivity (Tracy, 2013).

Collectively, these positionality (Bourke, 2014) and theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) considerations were demonstrated when asking an interview question related to the researcher’s interest in language and dreaming. While in the quest of something else, the response from one participant, Maria, generated unexpected analytical and theoretical outcomes that made the connection between positionality, serendipity, and wisdom (Copeland, 2019; Nutefall & Ryder, 2010). In summary, Maria recounted a dream that she has experienced from childhood, a dream that she interprets as relating to adversities in her home country and her on-going difficulties with her father. Accordingly, this serendipitous discovery resulted in developing a key coding concept, the recurrent ‘drowning-in-snakes dream’. This unexpected but significant study outcome contributed to major subcategories and the resultant core category, along with underpinning the participant’s story line in Chapter 5 and theoretical development in Chapter 6. This data-derived and driven finding, discovered by asking instinctive questions that generated serendipitous discoveries, recalls Wick’s (2019, p. 103) use of the Louis Pasteur aphorism: “Chance smiles at the prepared mind”. It many respects this interview outcome aligns with altamirage, one of the six approaches to serendipity that refers to researchers’ behavioural traits and their unique, unorthodox research abilities (Liestman, 1992). Positioned within the concept of potentiality, altamirage is situationally-triggered by circumstances, opportunities, and possibilities (Lizza, 2015). In turn, these theoretical considerations point to knowledge workers’ behavioural and experiential processes in terms of creativity and imagination, hard work and intellectual curiosity, and education and expertise that collectively increases the probability of generating serendipitous research outcomes (Olshannikova et al., 2020). It is worth noting that Copeland (2019, p. 2385) argues for serendipity in science “as an emergent property of scientific discovery”, one that contributes to the “relationship between the outcome of a discovery process and the intentions that drove it forward”.

80
Data Analysis: Coding and Making Connections

Microsituational data has conceptual priority. This is not to say that macrodata means nothing; but amassing statistics and survey data does not convey an accurate picture of social reality unless they are interpreted in the context of their microsituational grounding. Microsituational encounters are the ground zero of all social action and all sociological evidence. Nothing has reality unless it is manifested in a situation somewhere. (Collins, 2000, p. 18)

Punch and Oancea (2014, p. 278) advise that GT, as expounded by Strauss and Corbin (1990), is “a distinctive strategy for research which aims to generate explanatory theory grounded in data”. In considering data analysis as the engine room of GT research, its rigorous, systematic, and well-established procedural framework involves applying open, axial, and selective coding in order to identify, label, and organise data. Linking data analysis to the sequencing of actions and interactions that investigate people's experiences in managing a phenomenon, Strauss and Corbin (1990) explain that these processes enhance researchers’ abilities to interpret, define, and work creatively in developing theory. As part of the GT analytical processes, the researcher’s memo-writing and Resource Journal commentaries, as non-technical literature resources, contributed to story line formulation and theoretical development.

Memo-Writing

Strauss and Corbin (1990) discuss the importance of writing sequential memos such as code, operational, and theoretical notes throughout the three coding stages. However, in line with a revitalised GT approach that evolved over the study period, the researcher reduced the types and purposes of memos into one format. Importantly, an arts-informed coding and writing praxis developed in tandem. In preparing over one hundred memos during the study, the researcher developed a comprehensive written, research audit trail that heeded Strauss and Corbin's (1990) counsel. Accordingly, all memos were dated, given a
meaningful title, and provided an overview of the event or meaning-making analytical connection that triggered the memo-writing. Participant quotes and short phrases considered significant were included, together with the researcher’s follow-up actions and reflections. To enable easy access to memos, cross-referencing information such as categories, interview transcript material, and related documents was included in all memos (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The memo extract in Figure 3.1 provides an overview of the researcher’s approach:

Figure 3.1
Memo Extract After a Second-Round Interview

Grounded theory data analysis: Generation 1.5 research project: MARIA
SECOND RESEARCH INTERVIEW-RELATED DATA FINDINGS
MEMO TOPIC: Second-round interview discussion and theory development.
MEMO SEQUENCE: The fifteenth of twenty-seven theory development memos.
DATE: 17 December 2018
PURPOSE: Working towards substantive theory development. This memo provides an overall view of the main themes emerging from analysis of Maria’s second research interview data. These data findings are the result of open and axial coding processes, as well as identifying possible working theories emerging from the data.

• Possible major categories are nominated (e.g. Immigration systems; Learning systems; and Social-psychological systems).
• Potential areas of theoretical development interest are also nominated in terms of subcategories (e.g. Coping resources, adaptive capacities, and management systems).

Thematic identification process
• This thematic identification approach adheres, as far as practicable, with the Strauss and Corbin (1990) grounded theory (GT) research methodology.
• This process takes its lead from the main themes identified in the first research interview data findings (e.g. Immigration systems, Identity systems, Learning support systems), as well as considering the main themes identified in a previous second round research processes (i.e. Louisa’s analysis). Consequently, given the findings that emerged from Louisa’s coding, it is important to note that many first-interview thematic areas have been consolidated. For example, first-interview possible Core Categories of Acculturation systems and Immigration systems is now Immigration systems.

Related documents: Participants’ open and axial summary memos;
TD_MEMO_1_First RD_main cats_themes_V1_1 August 2018;
TD_MEMO_2_Scarcity systems_core category_V1_2 August 2018;
TD_MEMO_3_Scarcity systems_tunneling_Gen 1.5 equivalent_V1_5 August 2018;
TD_MEMO_4_Metaphors Gen 1.5 learners study by_tunneling_walls_V2_15 August
Collectively, adherence to these analytical and memo-writing processes ensured that memos contained the products of inductive and deductive thinking about the relevant and potentially relevant concepts and categories of concepts that had been identified. Additionally, memos clarified steps made when the researcher collapsed, linked, or split categories when determining the core category and consolidating the major categories. In carrying out these processes, the researcher acknowledged the reflective aspect of memo-writing which in turn determined its analytical value and alignment with the study’s methodological, philosophical, and theoretical positioning (Birks & Mills, 2011). Importantly, arts-informed and theoretical markers and references that related to the study findings were included. This was in line with memo-writing being a “fundamental analytical process”, one that encompassed “the recording of processes, thoughts, feelings, analytical insights, decisions and ideas” (Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 175).

Memos were prepared throughout data-generation and analysis. In generating written records of the “products of actual coding, plus theoretically sensitizing and summarizing notes”, this writing provided direction, purpose in possible theoretical sampling, and in due course, informed theory formulation (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 233). Accessing interview recordings and written responses to the research questions ensured that memo-
writing activities were empirically-accurate, analytically-sound, and theoretically-balanced in terms of credibility, rigour, significance, and theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As memo-writing assisted the researcher in coding processes, documenting literature access information, preparing story line sketches, and capturing theoretical developments (Corbin, 1986; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), an extract is provided in Appendix C. Importantly, this example demonstrates the researcher’s commitment to reflexivity, the act of analysing one’s writing that becomes “an active, systematic process” in qualitative social research, a process that provides “insight into their work that will guide future actions and interpretations” (Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 175). In this GT study, memo-writing framed, informed, and influenced what Lofland and Lofland (cited in Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 52), describe as identifying and making “meaningful linkages between the personal and emotional on the one hand, and the stringent intellectual operations on the other”.

**The Researcher’s Resource Journal**

It is not uncommon for the analyst to feel overwhelmed by the data, especially in the early phases of the research endeavour. This is normal, and the feeling passes as the research begins to take form and a coherent theory is developed. (Corbin, 1986, pp. 92-93)

Corbin’s sentiments about being daunted and dazed by the amount of data generated in GT studies resounded with the researcher. In response to this situational responsibility, the researcher kept a Resource Journal designed to chart the social production of knowledge journey. Keeping a journal throughout the study cycle also provided a resource that addressed the researcher’s positionality or theoretical sensitivity in the ongoing interaction during the data-generation methods, literature access that informed analytical processes, and writing stages. As a non-technical literature data resource, the researcher’s journal recorded “perspectives from different periods of time and vantage points”, written records that delivered a “rich and comparative basis for understanding patterns of continuity and change” (McLeod, 2003, p. 202).
As Begoray and Banister (2012, p. 2) point out, reflexivity is the “researcher's ongoing critique and critical reflection of their assumptions, biases and how these have influenced all stages of the research process”. Accordingly, maintaining Resource Journal commentaries met analytical, self-awareness, and theoretical development needs (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Tracy, 2013). In doing so, these commentaries contributed to the findings that developed substantive theory rather than creating a ‘fiction' about the study domain (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Importantly, this journal-writing commitment aligned with Strauss and Corbin’s (1990, p. 31) criteria for “good” science in terms of delivering credibility, ensuring precision and rigour, verification in the analytical processes, and developing the emerging theory. It is worth noting that Corbin and Strauss (2015) discuss journal keeping as an ongoing research strategy that documents activities, insights, and progress, a strategy in which the researcher becomes more aware of the ethical procedural, relational, and situational challenges and changes (Tracy, 2013) throughout the study. Corbin and Strauss (2015, p. 47) consider this journal as a separate vehicle from memo-writing, a resource tool that provides reflective, time-out opportunities when the researcher feels “overwhelmed, fatigued, and torn between multiple responsibilities” that can collectively “affect how a researcher responds to data”. However, in this study the Resource Journal also captured many of the areas that Strauss and Corbin (1990) discuss in relation to memo-writing. With these analytical and theoretical considerations in mind, it is appropriate and timely to provide a Resource Journal excerpt. The example below demonstrates the researcher’s commentary on the coding processes that evolved during the study and resulted in a rejuvenated GT procedural approach that remained faithful to the key tenets of the Strauss and Corbin (1990) version.

**Researcher commentary, 2 August 2019: Reflecting on the coding and data analysis processes…making major changes to the Strauss and Corbin (1990) GT approach**
Coding the third round of research interview and written responses (in lieu of interviews), and subsequent data analysis has occupied most of my time during 2019. In keeping with the Strauss and Corbin (1990) GT approach, these processes involved being totally immersed in the data, questioning the data, and allowing findings to emerge from the data.

With hand-on-heart, I can honestly say that following this approach has been outstandingly successful in gathering unique profiles of my research participants, profiles that helped develop story lines and working theories that strengthened over the year. While I do not anticipate finishing the remaining coding and analysis for several more months, I consider my time has been well spent.

Over the past months, through exhaustive coding, reflection, and analysis, I have collapsed Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) processes into one. It occurred to me that in earlier coding that essentially this is what I had been doing all along during the open coding processes. Subsequently, in moving on to the next axial and selective coding processes I was adding value to already valued-added open coding. With this research revelation in mind (i.e. collapsing all three coding processes in the one), I considered that while remaining faithful to the 1990 GT approach, I had updated it to 2019/2020 research needs.

In addition, during the coding process I also made connections to literary references that augmented my analysis of the research data. It is important to note that I had been using literary reference alignments since my initial coding during interview rounds two and three. With an arts background that included an honours thesis that examined the influences of non-Western art of the works of Pablo Picasso and Jackson Pollock, it was perhaps inevitable that incorporating literary references would be an innovative and value-adding exercise in the coding and writing-up stages of my research project.

The conviction that I was on the right research pathway was bolstered after reading a novel by Patricia Leavy, Spark (2019). This novel explores the research processes, critical thinking, problem-solving, and the value of using transdisciplinary approach methods. In turn, further reading indicated that the author is a proponent of arts-based research.

To demonstrate the depth and diversity of the Resource Journal coverage, a sampling of extracts is provided in Appendix D. Having considered the significance of memo-writing and the Resource Journal as important non-technical, data-generating resources, discussion now focuses on Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) three GT coding stages.

Open Coding: The Building Blocks of Theory

Open coding was the first basic analytical step during which the researcher broke down or fractured the data for closer examination (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This stage involved two processes. The first, constant comparison (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) provided
the researcher with the “precision and specificity” (pp. 62-63) necessary when making comparisons in the data, investigating “similarities and differences between each incident, event, and other instances of phenomena” (p. 74). Accordingly, the researcher manually coded interview transcripts and written responses to research questions that conceptualised and categorised the data. Conceptualisation involved a word-by-word, line-by-line, and incident-by-incident analysis that allocated each “discrete incident, idea, or event, a name, with something that stands for or represents a phenomenon” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 63). In relation to the second process, questioning the data, this approach paralleled the journalistic methods of communication in terms of asking who, what, where, when, why, and to what extent is this happening questions. Figure 3.2 below provides open coding examples from a first-round interview:

**Figure 3.2**
*Open Coding Examples: First-Round Interview*

- academic studies approach;
- academic writing approach;
- academic writing demands;
- accepting immigration to Australia (i.e. “I processed it and that’s it”);
- accessing information resources;
- acknowledging academic reading demands;
- acknowledging awareness university learning support;
- acknowledging being treated differently;
- acknowledging continuing parental support;
- acknowledging differing immigration experiences;
- acknowledging issues in academic writing (e.g. “Sometimes I do find it a bit difficult”).

Strauss and Corbin (1990) point out that this initial coding process can generate hundreds of conceptual labels or terms. However, in this study, thousands of terms were generated. Once concepts had been identified in the data, the next step involved assigning categories. Strauss and Corbin (1990) refer to this process as grouping together concepts or subcategories that appear to be associated with the same phenomenon. During this categorising process the researcher established categories in terms of their properties and dimensions. Properties, the attributes or characteristics of a category, include duration,
frequency, impact, and timing. Importantly, dimensions related to the positioning of
properties along a locational continuum included: often to never; more or less; and high or
low. As a precursor to the researcher using a systems-approach to selective coding, open
coding identified categories that drew conceptual power from related concepts and
subcategories. Following-on from the previous open coding example, Figure 3.3 below
provides an extract that illustrates the second process in open coding, allocating categories
and sub-categories.

Figure 3.3
Extract of Open Coding and Emergent Categories from a First-Round Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN CODING CONCEPTS_ALPHA_FIRS T INTERVIEW</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>GROUPING CONCEPTS TO CATEGORIES</th>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>457 Skilled Migration Visa</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMMIGRATION</td>
<td>IMMIGRATION EXPERIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic grades</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEARNING</td>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic learning support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEARNING SUPPORT SYSTEMS</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY PREPARATION COURSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic management approach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LEARNING STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic reading demands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ACADEMIC READING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic reading strategies (i.e. skimming text)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ACADEMIC READING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic studies approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC STUDIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic writing approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic writing approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic writing demands</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic writing feedback (e.g. “some minor grammatical errors”)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING</td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING CONVENTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic writing processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING</td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING CONVENTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting immigration to Australia (i.e. “I processed it and that’s it”)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMMIGRATION</td>
<td>IMMIGRATION EXPERIENCES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In alignment with Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 67), each category was assigned a meaningful, conceptual name that resonated strongly with the researcher and “logically related to the data it represents”. During this stage the researcher prepared memos and updated the Resource Journal. In terms of data organisation and storage, Excel spreadsheets were established in logical, GT-friendly formats that included data-generation extracts, concepts, categories, subcategories, and related analytical material. Figure 3.4 below demonstrates the initial open coding processes.

**Figure 3.4**

*Open Coding: Excel Spreadsheet Configurations*

| 1 | academic achievement (S2) (alignment with high aspirations, high expectations, expectancy values); |
| 2 | academic expectations (S2) (mel) (high aspirations, expectations, expectancy values equals high achievement); |
| 3 | academic expectations (S2) (mel) (alignment with high aspirations, high achievement, meeting expectancy values); |
| 4 | academic expectations (S2) (mel) (alignment with high aspirations, achievement motivation, expectancy values); |
| 5 | academic results (S2) (high aspirations, high expectations, expectancy values equals high achievement); |
| 6 | academic results (S2) (high aspirations, high expectations, expectancy values, high achievements (confident student profile (Khattab))); |
| 7 | academic expectations (S2) (mel) (high aspirations, high expectations, high achievements (confident student profile (Khattab))); |
| 8 | academic results (S2) (confident student profile) (high educational aspirations, expectations, expectancy values, achievements (Khattab)); |
| 9 | identity re-construction (S2) (confident student profile) (high educational aspirations, expectations, expectancy values, achievements (Khattab)); |
| 10 | identity re-construction (S2) (possible selves) (Confident student profile) (high educational aspirations, expectations, expectancy values, achievements (Khattab)); |
| 11 | identity re-construction (S2) (possible selves) (identity achievement profile) (active exploration, valuing opportunities, commitment, making investments (Marcia)); |
| 12 | identity re-construction (S2) (possible selves) (identity growth mindset (Dweck)); |
| 13 | academic expectations (S2) (possible selves) (identity growth mindset (Dweck)); |
| 14 | identity re-construction (S2) (positive academic results) (culturally-situated cognition, cognitive identity schemas, cultural mindsets); |
| 15 | identity re-construction (S2) (positive academic results) (making achievement choices, expectations for success, task values (doing well, intrinsic, utility, across-domain costs/competition)); |
| 16 | worldview informed by academic aspirations, expectations, making achievement choices, expectations for success, task values (doing well, intrinsic, utility, across-domain costs/competition)); |
| 17 | worldview informed by L2 possible selves; L2 self-images, L2 future self-images; L2 self-schemas); |
| 18 | academic expectations (S2) (L2 possible selves) (future, ideal selves, making achievement choices, expectations for success, task values (doing well, intrinsic, utility, across-domain costs, competition); |
| 19 | academic results (S2) (passed all four units); |
| 20 | academic results (S2) (exceeded 100% in one unit); |
| 21 | academic results (S2) (overwhelmingly positive); |
| 22 | academic results (S2) (downplaying, discounting, devaluing for hard work, abilities); |
| 23 | academic results (S2) (effort, timeplay, minimising importance, under-valuing); |

**Memos in Open Coding: Examining the Products of Coding**

Strauss and Corbin (1990) point out that code notes, the first type of memo, examine conceptual labelling, their properties, and the dimensions of these categories. In turn, theoretical notes expand, summarise, and build on code note material. Importantly, Strauss and Corbin (1990) suggest that researchers may prepare theoretical notes using technical literature that includes peer-reviewed journal articles, theoretical papers, and research reports relevant to the category being investigated. However, given the revised GT
approach, and the inclusion of an arts-informed literature category, Strauss and Corbin’s
three memo types and purposes were merged into one format for ease of access, purpose,
and retrieval. Collectively, this coding approach heightened the researcher’s theoretical
sensitivity and provided direction in terms of theoretical sampling (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).
Subsequent memo-writing incorporated operational matters, possible theoretical
connections, and follow-up actions such as future topics for investigation (Strauss & Corbin,
1990). The researcher used Excel spreadsheet formats that accommodated listings of all
conceptual data, categories and their associated properties and dimensions, and participant
quotes. The extract in Figure 3.5 below demonstrates the researcher’s revised memo-writing
approach.

Figure 3.5
Memo-Writing Extract: First-Round Interview Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memo-Writing Date: Monday 16 April 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes to self: Randy’s first-round interview observations...extracts from open coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-on-arrival factors, in the danger zone, limited number of years in which to improve and develop CALP. Presents a unique situation, 11 years in South Korea, 11 years in Perth. L1-L2 interferences, little positive transfer between languages. Korean language in the Ural-Altaic language family, somewhat similar to Japanese and Chinese in same aspects. Korean unique and unrelated to other oriental languages. Teaching methods typically conflict with Western country approaches (i.e. teacher-focused, not learner-focused). No L2 experience at all – starting from scratch. Only two months’ intensive L2 instruction. Why not 12 months? Private tutoring for seven months (now 12 years-of-age). L2 insight into problem areas (e.g. vocab development). Must have been a traumatic experience, moving to a foreign country, no immigration-destination language knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management issues, follow-up with other participants. Describing demographics in terms of classroom ‘mix’ of students from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Is this likely to be a shared experience with other participants? Unable to communicate effectively, BICS not well-developed; important psychohumanistic, psychosexual developmental issues at play. The importance of ‘fitting in’ in high school, having friends, and having a sense of belonging – crucial factors. Parental monitoring of educational outcomes (i.e. the expense and upheaval in moving to a better suburb in relation to high school education. Marginalisation needs further exploration in subsequent interviews, participant seems reluctant to divulge information. Cultural influences and expectations? Social pressures at high school, the self and family expectations, must study at university. First in family to go to university. Follow-up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three different courses, two different universities, unafraid to switch universities and courses. Check with other participants? Thinking and planning independently, no mention of parental input, although parents always supportive. Decision making informed by research, self-belief, and personal interests rather than courses that may provide greater employment opportunities. Is this a recurrent theme with Gen 1.5 learners? Ironic that initially focused on vocational study after high school, influenced by peer pressure, but selects a uni course that emphasises ‘hands-on’ practical components, not just theoretical. Attended summer school version of uni prep. Did other participants participate in uni prep courses? How useful were these courses in terms of managing their current undergraduate studies? Contradictory responses in relation to academic reading demands. Ambiguity and ambivalence? Duality of opinions regarding reading challenges. Contradictory statements, describing self-motivation, but seems ambivalent. Perhaps just appears this way due to a lack of adequate vocabulary?

BICS developed but conversational fluency, cohesion, and coherence seems difficult at times. Contradictory views, a uni degree as something ‘to put on a resume’. Wants to finish the course because under pressure to do so. Open to employment opportunities generated by having a university degree. Despite acknowledging difficulties with academic reading, adopts a casual, nonchalant approach to managing his studies, almost flippant, using humour when discussing this approach to assignments. Is this a way of compensating for lack of L2 skills? Seems hard to ‘nail down’ his management approach. Lacks awareness of the writing composition processes. Seems to use the knowledge-telling model in writing, backed up by additional information (i.e. “adds different bits as well’) before he attempts to ‘polish it up’ and later submit. Vague about reading and writing strategies taught in the uni prep course. Acknowledges being self-motivated, seems to consider that it is his responsibility to do well at uni. Self-reliance seems important. Cultural in origin? Asian minority factor and expectations.

Axial Coding: Making Connections Between Categories

In the second stage of the analytical process, axial coding, the researcher made connections between categories that emerged from the open coding analysis. In comparing, exploring, refining, and verifying relationships between each of the identified categories and subcategories, the researcher was faced with thousands of categories and subcategories. The researcher concentrated on ‘discovering’ and relating categories based on the causal conditions and properties that gave rise to them. These category-creating considerations included analysing the actions or strategies that participants used to manage their contextual situations and constructing categories in ways that demonstrated theoretical coherence and cohesion (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In line with using an astronomy metaphor, the researcher established categories that had axial tilts in their orbital planes that included
constraints, impacts, and proximity. In turn, these axial tilts influenced other categories and subcategories to varying degrees of complexity and connectivity. During this coding stage, the researcher reassembled the data in ways that demonstrated focus, meaning-making, and purpose (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Figure 3.6 below provides axial coding examples from second-round interviews.

Figure 3.6
Axial Coding Extracts: Second-Round Data-Generation Interview

| MANAGEMENT STYLE (ACADEMIC HIGHWAY JOURNEY METAPHOR); HIGHWAY JOURNEY METAPHOR; NAVIGATION A CRITICAL ISSUE; NO WORLDVIEW CHANGES OVER 2018 ACADEMIC; ENDEAVOURING TO CHANGE SELF CONCEPTS; MAINTAINING POSITIVE ATTITUDE; GREATER SELF-BELIEF IN OVERCOMING WORLDVIEW ROAD BLOCKAGES, HIGHWAYS JOURNEY METAPHOR BLOCKAGES, BARRIERS, NAVIGATIONAL COMPLEXITIES; ADHERING TO FRANKL QUOTE: "WHEN WE ARE NO LONGER ABLE TO CHANGE A SITUATION, WE ARE CHALLENGED TO CHANGE OURSELVES"; BECOMING WHO I WANT TO BE; NAVIGATION; TAKING THE RIGHT ROUTES, TRAJECTORIES; STICKING TO THE RULES; ENTRY; JOURNEY EBBS, FLOWS, DISRUPTIONS; MAKING INROADS; BACK-TRACKING; TAKING ALTERNATIVE ROUTES; NAVIGATING LIMINALITY, POSITIONALITY, INTERSECTIONALITY, CROSSING, PASSING JOURNEY BARRIERS; BREAKDOWNS; USING OFF-RAMPS FOR EMERGENCY SITUATION, UNPLANNED WITHDRAWAL FROM PLANNED JOURNEY; BECOMING DISORIENTATED; RE-ORIENTATION NECESSARY; BECOMING WHO I WANT TO BE; NAVIGATION; TAKING THE RIGHT ROUTES, TRAJECTORIES; STICKING TO THE RULES; ENTRY; JOURNEY EBBS, FLOWS, DISRUPTIONS; MAKING INROADS; BACK-TRACKING; TAKING ALTERNATIVE ROUTES; NAVIGATING LIMINALITY, POSITIONALITY, INTERSECTIONALITY, CROSSING, PASSING JOURNEY BARRIERS; BREAKDOWNS; USING OFF-RAMPS FOR EMERGENCY SITUATION, UNPLANNED WITHDRAWAL FROM JOURNEY; BECOMING DISORIENTATED; RE-ORIENTATION NECESSARY; NAVIGATING LIFE JOURNEYS; FRAMING AND INFLUENCING LIFE JOURNEYS; FRAMING FUTURES; NAVIGATION RESOURCE); LIFE JOURNEYS (GOALS; ALL QUOTES; [ON LIFE GOALS; WANTING PURPOSE, MEANING, SECURITY, POSITIVE OUTCOMES IN LIFE JOURNEYS] : QUOTE: [ON MANAGING, ACHIEVING ‘WANTED’ LIFE GOALS]: “Just one step at a time pretty much… Do what you’re doing…it might be tiring [AMS JOURNEY; MANAGING COMPETING DEMANDS] but at some point, there is an end date”.
| IMMIGRATION EXPERIENCES (HIGHWAY JOURNEY METAPHOR; APT FOR NAVIGATING MULTIPLE JOURNEYS (I.E. IDENTITY RE-CONSTRUCTION JOURNEYS); CONTINUATION OF IMMIGRATION JOURNEYS; BECOMING WHO I WANT TO BE; GETTING WHERE I WANT TO BE; LOST ENROUTE; LOST INTRANSIT; LOST IN TRANSITION; SELF-REPORT (HOME COUNTRY CULTURAL IMPORTANCE IN DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES) 9/10 ); BECOMING A BETTER DRIVER (LEARNER); IDENTITY DISTRESS; NAVIGATING; TAKING THE RIGHT ROUTES, TRAJECTORIES; IN TRANSIT; LOST IN TRANSIT; LOST ENROUTE; STICKING TO THE RULES; ENTRY; JOURNEY EBBS, FLOWS, DISRUPTIONS; MAKING INROADS; BACK- |
TRACKING; TAKING ALTERNATIVE ROUTES; NAVIGATING POSITIONALITY, INTERSECTIONALITY, CROSSING, PASSING JOURNEY BARRIERS; BREAKDOWNS; USING OFF-RAMPS FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS (E.G. SELF-REPAIR, FAILING UNITS); UNPLANNED WITHDRAWAL FROM SCHEDULED JOURNEY; BECOMING DISORIENTATED; RE-ORIENTATION NECESSARY.

Memos in Axial Coding: Discovering Relationships in the Data

Throughout the axial coding stages, the researcher prepared memos that analysed, explained, and incorporated conceptual, operational, and theoretical information that sequentially documented and expanded the relationships between categories and their subcategories. In asking further questions of the data, researcher engagement included operational considerations that built on coding and related analytical issues. Importantly, this engagement with the data identified avenues for further exploration included re-checking interview audios, transcripts, data sources, further sampling, and compiling subject topics for subsequent interviews and research questions. Importantly, these memos were used to document the consequences of participants’ actions, interactions, and the resulting outcomes and implications. While an example of the analytical challenges and demands inherent in memo-writing during axial coding is provided in Appendix C, the memo extract in Figure 3.7 below demonstrates its significance in terms of the developing story lines and theory.
Extracts from Maria’s MEMO 1_TN_Second interview reflections and theoretical considerations_9 October 2018_V1

In relation to Maria’s recurrent ‘drowning in snakes’ dream it seems quite clear that this dream (first happening when she was around seven years-of-age), has had on-going impacts in terms of identity development (never having a positive self-image; her Dad an alcoholic; he was never supportive; was always telling her that she would never amount to anything; and in the first interview said that that he was cold, detached, and disinterested in being a father (Maria’s mother abandoned her and her Dad took on responsibilities). If her identity was described as a voyage, she said she say that there had been ‘bumps’ along the way…It seems likely that coming to live in Australia as 16-year-old really opened her horizons, provided her with greater opportunities to do more with her life – driving her to aim higher than what her father expected of her – proving her Dad was wrong – that she is capable of achieving greater things.

Maria advised that there can be long breaks between experiencing this dream – the last occasion around a year ago. However, the dream script is always the same, and she recounted part of the dream during today’s interview session. I do wonder about what prompted her to started having this dream…Maria previously interpreted this dream as her Dad ‘holding her down’; stopping her from realising her true potential; preventing her from exploring opportunities (life, study, work); and always being super-critical and negative whenever she attempts anything. It is almost as if immigrating to Australia opened a new chapter in her life, and from that time onwards, she effectively started to withdraw herself from Dad…It seems to fit with that saying…one door closes (childhood adversity and difficulties in her home country) and another door opening but still having to deal with acculturation, enculturation processes, and her Dad in Australia. Maria regards herself as Australian and loves the opportunities available to Australians who want to take advantage of opportunities here (especially in relation to education).

Once again, Excel spreadsheets were used to organise and store the axial coding processes that established the relationships between categories and subcategories. These relationships, as Straus and Corbin (1990) predicted, became increasingly complex in terms of numbers and conceptual significance during the data-generation methods and analytical processes.

Selective Coding: Identifying the Core Category, Integration, and Conceptualisation

Described by Straus and Corbin (1990, p. 116) as being “the process of selecting the core category, systematically relating it to other categories, validating those
relationships, and filling in categories that need further refinement and development”, selective coding was a multifaceted and theoretically-significant exercise. It is important to recall that as the product of significant engagement in data analysis over a year-long period, many thousands of categories and subcategories were generated. In this final, extensive analytical process that required focus and purpose, the researcher consolidated the number of major categories in line with literature access, story line, and theoretical development. Having integrated the analysis and completed the interpretive processes, the researcher identified the core category as the Academic Highway Journey, “the central phenomenon around which all the other categories are integrated” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 116). In likening this core category to a newly-discovered planetary force, the Academic Highway Journey has five major categories or satellite systems orbiting within its sphere of influence. Dynamically and inextricably linked to one another, these five empirically, analytically, and inductively-developed systems comprise academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning. A Theoretical Memo that provides an overview of the systems development coding processes over the data-generation and analytical period is provided in Appendix F. In addition, Table 3.3 provides an overview of the five systems and their main areas of influence. In using a journey metaphor, the researcher developed a coherent and cohesive conceptual framework that integrated study findings that were reflective of the participants’ examinations of the worlds they live in and their perspectives in relation to making meaning-making connections (Goodman, 1978). Figure 3.8 below provides three examples of the consolidated GT coding processes in relation to academic, coping, and identity systems.

**Figure 3.8**

*The Researcher's Consolidated Grounded Theory Coding Examples: Categories, Subcategories, and the Academic, Coping, and Identity Systems as Major Categories*
Memos in Selective Coding: Developing the Story Line

In the selective coding stage, the researcher moved from describing the core category to conceptualization. As Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 116) define the story line as “The conceptualization of the story. This is the core category”, this process was crucial. Accordingly, as memo-writing activities generate “the first descriptive rendition of what the research is all about” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 219), selective coding memos continued.
this explanatory process. In developing the story line, the researcher examined and
determined the complexities, depth, and multiple inter-relationships that existed between the
core category, the Academic Highway Journey, and the five major categories or satellite
systems. Working with the data enabled the researcher to link coding and findings to other
settings and deciding whether the findings were transferable in the developing story line
(Creswell, 2012, 2013). Importantly, Tracy (2013, p. 250) alerts researchers to thick
description as being “in-depth, contextual, and rich accounts of what researchers see (and
also find missing)” in the data. This consideration was uppermost in the story line iterations.
Accordingly, and in keeping with the emerging theory, memos contained “rich descriptive
data; people’s own written or spoken words, their artefacts, and their observable activities”
that reverberated in the study findings and resonated with the researcher (Taylor & Bogdan,
1998, p. 135). In explaining the Academic Highway Journey in relation to its five orbiting
major categories or satellite systems, the researcher integrated the analytical work that
included developing the story line from earlier story telling memos, Resource Journal
commentaries, and working with the three types of literature (Birks & Mills; Leavy, 2009;
Scott & Howell, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). To recall, this literature included arts-
formed, non-technical, and technical material. During this stage, the researcher’s
overarching objective was to make GT-aligned analytical and theoretical linkages while
remaining cognisant of emotionally-experienced and personally-felt associations with the
data (Birks & Mills, 2011). In meeting this objective, the researcher achieved what Lofland
and Lofland (cited in Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 52) refer to making “meaningful linkages
between the personal and emotional on the one hand, and the stringent intellectual
operations on the other”. To demonstrate these collective responsibilities, Resource Journal
commentary that covered selective coding, memo-like considerations, story line, and
theoretical development is provided in Appendix E. In addition, an extract from the Resource
Journal written at the outset of the study is included in Appendix C, along with a memo
extract, to demonstrate the researcher’s ‘before’ deliberations and ‘after’ realities related to
developing theory “that meets the criteria for doing “good” science” outcomes’ (Strauss &
Corbin, 1990, p. 31). Importantly, this crucial story line writing stage became the researcher’s strategy for “facilitating integration, construction, formulation and presentation of research findings through the production of a coherent grounded theory” (Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 176). This strategy was successful in that after analysis, interpretation, and writing processes, the emerging theory was identified as the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. An extract of a story line memo is provided in Figure 3.9 below.

**Figure 3.9**

*Story Line Memo Extract*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation 1.5 research project: Story line development, 15 July 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong> Working towards substantive theory development by using the story line research strategy to integrate, explore, and present the outcomes of a grounded theory research study in education. This storyline evolves over the research journey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief description:</strong> Generation 1.5 learners ‘wanting it all regardless’ academically, buying into the great Australian aspirational and cultural dreaming, along with university marketing. ‘Wanting it all regardless’ despite: (i) being inadequately prepared for academic studies; (ii) experiencing literacy support disconnects; (iii) under-estimating the impacts of competing identity-role demands; and (iv) dealing with pervasive academic scarcity mindsets. These learners are driven by home country adversity; wanting better lives, greater opportunities, and meaning and purpose in their host countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research findings indicate that these learners are typically inadequately prepared for academic studies. In addition, learners tend to over-estimate their abilities; under-estimate the time required to improve their literacy and manage their academic assignments; under-estimate the impacts of dealing with competing identity-role demands in their personal situations; experience scarcity-influenced literacy decision-making, internal and external situational contexts, and associated across-domain demands adds further levels of complexity in relation to their management styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical considerations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wanting it all – right here, right now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Living the great Australian dream (i.e. going to university, getting a good job, buying a house, starting a family, traveling, having the ‘dream’ lifestyle).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Originally the Australian dream was considered as typifying white, middle class cultural aspirations (middle class aspirational and cultural dreaming), closely associated with Australian ‘lucky country’ thinking (Donald Horne, 1964).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Participants with immigrant backgrounds buying in to living the Australian dream cultural aspirations.
- The stereotypical Australian dreaming does not seem to re-conceptualised, re-framed, or re-defined in terms of relevance and achievability in today’s increasingly globalised societies.
- The Australian dream does not appear to be re-conceptualised in terms of different ways to measure happiness, life satisfaction, health, and well-being – seemingly out-of-alignment with 21st century realities but still aspired to regardless of associated implications.
- Australian aspirational dreaming
- Australian academic dreaming
- Selective adaptive coping
- Selective adaptive coping systems
- Scarcity-influenced decision-making
- Academic learning disconnects.
- Aggressive university marketing.
- Failing to provide targeted literacy support to students.

As the story line memo extract in Figure 3.9 demonstrated, in the evolving theoretical developmental processes, the final iteration focused on validating findings and refining the theory, rather than exploring new data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Accordingly, this story line contributed to substantive theory, the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. This Theory explained, positioned, and provided understandings as to how participant students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile managed their Academic Highway Journeys over a year. As with the previous GT coding stages, Excel spreadsheets accommodated selective coding data that reflected the complexity of the analytical processes and story line development.

**The Importance of Being Grounded in the Data: Procedural Engagement and Evolution**

As with any general methodology, grounded theory’s actual use in practice has varied with the specifics of the area under study, the purpose and focus of the research, the contingencies faced during the project, and perhaps also the temperaments and particular gifts or weaknesses of the researcher (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 276)

As Resource Journal discussion in this chapter demonstrated, and as the examples provided in Appendices C, D, and E illustrate, the revitalised GT approach evolved over the
data-generation, analytical processes that included literature access, and subsequent writing stages. In relation to this evolution, Strauss and Corbin (1994, p. 278) point out that “individual researchers invent different specific procedures” in keeping with situational demands. It is important to note that Patricia Leavy’s novel *Spark* (2019a) confirmed the researcher’s conviction that using an arts-informed research and writing praxis enhanced study findings and discourse in thought-provoking ways. In demonstrating creativity, innovation, and a praxis that integrated knowledge-building and value-adding, professionalism, and reflexivity (Eisner, 1997; Leavy, 2009), this approach is validated in the literature (Copeland, 2019; Janesick, 2001; Leavy, 2011, 2017; Olshannikova et al., 2020).

As the story lines in Chapters 4 and 5 provide the theoretical foundations in this study, using arts-enriched language had the power to connect, discover, and generate in-depth research insights (Leavy, 2009; Tracy, 2013). Accordingly, arts-informed meaning-making methods incorporated aphorisms, epigrams, knowledge markers, literary alignments, maxims, metaphors, and participants’ symbolic references and words that collectively performed explanatory functions that heightened the significance of the data findings (Leavy, 2009; Molino, 1997). For the researcher, the situational demands of this study justified this approach (Leavy, 2009, 2017; Strauss & Corbin, 1994), generating knowledge in ways that provided broader perspectives on participants’ real-world ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic journeys. It is worth noting that memo-writing and the Resource Journal commentaries were integral components in the researcher’s customised arts-informed research and writing praxis. Instinctively and intuitively developed, this positioning strategy synthesised the researcher’s arts and theoretical landscapes, generating imaginative and inventive ways of knowing, seeing, and telling (Eisner, 1997) that were practiced throughout the study. As Leavy (2009, p. 2) explains: “Grounded in exploration, revelation, and representation, art and science work towards advancing human understanding”. Informed by many sources (Eisner, 1997; Goodman, 1978; Goffman, 1959; Leavy, 2017; Molino, 1997), this research and writing praxis recalls Gwendolyn Goodright, a character in Patricia Leavy’s novel *Spark*.
Remaining faithful to the study findings, this arts-informed, interpretive approach aligned with Strauss and Corbin’s (1994, p. 276) perspective that studies are informed by the researchers’ analytical “temperaments and particular gifts”. In delivering a consolidated analytical approach, the importance of “maintaining a balance among the attributes of creativity, rigor, persistence, and above all, theoretical sensitivity” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 58) provided guidance throughout the study stages. As Strauss and Corbin (1994, p. 276) point out: “Knowledge is, after all, linked closely with time and place”, acknowledging the participants’ complex, microsystem-to-chronosystem influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Generating conceptually-rich study findings and literature-informed alignments, the depth and diversity of the difficulties that the participants’ experienced in their Academic Highway Journeys were discovered. As a result, the researcher’s embryonic and emergent shift towards a rejuvenated research praxis was warranted and rewarded in developing the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory.

**Theory Development: An Overview**

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the strengths associated with this longitudinal study resided in its research design, methodology and methods. Collectively, this approach provided coherence, cohesion, and compatibility. In using the researcher’s rejuvenated GT methodology based on Strauss and Corbin (1990), data analysis included accessing arts-informed, non-technical, and technical literature. With these matters in mind, and given the controversial role of literature use in GT studies (Birks & Mills, 2011; Buckley & Waring, 2009), Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 56) advise that while literature resources are beneficial in all stages of the study, it is crucial that researchers “guard against becoming a captive of any of them”. Making the pragmatic decision to work wisely with the three types of literature,
the researcher’s objective was knowledge-building, truth-telling, and value-adding to study findings (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Tracy, 2013). In using “a variety of other materials” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 55), and in adopting a personalised research and writing praxis, study findings were informed by theoretical alignments that were enhanced in creative and unexpected ways. In GT studies, the theoretical sensitivity construct is crucial (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Informed by the researcher’s personal and professional experiences that include assumptions, biases, and thinking patterns, this construct is also influenced by ongoing interaction with the data and by accessing literature resources. Importantly, Strauss and Corbin consider that these factors have the capacity to enhance the researcher’s theoretical sensitivity. In equating good science with good theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 42), the researcher identified relevance in the study findings and generated meaning by having a “rich background of information that “sensitizes” you to what is going on”.

Working with rigorous GT processes that linked participants’ cyclical and evolving actions and interactional responses and sequence (O'Donoghue, 2019), this study investigated how participants managed their undergraduate studies over an academic year. Mindful of the changing conditions that influenced participants’ actions and interactions (Punch & Oancea, 2014), the researcher was observant to the ways in which they made sense of their academically-underpinned worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978). In doing so, the researcher was astutely aware of the subtleties of meaning in the study findings (Goodman, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These attributes were crucial given the diversity and extent of consequences that resulted from participants’ academic choices and decisions, and critical when identifying the actions and interactions that resulted from these processes. Developing a descriptive storyline that represented the emerging theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), this ‘description’ was depicted analytically by assigning a name to the central phenomenon, the core category, the Academic Highway Journey. In turn, participants’ actions, intentions, interactions, and socially-situated responses were inextricably linked to this Academic Highway Journey, the central phenomenon around which
all five major categories or satellite systems were gravitationally-connected and influenced (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These five systems comprised academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning. While Appendix F provides an overview of the systems’ development outcomes resulting from the data-generation and coding periods, Table 3.3 below lists the systems and their fundamental areas of influence.

Table 3.3

The Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory: Satellite Systems’ Influences and Overlaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satellite Systems</th>
<th>Main Areas of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The main areas of influence for these systems are included. However, reciprocal coupling effects and varying degrees of interconnecting, intersecting, and overlapping impacts were evident at different stages of the participants’ Academic Highway Journeys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>This system covered the participants’ Academic Highway Journey demands and responsibilities during their tertiary education studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>This system covered the strategies and techniques the participants used while dealing with their academic journeys and their related across-life domain experiences and impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>This system dominated the study findings, influencing all other systems and impacting in all areas of the participants’ lives. This system was of paramount importance during their academic journeys in terms of self-identity, self-worth, and ascribed university student status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>This system related to the participants’ varied pre- and post-immigration experiences and perspectives and the ways in which they were managed. As with the identity system, this system influenced all others in varying ways and degrees of impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>This system related to all areas of the participants’ learning and learned behaviour in their across-life domain experiences—past and present—while attempting to be future-focused in their host countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table extends the connections made in Figure 3.8 that provided coding examples in relation to the academic, coping, and identity systems as being three of the major categories in this GT study.
In discussing the microsystem-to-chronosystem influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) that informed and influenced the participants’ storied-journey accounts and the evolving theory with its across-systems’ impacts, these developments are discussed in Chapter 6. However, in providing an overview of theoretical development, Birks and Mills (2011) point out that researchers must make every effort to maintain the balance between achieving their research aims and ensuring participants’ psychological health and well-being. To accomplish this demanding and difficult balancing act, discussion now focuses on the importance of the researcher being ethically responsible and maintaining professional accountability throughout the study.

**Ethical and Research Quality**

With approval from Edith Cowan University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, the tenet of non-maleficence, of doing no harm was a fundamental ethical commitment throughout the study (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015; Punch & Oancea, 2014). In strengthening the importance of professional conduct, the researcher submitted mandatory, six-monthly progress reports on ethical and research standards to the university’s Graduate Research School for approval. This research authorisation process is informed by the Australian Government’s National Health and Medical Research Council and its *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (2015). Given the complexities of investigating participants’ lives and producing public accounts of the study findings, Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) discuss the construct of phronesis. The authors explain that possessing and using practical wisdom is essential in being ethically orderly and well-organised in research processes. In making a concerted, conscientious commitment to balance and blend ethical responsibilities and research quality criteria, the researcher delivered credible, creative, and conceptually significant research contributions. In successfully project-managing these responsibilities from Ph D candidature through to thesis completion, consideration, and
conferral (Birks & Mills, 2011; Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015; Dunne, 2011; Tracy, 2013), the researcher ensured that all participants were fully informed about the study processes. Consequently, the participants received, read, signed, and retained a copy of the *Informed Consent Information* document. This document outlined the measures taken to ensure participants’ anonymity and confidentiality by using pseudonyms in data-generation and analysis, data storage processes, and writing-for-publication mediums (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015; O’Donoghue, 2019; Punch & Oancea, 2014). A copy of this document is provided in Appendix A.

Importantly, the research design, methodology, and methods chosen for this study were ethically supportive in terms of strengthening procedural, relational, and situational practices and processes (Tracy, 2013). It is considered that situating this study within the rigorous, systematic, and well-established GT methodology enabled the researcher to meet the “good science” criteria (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 31). As data-generating interviews are central to GT, the researcher used analytical and procedural processes that accurately and truthfully conveyed the ‘realities’ of participants experiencing the phenomenon being investigated. While having received voluntary, informed written consent from participants before the study began (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015), an overview of the ethical measures being undertaken to ensure the participants’ well-being was explained at the commencement of each audio-recorded interview. Similar information was provided to those participants who later in the study decided to provide written responses to research questions as an alternative to face-to-face interviews. Given the power dynamics and possible consequences in interview situations, Maria’s previously-mentioned recurrent dream is discussed to demonstrate the ways in which ethical and research quality measures were practiced in this study.
The Drowning-in-Snakes Dream: Framing and Grounding Ethical and Research Quality

A narrative frame from Maria’s first-round interview is used to establish the importance the researcher attached to ensuring ethical conduct and research standards were maintained throughout the study. This framing illustrates the researcher’s abilities to establish rapport with Maria, being ‘grounded’ in the data, making connections, and using literature resources that inform subsequent interview discussions, story line, and theoretical development (Birks & Mills, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As Maria reflected on her two-decades long recurrent ‘drowning-in-snakes’ dream: “The more I think… Like I’ve never really spoken to anyone about the dream, I think it just it relates to my Dad. A lot of things relate to my Dad from my childhood”. This disclosure highlighted the strength of the rapport, along with Maria’s confidence and trust in sharing sensitive personal information with the researcher. This rapport informed subsequent dream-related discussion that discovered the depth of Maria’s childhood adversity in her home country. Importantly, the researcher was only the second person to whom Maria had confided the background to and the on-going significance of her recurrent ‘drowning-in-snakes’ dream. The first person was her husband. Cognisant of the sensitivities surrounding this dream, the researcher demonstrated discretion, respect, and tact during the first and subsequent interviews, being alert to possible psychological repercussions. Symbolising how past events inform her present and drive her L2 future-self world (Dörnyei, 2009), Maria’s in-depth data descriptions generated findings that established credibility and meaning-making coherence in the developing story line. The following data frame involves Maria and her father, demonstrating the on-going psychological and family system impacts and implications of her recurrent dream:

We’re just laying in long grass on her side of the fence holding hands…And then all of a sudden like all the snakes just come. Like they start pouring from the sides on top of us…And then the ground kind of pulls us in.
These dream-related impacts and influences were considerable as Maria dealt with her Academic Highway Journey, the driving force behind her search for a strong sense-of-self that incorporated redemptive and redress directions (Brinkmann & Kavale, 2015; Dörnyei, 2014; Kerr et al., 2019; McAdams, 2008; McAdams & McLean, 2013; Scott, 2015). These findings highlighted the significance and strengths of the study’s longitudinal research design in that the complexities of this dream were identified and discussed over three, iterative rounds of interviews and data analysis. Additionally, Maria’s data-generated framing confirmed the necessity for interview transcripts to be accurate and precise given the importance of demonstrating accountability, credibility, and transparency in the study processes (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). To maintain rigour in the study (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017), the researcher conducted and controlled the GT study processes “in order to accommodate or explain all factors that can impact on, and thereby potentially erode, the value of research outcomes” (Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 176). Importantly, the outcomes of Maria’s serendipitous study findings demonstrated research quality that was coherent, cohesive, and compelling in story line and theoretical development stages (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Tracy, 2013). These study outcomes also matched Shuman’s (2012, p. 2) focus on narrative interactions in terms of how participants’ story telling incidents are managed given their “relationships to each other, to their large worlds, and to the events and characters within the narrative”. As Maria’s story line in Chapter 5 demonstrates, her narrative identity reconstruction explored the ways in which she managed her transitional passages between multiple systems and worlds (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; McAdams, 2018; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In accordance with Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical model, these transitions were performed for self and significant ‘others’. In making a substantial discovery that validated investigating a worthy research topic (Tracy, 2013), Maria’s recurrent drowning-in-snakes dream discussion is illustrative of the researcher’s whole-of-study approach. In balancing ethical and professional responsibilities in tandem with achieving significant study outcomes, the importance of meaningful research coherence was firmly established. Tracy (2013, p. 245) describes this coherence as an “anchoring” marker of
research quality. In a collage-like manner, the researcher created aesthetical assemblages that framed, positioned, and represented Maria’s findings throughout the study (Leavy, 2009, 2017; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Tracy, 2013).

**Using an Arts-Informed Research and Writing Praxis**

The researcher’s ethical situational awareness also extended to an appreciation that “certain ways of writing” contribute aesthetic merit to the resonance marker in research quality (Tracy, 2013, p. 246). In adopting an individualised arts-informed research and writing praxis (Leavy, 2011, 2017, 2019a, 2019b), aesthetic merit is described as comprising text that is “imaginative, artistic, beautifully written, and capable of emotionally affecting the reader” (Tracy, 2013, p. 239). With this aesthetic marker in mind, the researcher sought to achieve this writing praxis objective. However, Tracy (2013) advises that using creative, interpretive, and intuitive theoretical approaches in which “meaning emerges from the voices of participants” comes with a caveat. While explaining that researchers must “mindfully synch their stated research goals with theories, their research design, and their methodology” (Tracy, 2013, p. 245), these words of warning were countered by the previous research framework discussion. With these supportive components in place, the researcher exercised due diligence in maintaining ethical and research quality standards throughout the study. It is considered that this research praxis aligns with Tracy (2013, p. 232) in that “Conducting rigorous research means practicing the discipline and having the motivation to move beyond data and analysis methods that are merely convenient and comfortable”. Importantly, from data-generation methods through to theoretical development stages, the researcher was able to “let the mind wander and make the free associations that are necessary for generating stimulating questions, and for coming up with the comparisons that led to discovery” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 27). As Glaser (1998) points out, the nature of GT methodology is strengthened by being “subsequent, sequential, simultaneous, serendipitous and scheduled” (p. 15). While this research methodology has been revised
over the past decades (Buckley & Waring, 2009), Glaser’s views remain valid. As Maria’s recurrent drowning-in-snakes dream framing demonstrates, the praxis used in this study was aesthetically, empirically, and ethically-based; methodologically and theoretically authoritative; and creative and credible in terms of constructing well-crafted study findings (Leavy, 2017; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Tracy, 2013).

**Conclusion**

As research questions determine, direct, and justify the design, methodology, and methods selected (Crotty, 1998), this chapter discussed the framework used in this Generation 1.5 learner study. Set within the paradigm of interpretivism, the theoretical positioning of symbolic interactionism, and Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) GT methodology, these three components were described and explained. As data analysis drives theory development, open, axial, and selective coding processes were discussed. Importantly, as part of this analytical discussion, the researcher’s rejuvenated GT approach, along with an arts-informed research and writing praxis, was introduced and explained. It is worth noting that this praxis enabled the researcher to connect the rigorous and systematic techniques of GT methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) with the imaginative and innovative qualities of the arts (Leavy, 2009, 2011; 2019a, 2019b; Tracy, 2013). Collectively, these three components generated substantive theory contributions that validated the researcher’s commitment to the fourth element, that of ensuring ethical conduct, professionalism, and research quality throughout the research (Tracy, 2013).

The next chapter is the first of two chapters that present the narrative identity reconstructions of the six participants in this study. These narratives represent a more contemporaneous GT story line approach that provides the foundation for theoretical development in Chapter 6. Using participant-provided words, study findings, and literature
alignments, these storied-journey accounts demonstrate the ways in which their past home country experiences continue to resonate in the present as they manage their future-focused academic journeys. Like the characters in Patricia Leavy’s novel *Spark* (2019a), the participants are on a voyage of self-discovery, seeking meaning, opportunity, and purpose in their host country lives (Frankl, 1992). In relation to these journeys, Liev, a character in the novel whose name is an anagram for ‘live’ cautions: “Someday is always in the distance. Someday is dangerous. Be careful of someday” (Leavy, 2019a, p. 86). In investigating the passages and pathways that participants are pursuing in their ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ Academic Highway Journeys, Liev’s words are pertinent: “Today is always better than someday” (Leavy, 2019a, p. 88).
Life is no straight and easy corridor along which we travel free and unhampered, but a maze of passages, through which we must seek our way, lost and confused, now and again checked in a blind alley. But always, if we have faith, a door will open for us, not perhaps one that we ourselves would ever have thought of, but one that will ultimately prove good for us. (Archibald Joseph Cronin. In Knight, 1995, p. 149)

The previous chapter discussed the research design, methodology, and methods used to address the central research question in this Generation 1.5 learner study. Positioned within the paradigm of interpretivism and the theoretical positioning of symbolic interactionism, the study used grounded theory (GT) methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The data-generation methods involved interviews and written responses to research questions. With this research approach in place, the Wanting-It-All Regardless Theory was developed. The core category within this Theory was identified as the Academic Highway Journey. Of the five major categories influenced by this core category, identity systems dominated, with academic, coping, immigration, and learning providing impacting and interconnecting forces.

As part of a more contemporaneous approach to Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) storyline development, this chapter is the first of two that provides the narrative identity reconstructions of the six participants in this study. Given the degree to which participants made significant personal investments in telling their stories, this two-staged approach is warranted. For ease of reading, this first chapter introduces the three participants whose involvement in the study ended earlier than planned. While one participant withdrew from the study without notice after the first interview, two participants failed their semester one and two courses, becoming casualties who were unable to finish their Academic Highway
Journeys. In turn, Chapter 5 will provide the narratives of the three participants able to complete their journeys. Consequently, the depth and scope of these researcher-reconstructed narratives or storied-journeys will vary in keeping with the length of time the participants remained in the study. Privileging the complexities and richness of detail in storied-journeys (Anderson & Dunn, 2013), these contributions recall Goffman’s dramaturgical model (1959) with its characters, plots, settings, themes, and meaning-making performances. Importantly, study findings confirmed that telling their stories was cathartic in nature, beneficial in focusing participants’ thinking and problem-solving processes (Anderson & Dunn, 2013) during their academic journeys. These narratives also highlighted the emotional and psychological movement and “passage between multiple worlds” of transition (Stenner, 2018a, p. 151) as the participants recounted their past, pictured their present, and imagined their future. In both chapters, working with participants’ words and study findings, together with an arts-informed research and writing praxis, framed and positioned the storytelling. Importantly, these storied-journey accounts represent narratives in which “empirical data and theory are key elements in the work” (Moen, 2006, p. 64).

Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 116) describe the story as a “descriptive narrative about the central phenomenon of the study”. As Kerr et al. (2019, pp. 1-2) explain, narrative identity refers to the “internal, evolving life story that individuals construct by integrating stories related to their past, present, and future to provide their lives with unity, meaning, and purpose”. These evolutionary story processes are complex and multi-dimensional, with ‘selves’ viewed as ‘works in progress’ in terms of interconnectedness, personal transformations, and transitional growth (Kerr et al., 2019; Stenner, 2018b). Using narratives as a theoretical framework (Bruner, 2004), the researcher incorporated participants’ systems-influenced, storied-journey accounts that provided an overview of their defining moments from pre-immigration through to L2 future-selves (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014) aspirations and learning profiles.
Daniel’s Story

Mom and Dad wanted to bring us to Australia. First primary reason is for education because education here is good…[if] we were to stay [in home country], it would cost a lot to support us bringing us to study overseas and all that.

The Immigration Journey

Malaysian-born Daniel was fourteen years old when his university-educated parents immigrated under the Australian Government’s 457 Skills Migration and Rural Australia Program in 2013. Daniel and his family settled in Bunbury, a port city approximately 169 kilometres or 105 miles south from Perth, the capital city of Western Australia (WA). With education the major immigration driver, Daniel recounted his disjointed home country education, with teachers “[who] didn’t really teach me much and my foundation wasn’t that good. I feel like those schools doesn’t help me much.” Shrouded in secrecy, his parents counselled Daniel against discussing the imminent immigration move with his friends. Immigration, with its inherent on-going emotional, health, socio-psychological, and well-being impacts (Kim, 2007; Kim et al., 2009; Segal, 2002) built on Daniel’s numerous home country schooling upheavals. As Daniel explained: “I really didn’t like it to change school because you lost all your friends, lost all your relationships…you need to go to the new environment, pick new friends and all that”.

The Acculturation Journey

Immigration from and to any country, irrespective of its institutionally-assigned designation and global ranking that is based on democratic, developmental, economic, and political factors, is a life-changing, transitional event (Segal, 2002). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) The Resilience of Students with an Immigrant Background: Factors that Shape Well-being (2018) report highlights the
importance of immigrant students’ sense of belonging in their host countries. This belongingness is described as “feeling accepted and liked by the rest of the group, feeling connected to others and feeling like a member of a community” (OECD, 2018, p. 64). According to Roberge (2009), immigrant families’ arrival experiences are informed by the situations that triggered their home country departures. Disputing the view that immigrant children readily adapt to the cultural and linguistic situations in their host countries, Roberge discusses several psychological and social challenges. These challenges range from anxiety, cognitive and emotional stress, and depression through to inter-generational value conflicts and assuming greater family responsibilities than their native-born counterparts. In keeping with these considerations, Roberge (2009) highlights the importance of acculturation and identity formation in making cross-cultural adjustments.

Accordingly, transitioning involved meeting and managing significant cultural, linguistic, political, and social challenges across multiple life domains (Kim et al., 2007). As Daniel explains, “when I first got there, I still got my accent and all that, and people will look at me differently and say, whoa what is this. Like not in a good way”. Managing cultural shock and associated feelings of disorientation and isolation, Daniel also experienced discrimination, marginalisation, and racism at school and in the wider community:

There’s once we went to Big W and we were leaving and there’s just a couple of kids like from high school. Because they were in the leaver’s jacket, we can recognise them. And they just saw us because we are Asian and they just yell at us like, go back to your country and what, just all that, and like get a rock and throw it at our car. And come to us and say like fight me, come down and fight me, and all that. And dad just take pictures of them and take it to the police station.

According to Yosso et al. (2009), discriminatory, racist, and stigmatising actions, comments, and incidents that convey lowered expectations and stereotypical assumptions are referred to as microaggressions. There are three types of microaggression messages, the first being assaults that are intentional, explicit, and derogatory attacks, either verbally or
nonverbally. The second type involves insults that are boorish, disrespectful, and insensitive, acting as subtle criticisms based on an individual’s racial heritage and identity. Thirdly, invalidations are designed to denigrate, disparage, and devalue people’s racial and cultural backgrounds. Daniel and his family experienced all three types of microaggressions, dealing with on-going discrimination for the next five years. In keeping with Pietrus (2013), incidents involving prejudicial attitudes, behaviours, and cultural attributions from members of the public are considered public stigma, one of three types of stigma, the others being self and structural.

With little English as a second language (L2) instruction in his home country, starting Year 9 signalled the beginning of Daniel’s language-learning journey. Contrary to customary educational practice, Daniel did not receive government-provided intensive L2 instruction prior to enrolment at his initial high school. This is significant as Roessingh and Kover (2003, p. 8) point out that immigrants, especially those arriving between the ages of 12 and 14, face significant educational challenges and “must work hard to beat the academic time clock”. With little scope for first language (L1) transfer to L2 learning (Swan & Smith, 2010), Daniel’s language shock and anxiety increased despite moving to a different school for Years 11 and 12. However, Daniel’s acculturative difficulties lessened with fellow students being mostly overseas-born and grappling with similar educational, self-identity, and social issues. Critically, despite sporadic private L2 tutoring, Daniel failed Year 12 English twice a year over a two-year period: “Mom and Dad gave me a lot of support. They did help me as they can, but because some of the English terminologies they haven’t heard before so they couldn’t help me as much…they do what they can do”.

The Academic Management Journey

While Generation 1.5 learners typically have well-developed basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS), cognitive academic learning proficiency (CALP) is under-
developed (Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a). In addition, underlying proficiencies involving more cognitively demanding tasks such as abstract and critical thinking, making reading-to-writing connections, and problem-solving may also be challenging (Hinkel, 2004). A third level of L2 proficiency includes grammar, phonology, and spelling, the discrete language skills that may sometimes be learned in isolation from the developing CALP (Cummins, 2008). It is worth noting that BICS or conversational fluency alone is an unreliable predictor of academic success and that L2 academic writing may include the grammatical and syntactical constructions that individual’s use in spoken and conversational discourse (Hinkel, 2004, 2013). Eventually, ‘just’ passing Year 12 English provided Daniel with a university entrance score that enabled enrolment in the computing area. Importantly, Roberge (2009, p. vii) notes that while these learners may graduate from high school, many may be inadequately prepared to meet the cognitive challenges associated with academic L2 reading and writing demands. As Roessingh et al. (2005, p. 4) point out:

Developing CALP is a “long and uneven process”, one in which L2 learners “are continually chasing a moving target in their effort to close the gap between themselves and their NS [native speaker] classmates sufficiently to compete academically: many, if not most, never do.

In relation to post-secondary educational decision-making, Daniel describes the pressures: “My family expectation to me is like as an Asian in the community, every Asian that come to study overseas must have a degree, at least a degree”. In terms of home country expectations, “if you study in Australia you have to do good. That’s the overseas person thinking”. In relation to his own expectations, “I still got pressure on myself that I have to get a degree…It’s just about what I feel. Like if you don’t get a degree that’s just a shame”. Additionally, study findings indicated ambivalence and psychological distress in dealing with conflicting cultural attitudes, beliefs, and expectations:

But my Mom and Dad said to me that you don’t have to get a degree. You can do whatever you like. You can get an apprenticeship and all that. But I still feel like if you
don’t get a degree what’s the point of you coming to study overseas, why don’t you just study in [your home country].

These sentiments align with research emphasising the difficulties of managing increased self, family, community expectations, and socio-cultural pressures such as ‘losing face’, shame, and stigma (Leong & Kim, 2011; Thonus, 2003; Yosso et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2011). In explaining his reasons for tertiary study, “I want to get more job opportunities and a university degree is very essential in our country”, Daniel describes himself as an “average student” and “not a really good student”. Importantly, he also considers that people are always judging him, “like people even judge me how I speak”. These sentiments recall Bourdieu’s (1986) concept of capital and habitus, reconceptualised in this study as immigrant habitus, with a focus on cultural and social resources. For example, in relation to embodied cultural capital, Morrice (2013, p. 655) describes linguistic assets that include “language skills, aspirations, having the right accent, being familiar with particular academic discourses”. In terms of personal and social identity, an individual’s linguistic performance in ‘passing’ in social interactions is crucial as accents immediately identify either native speaker or non-native speaker status (Cutler, 2014; Renfrow, 2004). In relation to passing practices, Goffman (1963b) regards this construct as strategies that assist individuals’ negotiating and navigating ‘becoming journeys’ (Scott, 2015), allowing them to distance themselves from stigmatised, discredited identities and align with more socially-acceptable idealised ones.

Relocating to Perth for his university studies, Daniel experienced a further round of social contact and friendship losses as most of his friends were studying at different universities. As the findings demonstrated, while Daniel had high L2 academic aspirations and expectations, he under-estimated the study demands in terms of time and over-estimated his CALP-determined preparedness for L2 academic reading and writing demands. Given the importance of the reading skills necessary to build discipline knowledge and improve grammar, vocabulary, and L2 writing skills (Farahzad & Emam, 2010), Daniel acknowledged that his course reading load was difficult to manage: “It’s exhausting because
you need to spend three or four hours do it and go to lectures then do it another time”.

Regarding the L2 academic writing connection, Daniel discusses one unit involving referencing and written tasks, adding that he could not “see the point like why do you learn how to write something which you don’t even have to use it for the rest of three years”.

Demonstrating cognitive dissociation from the realities of unit outcomes such as improving his L2 writing skills, Daniel is dismissive: “We just do like computer stuff like programming and all that”. Additionally, he is also devaluing, discounting, and distancing himself from future L2 writing demands that include dealing with crucial across-life domain matters and managing business transactions.

In terms of liminality, Greco and Stenner (2017, p. 150) discuss the “paradoxical betwixt and between” transitional situations encountered when crossing and moving within different domain thresholds. The authors explain that individuals must be active, engaged, and resilient citizens in order to self-manage in ever-changing modern societies in which change is the only constant. In keeping with cognitive withdrawal from L2 academic stressors, what Kerr et al. (2019) refer to as being negative emotional attractors, Daniel advises, “I can read in general. I just can’t do essay writing”. However, as Generation 1.5 learners may have difficulty distinguishing between verbal and written registers in L2 writing, having formal instruction and practice is crucial (Hinkel, 2004). In relation to improving scarce CALP-influenced L2 reading and writing skills, findings indicate a learning support disconnection. While aware of university-provided literacy sessions, both face-to-face and online, Daniel explains his non-participation: “Not enough time I think. I really feel like now my work get too get packed up a lot more”. While confirming the value in providing after-hours academic support sessions, cognitive dissonance, in the form of rationalisation and making contradictory, counter-intuitive statements, Daniel considers he is the sort of student “who, likes to do it myself, like self-learning kind of thing. I can’t really study when someone is around me, that kind of thing”. Demonstrating cognitive downplay (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013) in relation to critical L2 literacy demands and disconnections, Daniel adds that it is his
personal responsibility to manage these academic pressures, describing them as “good pressure”. Ironically, in relating his time scarcity issues, Daniel raised L2 listening and reading comprehension stressors generated by overseas-born university lecturers:

I feel like I can’t stand it [reading and re-reading] for long because it’s really, really, really time consuming. Like you imagine that the lectures go for three hours. If you have to do the pre-reading it goes for three hours. It’s just oh…sometimes the lecturers are like from Afghanistan and all that, I can’t understand their accent. Not only me. Like the whole lecture can’t understand it.

The Future Self Identity Project Journey

While working with findings from only one interview, it was clear that Daniel’s Academic Highway Journey aspirations were underpinned by his immigration-influenced L2 future-self goals and visions (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014). Providing focus, meaning-making, and purpose in life (Frankl, 1992), Daniel’s academic journey was ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ driven. For Daniel, regardless of pre-and post-immigration adversities (Kim, 2002), his under-developed L2 literacy skills (Cummins, 2008; Hinkel, 2004; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a, 2012b), and reduced linguistic and social capital resources (Bourdieu, 1986; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a), this journey mattered. Accordingly, Daniel’s storied-journey account (Anderson & Dunn, 2013) represents his pursuit of an educational pathway that will shape and signpost his future.

Learner Profile Typology: The Regrounding Learner

Daniel’s study findings established the Generation 1.5 Regrounding Learner category. This profile is informed by Goffman’s (1974) frame analysis approach to defining and interpreting situational contexts. Learners’ within this profile seek permanence in their lives through having stability, stasis, and success in host country educational environments. Residing within the Wanting-it-all-Regardless Theory, this learner profile includes students
who have high academic aspirations and expectations, genuinely believing they can achieve success despite being L2 literacy-challenged. Subsequently, maintaining and negotiating academic crossing, passing, and positioning constructs (Goffman, 1959, 1963, 1974; Renfrow, 2004) is paramount. Importantly, dealing with adverse educational experiences (Cultler, 2014), inadequate dramaturgical performances (Goffman, 1959), and L2 self-identity matters (Dörnyei, 2003, 2009) were major theoretical considerations. As Daniel’s storied-journey situation demonstrated, this profile is immigration-driven with his home country past informing his host country future. In being acculturatively-focused, restoring psychological balance, meaning, and purpose in life was a fundamental across-life domain driver (Frankl, 1992). In ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’, a successful Academic Highway Journey is essential to Daniel realising his L2 future-self aspirations (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). This profile recalls Collins’ (2000, p. 18) contention that dealing with multiple levels of micro-situational stratification considerations such as ethnicity, race, and status constitutes the “ground zero of all social actions and all sociological evidence”.

Epilogue

Daniel’s storied-journey account recalls an aphorism by the cultural critic and philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1889/2017): “If we have our own ‘why’ in life, we shall get along with almost any ‘how”’. As Daniel withdrew from the study after the initial interview, the researcher is uncertain as to whether having the ‘why’ in his Academic Highway Journey was sufficient in supporting a successful ‘how’.

Randy’s Story

Basically, me and my family all moved to Australia back in 2006 with our own people. We decided to move because my Dad managed to get a job over here… I really don’t think about it much. I moved to Perth and I processed it and that’s it.
The Immigration Journey

In 2006, South Korean-born Randy and his family immigrated under the Australian Government’s 457 Skills Migration Visa Program. Eleven years old at the time, Randy explained: “I really didn’t get too much say in terms of coming to Australia. Yes, so that was pretty much it”, adding that the family “moved straight to WA. We didn’t go to any other State and we’ve been in WA ever since”. When asked to reflect on his home country situation, Randy described it as “pretty bad”, pointing out that:

If I were to look at the current, like, if I look at the past and then look at, I think moving was beneficial for me, I think 100 percent it was beneficial…I really call Perth my home, to be honest.

Randy’s participation in this study is unique in several ways, the first being that he had spent eleven years in both his home country and his host country. However, in arriving when aged eleven, Randy was approaching immigrants’ L2 educational “danger zone”, having limited years in which to develop the CALP necessary for achieving academic success (Roessingh & Kover, 2003, p. 8). Secondly, in relation to ‘processing’ and dealing with his immigration journey, the study findings indicated that moving to Australia was relatively straightforward and trouble-free, contrary to immigrants’ typical experiences (Morrice, 2013). Thirdly, in terms of immigration being unreservedly a positive life-changing event, as Randy explained:

I don’t doubt it for a second that it was, yes. I think in terms of life experience it’s something that I had to experience that not many people could have experienced and I just find that really beneficial to my parents, I suppose, we all.

The Acculturation Journey

In relation to the early-stage acculturative processes, those ‘in-between’, liminal transitional zones (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), Randy’s findings emphasise the socio-
psychological impacts implicit in arriving in WA as an eleven-year-old: “When it’s that age to express your feelings sort of thing, I wasn’t actually able to express my feelings…I think I was like set back because of the language barrier”. Entering Year 6 primary schooling, with no previous L2 instruction, Randy points out: “I didn’t know much English, well, not at all actually, so I kind of had to learn it from scratch, which was tough at the time”. While Korean belongs to the Ural-Altaic language family, similar to Japanese and Chinese in some respects, it is unique in being unrelated to other oriental languages (Swan & Smith, 2010).

With these L1 considerations in mind, and given the evolving interlanguage continuum is typically positioned somewhere between the home and the target language, the L2 learning journey can be a long and demanding one (Song, 2012; Swan & Smith, 2010).

In describing his early home country primary schooling days as “pretty disheartening” and “pretty hard”, Randy draws attention to his L1 and L2 cultural, linguistic, and social interaction clashes: “While I was at school like the only person that I was able to talk to was my brother in Korean but…and then the only time I was able to use my Korean language was just back at home”. These reflections are in keeping with Lakoff’s divided self metaphor (Gomez, 2015) and considerations that include the conflicts between the ‘inner self’ and ‘outer self’ components. The former relates to the inner, internal, hidden, and ‘backstage’ presentations; the latter links with the external, on-show, and ‘frontstage’ presentations that are ever-present in terms of emotional and rational identity sources and target domains (Goffman, 1959; Gomez, 2015). However, in relation to L2 learning support disconnections, Davison (cited in Goldschmidt & Miller, 2005, p. 14) advises that there is “little or no acknowledgment in pedagogic practice that the [second language] learners lived for most of the day in another language and another culture”. Davison (p. 14) also advises that “no matter how sympathetically viewed, [these students] were assumed to be on a continuum of conformity to some yet unobtained ‘native-speaker hood’…”. Additionally, re-adjusting and reconciling cultural differences in L2 teaching systems was necessary (Swan & Smith, 2010). In describing his home country education in terms of “teachers and students they all
have like sort of a different…I suppose, rank”, Randy considered his host country education was “very interactive”.

With Year 6 described as “challenging”, Randy’s parents engaged a tutor for six or seven months until his basic L2 skills improved. In contrast, Randy recalls Year 7 as being schooling that he “actually enjoyed”, while pointing out that “there were some words that I couldn't understand like…I kind of had the feeling of what they were sort of saying…that sounds a bit weird”. In terms of L2 instruction, Randy clarifies the learning context:

I think because of my background, when I was in high school, I did from Year 8 to 12, my English course was actually… wasn’t like a mainstream English course. It was English as a second language, which I think helped me quite a bit as well. Yes, they tend to be a bit more focused on the practical side instead of literature and everything.

Aware of cultural stereotyping associated with the model minority immigrant myth of Asian students being hard-working, high achievers (Leong & Kim, 2011), Randy explained that he “wasn’t a model student…there was certainly that Asian student sort of thing…I was never like that…I was glad that I had fun in high school instead of stressing about examination studies and stuff as well”. When discussing any possible culturally or racially-motivated discrimination experienced during his high school education, Randy noted that “there were cases obviously, like once or twice, but I didn’t really find them offensive at all”, cognitively downplaying and rationalising these incidents:

It is what it is, I suppose. That’s pretty much what I thought, and it’s pretty much how it is, I suppose… it was more like teenagers being teenagers, I suppose, and how they just call each other names and everybody has nicknames…I suppose like individual people might have different experiences when they moved over here but mine was a fairly positive one…there was a bit of a rocky way in between [Year 6], I suppose…Yes, that’s really it.

Randy’s words and study findings recalled Yosso et al. (2009) in that
microaggressions involving insults and invalidations may be psychologically damaging in terms of self-identity issues (Mallman & Lee; 2016; Morrice, 2013; Szabo & Ward, 2015). However, it is important to note that using covering, deflecting, and passing strategies to deal with microaggressions are inherently cognitively avoidant in nature (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Goffman, 1959, 1963). Collectively, these strategies are designed to prevent known stigma attributes and connotations from becoming obvious and obstructive in cultural and social interactions (Goffman, 1959, 1963b, 1967, 1974). As Goffman points out, the passing construct is critical for individuals in answering the crucial self-questions that include Who am I? and Who do I want to be? As Randy’s findings demonstrated, in wanting to ‘fit-in’ and take control of the situation, he deflected stigmatised attention and attitudes from others by using humour and accentuating positive attributes. In taking situational control, as research confirms (Goffman, 1959, 1974), Randy endeavours to frame and influence his ‘becoming who he wants to be journey’ (Scott, 2015). Reflecting on his high school education, Randy considers: “I pretty much knew like what was expected of me… I kind of just took that Year 11 and Year 12 as like a bit of… I didn’t take it too seriously”. In feeling “more focused” academically, Randy contemplated post-secondary studies because “all of my mates were going to university at that time”.

The Academic Management Journey

In relation to educational decision-making, Randy makes it clear: “My parents actually encouraged me to go to university, other than doing trades, so, yes, they were happy that I went to university”, adding that “my parents did push me a bit when I was in high school as well”. This educational positioning aligns with research that considers immigrant parents tend to have high expectations for their children, expectations that include tertiary education (Harklau & Siegal, 2009; Roberge, 2009). In relation to South Korean cultural attitudes towards higher education, Lebihan (cited in Snowden & Lewis, 2015, p. 591), reports that “87 per cent of 15 year olds in the poorest quarter of the population aspire to
tertiary study”, while the figure in Australia is fifty-two percent. Similarly, Thonus (2003) explains that additional Generation 1.5 learner pressures include being the first person in their family to become literate in any language, complete high school, and attend university. In recognising the diverse L2 needs associated with these learners, Vasquez (2007) highlights identity issues in language-learning environments as significant factors, while Roessingh and Douglas (2012a) emphasise the social capital pressures and culturally-embedded cognitive structures (Bourdieu, 1986) that build on past experiences in adapting to the present and affecting the future.

**Sense-of-Self Identity Drivers**

Randy’s identity-related study findings align with Bourdieu’s (1986) habitus as a system construct. Reconceptualised in this study as immigrant habitus, this permeable system is one that is “continually being restructured by the individual’s engagement with the social world” (Morrice, 2013, p. 655). Importantly, Morrice argues that in line with Bourdieu’s (1986) concept of field and capital, university education provides a strategy for students to amass highly valuable and valued “tradeable capital” (p. 665). In turn, this capital provides opportunities to establish personal, professional, and social identity statuses (Marcia, 2002). However, in terms of Randy developing the L2 linguistic social capital resources that would enable a smooth tertiary transition into future career opportunities, this academic journey was unmanageable, weighed down by maladaptive affective, attitudinal, behavioural, and cognitive responses that include avoidance, dissonance, and rationalisation (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013). In relation to the divided self metaphor (Ahrens, 2008; Gomez, 2015), Randy explains his cultural, linguistic, and social identity positioning or cultural code-switching approach:

> When I am, you know, in a group of Koreans, for example, my mindset changes to, like, Korean sort of settings or when I’m in, like, with my mates and I will go out for food or drinks, something like that, then my mindset changes. Like, it’s an automatic
sort of thing, like, it just changes, like, sort of thing. I think my mindset has become very adaptive to certain environmental situations, yes.

In recalling Dörnyei’s (2009, 2014) L2 motivational self system, Randy aligns with the ought-to L2 self worldview of surviving and avoiding failure, rather than achieving and exceeding academic expectations. As Randy puts it: “I think in terms of my learning…it’s just I don’t really like aiming too high. I’m that sort of student that a pass will be good enough, sort of thing”, considering that “I’ll be just like an average Joe student, sort of thing”. Lacking motivation, the multi-faceted component crucial to building the cultural, educational, and social capital (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009; Gardner, 2005; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a), Randy justifies failing one unit and ultimately withdrawing from his semester one studies:

Because I knew I wasn’t really going to be continuing studying for this year sort of thing, the results itself didn’t really affect me personally, and then, obviously, I didn’t feel 100 percent, well, didn’t feel satisfied…but I didn’t really have any emotional effect on it sort of thing, because there was a decision I could have made to do the examinations and I didn’t, and these are the factors I could have chosen, but I chose the one that I did, so.

**Scarcity Begetting Scarcity**

In Randy’s educational landscape of scarce L2 academic literacy, coping resources, and effective decision-making processes (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013), it is clear that “scarcity steals mental capacity wherever it occurs” (Feinberg, 2015, p. 19). As Randy rationalises: “I could have put more time into it. I could have, you know, I could’ve, could’ve, could’ve sort of thing. Obviously, yes, I didn’t action on it and that led to not having a successful semester”. In terms of effective decision-making scarcity, and evoking Kahneman’s (2011) fast and slow thinking systems, Randy explains: “I think I tend to make decisions fast…I think I need to make a bit more affirmative action, because I can’t stay in universities forever”, adding that “I don’t try to overthink it too much when I do have problems”. In describing ‘not overthinking’ as avoiding “going into certain subjects too
constructively”, Randy points out that: “I don’t really think about it after I’m done with [the problem] that certain day”. As Kahneman and Tversky (1984, p. 350) explain, decision-making problems involve complex cognitive and psychophysical factors, with complexities becoming evident when the “mismatch of decisions values and experience values introduces an additional element of uncertainty”.

With these considerations in mind, the study findings indicate that scarcity extends to Randy’s academic identity mindset. Dweck (2012, p. 28) discusses fixed and growth mindsets in terms of “entering new worlds”, emphasising that: “In one world—the world of fixed traits—success is about proving you’re smart or talented. Validating yourself. In the other—the world of changing qualities—it’s about stretching yourself to learning something new. Developing yourself”. As Dweck points out, mindsets are “powerful beliefs”, adding that “they’re just something in your mind, and you can change your mind” (p. 29). However, Randy seems unable and unwilling to make the new ‘learning world’ transitional changes, to ‘stretch’ himself academically, and to improve his academic L2 journey approaches. These findings are informed by Stenner’s (2018a, 2018b) liminality and transition concept and the need to transition between multiple worlds of endeavour and experiences. Instead, Randy uses the fixed ‘non-learner’ academic identity status (Dweck, 2012).

While implicitly acknowledging the need to change his fixed academic L2 identity mindset, Randy contends that: “I think it’s more got to do with my personality, and I don’t think that’s something that I can change within a day”. Paradoxically, while Randy considers he takes personal responsibility for his learning, he concedes struggling to meet academic L2 reading and writing demands. However, Randy discounts literacy support as being “something that hasn’t crossed my mind during the studies”. Importantly, findings show that Randy is immersed in the Australian culture. In wanting to ‘fit-in’ and ‘pass’ as an insider, he aligns more as a native English speaker, rather than ‘standing-out’ as a non-native speaker who requires L2 academic literacy support. However, in attempting to deliver ‘passing’
academic learning performances (Cutler, 2014; Goffman, 1974), Randy’s coping approaches include escapist or wishful thinking, together with post-decisional dissonance and rationalisation (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Lazarus & Folkman, 1987; Morrice, 2013; Schmader et al., 2001). This coping mechanism uses psychological deception and disengagement in situations where complete denial is implausible (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013). Crucially, cognitive framing (Goffman, 1959, 1974) uses illusionary ‘anchoring’ activities that are designed to manage and structure difficult academic capital fields (Bourdieu, 1986; Goffman, 1959, 1974; Morrice, 2013).

Collectively, this self-protective coping approach enables cognitive withdrawal that provides psychological distance between the realities and ramifications of L2 academic failure and associated across-life domain tensions. In devaluing the learning domain and the importance of academic success, Randy is discounting the validity of university outcomes by detaching himself from negative semester one results. This cognitive downplay strategy is designed to maintain relatively high levels of self-esteem that guard against self-identity threats that cast doubt on his academic abilities (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013). Using tenets of dispositional and situational attribution theory (McLeod, 2012), Randy deflects blame to the university course: “If it doesn’t grow my interest sort of thing, I tend to lose focus, I think, from my point of view”.

Students as Dissatisfied Clients

Having studied at another tertiary institution previously, withdrawing from his present studies, and planning to study at a third university, Randy symbolises a dissatisfied university client. As a ‘uni-hopper’ and ‘uni-shopper’, it is important to note that in order to enrol in the first institution, Randy completed an enabling course. Describing this course as a “bit of foundation unit…the unit itself when it came around to it was very similar to the Year 12 unit I did in high school”, Randy is dismissive of its value. As Randy makes clear: “the
only benefit I probably got was admission. Other than that, no, I don't think I benefited too much”.

Snowden and Lewis (2015) highlight the increasing marketing, massification, and mediatisation factors designed to influence students’ decision-making, enrolment, and participation pedagogy, practices, and processes. In turn, Bunce et al. (2017) discuss the longstanding position that tertiary institutions are run like businesses with students considered clients, consumers, and customers. Importantly, Schwartzman (1995, p. 215) questions whether “the metaphor of students as customers does place students at the center of the educational process, where they belong”, highlighting the manifest metaphorical mismatches between business and educational sectors. However, given the Australian Government’s demand-driven university funding model, and the resultant diversity of students who do not conform to the ‘traditional’ student profile (Roberge, 2009), providing adequate literacy support for all students remains problematic (Productivity Commission, 2019).

**The Academic Journey Progress Report**

Irrespective of his unpreparedness for L2 tertiary studies, Randy is undoubtedly looking for that elusive and mythical course that ‘grows’ his interest: “When I'm doing some studies or something, that [course] needs to be relevant to me somewhat directly”. As study findings and this narrative demonstrates, Randy’s L2 academic journey was cognitively complex, complicated, and contradictory in terms of Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) five levels, from the individual through to the chronosystem (Kahneman, 2011; Mele et al., 2010). Mindful of Lakoff’s divided self metaphor (Ahrens, 2008; Gomez, 2015), Randy must balance and reconcile: the academic journey mismatch between his L2 aspirations and his future-self visions (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009); his capacity to shape his self-identity performances (Goffman, 1959, 1974); and his ability to fulfil parental expectations (Roberge, 2009; Thonus, 2003). In
being unable to deliver this family-influenced, L2 learning and self-identity balancing act performance, Randy exited his Academic Highway Journey. Using attribution (McLeod, 2012) and rationalisation (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013) to accommodate past and present academic failures, Randy’s academic journey demonstrates Goffman’s (1971) ‘battlefield of the self’ metaphor. This metaphorical approach involves Randy negotiating cultural and linguistic capital and managing social identity clashes (Scott, 2015), together with dealing with conflicting positionalities and intersectionalities (Goffman, 1974). However, managing transitional journeys (Stenner, 2018a) within family systems that include reciprocal burdens and responsibilities (Thonus, 2003), Randy employs cognitive downplay and psychological disengagement as seemingly well-established coping resources (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Kim, 2002; Gomez, 2015; Scott, 2015).

While “not overthinking” all aspects of his L2 learning approaches, aspirations, and expectations, Randy’s academic pathway was ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ focused. This motivational driver, irrespective of scarce L2 literacy resources, ineffective decision-making processes (Kahneman & Tversky, 1984) and time scarcity (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) added to and further ‘laminated’ his L2 academic difficulties (Goffman, 1974; Scott, 2015). As the findings demonstrated, Randy used scarcity-influenced and cognitively-avoidant attitudinal, behavioural, and motivational responses (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) in relation to framing his L2 academic situation (Goffman, 1974) set within individual, microsystem, and mesosystems’ influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). In terms of situational inequality (Collins, 2000), Randy experienced L2 learning and literacy collisions and pile-ups that highlighted academic inattention and a lack of purpose that disrupted and ultimately derailed his highway journey. As evidenced in the findings, liminality-influenced L2 academic hotspot issues contributed to an unsuccessful transition for this undergraduate learner driver (Cheng & McCarty, 2013; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b).
The Future Self Identity Project Journey

Paradoxically, Randy is searching for the symbolism-laden door that offers both closure and an escape route from his present L2 academic journey difficulties to new beginnings and imagined greater opportunities in a different university situation. In being mindful of Cronin’s words in this chapter’s epigram and the search for a special door, Randy’s transitional, liminality-influenced (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) academic journey recalls Mohsin Hamid’s refugee novel Exit West (2017). Using magic realism, Hamid uses the metaphor of the door as guarded entry points to countries that might provide safety, security, and stability to asylum-seeking refugees. As with Randy, the refugees try several doors without success. In navigating and negotiating his L2 academic journey, study findings indicated that Randy is adopting the spirit and values of his host country, with cultural adaptations that tend to emphasise autonomy and choice over obligation to generalised and significant ‘others’.

In many respects, Randy is attempting his own version of “self-branding”, taking “an entrepreneurial approach to the self” (Whitmer, 2018, p. 1) by uniquely framing his academic endeavours and experiences. In keeping with the battlefield of the self-construct (Goffman, 1971), the divided self metaphor (Gomez, 2015), and the need for greater awareness of the cognitive and neurological processes that underpin them (Ahrens, 2008), self-branding involves self-determination and self-discovery (Whitmer, 2018). In addition, Whitmer (2018, p. 3) discusses self-branding as aligning with Mead’s symbolic interactionist theories in that “The self never develops in isolation”, considering that “the self is constructed in dialog with generalized others. [It is] Through this dialog, the individual comes to internalize others’ views and expectations”. However, as Wee and Brooks (2010, p. 56) assert in terms of fostering branding strategies: “The actor is expected to present a self that is constantly working on itself, to better itself and its own relationships with others, all the while
demonstrating that its behaviours are reflections of an authentically unique personality”. As Randy makes clear in relation to his cultural identity and nationality affiliations:

I don’t really think about it that much, but I would view myself as an Australian, reason being is I’ve spent here for a long period of time, and because I’ve grown up with the culture here and education done in Australia, I see myself as an Australian.

**Learner Profile Typology: The Misframing Learner**

Study findings from Randy’s first and second interviews established the Misframing Learner category. This learner profile is influenced by Goffman’s (1955, 1959, 1963a, 1963b, 1971, 1974) exploration of self and identity; informed by social interactions, constructions, and reconstructions of narrative identities; and the framing of everyday social life experiences that includes stigma (Goffman, 1959, 1963b). According to Scott (2015, pp. 78-79), as the self evolves over time and is inherently fluid and fragile, misframing occurs:

When an actor misperceives the frame of a situation, or interprets it differently from other participants. This often happens when one is an outsider to a group, approaching it from the position of Simmel’s (1908a) ‘stranger’ who lacks access to their shared stocks of background knowledge.

Residing within the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory, the Generation 1.5 Misframing Learner profile describes students who have high academic aspirations and expectations, genuinely believing they can achieve success despite having under-developed CALP-influenced L2 literacy resources. In turn, these limited resources are further jeopardised by learners consistently “breaking frame” (Goffman, 1974, p. 345) and displaying cognitive downplay, as evidenced throughout Randy’s academic journey. With these sentiments in mind, Randy describes his semester one situation:

I don’t think I avoid stressful situations, but I think I take a different approach, sort of thing, but I don’t try everything in a situation constantly, if that makes sense,
and then I try to keep a positive attitude towards it, I suppose, but during the studies I suppose, especially last semester, I didn’t really feel any pressure or anxiety and things.

Generation 1.5 Misframing Learners display what might be termed ‘dimming-the-lights-cognition’. This cognitive mindset seeks psychological disengagement from academically-influenced stressors, using avoidance strategies that include deception, deflection, denial, detachment, disconnection, discounting, disequilibrium, dislocation, dissociation, distancing, distortion, and distraction (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013). In using cognitive downplay, these self-protective strategies effectively disengage learners’ self-esteem, self-worth, and sense-of-self from their negative academic results. In devaluing their learning situations, disregarding the validity of more realistic assessments of their academic positioning, these learners attribute blame elsewhere. Misframing Learners are essentially ‘trapped’ by their academic mindsets that are fixed rather than growth-orientated (Dweck, 2012) and informed by the scarcity construct that ‘steals’ cognitive capacity (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). These learners operate on deficit thinking and compromised decision-making (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Kahneman, 2011; Lazarus & Folkman, 1987; Marcia & Josselson, 2013; Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) in order to ‘self-manage’ their acknowledged L2 academic literacy and liminality-influenced learning issues (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b).

Epilogue

Albeit negatively, Randy’s Academic Highway Journey aligns with Mahatma Gandhi’s (n.d.) social activist-influenced words: “Your beliefs become your thoughts. Your thoughts become your words. Your words become your actions. Your actions become your habits. Your habits become your values. Your values become your destiny”. Randy’s unsuccessful search for a meaningful and purposeful educational pathway also recalls Viktor Frankl’s experiential and transition-based philosophy: “When we are no longer able to change a situation…we are challenged to change ourselves” (Frankl, 1992, p. 116). However, in terms
of changing and adopting a growth academic L2 mindset (Dweck, 2012), Randy concludes that “in terms of remedy, I don’t, there were short-term remedies, but such is life, you know”. The ‘such is life’ reference recalls the iconic, laconic, and highly disputed last words supposedly spoken by Ned Kelly, an infamous Australian bushranger before he was hanged in Melbourne in 1880 (Scott & McFarlane, 2014). These are surprising words from a student with an immigrant background and L2 formal instruction that “focused on the practical side instead of literature and everything”. Accordingly, using the words “such is life” demonstrates that while Randy misframes his L2 academic situations, his cultural code-switching mindset enables him to ‘fit in’ acculturatively-speaking. However, the unanswerable study question is whether universities as reinventive institutions (Scott, 2010, 2015) promoting transformative and transformational self-identity change can provide Randy with that magical and mythical academic pathway he is seeking for a third time.

Sarah’s Story

So culturally, religiously, we’re quite different from the other ethnic groups of the region [in Afghanistan]…We were killed off, thousands and thousands of our people were sold into slavery. Dreadful, absolutely horrendous…women were abused, raped. All this, just anything awful you could possibly imagine, Hazara people have suffered that. This discrimination, it continued throughout the decades, and from, you know, from leader to leader. And then it reached the point where the Taliban was in control of Afghanistan and that put my family in grave danger because Hazaras were politically very different as well to what the Taliban believe in…My parents came here to give me a chance at a better life through peace and knowledge. I can’t bear to put their struggles and sacrifices to waste.

The Refugee Journey

An Haraza from Afghanistan, Sarah was five years old when she and her family fled persecution in 2001: “We went over to Pakistan, and from Pakistan we came to Indonesia. Or was it Malaysia? I’m not actually sure. And from there we hopped on a boat”. Describing herself as a “boat person” and a “queue jumper”, the family were taken to the Australian Government’s offshore detention centre at Christmas Island. Located in the Indian Ocean,
this centre is 1500 kilometres or 933 miles west of the Australian mainland and 2605 kilometres or 1619 miles north-west from Perth, the Western Australian capital city. Subsequently relocated to two Australian Government onshore detention centres, the third and final move saw the family settle in Perth in 2007. Sarah was twelve years old at the time of this move, explaining that she “really did resent being there…I missed living in New South Wales where I wasn’t so different from the rest of the crowd”. Importantly, Sarah adds that “in Sydney we lived in a really multicultural area and so everyone... almost everyone spoke a different language at home”.

**The Acculturation Journey**

In discussing the crucial factors that help shape immigrant students’ sense of belonging and well-being, resilience is described as a person's “ability to overcome adversity and display positive adjustment” (OECD, 2018, p. 31). As vulnerability to hardships is dependent on the individual, their environment, and the factorial interplay between the two, developing resilience is paramount (OECD, 2018). However, in terms of narrative identity reconstructions, Sarah seems ‘stuck’ in liminal transitional zones (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). With ‘making-it-happen’ and transitioning in mind, Sarah describes her refugee journey as being:

> An adventure, exciting, stressful, scary and uncertain throughout various times. What I and thousands of others who went through that experience was a violation of our human rights. It was a specific time in my life, it came and went, I’ve lived and learnt from that experience. I don’t dwell too much on it as much as I used to.

> Whether unable, unwilling, or somewhere in between in terms of ‘moving-on’ from her refugee and detention centre past, Sarah’s words, “I don’t dwell too much on it as much as I used to” are significant. Nearly two decades on, Sarah’s past continues to influence her future. Sarah’s words call to mind King’s (2001, 2004) evaluation of Elkins’ (1968) text on American slavery and the analogy used in relation to Nazi camp systems. While King
explains the “capturing, transporting, and breaking in” of camp detainees (p. 157), Sarah’s refugee comments draw attention to the global treatment of refugees and asylum seekers held in detention centres worldwide. Additionally, these considerations call to mind Elkins’ negative transformational components, discussing the detachment, the shock, and the psychologically-damaging impacts of forced detention that are considered part of refugee or asylum seeker experiences (King, 2001, 2004; Ludwig, 2016). Ludwig explains that refugee labelling can be stigmatising in terms of identity development, personal agency, and volition, “preventing them from leaving a difficult and painful past behind, reducing their sense of self-worth, and making them into perpetual long-suffering Others” (p. 6). While being a refugee is just one aspect of their identity, Ludwig (2016) considers this label continues to define them, creating additional burdens in dealing with past home and host country traumas and making positive, future-focused cross-cultural adjustments.

Having completed all her primary and high school education in Australia, Sarah explains her L1 and L2 learning and literacy predicament:

I'm fluent in English. I really struggle with my native language and that has a lot to do with growing up. I just wanted to fit in. There was that stigma of being one of those awful boat people. So language was how I tried to bridge that gap.

This observation recalls post-immigration and identity development research in relation to the construct of bilingual semilingualism, a situation in which the developing L2 comes at the expense of a diminished L1 (Roessingh & Kover, 2003). In managing the academic, emotional, familial, motivational, personal, and social acculturative processes, Sarah describes how she copes: “Immersing myself in knowledge! Educating myself on my rights, on the politics and ethics of immigration, talking about it, writing about it, reflecting on it”. Consequently, Sarah describes herself a “third culture kid” (Walters & Auton-Cuff, 2009). This term, typically applied to people who spend many of their developmental years living away from their home countries, represents an in-between cultural identity adaptation that is
neither their ‘home’ nor their ‘host’ culture influenced. These cultural considerations align with liminality and being ‘stuck’ in hotspot transitional areas (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). Additionally, Brettell and Nibbs (2009) discuss immigrant children’s identities as being fluid and multi-faceted, noting that hybrid ones may develop. While Brettell and Nibbs use the term “lived hybridity” (p. 680) to describe this situation, Goodman (1978) uses ‘worldmaking’ to capture these experiences. These identity development descriptions align with the Generation 1.5 term that encapsulates Greco and Stenner’s (2017, p. 148) liminality hotspot transitions as “events of becoming” and dealing with difficult ‘becomings’ that require active self-management for transformational growth. Additionally, study findings indicate that Sarah’s identity is defined by intrinsically-motivated Islamic religiosity (Allport & Ross, 1967). This religiosity provides the creed that: supports narrative identity reconstructions (Kerr et al., 2009); integrates past, present, and future life story journeys in harmony with religious-self positioning (Holdcroft, 2006); and drives her daily living. As Holdcroft (2006, p. 90) advises “These individuals find their master motive for life in religion”.

The Academic Management Journey

In relation to educational decision-making, Sarah confirms that university education “was a given”, declaring that “you’re here in this country where you have the opportunity for education, to advance yourself, to then be able to contribute back to society. So why wouldn’t you? I mean, it was a no-brainer almost”. In terms of course choices, Sarah advises that in her culture there are “golden careers…doctors, lawyers, engineers, dentists” that are highly-valued, eventually deciding, in keeping with self, family, and local L1 community expectations, to study law. However, studying law requires very specific, CALP-influenced critical thinking skills, along with highly-developed reading and writing abilities (Hinkel, 2004; Roberge, 2009). When asked to consider if her Islamic faith influences her learning approaches, Sarah clarifies her positioning:
Being a good Muslim means to do good and throw it into the sea. For me it means to be thankful for what I have been given in life - for all the good and the seemingly bad, to remain patient in times of adversity but to strive to make something good of the bad, to help others, to seek knowledge from cradle to grave, to show respect and kindness to all, to be brave enough to stand for the truth, even if it means I have to stand alone (that’s a quote from someone I can’t remember who), to fulfil my religious obligations.

Achievement-focused, Sarah has high academic aspirations and expectations, expecting to “start at [university] and do great from the get-go”. However, subsequent learning outcomes echoed those of her Year 12 high school experiences, feeling “very stressed which resulted in very poor-quality work” and assessment grades. Ultimately, Sarah withdrew from her semester one studies, advising that “the increased pressure and the health issues played a role...It was awful. I thought having a change in environment and studying my dream course would make things easier, but it didn’t. I was gutted”. However, as Roberge (2009) points out, high school graduation does not necessarily guarantee Generation 1.5 learners will be able to meet the attitudinal, behavioural, and cognitive challenges associated with university demands. Importantly, additional challenges for Sarah involved her family and her L1 community: “In general Hazara people, we value education very much...But then the expectation is why does [Sarah] find it so difficult? Because she’s been here for 17 years, you know?”

Sarah’s intrinsically-motivated religiosity, together with the importance she attaches to ‘being a good Muslim’, is pervasive throughout the findings in which identity systems dominate. Peek (2005) discusses the three types of religious identity development. Firstly, ascribed identity is a cultural, personal, or social characteristic of individual selves and their standing in social worlds. Secondly, chosen identity, either personal or collective, involves becoming more aware of belief and value systems as part of human development. Thirdly, declared identity typically develops in response to a specific event such as the September 11 terrorist attacks in the United States of America in 2001. Events such as these provide ways in which to demonstrate a strong, on-going spiritual commitment to their faith. While Sarah was five years old when fleeing her home country, study findings indicate that all three
religious identities are integral components in determining her ‘becoming who she wants to be journey’ (Scott, 2015). However, Sarah appears to be profoundly influenced by the injustices, the personal suffering, and the on-going persecution the Hazara people have experienced since the 1890s when the autonomous region was forcibly integrated into the Afghan state (Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2020). As Sarah recounts:

The region of Afghanistan that belonged to us was called the Hazarajat…The Silk Road ran straight through…Like because our history has been destroyed, our documents and written history has been destroyed, but I can only imagine how prosperous and rich the people of that region would have been, because of that close connection with the silk route and trades people and merchants…these taxes that were imposed on us, eventually led us to just lose everything and over 60 percent of our population was just wiped out.

Providing the conceptual framework for ‘living’ her faith, Sarah’s religious rituals provide the psychological and spiritual strengthening that helps foster social advantages, benefits, and adaptive self-regulatory coping resources (Koole et al., 2017). Demonstrating survivalist self-reliance and resilience, Sarah explains:

Seeing as I’ve been struggling with my studies for a long time, I could very easily just give up and get a full-time job or something. But I’ve learnt from Islam that there is a beauty in the struggle and that gives me motivation to keep going, no matter how long it takes me to finish what I started.

In confirming that she did not seek academic literacy support during the study period, Sarah defends her position: “I keep my struggles with my studies myself, I don’t share it with my family or community. Even if they were aware, there would be no consequences”, unwilling to expand further on this view. Paradoxically, continuing full-time studies rather than reducing the semester two course load, Sarah reports that “I am not going to put pressure on myself by expecting amazing grades. I hope to just pass…and slowly build my way up and increase my expectations of myself in the semesters to come”. Nevertheless, in due course, Sarah withdrew from all units. In many respects, Sarah’s withdrawal highlights three of Greco and Stenner’s (2017) four characteristics of liminal hotspot transitioning,
those of paradox, paralysis, and polarisation. While the fourth characteristic is discussed as potential pattern shifts that indicate positive transitional movement, a fifth characteristic, ‘passage’, might usefully signify successful transitioning. As Stenner (2018a) contends, liminality involves movement between multiple worlds of experiences.

Set against a backdrop of scarce resources that include academic literacy, coping, and effective decision-making (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013), Collins’ (2000) situational inequality highway journey metaphor and Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical metaphor are influential. In delivering her ‘learner driver’ undergraduate student role performances, Sarah misread, ‘misframed’, and mismanaged her learning situations (Goffman, 1959, 1974). Miscast in this role, whether as a “sincere” or as a “cynical” performer (Goffman, 1959, p. 28), Sarah displays “inadequate dramaturgical direction” (Goffman, 1959, p. 60). While seeking to realise her full, unique academic potential (Maslow, 1943), in “trying to keep on top of everything”, Sarah ends up “failing at it”. In keeping with the academic highway and theatrical journey metaphors, this failure is multi-dimensional. In being unable to navigate, negotiate, and manage her learning ‘traffic’ performative demands (Goffman, 1959, 1974), Sarah lacks a growth identity mindset (Dweck, 2012), the CALP-underpinned foundational capacities and skill sets, and academic grit and resilience (Duckworth, 2017). Collectively, these cognitive capacities are crucial in becoming a self-regulated, independent, and proficient undergraduate learner driver (Goffman, 1959; Zimmerman, 2002). Experiencing ‘stage fright’ in orchestrating successful student learner performances (Scott, 2007), Sarah struggles with moving her ‘backstage’ course knowledge to ‘frontstage’ assessment performances (Goffman, 1959, 1974; Scott, 2007, 2015).

In due course, these L2 academic learning difficulties resulted in Sarah experiencing self-blame, self-doubt, and lowered self-worth: “My parents came here to give me a chance at a better life through peace and knowledge. I can’t bear to put their struggles and sacrifices to waste. I hope to just get past the line this semester…”. Importantly, in feeling stigmatised,
bringing shame, and losing ‘face’ with self, family, and L1 community audiences by delivering unconvincing student identity and learning performances were evidenced in Sarah’s study findings (Goffman, 1955, 1959, 1961, 1963b, 1974; Scott, 2015; Zhang et al., 2011; Zhang & Grigoriou, 2011). Consequently, in feeling ‘unmasked’ in terms of identity (Strauss, 1977), academically ‘found out’ in relation to the student impostor syndrome (Bothello & Roulet, 2019), and being ‘stalled’ and ‘stuck’ in liminal hotspot transitioning (Stenner, 2018, 2018b), Sarah is forced to take the academic journey exit route. Collectively and paradoxically, findings indicated that Sarah’s Islamic self-beliefs were forced to ‘give way’ to a pervasive academic scarcity mindset that was liminality-influenced (Collins, 2000; Goffman, 1959, 1963, 1974; Greco & Stenner, 2017; Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013; Scott, 2007; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In failing to function adequately, Sarah’s academic studies were undermined by counter-productive decision-making that eroded her performances, triggered stress that depleted available coping resources, and exacerbated existing learning and highway journey transitional processes (Antonovsky, 1980; Lazarus & Folkman, 1987; Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). However, as Stenner (2018b, p. 53) points out, individuals’ typical transitional zone difficulties “pale into insignificance” when compared to the “seemingly endless transitions of migration, permanently suspended between ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’; or those facing the now routinely permanent ‘wars against terror’”.

While having received all her schooling in Australia, Sarah struggled in her law studies. In terms of Dörnyei’s (2014) L2 motivational self system, ‘semester one Sarah’ aligns with the ideal L2 self. This involved being motivated to succeed in a law course that was considered one of the ‘golden’ professions in her home country, being driven by self, family, and L1 community expectations. However, ‘semester two Sarah’ aligned with the ought-to L2 self. This involved surviving and avoiding further academic failure and meeting significant ‘others’ expectations. However, in relation to dealing with academic demands, both the ideal and the ought-to L2 selves required a self-regulatory learning approach that
reduced literacy gaps (Panadero, 2017). Additionally, these learners require an awareness of the micro-situational encounters and experiences in L2 learning environments (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Collins, 2000; Goffman, 1959) and an understanding of the motivational factors implicit in generating future self-guides capable of delivering harmonious outcomes (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009).

The Future Self Identity Project Journey

In Sarah’s first and only interview before deciding to provide written responses to research questions in the second data-generation round, she confirms that “education is almost half of what my identity is”. Clearly, Sarah’s achieved university student identity status is significant (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005; Marcia, 2002). In turn, she explains that “being a Muslim, an Hazara, an Australian, a woman, a learner are all very important” components in her identity. However, in describing her identity as “a big colourful mural”, Sarah points out that “one is not more important than the other, each of them helps to enrich the other aspects”. Inventive and innovative, invoking the narrative art form of the mural enables Sarah to symbolically showcase identity areas that encompass home and host country experiences. In the second round of research contributions, Sarah describes her identity as consisting of “many things, my upbringing, my values, my experiences, who and what I surround myself with, my hopes for the future”. In looking to the future, Sarah advises: “I’m very stubborn, which in a way explains why I am still determined to continue with university. Some others that I would consider are a part of who I am: loyal, optimistic, confident, extremely opinionated and impatient”.

In acknowledging that identity negotiation processes become more complex when creating and using hybrid and hyphenated identities (Sirin & Fine, 2007), identity development may be problematic for younger-arriving immigrant children who have little or no home-country memories (Roberge, 2009). It is important to note that Sarah was five
years old when she arrived in Australia. However, in dismissing the hyphenated identity and being either left or right of the hyphen in terms of it acting as a ‘plus’ sign signalling cultural priorities (Walzer, 1990), Sarah explains:

I came to a point in my life that I realised it’s best to just accept my Hazara identity and that it is possible to be a third culture kid - a product of my environment, embracing my Hazara-ness and my Australian-ness. Also, I think it’s healthy and vital for growth to be able to critique aspects of both sides without feeling like it’s an attack on the culture as a WHOLE [original emphasis]…Australian-Hazara or Hazara-Australian, they are both the same to me.

Study findings demonstrated that cultural heritage considerations, education, identity, and religiosity were crucial components in Sarah’s Future Self Identity Project journey. This journey recalls Giddens’ (1976) “reflexive project of the self” theory in which reconstructed biographies or self-identity narratives are subject to multiple influences that include networks of micro and macro-level consumerism, mass media, and social interactions (Gauntlett, 2008, p. 107). In turn, West (cited in Morrice, 2013, p. 664) discusses the fragmentation construct in which educational and emotional coping resources assist learners in moving on from past life “fragments” or traumas:

Higher Education is potentially a space in which to manage and transcend feelings of marginalisation, meaningless and inauthenticity in interaction with others; in which it is possible...to compose a new life, a different story and a more cohesive self.

Importantly, West’s sentiments recall Bourdieu’s (1986) concept of habitus, reconceptualised in this research as refugee habitus that focuses on developing cultural and social capital resources. The reinventive institution construct (Scott, 2010, 2015) is also recalled in terms of universities offering life-changing educational opportunities for its students. In keeping with Sarah’s narrative identity reconstruction, the researcher’s use of quatrain seven from the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam aligns with aspirational and inspirational life stage developmental change (Marcia, 2002; Marcia & Josselson, 2013):
In line with study findings, storyline development, and using an arts-informed writing praxis, these words convey rejoicing in the present. With Spring signifying rebirth, celebrating and creating a new life in Australia by ‘filling the cup’ of across-life domain opportunities (Leavy, 2019a), the past is acknowledged. While Winter represents the dark times, refugee habitus as culturally-embedded cognitive structures that build on past experiences, Spring heralds transitional change that rejoices in the present and shapes the future (Morrice, 2013; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). These changes also require imagining and welcoming the future and living life with meaning and purpose (Frankl, 1992; Maslow, 1943). The migratory bird metaphor that embodies flight and freedom, change and movement, symbolises Sarah’s difficult across-life stage journeys that require resilience (OECD, 2018) for liminal passage between multiple worlds of meaning-making (Goodman, 1978; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In relation to dealing with Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological systems theory, resilience is required in terms of exploring, evaluating, and decision-making, together with dealing with vulnerabilities, making necessary adjustments, and valuing commitments (OECD, 2018). The migratory bird metaphor also evokes the religious spirituality and symbolism implicit in Sarah’s ‘past-to-present-to-future’ worldmaking experiences. Importantly, data analysis and study findings indicated that ‘bird-on-the-wing’ academic drivers were crucial components within the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory.

**Learner Profile Typology: The Stigmatised Learner**

In line with Goffman’s (1959) theatrical metaphor and description of life as a series of performances, and given Sarah’s unsuccessful learning and student identity presentations (Scott, 2007), findings made it clear that the repercussions of shame and stigma-associated
refugee and host country experiences played crucial roles in her academic journey. As Sarah advised: “I just wanted to fit in. There was that stigma of being one of those awful boat people”, emphasising that “my parents came her to give me a chance at a better life through peace and knowledge. I can’t bear to put their struggles and sacrifices to waste”. According to Goffman (1963, p. 8), stigma refers to an “attribute that is deeply discrediting to an individual”, signifying shame and disgrace, along with identifying a “blemished person”. In explaining acts of stigmatisation, Goffman (1963, p. 3) contends that these considerations are typically directed at people deemed to have attributes “incongruous with our stereotypes of what a given type of individual should be”. Stigma may lead to psychologically-destructive self-doubt and denigrating self-judgement, together with discrimination and prejudices that are direct and obvious or subtle and implied (Mallman & Lee, 2016; Morrice, 2013).

According to Pietrus (2013), dealing with the three types of stigma is challenging and complex, with pervasive negative impacts across all life domains. Firstly, self-stigma involves accepting while not necessarily agreeing with negative stereotypes; feeling ‘blamed’, ashamed, and targeted; and avoiding situations that may produce stigmatising responses. Secondly, public stigma involves prejudicial attitudes, behaviours, and cultural attributions made by members of the public. Thirdly, structural stigma involves prejudicial attitudes and behaviours at the institutional level that may result in situations in which people are denied their basic human rights. Highly relevant to all participants’ narrative identity reconstructions, structural stigma occurs when government policy agendas fail to address issues in areas that include asylum seekers, immigration programs and intake flows, and refugees. In relation to stigmatising labelling that results in victimisation and objectification, Ludwig (2016, p. 16) highlights the importance of “policy makers, the media, and the larger society not only to distinguish between legal refugee status and the informal refugee label but also to acknowledge that refugee status can be, and indeed in many cases is, temporary”. 
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Study findings indicated that the three types of stigma were applicable in Sarah’s situation. Self stigma was evidenced by the fact that despite having lived in Australia for nineteen years, there is unequivocal, on-going self-labelling as a boat person, a queue jumper, and a third culture kid. Public stigma is acknowledged through mass media coverage, while structural stigma permeates through Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) microsystem to chronosystem levels given Sarah’s refugee and detention centre comments. As Ludwig (2016) acknowledges, while the refugee status may be initially beneficial in terms of government assistance programs, over time it may become troublesome, casting dark shadows over future identity growth and transitional opportunities. However, in describing a worldview that aligns with her Islamic faith and her eudemonic, subjective drive for psychological well-being (Krems et al., 2017), Sarah remains optimistic:

There’s a Hazaragi proverb my mother always tells me, “Do good and throw it into the sea.” And I think this sums everything up. Do good, say good, think good without expecting immediate rewards for the goodness you put out into the world, because goodness is never ‘wasted’.

Findings from Sarah’s first interview and from her written responses to second round research questions, established the Stigmatised Learner category. Residing within the Wanting-it-all-Regardless Theory, this profile encompasses students who have high academic aspirations and expectations, genuinely believing they can achieve success. However, these learners are impeded by pervasive, scarcity and liminality-influenced academic mindsets that are underpinned by past feelings of guilt, shame, and stigma that culminate in the present ones in terms of managing their academic journeys. The Stigmatised Learner profile involves Generation 1.5 students’ attempts to reconstruct their narrative identities while dealing with significant biographical, demographic, and psychological barriers, blemishes, and burdens (Kerr et al., 2019; Krems et al., 2017; McAdams, 2017). In line with this learner profile, Sarah’s empirically-based and theoretically-
informed study findings and considerations tend to indicate unresolved self-identity issues (Scott, 2015).

**Epilogue**

In dealing with refugee, acculturative, and academic journey drivers in which past experiences shape Sarah’s future, she struggles to transition in her post-refugee life journey chapters (McAdams, 2001). This is in line with study findings that indicated perceived and experiential perceptions associated with self-issues that include self-labelling, self-attribution, and devalued self-worth in her host country. However, Sarah must also cope with the on-going repercussions of the hyper-saturated media coverage of the ‘war on terror’, its conflation with Muslims being terrorists, and subsequent anti-Muslim sentiments (Ludwig, 2016). In being culturally and religiosity-influenced in terms of restoring psychological stasis and wanting meaning, purpose, and harmony in all across-life domains (Allport & Ross, 1967; Frankl, 1992; Holdcroft, 2006), Sarah encounters emotional, physical and, psychological setbacks along the way during her Academic Highway Journey. Sarah’s balancing act in terms of academic, coping, identity, and learning systems was precariously positioned given her refugee past (Mele et al., 2010). While striving to justify her achieved university student identity status to self, family, and significant L1 community ‘others’, wanting an academic journey in harmony with the past, the present, and future directions was difficult to manage and negotiate successfully.

Sarah’s unresolved identity influences and issues (Scott, 2015), as emphasised in the Future Self Identity Project discussion, were evident throughout the study findings which informed this storied-journey account. In hampering and hindering her academic journey, these impacts are inherent in the five levels of Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological framework for human development theory. From the microsystem level through to the chronosystem level that encompasses patterns of events, experiences, and life course
transitions, these collective forces were set against the backdrop of Sarah’s socio-historical and political factors that continue to be culturally and cognitively complex and confronting. As Sarah withdrew from the study after failing her semester one and two courses, she became a ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ casualty in her Academic Highway Journey. In wanting to “become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming” (Maslow, 1943, p. 382), Sarah’s collective academic, coping, identity, and learning system challenges and demands were manifest as she sought reinvention and transformation through her undergraduate studies (Scott, 2010, 2015). However, it is imagined that in an ideal educational world that Sarah’s eloquently and emotively stated views on tertiary education will be realised: “If I’m not eager to seek knowledge, if I’m not willing to take up this opportunity to be university educated then am I really living my life to the fullest?”

**Conclusion**

This chapter provided the narrative identity reconstructions of the three participants whose involvement in the study ended earlier than anticipated. As these storied-journey accounts demonstrated, living life fully with meaning and purpose is challenging on multiple levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Frankl, 1992; Goodman, 1978; Marcia, 2002). The next chapter, Chapter 5, presents the narrative identity reconstructions of the three participants able to complete their Academic Highway Journeys. Collectively, the story telling in these two chapters calls to mind the contemplations of the poet Robert Frost (in Lathem, 1969, pp. 335-336) with an extract from *Carpe Diem* (1938) conveying the perplexing and puzzling phenomenon of life:

But bid life seize the present?
It lives less in the present
Than in the future always,
And less in both together
Than in the past. The present
Is too much for the senses,
Too crowding, too confusing—
Too present to imagine.
Chapter 5
From Past to Present to Future: Telling the Stories Participants Wanted to Tell
Part 2

In acknowledging, benefiting from, and valuing the richness of detail generated in the Generation 1.5 learner study findings, a two-staged approach to presenting participants’ narrative identity reconstructions is warranted. The previous chapter presented the first three participant narratives. While one participant withdrew from the study after the first interview, the remaining two failed their semester one and two courses, casualties who were unable to finish their Academic Highway Journeys. This chapter provides the narratives of the survivors, the three participants who were able to complete their journeys. Consequently, the depth and scope of this chapter’s storied-journey accounts will reflect the participants’ year-long involvement in the study.

Rebecca’s Story

It was a nightmare for me. I did not want to leave my life in Italy and also, I did not want to move in a country so far away from my birth country. I still think it was not a good idea for my life. I was a teenager and I spent my years as a teenager here in Australia, so I missed a lot of normal things that teenagers normally do. I always say that I had to grow up very quickly because of that. Sometimes I think in the future I will miss the years that I did not live as a teenager and regret all the time that I spent here in Australia.

The Immigration Journey

With an Australian citizen mother, Italian-born Rebecca was sixteen years old when emigrating under the Australian Government’s Family Migration Program in 2013. As Rebecca explains: “It was very difficult, especially because I knew a bit of English, but it was just basic English...going to school, speaking another language, and everything was different. It still is different”. Rebecca had visited Perth previously: “For a holiday, for me it
was fine, but not live in the city…I didn’t want to come here”. As Rebecca explained: “I cried for a week and a part of me did not want to believe that I had to leave everything behind”. As immigration is a life-changing, stressful event (Segal, 2002) with “seemingly endless transitions” (Stenner, 2018b, p. 53), Rebecca made her views clear: “Immigration is a big thing, and that people wherever you go are racist. Citizens of any country do not accept immigrants and perceive them as a problem”.

**The Acculturation Journey**

Study findings indicate that Rebecca continues to grieve for her lost life in Italy, clear evidence of migration grief. Parkes (1965) describes this grief as having two components, the first being the tangible, physical and psychological sense of personal loss that can be likened to the loss of a loved one. The second component involves the intangible, symbolic home country loss in terms of cultural, personal, and social identities and statuses. According to Parkes, migratory loss involves four stages: numbness; searching and yearning; despair and disorganisation; and reorganisation. However, Parkes indicates that with prolonged or unresolved grieving and mourning, internalising these psychological migratory responses may lead to depression. Of relevance in Rebecca’s situation, Doko (cited in Casado et al., 2010, p. 612) introduces the disenfranchised grief construct, “the grief that persons experience when they incur a loss that is not or cannot be openly acknowledged, publicly mourned, or socially supported”. Rebecca’s apparent unresolved and internalised psychological grieving (Parkes, 1965), recalls Doko’s contention that immigrants are expected to adjust to their host country situations. However, Doko (p. 612) argues that societal dismissal of “grief expressions over cultural and personal losses associated with immigration” can make the normal migratory grieving experiences more difficult to manage. In keeping with Stenner’s (2018a, 2018b) liminality construct, being ‘stuck’ in the transitional grieving stages of searching and yearning (Parkes, 1965) frames immigration as a liminal hotspot issue with on-going, across-life domain implications and
repercussions. Stenner (2018b, p. 53) highlights migrants’ sense-of-self positionality, along with the psychological and navigational difficulties implicit in being “permanently suspended between ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’...” in host country situations. In terms of personal inaction to difficulties, Stenner (2018a, 2018b) suggests that these responses can be likened to paralysis in being unable to self-manage liminality-influenced transitions.

As an unwilling, involuntary immigrant grieving for her lost culture and way-of-life (Parkes, 1965), the acculturation processes continue to be difficult for Rebecca. As Szabo and Ward (2015) argue, personal commitment is the crucial component that enables immigrants to positively reconstruct their identities in their host countries. This identity commitment is typified by their English as a second language (L2) motivation and a willingness to consider available options, make informed decisions, and generate personal contributions (Dörnyei, 2003). While there is no formula that determines how an individual will respond to acculturative processes or how long this journey might take, Segal (2002, p. 8) contends that immigrants require “ambition, energy, fortitude, and adaptability”. With these sentiments in mind, study findings make it clear that Rebecca is either unable or unwilling to fully commit to living in Perth. In responding to a ‘waving-a-magic-wand’ happiness-related research question as to where she would be and what might she be doing in her ideal world, Rebecca replies: “I would be in Italy with a normal job, a house, my friends, my family including my cat”.

Beginning her host country education in Year 11, Rebecca advised that from the beginning the “most difficult obstacle was the language...studying in another language is also very challenging”, along with managing the “little things like going for shopping and explaining myself”. Rebecca points out that other major acculturative obstacles included encountering cultural and linguistic discrimination “because I have an accent” and experiencing prejudice and racism in the workplace. Both acculturative obstacles continue to leave Rebecca feeling insecure, unhappy, and vulnerable. Importantly, managing
immigration-influenced adversity requires evaluating situations, adjusting, and developing academic, emotional, and social resilience that influences and shapes an individual's overall sense of well-being (Antonovsky, 1980; Lazarus & Folkman, 1987; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2018). Seery et al. (2010, p. 1025) describe resilience as "the successful adaptation or the absence of a pathological outcome following exposure to stressful or potentially traumatic life events or life circumstances". However, coping with and managing these acculturative difficulties contributes to language anxiety or xenoglossophobia. According to Williams and Andrade (2008), this phenomenon, also referred to as language shock that is part of broader cultural shock, occurs when individuals experience confusion, distress, and embarrassment in social interactions. Williams and Andrade (2008, p. 182) describe this construct as "the inability to present one’s ideas and opinions as well as one can in the target language, issues that can undermine self-esteem and threaten one’s self-image". Given Rebecca's limited formal L2 instruction, under-developed cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), and inadequate understanding of the important reading-to-writing connection, the language shock construct adds to and ‘laminates’ (Goffman, 1974) the linguistically-based obstacles in her educational journeys. As Rebecca explains: “Sometimes I always use the same words, and I know that because it’s not my language”.

While endeavouring to manage these collective L2 pressures, Rebecca declares that she “never liked school” and that “when you are young, you don’t really think about the future”. Leaving high school after six months, Rebecca later commenced studies at a privately-run vocational training centre. With the benefit of hindsight, Rebecca reflects on her acculturative experiences:

After five years, I understand why I was scared and why I was crying. I remember I cried a lot even the first years. I had and I still have a lot of difficult times, times where it was difficult for me to explain myself because of the language barrier. I started to miss even the very simple things that you do not think that they are important, but when you are far away from home then you realise how important they
are. I miss reading my Italian magazines, reading books in Italian, listening to my Italian radio in the car, I miss my food, the food that I used to buy when I was in Italy. I do not feel comfortable when I go out and after I speak some people treat me differently only because I speak with an accent.

Rebecca’s deeply-felt reminiscences align with the following song lyrics that express a fusion of wishfulness and wistfulness:

Yesterday, all my troubles seemed so far away
Now it looks as though they’re here to stay
Oh, I believe in yesterday. (Lennon-McCartney, Yesterday, 1965)

°°° °°° °°°

Those were the days my friend
We thought they’d never end
We’d sing and dance forever and a day
We’d live the life we choose. (Hopkin, Those Were the Days, 1968)

These song lyrics convey the feelings of despair, disempowerment, and disillusionment that were echoed in the study findings as Rebecca’s unresolved migratory grief searching and yearning stages continue (Parkes, 1965).

The Academic Management Journey

In terms of decision-making, parental support for Rebecca’s tertiary studies was mixed. With an Italian-born, educationally-unsupportive father, Rebecca points out that “he actually wanted me to find a job and work, a full-time job...because he doesn’t believe that you can get a good job if you study”. By way of contrast, her Australian-born mother was “okay with it, she was happy with it”. However, Rebecca’s older brother, already studying at university, was instrumental in her considering and enrolling at the same tertiary institution. In wanting greater employment opportunities, and regardless of inadequate L2 academic skills and proficiencies, Rebecca made the bold decision to begin a psychology degree. In explaining her decision-making, Rebecca advised: “In Italy, in high school, I did a psychology
class…and I really liked it...now I realise maybe I can start uni and try, if I like it or not, and I chose psychology, and yes, I like it". As Rebecca makes clear, this decision was the result of dealing with her immigration situation, informed by “wanting to do something positive for myself and my experience here in Australia. By studying and getting a degree I want to prove myself that I can actually do something even if I am far away from home”.

In Rebecca’s academic journey, L2 anxiety is multifactorial. As findings indicate, dealing with L2 teaching and learning contexts while attempting to meet academic discourse community demands and expectations was stressful. While Marr (2005) links these considerations with L2 learners’ lack of socio-linguistic awareness, Williams and Andrade (2008) highlight two sets of crucial language anxiety influences. The first set includes situational variables such as educational activities, social interaction with others, and teachers’ attitudes, behaviour, and teaching methods. The second set involves learner variables including actual and perceived L2 abilities, age, attitudes, cultural beliefs, gender, learning approaches, and personal attributes (Williams & Andrade, 2008). Collectively, these language anxiety influences may trigger cognitively damaging and detrimental cycles of anxiety in language-learning and language-use situations (Williams & Andrade, 2008). Consequently, these situations are indicative of sequences of reciprocal cause and effect in which two or more elements intensify and aggravate each other, potentially leading to worsening circumstances (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Williams & Andrade, 2008).

Importantly, these theoretical considerations have wider implications in terms of Rebecca’s sense of belongingness and inclusion, self and identity, and maintaining her achieved university student identity status (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009; Marcia, 2002; Wikowsky et al., 2016).

For Rebecca, managing her academic journey within the landscape of role-identity theory had inherent across-life domain challenges, conflicts, and responsibilities (Marcia, 2002; Marcia & Josselson, 2013; Thoits, 2012). However, coping within the resource scarcity
and depletion theory (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) requires allocating finite personal attentional, attitudinal, behavioural, and cognitive resources. As Rebecca’s study findings indicated, balancing and reconciling resource allocation in competing, across-life domain demands while striving for positive outcomes in all areas was cognitively complex and challenging (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013). In pursuing an educationally-influenced and underpinned self-actualisation (SA) journey designed to realise her full, unique potential in life (Maslow, 1943), Rebecca was disadvantaged by scarcity-influenced decision-making (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). In turn, the resultant compromised cognition and taking cognitive short-cuts (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) further exacerbated Rebecca’s difficulties in managing her L2 academic liminality hotspot-influenced transitional issues (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). A liminal hotspot is defined as “an occasion characterised by the experience of being trapped in the interstitial dimension between different forms-of-process” (Greco & Stenner, 2017, p. 147). As the authors explain, “hotspot” uses the “metaphor of heat to indicate the fluidity engendered by the situation of liminality through the suspension of the existing normative pattern of a given form-of-process” (p. 160). In many respects, Rebecca’s L2 academic transitioning issues align with three of Greco and Stenner’s (2017) four characteristics associated with liminal hotspot transitioning, those of paradox, paralysis, and polarisation. With Greco and Stenner describing the fourth characteristic as self-actions that drive potential pattern shifts as part of positive transitional movement, this stage seems improbable for Rebecca. In describing her academic journey as “an uphill battle”, Rebecca continues the metaphorical conceptualisation:

I see the roads even more challenging for me…I am trying to overcome these roads with a positive attitude and by trying to face the difficulties and trying to find solutions…it has very complicated roads with my goals and interests far away from me and difficult to reach.

Moving Between Multiple Worlds
In line with the Academic Highway Journey metaphor, and given Rebecca’s L2 barriers and blockages, she was ill-prepared to manage the resulting learning ‘traffic jams’ and literacy-driven delays that framed and positioned her undergraduate studies (Collins, 2000; Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). While ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ in completing her academic journey, Rebecca was ‘stuck’ in L2 academic liminal hotspot transitioning (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In terms of ‘moving on’, these complex sense-of-self and self-worth issues included dealing with entrenched cultural declinism (Edgerton, 1977), situational paralysis (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), and pessimism in host country situations (Segal, 2002). However, concentrating on selectively-chosen and possibly inaccurate and unreliable home country memories of her ‘past-self’ may fuel cognitive biases that influence ‘present-self’ narrative scripts that delay ‘future-self’ transitional growth (Casado et al., 2010). To ‘move on’ Rebecca must acknowledge the self-identity ‘dangers’ inherent in focusing on past perceptions and making continual comparisons that adversely impact in the present and threaten her future. In terms of developing cognitive resilience and coping resources (OECD, 2018), the importance of developing L2 motivational ‘future-self’ guides (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014) that drive reconstructed narrative identities are paramount. These guides or visions for the future require action-orientated, change-focused (Dörnyei, 2003, 2014; Scott, 2015) and opportunity-fuelled evolutionary thinking (Hunt, 2014). Essentially, moving on requires adopting the ‘bird-on-the-wing’ driver as discussed in Sarah’s story, a construct that symbolises flight, freedom, and movement. In Rebecca’s situation, ‘bird-on-the-wing cognition’ involves navigating life stage journeys (Marcia, 2002; Marcia & Josselson, 2013) and finding personal fulfilment, meaning, and purpose in life (Frankl, 1992; Maslow, 1943).

While conceding her L2 academic literacy disconnections and limitations from the outset, as evidenced by making enquiries about enrolling in a university preparation course, Rebecca was unable to make a moving-on, L2 learning commitment. In discussing the L2 educational ambiguity, ambivalence, and anxiety, along with the paradox and paralysis
evident in her decision-making processes (Greco & Stenner, 2017), Rebecca acknowledged “I know I have to work on my academic English”. As Rebecca pointed out: “I have still a lot of things to learn and especially to improve. I think my study journey for now is ok not great, I know I can do more”.

Rebecca’s reflections call to mind the aphorisms of author, journalist, and philosopher Albert Camus. Using the visual arts triptych format, the researcher used aphoristic markers that aligned with Rebecca’s ‘grounded’ worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978) as reflected in her storied-journey accounts (Kerr et al., 2019; Krems et al., 2017; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Whether identity and self-making or words-of-warning and wisdom-framed, Camus’ (n.d.) aphorisms situated and positioned Rebecca’s achieved university student identity status (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005; Marcia, 2002) and immigration-influenced, academic journey triptych. The first panel invites deliberation on Rebecca’s acknowledged home country past: “We continue to shape our personality all our life. To know oneself, one should assert oneself”. The second panel draws attention to Rebecca’s perceived host country present: “Life is a sum of all your choices. So, what are you doing today?”. The third panel, and the most important one given the study findings, focuses on Rebecca’s wished for and much-wanted future happiness: “Find your happiness in yourself”. Collectively, Camus’ aphoristic pronouncements highlight Rebecca’s vacillations and vicissitudes that signal a call for action (Adler, 2008, p. 423).

Throughout the data-generation and analytical processes, immigration impacts in relation to Rebecca’s on-going indecision about returning to Italy, resonated and reverberated, albeit adversely, in the findings. Accordingly, these considerations drew attention to Rebecca’s L2 self-issues such as self-esteem, self-worth, and sense-of-self, along with difficulties coping with across-domain, inter-role, and role-identity clashes and complexities (Goffman, 1959; Scott, 2015). Importantly, Rebecca’s search for happiness, meaning, purpose, and unity in life (Frankl, 1992) was a recurring theme in the findings. As
Rebecca makes it clear: “I am not very happy with my life here in Perth and I feel that my life is not moving forward”.

**The Future Self Identity Project Journey**

In feeling overwhelmed by her staying-or-leaving dilemma and its inherent paradoxes and situational paralysis (Greco & Stenner, 2017), Rebecca’s planning for the future is circuitous and tortuous: “I didn’t want to continue, but then I’ve got my family here, I don’t want to go back, and I also said, if I don’t try, I will never know”. Consequently, this emotional disequilibrium, evidenced by ambivalence, indecision, and uncertainty serves to impact adversely on Rebecca’s ability to focus on her L2 academic studies and manage her future-self planning. Emotionally, physically, and psychologically exhausting, Rebecca’s self-defeating and time-consuming attitudinal and behavioural responses also deplete existing cognitive coping resources (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987) and exacerbate prevailing scarcity issues (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). As Rebecca clarifies: “This indecision makes me think a lot and most of the time makes me confused and I just want to find a solution that is the best for me. I feel sad when I am undecided”.

Recalling Lakoff’s divided self metaphor (Ahrens, 2008; Gomez, 2015) and Greco and Stenner’s (2017) liminality construct, Rebecca is seemingly ‘paralysed’ and unable to determine her future. Rebecca is torn between returning to her home country with its happy remembrances and strong cultural connections or remaining in her host county with her family and feeling unhappy and culturally-disconnected. In keeping with Bruner (2004), Rebecca is cognitively caught between the familiar and the possible in terms of reconstructing narrative identities that result from exploring cultural dialectics, making commitments, and undertaking L2 future-self becoming journeys (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009; Greco & Stenner, 2017; Scott, 2015; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In Rebecca’s words:
The Italian culture is winning at the moment and probably because I feel more close to the way of thinking and living...I think I will always see my identity as an Italian, my thoughts might have changed a bit while trying to adjusting and living in a completely different country; but my values and behaviours will always remain linked more with my home county.

Self-making as a narrative art is both internally and externally-influenced (Bruner, 2004). Collectively, these influences provide the "principal means for establishing our uniqueness", a uniqueness that it is typically “guided by unspoken, implicit cultural models of what selfhood should be, might be—and, of course, shouldn’t be” (Bruner, 2004, p. 3). Ironically, while the other study participants viewed immigration as escape routes and lifelines to greater across-life domain opportunities, gaining an Australian university degree would provide Rebecca with an exit route. This degree would provide return passage to Italy and the cultural life she considers she was forced to leave behind. As Rebecca confirms: “Yes…if I get the qualification and then I see that I don’t like here, then I will go back to Italy”. This finding provides a form of reverse immigration (Cassarino, 2004) in that without host country high school accreditation, Rebecca would be unable to undertake university education in her home country. Collectively, these findings and theoretical alignments demonstrate the dilemmas implicit in lacking self-efficacy (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Zimmerman, 2002), dealing with divided self implications (Gomez, 2015), and managing the consequences of an “uphill” Academic Highway Journey. These findings also signpost Rebecca’s SA-like journey with its Aristotelian-influenced, eudemonic sense of well-being, along with a subjectively-felt one (Krems et al., 2017). As the authors explain, SA-conceptualised journeys are multifaceted. In being closely linked with happiness (Greco & Stenner, 2013) and having a meaningful and purposeful life (Frankl, 1992), these journeys seek accomplishment and fulfilment; belongingness and personal contentment; caring social relationships and psychological well-being (Maslow, 1943). In Rebecca’s words: “I would like to become a person that is happy with her life, with a full-time job, and humble and simple life, I would like to become a Mum and take care of my family".
In surveying Rebecca’s self-making landscape by using paradigmatic and arts-informed narrative analytical and interpretive processes (Adler, 2008; Bruner, 2004; Leavy, 2011, 2017, 2019a, 2019b), study findings illustrated that in managing stressful, across-domain situations, the psychological construct of locus of control played an important role. Locus of control, either internally or externally-focused, refers to an individual’s agency and belief systems regarding the causes of their circumstances, experiences, and outcomes in life in terms of attributing failure or success (Williams & Andrade, 2008). Overall, findings indicate that Rebecca has an external locus of control, believing that external forces such as the actions of others, fate, and situational contexts continue to have a greater role in determining her life outcomes. Importantly, in acknowledging and considering her L2 academic abilities, actions, and attitudinal shortcomings during her Academic Highway Journey, Rebecca demonstrates a degree of internal locus application. However, as study findings revealed, Rebecca’s coping resources are inherently cognitively avoidant, escapist, and wishful thinking in nature. In being ‘paralysed-by-fear’ and incapable of self-actions that might provide positive transitional passage, Rebecca is unable to address her L2 academic literacy hotspot issues (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). As Rebecca concedes: “I would like to improve my writing in an academic English, at the moment I think I use very basic English”. These findings are informed by Mullainathan and Shafir’s (2013) scarcity and depletion theory. In keeping with Rebecca’s immigration and family-influenced ‘staying-in-Perth or returning-to-Italy’ dilemma, she is ‘stuck’ in her ‘becoming who she wants to be’ life journey trajectory (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Scott, 2010, 2015; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). Situated within Scott’s (201, 2015) reinventive institution construct, Rebecca’s academic and identity systems’ journeys are interconnected.

With these sentiments in mind, Rebecca is dealing with multiple across-domain liminality hotspot issues. As Stenner (2018b) points out, given today’s constantly changing globalised communities, liminality will be the norm rather than the exception. In other words, liminality-influenced changes have the potential to blur the navigational and transitional lines
associated with life stage and sense-of-self developmental categories and practices (Marcia, 2002). In turn, this ‘worldmaking-process-blurring’ construct (Goodman, 1978) impacts negatively in self-identity making situations that seek to establish and maintain psychological stasis (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005; Greco & Stenner, 2017; Scott, 2015; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). However, in removing transitional obstacles, limitations, and making changes, Stenner (2018b, p. 52) explains that these components tend to create paradoxes due to the uncertainties as to “what we should ‘become’…”. Subsequently, self-identity ‘becoming journeys’ (Scott, 2015) can be distressing and disturbing experiences with associated psychological implications. Stenner (2018b, p. 52) contends that these paradoxes may lead to “situations akin to paralysis, or to situations of tension and conflict that we call ‘polarisation’…” in which people must address transitional liminal hotspot issues. As Rebecca’s words confirm:

I do not think that I moved on completely from these [immigration-influenced] situations. I had so many difficult situations and bad experiences that now I remember them in everything that I do. Sometimes the bad experiences that I had, stop me to do things that I would like to do or try, talking about university or life in general.

**Learner Profile Typology: The Paralysed and Polarised Learner**

With the liminality construct in mind (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), the impact of what the researcher refers to as a profoundly problematic paralysis and polarity paradox was identified consistently throughout Rebecca’s study findings. This paradox is a perceptually-based construct that influences Rebecca’s affective, behavioural, cognitive, and motivational responses to L2 academic domain stressors (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). This paradoxical L2 learning and literacy finding is further compounded by Yamashiro and McLaughlin’s (2000) contention that higher levels of anxiety tend to indicate lower levels of proficiency. Consequently, higher levels of motivation may lead to a higher level of L2 anxiety, which in turn, may lead to a lower level of proficiency.
Collectively, these theoretical considerations underpin Rebecca’s Generation 1.5 learner categorisation, establishing the Paralysed and Polarised Learner profile.

Residing within the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory, this learner profile describes students who have high academic aspirations and expectations, genuinely believing they can achieve success despite minimal formal L2 instruction, writing practice, and academic literacy resources. Importantly, these scarce resources are further jeopardised by being paralysed-by-fear when dealing with multiple across-life domain challenges and complexities that detract and distract learners from their L2 academic journey demands and responsibilities. With the Paralysed and Polarised Learner profile in mind, Rebecca explains her academic rationale and worldview: “I wasn’t ready. I started just because I wanted to try”. However, in emphasising that “I always thought about doing less units also to be able to focus more on my studies...but I wanted to pass everything and finish my studies as soon as possible in order to get a stable job”. Rebecca’s words demonstrate the resolve and urgency of the Wanting-it-all-Regardless Theory, replete with its liminal hotspot-generated transitional issues that create cognitively-complex situations in which feelings of paralysis and polarisation arise (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). Collectively, these pressures are exacerbated by L2 academic literacy and time management scarcity (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). Rebecca’s storied-journey account aligns with Adler (2008, p. 423) in terms of narrative story telling that is based on capturing the individual’s “own explanations about what they want and how they go about achieving it”. After five years in Perth, Rebecca concludes:

I have learned that everything is possible, that life can change suddenly, but that I was able to overcome different experiences that made me stronger and made me grow up a lot. I met a lot of new people and I learned a new language, even though I did not make the choice to leave my country... My country will always be my point of reference of course, and my Italian values and culture is always with me, but I am trying to build my life here in Australia and if I do not feel happy here I still have the option to go back to my country.
Epilogue

Bruner’s (2004, p. 7) contention that “experiences are filtered through language into verbalized events”, demonstrates the importance of linguistic processes that shape the individual’s identity, selfhood, and self-making stories. Importantly, throughout Rebecca’s storied-journey accounts (Anderson & Dunn, 2013), her words, both spoken and written, mirrored her on-going ambiguity and ambivalence, indecision and decision-making paralysis. The home country versus host country cultural conflicts and divisions were implicit as Rebecca referenced Italy as “my country” and being “far away from home”. Underpinned by migratory grief (Casado et al., 2010; Parkes, 1965), Rebecca’s declinism (Edgerton, 1977) is clear as she considers her way-of-life has changed in negative ways and with resultant cultural deprivation (Elchardus & Spruyt, 2014). However, in exploring her host country terrain, Rebecca is undertaking multiple expeditions that are immigration-influenced and interconnected with her Academic Highway Journey. While demonstrating insight, acknowledging that changes are necessary, and attempting to make sense of her worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978), Rebecca lacks the coping resources necessary to channel these understandings. This channelling involves formulating L2 future-self guides (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014), orchestrating self-making identities and performances (Goffman, 1959; McAdams, 2008, 2018; McAdams & Guo, 2015), and editing narrative identity scripts (Bruner, 2004; Krems et al., 2017; McAdams & Guo, 2015; McAdams & McLean, 2013). As Rebecca points out: “My life is definitely better since I started university. I feel happier, even though there are times where I feel I will not be able to graduate and there are still challenges”. While Rebecca concedes she feels “satisfied and proud” of her achievements, she considers her life in Perth is “not a happy life. I miss a lot of things in my life, I am still strongly attached to my country and my Italian culture”.

Rebecca’s reflections call to mind Goffman’s (1959, 1967, 1971) dramaturgical model in terms of ‘backstage’ and ‘frontstage’ selves striving for impression management that is
designed to avoid being ‘found out’ and ‘unmasked’ (Strauss, 1977). In terms of self-identity reconstructions and performances (Goffman, 1959; McAdams, 2018; Scott, 2007), Rebecca’s study findings indicate the use of paralysed-by-fear framing processes (Goffman, 1974; Greco & Stenner, 2017; Hand et al., 2013; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) intended to address the impacts of social order disequilibrium (Kim, 2007; Kim et al., 2009). Consequently, these across-life domain cognitive challenges and situational stressors must be recognised and addressed (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Goffman, 1959, 1967, 1969).

However, in discussing the future, Rebecca is clear that she needs to: “Do what makes me happy so happiness is the most important thing in my life today. I think we only have one life, so we have to be happy in everything that we do”. In Rebecca’s worldview of happiness and living the life she longs for, the following lines from Walt Whitman’s *Birds of Passage* collection, the *Song of the Universal*, invite consideration:

Is it a dream?
Nay but the lack of a dream,
And failing it life’s lore and wealth a dream,
And all the world a dream. (In Kouwenhoven, 1950, p. 184)

As Walt Whitman’s words convey, life’s universal truths involve an individual’s actions, attitudes, and beliefs in relation to their ambitions and aspirations to dream, to achieve them, and to live them. While Rebecca makes it clear that “we only have one life”, living life fully calls for personal commitment that has the capacity to turn future-self dreams into realities (Dörnyei, 2014; Marcia, 2002). However, in making this commitment, Rebecca must manage and navigate multiple worlds of transitional passage (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a), changing course from being paralysed-by-fear to being ‘empowered-for-evolution’ (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009; Hunt, 2014).
Maria’s Story

Dad thought that he was doing the right thing, bringing me to Australia, so he married and came here, thinking that we’d have a better future.

The Immigration Journey

In 2007, sixteen-year-old Maria immigrated from Serbia with her father who qualified for entry under the Australian Government’s Marriage Visa Program. As a significant transitional event (Stenner, 2018b), Ko and Perreira (2010, p. 465) point out that immigration “can turn an adolescent’s world upside-down” until they develop the resources, skills, and strategies necessary to “turn their world right-side-up” in their host country. Describing her immigration experiences as “emotionally challenging”, Maria emphasised that “leaving all my friends and everything and coming somewhere where I just didn’t belong and didn’t speak the language” was extremely difficult. In relation to aspects of her pre-immigration journey, it was clear that Maria’s relationship with her father had always been difficult: “Dad doesn’t cuddle, Dad doesn’t give hugs, Dad doesn’t say a nice word. Even when I got into nursing [in Australia], there was not...He’s not supportive”. With these considerations in mind, it is necessary to consider Maria’s adverse home country experiences.

The Pre-Immigration Adversity Journey

Maria grew up in Serbia during the 1990s Bosnian Wars, a period that was marked by ethnic, national, and political conflict (Lampe, 2020). Accordingly, Maria was subjected to multiple levels of adverse childhood experiences (ACE). As discussed over three research interviews, Maria’s microsystem to chronosystem levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) of adversity included cultural, educational, familial, historical, linguistic, personal, political, and religious,
along with discrimination, displacement, and societal adversity. Recalling the divided self metaphor (Ahrens, 2008; Gomez, 2015), Maria explained:

> After the war, everything got divided into Serbian and Croatian, so even the school, it'll be the same school, but there would be a Serbian class and then a Croatian class. So, it was... Yes, everything was divided, and it was a bit hard.

After year-long data-generation and analysis, findings indicated that Maria was endeavouring to move on from her ACE-driven situation that continued to influence her present and inform her future. According to the United States of America’s Center for Disease Control (cited in Davis et al., 2017, p. 1), ACE is defined as a “set of traumatic experiences (witness or exposure) occurring before the 18th birthday including abuse (emotional, sexual, or physical), neglect (emotional or physical), and household dysfunction (e.g., parental violence, parental incarnation)”. Additional ACE indicators include: bullying; exposure to chronic stress; family dysfunction; family economic issues such as educational background, employment situation, and income; parental divorce, loss, or extended periods of separation; and parental mental health issues that include alcohol and substance abuse (Davis et al., 2017; Merrick et al., 2017; Metzler et al., 2017). As the study findings confirmed that these ACE indicators were applicable in Maria’s situation, they are acknowledged in this narrative.

In relation to Maria’s emergent adulthood developmental stage, and subsequent transitional journeys, Davis et al. (2017, p. 2) highlight the inherent, inter-relational complexities between ACE and negative health outcomes. The authors describe these complexities as life opportunity determinants that may limit the typical adulthood transition in terms of it being an “age of possibilities (optimism) [original emphasis]”. Importantly, Davis et al. (2017) explain that multiple early adversity exposure can have lifelong, negative impacts on adult mental health outcomes, along with possible intergenerational abuse and neglect in the children of parents who have experienced ACE (Merrick et al., 2017; Metzler et al.,
2017). As Maria’s husband is also dealing with the consequences of his adversity-influenced childhood, and as the parents of two young children, they are cognisant of the inherent implications. With these significant ACE-related factors in mind, and given study findings indicated that Maria’s two-decades-long, recurrent dream plays an important role in her L2 future-self journey (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014), this dream is now discussed.

**The Recurrent Drowning-In-Snakes Dream**

Maria’s recurrent sleep disturbances may be considered nightmares, the “long frightening dreams involving threats to survival or security, from which the sleeper awakens” (Agargun et al., 2003, p. 139). In highlighting the connection between ACE and dreaming that includes nightmares, Duval et al. (2013, p. 767) define disturbing dreams as “vivid dreams marked by intense negative emotions such as fear, anxiety, and anger”. Importantly, the authors advise that these dreams may “persist years and even decades after trauma exposure” (p. 767) as a way of indicating the extent and severity of past traumas. In noting that Maria first experienced this dream as a seven-year-old, Agargun et al. (2003) draw attention to the fact that nightmare prevalence increases during the life stage transitional period from childhood to adulthood. Additionally, the authors emphasise that recurrent anxiety dreams may be associated with dissociative states and post-traumatic stress disorders. In relation to dissociation, using this cognitive avoidance coping strategy enables individuals to disconnect from the negative feelings and thoughts linked with remembrances and reminders of traumatic events (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013).

In discussing the contextual factors associated with her recurrent dream, Maria advised that when her childhood summer holidays ended, she lived with her father:

> Because when I went to school I was with Dad, and that’s when the dream [started]… Like I had anxiety of being alone. Because Dad would work, you know, seven days a week and then he would go and drink when he’s not at work.
Two decades on, Maria describes her responses to the recurrent dream in which she and her father are laying in long grass near their family home: “I always wake up not being able to breathe or like gasping for air...I will be like crying and gasping for air…That’s how I wake up every time, and that’s why I remember the dream every time...”. Resulting from childhood adversity in her home country, these dreams become the second of Maria’s three “…nuclear episodes [original emphasis] or specific and consequential scenes in the life story such as high points, low points, and turning points” (McAdams, 2001, p. 108). The following dream script, in Maria’s words, demonstrates how the past, the present, and the future are inextricably linked.

**The Recurrent Drowning-In-Snakes Dream Script**

**Right next to our house is a neighbourhood house but that woman lives in the city.** So it’s usually like quite overgrown with grass...And there is like a broken wooden fence in between ours. So we’re just laying in long grass on her side of the fence holding hands...just laying flat on grass looking at the sky. And then all of a sudden like all the snakes just come. Like they start pouring from the sides on top of us...And then the ground kind of pulls us in and we just get covered with snakes, and that’s where I wake up...my Dad’s holding my hand and I’m crying...It’s the same dream. Same time, same spot, same everything...I just know it’s tall grass, my Dad holding my hand...Like, yes, I even know which way we’re laying. That’s just been to that detail but not like what we we’re wearing. I know it’s a bright shirt because the sun reflects on my shirt...Once the snakes like cover us, that’s when the ground just goes like a little bit deeper and then I wake up. That’s always where I wake up...Like we sink into the ground...Likely completely covered...They covered us. I think like from the pressure I guess from us and the snakes, the earth kind of like just sucks us in...I think because of like the heaviness of the snakes and whatever, that’s why I can’t breathe...and that’s why I wake up. Because everything is like...Everything is on top of me...Like I’m still holding my Dad’s hand and I can’t breathe because there’s a bunch of...Like a thick layer of snakes all over us...I hate snakes. I’ve had to fight off snakes as well. I think that’s maybe why I have the snakes...And I guess when you sleep they say you can like relive the...Like you’re living the dream at that stage...Like I know it has been happening for so long now...And I never dream. Like that’s the only dream that I know it’s like a repeated and I remember it so clearly...Intense...Like I remember that one so many times it happened. Like the same position and the same everything.

**Interpreting the Recurrent Dream and Study Findings**
The vividly recalled detail in Maria's recurrent dream script involves reliving sensory system perceptions of audition or hearing, somatosensory or touch, vestibular or balance, and vision or sight. For Maria, the intense feelings of emotional anxiety and distress, debilitating and disturbing psycho-physiological responses, and disempowerment and learned helplessness are continuing home country reminders. The dream's theatrical-like framing aligns with Goffman's (1959, 1971, 1974) self, identity, and role-informed dramaturgical model. These recurrent dream performances with their characters, setting, staging, story grammar, and themes are overtly dangerous and life-threatening, signifying a lack of situational agency and control (Goffman, 1959; Kim, 2002). The theatricality of Maria's role performances demonstrates her fragility and vulnerabilities that are set against a backdrop of socially-situated ACE events and experiences. The staging is symbolic, with Maria and her father laying in a coffin-like position, with funereal-like direction and interment in terms of sinking into the ground under the weight of snakes that cover their bodies. Maria's frontstage and backstage self-presentation performances (Goffman, 1959) are symbolically significant.

Drawing on Kohut's (1977) self-state dream construct, the images that represent the self as being under threat in terms of safety, security, self-esteem, and survival are typically associated with the psychological distress due to unresolved traumatic events (Agargun et al., 2003; Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2020; McAdams, 2001). In drawing on literary and psychoanalytically-informed literature alignments (Marcia & Josselson, 2013), Maria's dream can be likened to a symbolic death, with waking 'just-in-time' signalling rebirth and regeneration. Similarly, in line with a restorative justice-like perspective (Ehret, 2020; Goodstein & Aquino, 2010; Heath-Thornton, 2018), Maria seeks to right her familial and home country injustices, "being offered a 'second chance' opportunity to re-start the journey towards acknowledging, forgiving, and reconciling past wrongs (Heath-Thornton, 2018; McAdams, 2008, 2018). Accordingly, this self-awakening provides an opportunity for the adult 'dreamer awake' to reflect on their life, to review their actions and interactions with
those around them, and to reconstruct their life course narrative. As Maria explains: “…I think I do a lot of things to defy my Dad and just to prove him wrong”. These considerations align with the construct of narrative generativity and redemptive-self reflections in terms of scripting that determines ‘who they were’ and ‘who they want to become’ (McAdams, 2001, 2008, 2013, 2018; McAdams & Guo, 2015; Scott, 2015).

Collectively, these conceptual and theoretical considerations demonstrate the significance of Goffman’s (1974) frame analysis construct in terms of interpreting, defining, and meaning-making in worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978). In working towards impression management and problem-solving resolutions (Goffman, 1959, 1974), reconstructing identity self-narratives requires reworking the present-self in order to reconstruct the future-self (McAdams & Guo, 2015). In using a filmic parallel in relation to Maria’s recurrent dream, the dreamer awake is experiencing a ‘groundhog day’ situation which requires introspection and self-actioning for identity change, growth, and transition (Scott, 2015; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). As Maria explains: “I do believe it’s related to my Dad quite a lot. Just dragging me down or holding me down”. Importantly, Goffman’s (1959, 1974) frame analysis considers the fluid, fragile, and continually under-siege-self attempting to make sense of the world around them and their place in it (Goodman, 1978; Collins, 1986). Given the Goffmanian view of life as a succession of staged performances (Scott, 2015), Hancock and Garner (2014, p. 167) argue that in terms of dramatic self-presentation and interpretation, “everything is shifting, fragmentary, performed, and perspectival…the blurring of the real and the staged”, generating responses that may be negative or positive, imagined or real.

In relating this recurrent drowning-in-snakes dream to her unresolved home country issues, Maria provides additional perspectives:
I believe that I blame my Dad for a lot of things, and the more I think... Like I've never really spoken to anyone about the dream, I think it just it relates to my Dad. A lot of things relate to my Dad from my childhood...I think I do a lot of things to defy my Dad and just to prove him wrong, so yes...I think it's mainly my Dad because he was the... You know he was a single father who always used to... He used to drink as well and it was just he wasn't very supportive...I think he put a stop or I think that he prevented a lot of things like not happening. But again, he didn't earn a lot and he could not afford a lot...

**Living with the Recurrent Dream Associations**

With Maria's ACE-related considerations in mind, study findings indicate that her L2 generativity-influenced life journey is redemptive in nature (McAdams, 2008, 2018; McAdams & Guo, 2015). In terms of recovery, redemption, regeneration, and restorative justice, Maria’s recurrent drowning-in-snakes dream functions on four levels. Firstly, the dream sequences serve as catalysts in relation to developing a sense of hopeful resilience, the combination of two psychological characteristics that function as protective resistance resources in responding to pre-immigration adversity (Duggal et al., 2016; McAdams, 2008). Importantly, Frankl (1992, p. 139) explores “tragic optimism”, situations in which individuals “remain optimistic in spite of the “tragic triad”...those aspects of human existence which may be circumscribed by: (i) pain; (2) guilt; and (iii) death”. In line with Maria’s situation, Frankl discusses ‘pain’ in terms of finding meaning from suffering, concluding that: “In some way, suffering ceases to be suffering at the moment it finds a meaning’ (p. 117). Secondly, the dream script aligns with tenets of restorative justice (Ehret, 2020; Goodstein & Aquino, 2010; Heath-Thornton, 2018) in terms of taking control, acknowledging, and making peace with the past, while resolving that chapter in her life story and focusing on the future (Kerr et al., 2019; McAdams, 2001, 2008; McAdams & Guo, 2015). Thirdly, given both maternal and paternal ACE family exposure, the dream script provides the driving force to break the intergenerational cycle of abuse and neglect (Metzler et al., 2017). Fourthly, given the nightmarish elements of Maria’s recurrent dream script, these deeply-experienced and deeply-felt emotions provide a parallel bird-on-the-wing driver in the quest for greater L2 future-self life opportunities and outcomes (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009). Collectively, Maria
aims to reverse and rework the ACE family narrative and improve across-life domain outcomes.

In relation to overcoming life’s adversities and working towards building a better future for herself and her family, Maria uses the mountain-climbing metaphor, pointing out that “like I’m not afraid to work for it, but I’m not striving for mountains. I don’t know. Like I think I have mountains [of past adversity to deal with] already”, adding that she is “climbing up. We can climb it, I guess”. Maria’s worldview aligns with Easterbrooks et al. (2013) in that resilience develops from interactions between individuals and their situational contexts, along with their psychological attributes such as hope, optimism, and self-efficacy. However, in discussing the paradox of hope, Mattingly (2010, p. 3) cautions that having “hope is to be reminded of what is not and what never might be”, pointing out that there is a delicate balance between hope and despair.

The Post-Immigration Journey

With immigration considered one of life’s most stressful events (Casado et al., 2010), immigrants’ abilities to manage the cultural, emotional, and psychological acculturation processes are multiply-influenced. However, of paramount importance are home country experiences, migrants’ reasons for leaving, and their rationale for selecting their host countries (Roberge, 2009; Segal, 2002). Subsequently, resilience-reinforced resistance resources (Yosso, 2005) that include coping strategies, cultural and social stability, and the material support necessary to deal with across-domain adaptations and adjustments are crucial in managing transitional change (Idan et al., 2017; OECD, 2018; Yosso, 2005; Yosso et al., 2009). As Dörnyei emphasises, positive L2 future-self guides must be motivationally-driven, action-orientated, and change-and-opportunity-focused (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2014) in terms of developing and using evolutionary thinking (Hunt, 2014). Overall, these factors inform immigrants’ subsequent acculturation strategies that Berry (1997) discusses in terms
of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalisation. However, Segal's (2002) immigration framework provides a broader scope that includes acculturation and assimilation, segmented assimilation, integration, accommodation, separation, marginalisation, and rejection.

However, irrespective of her negatively-experienced, framed, and influenced family life and home country situations, Maria arrived in Perth feeling “just lost, generally, not just with language, but being, I think, a teenager that just arrives to Australia”. Describing her early-stage acculturative experiences as “a bit scary”, overcoming the L2 barrier, the accompanying anxiety, and cultural shocks were crucial in developing the necessary linguistic resources. In starting her high school education in Year 11, Maria points out that “because my stepmother has two boys, and one of them is the same age, exactly the same age, as me…instead of going to learn English and go to English second language, I was put in high school with no understanding of English”. Feeling “rejected” from the outset, Maria explains:

Usually, as you arrive, you get, I think, 500 hours from government, and you go to learn English, which my Dad did. But I was, because my stepbrother was going to school, I just automatically went in the same grade as him. I failed. I failed English. I think I failed English even before I entered the classroom, because my English teacher did not even want to speak to me…It was bluntly said in front of me that I shouldn’t be there.

Despite this L2 educational setback, Maria advises that she “did quite well” at high school. Undertaking vocationally-orientated subjects rather than academically-focused ones, Maria studied “arts and sports and easy English” with a “wonderful teacher that tried to do as much as she could to help out. And I learnt basic English…So I passed most of it”. After completing high school, Maria enrolled in a visual arts course at one of the Australian Government’s network of Technical and Further Education (TAFE) centres. In many respects, this enrolment signalled the start of her L2 future-self quest for coherence, meaning, and purpose in her host country life (Frankl, 1992). However, it is important to note
that in meeting her future husband on the second day of her Year 11 schooling, Maria met someone whose life had been, and would continue to be, uncannily and uniquely similar. Given the significance of this turning-point, life journey connection (McAdams, 2008), it is necessary to discuss the consequences of this meeting in relation to Maria’s L2 future-self aspirations and goals (Dörnyei, 2014).

Destiny, Fate, or Stars in Alignment: The Living-Parallel-Lives Construct

Maria’s meeting with her future husband becomes Maria’s third nuclear episode, a construct that McAdams (2001, p. 108) describes as being one of those crucial, book chapter-like events that have “specific and consequential scenes in the life story” that individuals reconstruct. In many respects, Maria’s nuclear episode meeting is mindful of Krumboltz’s (1975) happenstance learning theory which argues that every situation presents “potential opportunities if individuals can recognize them and then take action to capitalize on them” (Krumboltz, 2009, p. 136). In addition, Maria’s life-changing and future-self defining meeting is informed by Bandura’s (1982, p. 747) psychology of chance encounters in that:

The separate chains of events have their own causal determinants, but their intersection occurs fortuitously rather than through deliberate plan. Some fortuitous encounters touch only lightly, others leave more lasting effects, and still others branch people into new trajectories of life.

With the benefit of hindsight, Maria acknowledged immigration as a lifeline and an escape route from a difficult home country situation. However, in dealing with the challenges implicit in reconstructing her post-immigration, L2 future-self life, meeting her husband-to-be on the second day of her high school journey was life-changing. This meeting calls to mind the astrologically-influenced and spirituality-inspired Age of Aquarius/Let the Sunshine In (Soul City, 1969) song lyrics:
When the moon is in the Seventh House
And Jupiter aligns with Mars
Then peace will guide the planets
And love will steer the stars
This is the dawning of the age of Aquarius
Age of Aquarius
Aquarius
Aquarius
Aquarius
Aquarius
Let the sunshine, let the sunshine in, the sunshine in.

In considering the study findings in relation to these song lyrics, Maria’s fortuitous meeting foreshadows the beginning of her Age of Aquarius, signalling the arrival of a saviour offering salvation and symbolising a new life chapter. This meeting also recalls Scott’s (2015) identity as a ‘career’ concept with its trajectories of patterned movements, roles and status, and selfhood changes over the life course (McAdams, 2001, 2018; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In keeping with study findings, Maria and her husband are ‘living-parallel-lives’: “Like we always say…like we just kind of…our life has just been together. Like we’ve just grown together”. In relation to this construct, the shared components include: (i) experiencing childhood adversity and dealing with the continuing repercussions; (ii) being raised by grandparents during their childhood and early adolescent years; (iii) studying at high school at the same time; (iv) studying at TAFE at the same time; (v) leaving their respective family homes at the same time, a move that provided Maria with her third lifeline in terms of an escape route from her father, her past, and her step-family; (vi) studying at university at the same time; (vii) working and studying full-time; (viii) dealing with seriously ill grandparents at the same time, albeit in different countries; and (ix) having a ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ approach to completing their academic studies. In highlighting the on-going significance of living-parallel-lives, Maria acknowledges the inspiration and motivation she receives from her husband, someone “who comes into the story so many times”:

But just having that support. Like he’s the person that I can literally just talk about anything. He’s the one that, you know, encourages me. He has the Rocky, from Rocky movies, like life will punch you in the face and you have to get up and do it [try again]...We were best friends for a long time.
In terms of arts-informed alignments, the lyrics from Bob Marley’s Rastafarian and reggae-influenced protest song *Get Up, Stand Up* (Island Records, 1973; King & Jensen, 1995) have relevance: “Get up, stand up, stand up for your rights! Get up, stand up, don’t give up the fight!” (Marley, 1973). As the study findings make clear, Maria’s trilogy of key nuclear episodes in her life, her ACE-influenced background, her recurrent drowning-in-snakes dream, and the living-parallel-lives construct support the Marley musical connections and the *Rocky* filmic orientations. In Maria’s situation, and in keeping with McAdams’ (2001, p. 108) psychology of the life story model, these major autobiographical events have the capacity to embed past events and “ground” L2 future-self goals in the working memory system that functions to make sense of situational contexts. In addition, Conway et al. (2000, p. 271) discuss autobiographical “grounding”, recalling one of Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) guiding GT principles in that researchers must be ‘grounded-in-the-data’. However, for Maria, this grounding refers to self-knowledge and memory linkages to personal goals that are developed through shared life story episodes and events. In turn, these autobiographical events and processes impact directly on Maria’s sense-of-self and identity development. These impacts are considered in relation to generative, narrative, and reconstructed self-identity narratives that are redemptively-informed (McAdams, 2008, 2018; McAdams & Guo, 2015); restorative justice in righting the wrongs of the past (Goodstein & Aquino, 2009); and ‘becoming journeys’ (Scott, 2015). Crucially, these L2 future-self journeys focus on overcoming life’s earlier adversities by reconstructing and reworking meaningful life narratives. These complex cognitive challenges are in keeping with Goffman’s (1974) frame analysis construct in that the “reimagining of the distant past, in light of changing psychosocial concerns in the adult years” is capable of influencing individual’s interpretations and definitions of “what the near and distant future may bring” (McAdams, 2001, p. 107).
Maria confirms that living-parallel-lives incorporates a carpe diem-influenced, ‘having-a-go’, and ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ approach to maximising across-life domain opportunities:

Definitely…Yes. We remind each other why, why is all this happening, and why we are so intense…we talk about it especially when we have our, you know, oh my God I’m failing and everything is ending [situations]. And that’s when he brings the Rocky Balboa, you know, speech…You have to go and do this.

While describing their living-parallel-lives as “stressful”, Maria points out that: “I think that’s what probably drives us to do it. There are moments that we are at each other because it’s exam period and it’s just crazy”. However, Maria’s words suggest a seemingly cosmic connection: “Our life has just been together. Like we’ve just grown together”. While explaining that the practicalities of their living-parallel-lives journey is “exhausting”, Maria concedes, “I think that covers it up pretty nicely. Life is exhausting”. Nevertheless, while demonstrating a sense of hopeful resilience (Duggal et al., 2016) and tragic optimism (Frankl, 1992) that involves turning past sufferings into future achievements and accomplishments. Maria pragmatically outlines some of the potential pitfalls of living-parallel-lives:

My husband always says, you know, people break apart and all that stuff. One day who knows. Our life might go like this or they might just stay together, but we’ll deal with that whenever it comes…And then you’ve had to stop and you analyse your relationship and you’re like, if there’s…But we’ve just…It hasn’t…We’re partners in everything…We love each other.

In keeping with Dweck’s (2012) identity growth mindset in that academic abilities can be developed through sustained “putting in the effort” approaches that welcome learning and literacy journey challenges, Maria’s response is unambiguous: “Like you just have to”. Given their living-parallel-lives construct drives and supports their university studies, Maria considers that this shared journey is crucial to achieving their across-life domain goals, providing meaning, purpose, and unity in their lives. As Maria points out:
Yes, definitely. There is already. Like I find that we’ve learned so much over the well him three semesters, me two semesters. Like just conversation in general with some of our friends…Contributing to conversations and understanding and like, yes [becoming] a more knowledgeable interesting partner that can actually hold a conversation about something that is more than just general day-to-day jargon…Like we feel a bit…I can’t say higher…You know like there are little challenges that kind of keep it interesting as well.

Collectively, Maria’s study findings provide connections and linkages to her troika of life-changing nuclear episode drivers, the childhood adversity, the recurrent drowning-in-snakes dream, and the living-parallel-lives construct. While all drivers contribute, impact, and influence Maria’s L2 future-self goals and narrative identity reconstructions, findings indicate that the living-parallel-lives with its complex autobiographical, culturally, and emotionally-embedded worldmaking experiences is crucial. In turn, this hegemony informs Maria’s Academic Highway Journey and her L2 future-self narratives that are world-embracing in terms of optimism for transitional change and growth (Hunt, 2014; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b).

Importantly, these life journey drivers recall Goffman’s (1961) total institution situational context, further developed by Scott’s (2010, 2011, 2015) reinventive institution construct that likens universities to places that students voluntarily join in order to achieve transformative and transformational change (Goffman, 1961). As Carter Phipps (cited in Hunt, 2014, p. e993267-1) points out, “We live in a dynamic changing, evolving universe instead of a static, fixed, unchanging one”. In navigating her evolving, educationally-driven L2 future-self journey in an uncertain and unpredictable world, Maria requires wide-ranging, resilience-based resistance resources in order to deal with anything “that life throws at you”. In alignment with Maria’s ‘change-is-the-only constant’ worldview (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), novelist and philosopher Iris Murdoch’s (n.d.) value-of-education affirmation is relevant to all the study participants:

Education doesn’t make you happy. Nor does freedom. We don’t become happy just because we’re free – if we are. Or because we’ve been educated – if we have. But because education may be the means by which we realize we are happy. It opens our eyes, our ears, tells us where delights are lurking, convinces us that there is only
one freedom of any importance whatsoever, that of the mind, and gives us the assurance – the confidence – to walk the path our mind, our educated mind, offers.

The Academic Management Journey

In terms of educational decision-making processes, making this commitment evolved over time. While advising that she was accepted into a university arts degree course without the appropriate high school accreditation or Australian citizenship status, submitting a portfolio presentation enabled enrolment. In Maria’s words:

So always in the back of my mind I was like, well I did get into university and I could possibly do it… I started working in the nursing home and just being older, and I’m like what am I going to do with an arts degree… And I always kind of knew that I didn’t think it happened… I’m smart enough or good enough to do, to be a nurse… Like in Europe you have to be a great student to get into nursing… Like as I said you don’t have those opportunities in Europe. You just don’t.

Sowing the seeds of high L2 academic aspirations and expectations, Maria’s previous university acceptance also signalled academic ability and suitability, irrespective of her acknowledged CALP constraints, limited formal L2 instruction, and inadequate L2 writing practice. In Maria’s words, her ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic journey is driven by her conviction that “we’ll all be in the same position in ten years down the road if we don’t do uni… it has an end and it has a purpose and it just has to happen”. However, in discussing her L2 academic challenges and demands, Maria observes that “in talking about my Dad in the dream… it made me realise a couple of things just how far I’ve come as well and how strong I am”, the implication being that her academic journey is another difficulty that must be managed. While describing her academic, employment, and family demands, collectively considered as living-parallel-lives challenges, demands, and responsibilities, as “exhausting” and “stressful”, Maria is adamant: “There’s something that waits after that [degree] that will possibly improve the way of life and then time management and everything else… It’s going to give us opportunity to do more.”
With study findings confirming the importance of Maria’s L2 academic journey drivers, along with navigating interconnecting and intersecting corridors and pathways between multiple worlds (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), Maria is unwavering: “It’s always going to be number one because it’s got an end date...Well kids are the priority. That’s the main thing. I think first thing. But like even our university is for our kids”. Describing her journey as being “self-managed”, Maria acknowledges and appreciates her husband’s support, while noting that, “at the end of the day no one will do your studying for you and if you can’t, not access [university-provided literacy support]...if you can’t find time...then you just kind of have to do it yourself or, yes, try”. In line with the evolutionary thinker concept (Hunt, 2014), Stenner (2018b, p. 52) asserts that individuals must be cognitively flexible and resilient in order to self-manage their lives, able to deal with the “instability, change, uncertainty and ambivalence” that typifies the unpredictability in today’s modern societies. Mindful of her L2 academic limitations, Maria uses a mixture of pragmatism and rationalisation when evaluating her progress: “Yes. I know that I could do it better but I have...I guess I make up excuses, but at the end of the day it’s really tiring”.

In Maria’s liminality-influenced (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) and social inequality-driven (Collins, 2000) L2 educational landscape, academic learning support disconnections and time scarcity are constants throughout her studies (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). Importantly, research indicates that Generation 1.5 learners are seemingly ‘invisible’ in the undergraduate student community (Harvey & Mallman, 2019), neither ‘insiders’ nor ‘outsiders’, effectively caught betwixt and between two academic, liminality-influenced learning worlds (Davison, 2005; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). As Harvey and Mallman (2019) point out, migrants, particularly those from refugee backgrounds, face additional, specific, and currently unmet L2 academic support challenges. Importantly, Harvey and Mallman argue that university access without appropriate L2 learning and literacy support is counter-intuitive, at odds with Australian institutions that market and promote educational
opportunities for all students (Bunce et al., 2017) irrespective of their cultural, educational, historical, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds. In Maria’s situation, the study findings identified L2 learning support disconnections that included: the inadequacies of the university preparation course she completed; the strong focus on online teaching approaches rather than greater opportunities for face-to-face teaching and support situations; and the lack of accessible and ‘just-in-time’ feedback, either in-person or electronically. Based on Maria’s three interviews, findings confirmed that these L2 learning and literacy support disconnections collectively limited her educational opportunities. For Maria and other Generation 1.5 learners, these limitations represent ‘lost’ opportunities to become ‘visible’ in terms of their L2 support needs (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Witkowsky et al, 2016).

In Maria’s L2 academic journey she requires the opportunities and the possibilities to contribute her unique cultural capital life experiences, perspectives, resources, and strengths in her learning situations (Yosso, 2005; Yosso et al., 2009). In terms of Yosso’s (2005, p. 70) cultural wealth model developed for American “Students of Color”, the six types of capital comprise aspirational, familial, linguistic, navigational, social, and resistance or resilience resources. In highlighting the need for improved institutional intervention and support at all levels, Harvey and Mallman (2019, p. 1) advise that Australian institutions “frequently lack the willingness or capacity to recognize various strengths and forms of capital possessed by ethnically diverse students”. As study findings demonstrated, Maria has all six cultural wealth components (Yosso, 2005), some of which work positively, others negatively. In relation to the former, for example aspirational and resilience, Maria’s capabilities shine through. However, in relation to the latter, for example linguistic and navigational, Maria’s difficulties remain invisible in unsupportive teaching and learning environments. However, if non-traditional students are to achieve their true potential during their university studies, academics, administrators, L2 learning support, and teaching staff must make significant attitudinal, cultural, and pedagogical changes (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman,
As Witkowsky et al. (2016) point out, the worthiness of non-traditional students’ cultural wealth should be welcomed as a way in which to increase the institutions’ capital resources.

**The Redemption and Regeneration Journey**

McAdams and McLean (2013, p. 234) define redemption as “scenes in which a demonstrably “bad” or emotionally negative event or circumstance leads to a demonstrably “good” or emotionally positive outcome. The initial state is “redeemed” or salvaged by the good that follows it”. In keeping with study findings and the salvaging construct (McAdams & McLean, 2013), Maria seeks redemption and salvation that is driven by causal influences that include multiple, across-domain levels of childhood adversity and family dysfunction in her home country. Maria explains the lingering reproaches and repercussions:

...I think that’s always going to be a thing that sticks with me. There’s a lot of progress that I have like learned how to... I’ve learned how to say no and to protect my feelings from my Dad, but like there is moments that, you know, he'll say something and straight away I will get angry or hurt in some ways...Like my Dad still puts a barrier between like my family and my husband’s family...My husband knows that my Dad is my biggest enemy pretty much...I’ve become an adult so I know how to say no and not to... Even if I might be hurt, I still can be like, no we’re not doing that...

In discussing her L2 future-self goals and visions (Dörnyei, 2009), Maria advises that she values her Australian citizenship “more than anything”. Importantly, Maria declares that she: “would not change Australia for anything, and I think you’ve given me a lot of opportunities that I would not have had in my life, and I really appreciate that”. Consequently, Maria’s recurrent-drowning-in-snakes dream symbolises past ACE exposure and unresolved traumas, representing reminders of her past that continue to haunt her present. In salvaging from these emotionally and psychologically-damaging events and experiences, findings indicate that Maria is setting generativity-informed redemptive family, personal, and pro-social aspirational goals (McAdams, 2008, 2018; McAdams & Guo, 2015). Maria’s quest for
redemptive recovery, release, and solace is epitomised by her ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ Academic Highway Journey. Summoning-up an almost deliverance-like energy, purpose, and urgency in its redemptive processes, there is an accompanying sense of religiosity (Holdcroft, 2006) and comfort theory connections (Franks et al., 2013).

In relation to generativity, McAdams and Guo (2015, p. 475) highlight the individual’s ability to recall and recalibrate important life events in terms of following a “redemption sequence—a negative scene turns positive, and experiences of adversity or suffering eventually lead to positive, growth-inducing outcomes”. Effectively continuing the dichotomy between positive and negative experiences, Maria advises: “There are always hard bits but you just have to take the good and the bad”. This redemptive-self L2 narrative provides a persuasive L2 future-self driver in terms of actioning behavioural, cognitive, and emotional responses (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009). Subsequently, these responses have cultural, educational, emotional, and societal implications which influence decision-making, goal-setting, and problem-solving strategies (Dörnyei, 2003). Collectively, these redemptively-influenced processes evoke Frankl’s (1992, p. 105) “will to meaning” motivation that leads people to derive purpose from their adverse personal events and experiences. However, in finding this purpose in life through her Academic Highway Journey, Maria must manage her L2 academic learning and literacy challenges and difficulties, calling to mind Dweck’s (2012) identity growth mindset model with its actional L2 motivation underpinnings (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005).

**Considering the Connections**

With these factors in mind, study findings established that Maria’s ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ quest was underpinned by the strong beliefs, morals, and value systems that were instilled by the time spent living with her grandparents. In terms of redemptively-underpinned generativity (McAdams & Guo, 2015), Maria wants to make a difference in her
nursing career, signalling her sensitivity to the adversity, pain, and suffering experienced by others. However, given Maria’s complex selfhood issues, restoring psychological stasis is dependent on achieving across-domain life balance and harmony (Marcia & Josselson, 2013). As achieving psychological stasis involves finding meaning, purpose, and unity in her life (Frankl, 1992), her academic journey symbolically frames and positions these goals. Crucially, Maria’s storied-journey constructions involve agency, difference, and identity (Kim, 2002; McAdams, 2001, 2008, 2018); situational dominants and inequality (Collins, 2000); and worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978) that involve movement and transition between multiple worlds and life-stage developments (Marcia, 2002; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In relation to the complexities of these storied-journey constructions, Mattingly (2010) portrays “life as imaginatively constructed, as hoped for, as dreaded, a valuable thing… a vantage point from which to see how the past and the present are saturated by dreams—and nightmares—of the future” (p. 167). Mattingly’s views align with Maria’s recurrent drowning-in-snakes dream that continues as a waking nightmare. Seeking deliverance, redemption, and salvation from this dream and its associative negative memories is part of information processing that involves complex neural pathways that recognise a stimulus and provide a response (Suzuki, 2005). In doing so, Maria strives to put as much emotional and psychological distance as possible from her past-self: “A lot of things relate to my Dad from my childhood…I do a lot of things to defy my Dad and just to prove him wrong”. However, in shaping her L2 future-self, Maria makes it clear that she is: “Proud of where I am, but I know I can do better”, acknowledging that: “I always grill myself about the things that I didn’t do. I don’t reflect on the good things that I’ve done”.

As established in the recurrent dream script discussion and theoretical alignments, Maria is seeking release from the negative home country situations that contributed to a self-identity constraining ‘psychological prison’. In turn, this ‘psychological imprisonment’ provides a platform for self-reflection, a representational frame that demonstrates the culmination of Maria’s multiple, ‘laminated’ (Goffman, 1974) levels of childhood adversity. In
keeping with this narrative theme, the lyrics from Bob Marley’s experientially-informed, protest-focused, and spiritually-strengthening *Redemption Song* (1980) (Island Records, 1980; King & Jensen, 1995) afford a musical parallel. Marley’s message of deliverance, freedom, redemption, and transformation is clear: “Emancipate yourselves from mental slavery, None but ourselves can free our minds”. As Frankl (1992, p. 9) asserts, “to survive is to find meaning in the suffering”, maintaining that while many things can be taken away from a person dealing with adversity, what “remains is “the last of human freedoms”—the ability to choose one’s attitude in a given set of circumstances”. In choosing one’s attitude, Giddens’ (1976) reflexive self and self-identity is recalled as a mechanism for the psychological examination of the past, the present, and the future (Adams, 2003). These considerations also indicate a restorative justice-like approach (Goodstein & Aquino, 2010) with the inherent actional process orientations (Dörnyei, 2003) that underpin Maria’s redemptive-self L2 motivations (McAdams, 2008, 2018).

Maria’s future-focused, ‘wanting-it-all regardless’ academic journey is strengthened by coping resources that include hopeful resilience (Duggal et al., 2016), the paradox of hope (Mattingly, 2010), and tragic optimism (Frankl, 1992). For Maria, the necessary academic L2 future-self factors include maintaining self-belief, self-esteem, and self-worth, along with having the confidence that results from self-efficacy when managing liminal hotspot issues (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018b). However, to realise her true academic potential, Maria requires on-going, targeted, and timely L2 learning and literacy support that is provided in welcoming environments (Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Witkowsky et al., 2016), all of which are scarce commodities in her tertiary education landscape. These crucial considerations call to mind Stevenson’s (1991, p. 102) fears about “at-risk students who are delivered by the redemption of learning”. Accordingly, Stevenson delivers a rallying call in terms of educators’ redeeming learning “by making it collaborative, thematic, oral, and charged with high expectations”. However, Maria’s study findings indicate that this nearly three-decades-old call for pedagogical change remains unanswered. Accordingly, Maria’s
Generation 1.5 learner profile aligns with McAdams' (2008, 2018) redemptive life story model. The dichotomies and paradoxes implicit in McAdams’ narrative genre enable Maria to ‘anchor’ past-self adversities with negative outcomes in order to imagine future-self goals with positive outcomes.

The Future Self Identity Project Journey

With the benefit of hindsight, Maria acknowledges the importance of immigrating to Australia in 2007:

Probably the best thing that has ever happened. It definitely is. Like I don’t know where I would be. What would I do? Like I wouldn’t have had opportunity. I wouldn’t have met my friends. I wouldn’t have met my husband. Like none of this would have happened if we had not come.

Maria’s major immigration and L2 identity-influenced nuclear episode life drivers continue to influence her Academic Highway Journey. Firmly focused on the future, Maria makes the point that achieving life goals is about “putting in the effort. Like you just have to”, explaining that:

Because both of us are working, you know. We’re working jobs and we’re earning money and that’s all fine but, you know, in 10, 15 years down the line, down the track, we want to be a family that...We don’t have to have a lot but you know, we can take two-week holidays with our kids a year. Weekend just do things, you know. Not have a lot. I don’t have to have a mansion and I don’t know what, but just be comfortable and be able to afford these things and send our kids to university. Like I want to be a mom that, you know, stays at home for however long you need as long as you finish school.

Having lived in Perth for over thirteen years, most of this time situated within her living-parallel-lives construct, this period has signalled positive identity and across-domain transformational and transformative growth (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). As narratives demonstrate life in progress and life that is ‘grounded’ in worldmaking experiences...
(Goodman, 1978; Mattingly, 2010; McAdams, 2001), Maria reflects on the present while ruminating on the past and its associative memories (Suzuki, 2005):

I love...As hard as it is, I love my life. I do. I love what we’ve achieved and I love what we’re working on. There is always hard bits but you just have to take the good and the bad and just take it as it comes really...I come from much more simple way of living so I appreciate little things...I see it from maybe a different point of view. So the simple way back in Serbia, I lived in a village, you know. Like we didn't have...We had chickens and we had the backyard. Your dig your gardens and you do things. Like you don’t just go the shop and buy food. Like it’s still a simpler way of living.

**Learner Profile Typology: The Redemptive Learner**

As Maria salvages from the negatives of the past in order to create positives in the future, obtaining a university degree symbolises redemption and salvation through education (Stevenson, 1991). In doing so, this approach establishes the Generation 1.5 Redemptive Learner category that resides within the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. This learner profile describes students whose past adversities are used to deliver “redemptive sequences” (McAdams & Guo, 2015, p. 475) in educational situations that are designed to deliver fair and positive outcomes or restorative and procedural justice (Goodstein & Aquino, 2010; Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.). These learners have high L2 academic aspirations and expectations, genuinely believing they can achieve success regardless of any across-domain barriers and breakdowns along the way. However, in turning redemptive-based goals into academic realities, these learners must overcome major L2 academic learning and literacy challenges. With under-developed CALP (Cummins, 2008) and minimal formal L2 instruction (Hinkel, 2004, 2013), dealing with inadequate formal reading-to-writing instruction and practice (Gallagher, 2011, 2014) adds to Maria’s L2 literacy limitations. These learning loads are further exacerbated by a lack of accessible, targeted, and timely L2 academic support services (Harvey & Mallman, 2019). Collectively, these redemptive and regenerative components and L2 educational hurdles are positioned within the Redemptive Learner profile. In this profile learners reconceptualise their past and their present in ways that positively propel their futures (McAdams & Guo, 2015).
Epilogue

Maria’s Academic Highway Journey symbolises her L2 future-self goals and visions in her host country. With a redemptive-self orientation to redress the wrongs of the past, Maria refuses to settle for anything less than ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’. Maria is maximising her freedom to choose, to take control, and to become the person she wants to be—wanting to reduce the gap between her aspirational goals and achieving them (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009; Scott, 2015). As Maria has made clear, immigrating to Australia has “given me a lot of opportunities that I would not have had in my life”. Being given the golden gift of opportunity, the living-parallel-lives construct, marriage, and children have provided Maria with the emotional and psychological stability she sought. Importantly, Maria’s exodus-like search for the ‘promised land’ is epitomised in her L2 academic journey with its reconstruction, redemption, and salvation positionings. As the study findings demonstrate, Maria is driven by her dreamer awake, ‘getting-up and standing-up’ attitude to dealing with life’s adversities. Collectively, Maria’s narrative highlights the complexities of the Generation 1.5 Redemptive Learner profile. In representing the real-life dramas, the identity-making performances, and the self-defining life story episodes, Maria’s sense of personal destiny is embodied in the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory.

‘Letting-the-sunshine-in’ and welcoming the dawning of a new world of opportunities and possibilities, Maria is turning her L2 future-self, post-immigration “world right-side-up” (Ko & Perreira, 2010, p. 465). In choreographing her upward Academic Highway Journey spiral (Fredrickson, 2009), Maria is embracing redemptive and regenerative opportunities for scripting self-identity changes (McAdams & Guo, 2015). Importantly, Maria is harnessing the possibilities of reinventive and transformative change (Scott, 2010, 2015). The words of McAdams (2008, p. 20) echo Maria’s immigration-influenced, education-driven, and future-focused worldview:
Redemption comes to me in the form of atonement, recovery, emancipation, enlightenment, upward mobility, and/or the actualization of my good inner self. As the plot unfolds, I continue to grow and progress. I bear fruit; I give back; I offer a unique contribution. I will make a happy ending, even in a threatening world.

Louisa’s Story

I come from a country that has a lot of issues but, at the same time, people are very optimistic and very positive. That makes a difference…I thought it was going to be the same experience as in the UK…then when I’m here [in Australia] I’m older. It was a bit of a struggle at the beginning, finding my place…feeling at home…understanding the culture…getting used to not being independent and all that, that was more difficult.

The Immigration Journeys

Colombian-born Louisa was thirty-three years old when she immigrated under the Australian Government’s Marriage Visa Program in 2011. However, for Louisa, this was her third experience dealing with immigration-related cultural adjustments, adversities, and life upheavals. Given the uniqueness of this study situation, and in keeping with the Goffmanian view of life as a series of staged performances (Scott, 2015), Louisa’s immigration experiences are discussed in terms of a trilogy of acculturation journeys. In using an arts-informed approach to narrative identity reconstructions (McAdams, 2008), Louisa’s journeys represent significant life stage challenges, epiphanies, nuclear episodes, and turning-point events in her life. In Louisa’s words:

We all have unique experiences but there are a lot of people that, like me, have lived in other countries and that have shaped in a way… not equally… but in a way has influenced the way we do things and [our] take on the world. I think what might be a bit different is that I come from a country that has a lot of issues… it’s like a mindset that is part of my culture, the ability to be resilient despite the difficulties.

The First Acculturation Journey: The United Kingdom
As a thirteen-year-old arriving in the United Kingdom [UK] with her family in 1992, Louisa points out that “it was like putting me in another planet, it was horrible. I felt like in kindergarten when my Mum dropped me off at the school the first day”. Accordingly, Louisa makes it clear that starting Year 8 with little L2 skills was “overwhelming and a tremendous load on my shoulders, I felt minuscule and hopeless, very scared and intimidated by the school environment. It was a very aggressive place”. In terms of the culture shock she initially experienced, Louisa discussed bullying, discrimination, linguistic, personal and social marginalisation, and racism. Collectively, these components represent multiple and multifaceted ACE factors (Davis et al., 2017). Louisa related two negative encounters, one physically threatening and one verbally denigrating. The first incident “was the really bad bullying incident, where a group of girls came after me with a baseball bat to beat me up…bad days”. As Louisa emphasised: “I was not used to that in Colombia, where it’s very violent, but you don’t see that violence translated at school. Violence is something adults do. Violence is not something you see at schools”. The second incident was verbally and racially motivated, involving an encounter in which “one girl said to me that I was odd because I was not black or white”, surprising to Louisa because in Colombia: “A lot of people we are very mixed”. These incidents recall microaggressions in terms of assaults, insults, and invalidations (Yosso et al., 2009).

Study findings from Louisa’s four interviews indicated that she struggled to develop the adaptive coping mechanisms necessary to manage competing cultural identity, sense-of-self, and “self-in-process” (Kerr et al., 2019, p. 2) clashes in external and internal situational environments (Guidano, 1991; McAdams & Guo, 2015; McAdams & McLean, 2013). Lacking the bicultural competency and cognitive flexibility resources necessary to deal with her ACE-informed psychological anxiety, cognitive and physical disengagement, and identity-related distress (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013), Louisa advised: “I think I got depression…I didn’t want to wake up in the morning and get ready to go to school”. While attending classes for L2 learners was beneficial, Louisa described her early-stage acculturative experiences:
I felt vulnerable, unprotected. I felt scared like petrified really of not being able to communicate my feelings, my needs. Like not being able to connect with other people like I will be mimicking everything basically, so I didn't understand the nuances and the social cues you know like culturally we’re so different. So you don’t stare and in my country you stare at people.

Moving to a different London high school improved Louisa’s personal safety and security situation, along with generating more positive, across-life domain acculturative experiences. However, in acknowledging that “there were still lots of people you know different colours, different countries but they all had one thing in common; we were all Catholic”, a religious consideration that surfaced throughout the study findings. In relation to developing L2 capabilities, Louisa explained that it was only “after probably six months I could have a conversation that made sense and by nine months I felt very confident having a conversation, [but] not writing”. However, after four years in the UK, Louisa reluctantly returned to Colombia with her mother and two sisters:

We returned because the marriage was breaking down, my Dad was having an affair…my Mum was sick of the situation with my Dad…she decided she had enough and wanted to go back home. It was a very difficult time for me, trying to convince her to stay.

The move signalled a second cycle of negative cultural adjustments and vulnerabilities. In having to deal with family and personal life adversities and upheavals, Louisa also encountered return migration or reverse immigration discrimination (Cassarino, 2004).

The Second Acculturation Journey: Reintegrating and Repositioning in Colombia

Readjusting to a changed family life situation in Colombia was an extremely challenging situation for Louisa because her father:
Stopped taking care of us financially and emotionally and the next five years was a struggle for my Mum to put us through school, for three girls, uniforms, food, books, medicals, clothes, etcetera. Tough times, I can’t bring myself to forgive my Dad. He was very irresponsible. I love him and try to take care of him and his needs. But I resent him. Forgiveness is a hard one for me. This is an issue that permeates into all of my relationships: personal and work related. It’s hard for me to forgive and to move on.

With her father abandoning the family, a further layer of adversity and complexity compounded the psychological distress and educational upheaval experienced on returning to Colombia. These impacts were felt in multiple ways in across-life domains. As the findings determined, Louisa’s “tough times” in relation to schooling continued. It is worth noting that Louisa experienced frequent learning disruptions during her Colombian primary school education. Describing these educational years as “just like a hole. Like a gap. Like a knowledge gap”, Louisa added that “I think I had like an attention deficit but I don’t think I was diagnosed…I had lots of issues concentrating, remembering…my teacher used to beat me up, it was a mess…that was in Year 2”. However, in returning from the UK as a seventeen-year-old, Louisa experienced one of the major difficulties facing returning Colombian citizens, dealing with incompatible educational systems (Battistella, 2018; Cassarino, 2004). While Louisa had completed Years 8-11 in the UK, in the absence of an agreement between the two countries, she was forced to repeat her high school education. Feeling excluded and unwanted, being told that she was “too old” and that she would be a “bad influence for the younger kids”, finding a school that would accept her enrolment was problematical. In Louisa’s words: “My Mum just you know was almost on her knees please, please take her. And then they took me”. In terms of return migration reintegration and repositioning issues, Louisa’s education was set back by four years, along with subsequent implications in terms of self-identity transitions and the typical life stage developmental processes (Marcia, 2002). In many respects, this reverse immigration situation mirrored the educational adjustments and the psychological unpreparedness she experienced in her UK schooling.
In relation to tertiary education, Louisa completed a university degree in visual design and communication in 2008. Working as a part-time teacher in the vocational training area, Louisa described this experience as “awesome”, emphasising that: “I loved it and I thought oh my God, I want to do this forever”. In 2010 Louisa started corresponding with her future husband, an American-born teacher living in Perth, Western Australia. Louisa visited him once before immigrating to Australia in 2011.

The Third Acculturation Journey: Crossing, Passing, Positionality, and Reconstruction in Australia

I felt that I was going to adapt here so easily…hit the ground running…it hasn’t been…it has been quite difficult.

Immigrating to marry, to have “a husband which I could have babies with, which I could have steady family life” for herself and her young daughter, Louisa made it clear to her future husband that “if we’re going to be together, it’s just you and me together. I don’t want to have to deal with unfaithfulness”. In many respects, Louisa’s immigration to Australia can be considered an escape route or a lifeline from her family relationship difficulties and divorce in Colombia to opportunities in Australia that promised “the family values” and the stable family life that she sought. As Louisa emphasised: “I wanted a family. That’s what I wanted”. With these worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978) in mind, Louisa married in 2012. Firmly-focused on achieving future happiness, Louisa put her past negative events behind her, steering a course towards a better and brighter future in Perth. In line with making new beginnings, Louisa intended to start university as soon as possible. However, family-related goals took priority:

When we do everything that we want to do, I want to go back to uni and become a teacher. He goes sweet. Let’s do that. And so, we started working like crazy and saving up for a house. That took a long time and then finally we bought a house and then I said to [my husband], I said okay so I’m going to go into uni. He said oh why don’t you wait until…Because we were travelling that end of year to America and Colombia. He said let’s save for the trip, let’s do the trip and then you do it after that.
And so I thought yes, I’m going to come back in January, wait and then go into university. And that was in 2017.

In working towards realising her university-related, L2 future-self goals, Louisa recalls: “I feel that I was very efficient from the beginning, getting a job, working, saving with my husband…Everything we planned, we did”.

**The Academic Management Journey**

One of the reasons why I’m here is because I always wanted to do this when I was back at home [in Colombia], but circumstances and time, and things that happened, got in the way of being a teacher, or becoming a teacher. And then when I got here, I knew that I wanted to do it, but my husband and I had goals, like building a house, and being financially secure…I had to wait. But also, I realised that the more that I delayed doing it, the less I could grow as a professional and do what I wanted to do…to be able to achieve that dream, and also seeing that I had other possibilities in life, to fulfil my dreams, not only being a graphic designer, but also becoming an educator.

In relation to Louisa’s Academic Highway Journey, the storied-approach (Anderson & Dunn, 2013) involves the years 2017, 2018, and 2019, with each year treated as a significant chapter in keeping with McAdams’ (2001) life story model. These life chapters focus predominantly on the words, findings, and literature alignments resulting from Louisa’s fourth, optional interview. In using this narrative model, findings confirmed previous study results as well as generating greater understandings of Louisa’s “praxis of living” and the seemingly endless circularity of acting, constructing, experiencing, explaining, meaning-making, recognising, and reflecting on her worldmaking experiences (Guidano, 1991, p. 5). Given the multiple across-domain impacts on Louisa’s L2 academic journey approach in the 2018 study year, the 2017 life chapter functions as a prequel and 2019 as a sequel. In keeping with an arts-informed research and writing praxis, Louisa’s narrative reconstructions considered the culturally and psychosocially-embedded structural complexities of these years. With data analysis and findings demonstrating the significance of key life events, the positives and the negatives, the meaning-making and morality-based processes were
inherent in Louisa making adaptive, self-identity transitions and transformations. However, the overarching driver, the importance of tertiary education, was critical in Louisa understanding who she was, who she is now, and who she wanted to become (Dornyei, 2014; Guidano, 1991; McAdams, 2001, 2008; McAdams & Guo, 2015; McAdams & McLean, 2013; Scott, 2015). In Louisa’s words:

I feel that because this is what I wanted all along from the beginning since I arrived here, and I had to wait because we were saving for the house, we were saving to pay off debts, we were getting our family comfortable and in a good financial position, I had to push away my dreams and my desires to allow for all those other things to happen. So now it’s like, okay, let’s go. Let’s do it.

2017: The Year of Wreckage—The Prequel

Prior to enrolling at university, Louisa completed an International English Language Testing System assessment or IELTS, passing all language modalities except writing. As Louisa explains: “Since I came to Australia I made like an effort to read more so I can improve my writing style”. However, after passing the university-organised writing test, Louisa enrolled in her design and technology education degree. Aligning with the life story model of identity (McAdams, 2001; 2018), Louisa’s triadic life chapter interpretations recall Goffman’s dramaturgical metaphor model (1959, 1967, 1971), frame analysis (1974) and the Goffmanian view “that social life is organised like a theatrical performance” (Scott, 2007, p. 191). Affording significant theoretical contributions to the study findings, the following interpretive frames or narrative snapshots provide the backdrop, the story line complexities, and the ‘stage fright’ (Scott, 2007, 2015) impressions and experiences that were crucial factors in Louisa’s Academic Highway Journey performances:

2017 was a wreckage. When you see those accidents in the highway, where one truck hits the other and hits the other and hits the other...a domino effect. So, I feel like something happened to me, and then another thing, and then another thing. And the ball kept getting bigger and bigger. And my anger and inability to forgive just spiralled out of control. And I think that that’s something probably that I need to work on. My ability to forgive and move on, and all that stuff. But back then, and probably still now, it was very difficult...So, when I lost the baby it was the worst blow...And I
was trying to get a lot of normalcy, as much as I could. So, I remember that in the week that I lost my baby, that’s when I signed up to uni or I got the reply, you are successful.

**It’s [2017] a prequel.** So I said to him, I’m going to leave you…But I was emotionally and mentally a wreck [dealing with husband’s unfaithfulness]…And that was the end. I was like, what the hell are you doing to me? I just lost your baby. How can you be so heartless and cold, and inconsiderate, and evil…I just wanted to die. And I thought, if I’m alone, I’m going to do something. And I don’t want to be alone. And I don’t want to be in a position where [name of Louisa’s daughter] suffers what I’m going through. So, I just stayed. But I stayed bitter.

**So, 2017, our relationship just took a dive…**And I think also me being here [studying at university] all the weekends was a coping mechanism so I wouldn’t be at home. Because I couldn’t study when I was with him at home. I couldn’t concentrate. I just couldn’t. I just needed to be out there. And when I got here, I was able to just sit down and power through all my stuff.

As Louisa’s words demonstrate, she is attempting to make sense of her 2017 Year of Wreckage worldmaking experiences. However, in seeking what McAdams (2001, p.102) refers to as an “integrative configuration of self-in-the-adult-world”, this configuration requires integrating the “wide range of different, and probably conflicting, roles and relationships that characterize a given life in the here and now”. As McAdams (2001) points out, these integrative cognitive processes must function diachronically and synchronically, in ways that can be viewed as “integral of the same self-configuration” while being “brought meaningfully together into a temporally organised whole” (p. 102).

Louisa’s self-in-progress or self-in-turmoil identity considerations recall Goffman’s (1959, 1967, 1971) dramaturgical model and the framing construct (1974) that defines and interprets social interaction, self-presentation, and impression management. Accordingly, these theoretical components consider the complexities and dichotomies implicit in managing an individual’s key praxis of living episodes and events (Guidano, 1991). In relation to ‘self-as-process’ changes and transformations (Gerzi, 2016), the divided self metaphor (Ahrens, 2008; Gomez, 2015) discusses the dichotomy of emotions and rationality that are inherent in social interactions. In turn, the notion of a “bipolar selfhood” (Guidano, 1991, p. 13) that differentiates between the internal, inside ‘self as subject’ and the external,
outside ‘self as object’ requires theoretical examination (Ahrens, 2008). However, as McAdams (2001, p. 101) asserts, developing an integrated self-identity that reconciles the ever-changing biographical, causal, temporal, and thematic influences into a coherent and cohesive life story is cognitively challenging and psychologically complex. Importantly, McAdams suggests that life stories “may be well situated to play an integrative role in the scientific study of human behaviour and experiences”.

2018: The Year of Wanting-It-All-Regardless—Making Up for Lost Time

The following interpretive frames provide background information and understandings of the key events that served to inform and shape Louisa’s 2018 Academic Highway Journey:

**It was just adjusting.** Adjusting to a new normal in my relationship with him. So, the new normal was we weren’t really acting like husband and wife. So, adjusting to that new normal and accepting that was going to be us. And we have very different points of view, politically speaking or religious orientations. Whatever. We’re both Catholics, but we are not in the same path at all…very different [pathways]. I was taught about accepting, forgiveness, helping. Doing the Christian thing, what Jesus would do for others. His is the more Old Testament thing. Very anger of the Lord will fall upon everybody, and everybody will die…It was more like us against them, or something like that.

**And then, on the second week of January 2018, they called us to say no, the pregnancy didn’t continue [through IVF].** And I think for us, for me and my husband, that was the beginning of the end. It’s unfair, but in my head I blame him for it. Because since I was 32 years old, I’d been asking him, let’s go to the doctor, let’s get this checked. Let’s not waste time…And it was only until I was 37 that he actually listened to me. So, it was five years of lost time that we weren’t going to get back…I blamed him for wasting our time…So middle of 2018, I think I was going through an identity crisis. I don’t know. Because of back in 2017, when I lost a baby, 2017 was trying to fall pregnant again.

**So, 2018, because obviously my behaviour changed, his behaviour changed, and our dynamic as a husband and wife was not there anymore.** And while I was in university, it was okay. I could cope, I could be okay, I was focused. But in comes the holidays. I was a mess. Those two, three, four weeks, whatever holidays I had from uni, it was terrible. It was absolutely terrible. So, for me to be in uni was like a mental escape from everything that was happening at home…Yes, probably that’s what I could call it. It was a mental escape.
The Situational Context

Throughout the first three interviews, study findings indicated that while Louisa was making multiple, immigration-influenced across-life domain journeys, her educational ‘wanting-it-all-regardless journey’ took priority. However, while confirming this finding, fourth interview discussions generated data findings that radically extended previous interpretive insights and theoretical positionings. While Louisa’s baby loss grief and counselling sessions were discussed in the previous interview, fourth interview study findings confirm that Louisa used cognitive avoidant coping behaviour and language to limit and mask the extent of the across-domain adversity and upheavals she was experiencing during the 2018 study period. Louisa’s cognitive battle or duel, in terms of the complexities and dichotomies, is captured in the following narrative frames:

[Interviews one and two extracts] Sometimes he [my husband] says oh my God I cannot believe what you’re doing. He is proud and sometimes he is worried…He says I worry about you…Because of how it was at the beginning with the miscarriage and everything I was pretty upset and I was very not in a good place and he saw me through that and saw me dealing with university and everything how stressed I was. But I think now he sees that I’m better but he says oh I worry about you, you work all the time and then you come home and then you study.

[Interview three extracts] With my husband, my relationship has suffered a few blows…I have to give it to him, he’s the best partner because he’s very patient. He just says, I’m worried because you work so hard and study so hard and I worry about you. But he’s very flexible, he’s very supportive of what I’m doing…Most of the time, he’s okay with me spending long hours here and he doesn’t mind…There’s always an area that is going to suffer. My husband is an adult and I don’t worry as much for him, although he’s my partner and I should. For me, I prefer to neglect my relationship with my husband than the attention that I give to my daughter, just because she’s underage…He understands. He’s aware of that… I will say I give priority to being a mum than to being a wife.

In keeping with the liminality construct that involves re-positioning and transitioning in cycles of continual change in post-modern societies (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), the constants throughout all interview findings were Louisa’s perseverance and resilience in achieving her L2 academic aspirations, expectations, and goals. In further strengthening and validating the
Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory, Stenner discusses the liminality hotspot issues and the paradoxes implicit in self-identity change given the removal of limits in these transitioning processes. As Stenner (2018b) argues, “it is not clear what we should ‘become’. ‘Becoming’ can then become a rather troubled experience” (p. 52), one that can generate emotional and psychological repercussions. While dealing with multiple levels of across-life domain adversity, Louisa identified her principal academic bird-on-the-wing driver as being underpinned by her earlier baby loss grief: “That was the hardest. Everything else has a solution, that has no solution”. As Louisa emphasised: “All these issues with the baby, because it’s like a recurring thing. It flares out at the moments where I’m most vulnerable or most stressed”. However, in dealing with these psychologically distressing impacts, Louisa reveals that: “I’ve been doing my best, there are moments when it really overwhelms me and really drags me down. I’ve been on kind of a sustained depression for a long time, but I try to not let it overpower me”. While Louisa’s very ‘real’ baby loss grief signifies the ‘death’ of future parenting expectations, this anguish was heightened by the ‘symbolic’ death of her dreams, goals, and hopes for a secure, stable, and successful marriage in Australia. Paradoxically, while Louisa’s delayed L2 academic ‘wanting-it-all-regardless journey’ was always her priority, this journey now signals across-domain ‘re-birth’ or rejuvenation that has greater significance given the adverse and unexpected family relationship clash and crash in 2018. Accordingly, Louisa’s relationship collision foreshadowed significant changes in her L2 future-self life journey.

**Studying by Metaphor**

It is important to recall Louisa’s 2017 Year of Wreckage and the associated Academic Highway Journey metaphor with its inherent symbolism. While Louisa described cars colliding into one another, creating multiple, domino-like crashes and impacts, key academic ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ positionings emerged from the wreckage. These
included: using available coping resistance resources in terms of marital decision-making processes; making interim self-identity repairs; and revising narrative script changes that generated a personalised, salutogenic-informed praxis of living framework (Antonovsky, 1980; Guidano, 1991). In order to ensure there were no academic journey disruptions, exits, or re-directions, Louisa assessed the marital wreckage. With the emotional damage deemed beyond repair, Louisa considered the marriage had irretrievably broken down. Working full-time, maintaining a full-time academic course load, and studying on weekends, Louisa continued her ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ highway journey as scheduled. In describing the situation, Louisa justifies her positioning:

For me, whatever I achieve now and into the future is regardless of what happened before, what I did or what I didn’t do. Sometimes I do dwell on things, I’m like, oh my God. I should have studied this earlier, or, I shouldn’t have done that, but then I usually go, you know what? It started when it started, and the important thing is that I’m enjoying it now. But for me, yes, it’s like, regardless of what happened before, all the things that didn’t go well, all the things that were negative in my life or difficult for me like the baby or things before time...Regardless of what happened to me emotionally or at work or anything else, this degree or this uni experience is a gift to myself...this is a moment for me. It’s like going to a spa but coming to uni. It’s like giving myself a present that I really cherish and appreciate... If I didn’t study, I would be very disappointed with myself.

**Making Situational Adjustments**

As Louisa’s interpretive frames and narrative snapshots demonstrate, navigating the seemingly endless circularity processes between immediate and past acculturation experiences that collide with emerging selfhood, sense-of-self, and transformational journeys was cognitively and emotionally demanding (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Guidano, 1991; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). While 2017 was the Year of Wreckage, in keeping with the life story model of identity (McAdams, 2001), Louisa’s 2018 Year of Wanting-It-All Regardless was unequivocally, autobiographically-driven in terms of making up for “five years of lost time”. Accordingly, Louisa uses past adversities to energise future opportunities, to “vivify and integrate life and make it more or less meaningful” (McAdams, 2001, p. 101). For Louisa, the
2018 life chapter drivers included generating a renewed sense of meaning and purpose in life (Frankl, 1992) and making the necessary adjustments for “living a life that sounds fun and fulfilling for me”. Importantly, Louisa confirmed her conviction that education is a “liberating factor”, inextricably linked to “the freedom to choose, to make decisions that are best suited for you and for the people that depend on you”. As the findings from all four interviews confirmed, Louisa’s Colombian upbringing, her cultural beliefs, customs and sayings, and religiosity-driven value systems underpinned her intrinsic resilience. This foundational resilience sustained and strengthened Louisa’s L2 academic and future-self aspirations, dreams, and goals (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009), paradoxically, the life journey she “wanted all along from the beginning”.

*Culturally-Underpinned Resilience Resources*

Confirming the validity of the ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ Academic Highway Journey theoretical construct, Louisa considered that “it’s also part of the Colombian culture, like, you know, fake it until you make it. Do it, and do it until it is true, until [you make it happen]”. In drawing on her cultural influences, Louisa explained that when dealing with difficult academic and family pressures, she is reminded of the Colombian saying that “it could be really worse”. As a coping resource, this saying is grounded in cognitive dissonance and adaptive rationalisation (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013), hopeful optimism (Duggal et al., 2016), the paradox of hope (Mattingly, 2010), tragic optimism (Frankl, 1992), and the importance of developing resilience (OECD, 2018). During the fourth interview discussions, Louisa highlighted her “determination and trying to always give 100 percent”, pointing out the importance of “giving your best in everything you do in life…you don't have to be 100 percent or the best in everything. But make sure you did give your 100 percent effort to whatever result you got”. In terms of motivation, Louisa emphasised her use of “cheerleader role” self-chatter:
I tell myself, don’t worry…you’re fine…Because a lot of times I have thought I can’t do this. I’m so tired. I’m so overwhelmed. And then there is a little voice inside that says, no, you can do this…I give a pep talk…you will do it. You can do it. This is for me…Whatever I think that I want to do, I make it happen.

Accordingly, Louisa’s self-reliance sentiments and survivalist resources and perspectives put her L2 academic journey in context, demonstrating the attitudinal, behavioural, cognitive, and motivational drivers for ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ in 2018. In turn, these drivers aligned with the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche’s (n.d.) aphoristic writing that frames psychological observations: “Out of life’s school of war: What does not destroy me, makes me stronger”.

The Academic Highway Journey: A Coping Resource

As findings from the fourth interview confirm, Louisa’s academic journey provided the self-identity and life story drivers for this and future life chapters. Continuing to spend her weekends studying at university, often with her daughter in tow, Louisa explained this practice or study ritual as being “like a mental escape from everything that was happening at home”. Louisa’s “mental escape” coping strategy is considered a significant ‘wanting-it-all-regardless journey’ driver. However, it is important to note that individuals have finite amounts of the coping strategies and personal resilience resources that are necessary to effectively deal with stressful situations (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013). Employing cognitive downplay strategies that included psychological detachment, disengagement, and distancing provided Louisa with opportunities to take ‘emotional breaks’ from her difficult home-life situation. Affording an educational adaptive buffer zone that drove her L2 future-self life journeys (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013; Dörnyei, 2003, 2014), Louisa reflected: “Probably if I wasn’t in uni, it would have been terrible for me to deal with all these things. And probably I would have gone into a deep depression. Deeper than what I’ve been through”. Louisa’s presence at university assumed almost quasi-religious associations in terms of coping forms
and functions. Accordingly, this finding invited comparison with doctrinal beliefs systems and teachings, intentional behaviour and personal value systems, rites of passage and rituals, and structural agency functioning that are typically associated with traditional religions (Franks et al., 2013). For Louisa, university became a place of sanctuary, a major coping mechanism that provided emotional comfort and solace that alleviated the multiple levels of personal adversity she was experiencing. The sanctuary of studying offered Louisa a psychologically safe and secure learning environment. In highlighting this study finding, it is noted that the University of Leicester in the UK made the following announcement (University of Leicester, n.d.):

This University, as the city itself, is notable for its general humanity and support of the community in which it is placed. You have now become a University of Sanctuary, offering scholarships to people who come here for many reasons — to seek safety, sanctuary and learning — and you, the citizens of this city, will be supporting them and I hope will continue to support them. (Sir David Attenborough, at the official opening of Centenary Square, University of Leicester, 11 November 2018)

In terms of Louisa’s strong reliance on her academic studies as a coping resource and as a L2 future-self life driver, Witkowsky et al. (2016, p. 30) discuss undergraduate students with “unique life experiences and circumstances”. This discussion included the difficulties associated with dealing with across-life domain adjustments, transitions, and vulnerabilities that have the potential to impact negatively in educational contexts. Witkowsky et al. (2016) use terms such as “students with families and students of nontraditional age” (p. 38), considering that these learners represent “one of the underserved student populations in higher education” (p. 30) in terms of receiving institutionally-provided interventions and support programs. In acknowledging the academic and family-influenced pressures experienced as an older student, Louisa talks about the personal fulfillment she derives from her tertiary studies:

I think the joy that I get of studying, it’s very powerful. It’s a very powerful driving force in my life. I feel successful, I feel complete, like I’m doing what I want to do, and like I
feel that I'm doing something for myself. Like when you go for a shopping spree. You buy yourself lots of clothes. Then, when I come to uni, it’s like I’m doing something for myself. I’m going on a binge, indulgent thing of knowledge, I guess. I don’t know. Something like that. But it’s nice. It’s a nice feeling when I’m in uni…I guess it’s the sense of showing myself. That even though I’m a mature age student, I can deliver just as good as a 20-year-old or a 19-year-old. That it’s more about the commitment you make to yourself and to the subject or to the course that you’re doing.

Managing and Navigating Academic Demands

As findings from all four interviews revealed, Louisa required greater understanding of the critical L2 reading-to-writing connection, situations she has always found to be “challenging” and “overwhelming at times”. Studying and working full-time, Louisa highlighted the most critical scarcity issue, that of time: “I just feel like I have to spend like extra time to do it, like a lot of extra time. Like if a normal person will spend one unit of time, I will spend four or five". In relation to university-provided L2 learning and literacy support services, Louisa’s findings reflected the views of the other participants in this study, calling for more accessible hours and scheduling sessions in the evenings and on weekends. These findings also emphasised the need for institutions to have a greater awareness of the L2 learning and literacy obstacles facing non-traditional students and students with family responsibilities, and being proactive in taking steps to minimalise them (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Witkowsky et al., 2016). However, irrespective of inaccessible L2 learning and literacy support, academic skills, and time scarcity, Louisa met her 2018 academic aspirations and expectations, passing all units. It is important to note that Louisa’s degree is more practical in nature, with assessment based largely on designing and manufacturing objects and items of furniture in metal and wood. However, the L2 academic writing component remained one that Louisa struggled with throughout the study. In discussing the importance of her Academic Highway Journey and the resources she required along the way, Louisa introduced what she considers one of her most important academic journey drivers, ‘just-showing-up’ when dealing with challenges and transitions:
The only thing you have to do in life is actually show up. And when you show up, it’s actually 80 percent of the job done, because you’re showing up, you’re there, you’re present. And then, the other 20 percent is making the effort…you’re open and you are ready to do whatever it is you’re doing. And then, just put a little more effort, and then things will get done. And that day I understood that no matter how scared you are, how anxious you are, whatever it is you’re feeling, how lazy or how depressed or whatever it is you’re feeling, it doesn’t matter…Just go. Make an effort to arrive. And once you arrive, things suddenly appear to be easier…So, when I come to uni, there are days that I don’t want to come. I’m so exhausted. I’m falling asleep almost. And I say to myself, just show up…. I try to apply it to everything.

While just-showing-up can be cognitively challenging to put into practice, Louisa positioned this coping strategy in relation to the importance of education in her life: “It just makes you feel like you’re doing something worthwhile. But it’s also feeling that you are growing inside”.

**Cognitive Coping Strategies**

As study findings confirmed, Louisa’s cognitive coping strategies constituted a crowded theoretical landscape. This terrain included cognitive avoidance, downplay, and rationalisation or ‘weakness-of-will’ in justifying actions, behaviours, and resultant outcomes (Cheng & McCarthy, 2013). Louisa also employed escapist, wishful thinking, and post-decisional dissonance strategies designed to reduce anxieties and tensions at home while striving for psychological stasis in her studies (Acevedo, 2018; Ainley, 2006). In relation to Lazarus and Folkman’s (1987) cognitive and relational theory of coping that comprises emotion-focused, problem-focused, and cognitive avoidance strategies, Anderson et al. (2005) suggest that “effective coping actually relies upon a healthy balance of all three approaches. However, while difficult to determine what constitutes a ‘healthy balance’, study findings indicated that Louisa used all three strategies over the three-year, life chapter periods captured in this storied-journey account. In using transactional coping strategies in which stress is a ‘transaction’ between the individual and their environment (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987), findings demonstrated a mixture of fast and slow cognition in decision-making processes (Kahneman, 2011). Importantly, the scarcity and depletion theory
(Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) played a crucial role. Collectively, this coping landscape contributed to Louisa developing a personalised sense of coherence framework which includes eudemonic well-being (Antonovsky, 1980) that aligned with Louisa’s layperson perceptions of a SA journey (Krems et al., 2017; Maslow, 1943). However, throughout her Academic Highway Journey, Louisa continued to maintain a pervasively-positive and powerful attitudinal, behavioural, cognitive, and motivational positioning. Louisa was relentless in pursuing her ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic journey, irrespective of dealing with her husband, a significant ‘other’ casualty along the way.

**Coping and Religiosity: On the Road to Damascus Turning Points**

In discussing the relationship between coping and religiosity, Parenteau et al. (2011, p. 408) describe it as “rich theoretical soil”. The authors advise that when dealing with adversity, a person’s religious orientations may influence the ways in which stressors are assessed and managed. In terms of a person’s belief in God, Parenteau et al. (2011, p. 409) argue that religiosity “can be categorized as a positive (i.e. belief in a benevolent God) or negative appraisals (i.e. belief in a punishing God)”. In accordance with this theoretical argument and religious considerations, Louisa’s study findings indicated that she aligned with the former, positive worldview, while her husband preferred the latter, negative one. Consequently, a further dichotomy and differentiating element in their difficult marital situation was identified. However, Parenteau et al. (2011) cite the axiom “God never gives us more than we can handle [original emphasis]” (p. 422) in relation to coping with adversity. The following narrative frames illustrate the complexities of Louisa’s Road to Damascus events.

**So, I think that was me being, I guess how young people say it, flexing him. I was forcing him into doing something for us [going to counselling sessions], because I felt that his priority was not our relationship. And I was more like a teammate, like a working partner, than a wife. So, I was like, okay, mate, if we don’t go to…Because**
as time progressed nearing the end of the year [2018], and I saw that he already booked his ticket and he made that decision to leave and leave me alone during Christmas and New Year. But he was going to leave, and he was not going to be there for anything…So, his priorities were something different.

So, I was like, okay, we're not going to have a baby. Fine. But then, I need to start living a life that sounds fun and fulfilling for me as well. Not just for you…So, I finished the semester…He left on 11 December [2018] or something like that. And I was like, okay, you’re gone. And then, I started thinking it's not fair. I don’t want to be in this relationship anymore. So, all throughout the end of the year and into the beginning of the [next] year, I was thinking what do I want? And I don’t want this. And he doesn’t want it either. And it's not fair to put a person through that, not even if he did that to me. But I thought, it’s not what I want, it’s not what he wants. So, we shouldn’t be together. Probably I’m not the person [for him]. You know how you have in your head an ideal person that you would like to share your life?

2019: The Year of Realisations—The Sequel

This year acknowledged the passing of Louisa’s lost dreams, of crucial across-life domain decision-making, and of moving on in her life story. With the benefit of hindsight, Louisa refused to ‘settle’ for less than what she wanted in her life and in her relationships. In ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’, Louisa reflected on the key self-defining episodes and moments in her 2018 Academic Highway Journey:

It made me realise that I really didn’t want to be in that relationship…So, when he left and I was alone, I didn’t feel alone, because we were never together. And when we were together, he was not present…He was always playing games with other people all around the world. And I understood that probably our relationship was not fulfilling, and he was not happy…And I was emotionally not able to provide him with what he wanted, because I was still grieving…He would say, why haven’t you been able to, how do you say it? Get over it. I’m like, I don’t know. Just because probably that was my dream. And I’m grieving that I’m not going to be a mother again. And it’s difficult. It’s hard. That’s all I wanted since I married…So, right now I feel like I lost my husband and all that.

I don’t know. It’s difficult, but then I have to realise as well that maybe I’m not a person that is supposed to be in a relationship that way. Maybe I should focus myself in different things of my life and stop thinking that the realisation of my life has to be with a man…I’ve come to terms with the fact that I don’t need to reproduce to validate myself. And that’s another thing that was interesting. I don’t need to become a mother to be of value or to be happy, or to find a fulfilment in life. Because I’m already a mother…So, those things make me realise that, yes, even though I have a lot of difficult things happening, and things with my husband didn’t work out, I’m trying to make it on my own. Really on my own.
Importantly, fourth interview data findings highlighted the role that Louisa’s involvement in the study played in her L2 future-self journey:

I think probably it’s cathartic…Yes, cathartic. Because when I speak about it, these are things that I have on my mind. But when you voice them out and speak about them, then you think more. When you verbalise what you’re feeling, you think about those things more. And then, doing this has helped me know myself more as a student, I guess. Or as a person that has taken this study journey. And know myself, know my limitations and potential I guess in a way. Probably I wouldn’t have the same interview with you, months ago I would have been a wreck.

Collectively, interview findings demonstrated the significance of Louisa’s 2017, 2018, and 2019 life story chapters. These narratives acknowledged the situational adjustments and complexities, the key role-identity challenges and demands, and the Road to Damascus-like events and experiences inherent in Louisa’s transitioning and becoming journeys (Dornyei, 2014; McAdams, 2001, 2018; Scott, 2015; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). In turn, the ways in which Louisa internalised, interpreted, and integrated these self-identity worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978) into life story frameworks were informed by Goffman’s The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959) and its dramaturgical model, Relations in Public (1971), and Frame Analysis (1974). This framework also included Guidano’s (1991) praxis of living construct. Importantly, these theoretical frameworks informed and validated the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory and situated Louisa’s L2 future-self life story chapters (McAdams, 2001, 2018).

The Future Self Identity Project Journey: Thinking It, Describing It, Visioning It, and Making it Happen

In keeping with study findings, Louisa is intrinsically and situationally-driven to achieve her study goals, regardless of acknowledged L2 limitations, academic support
disconnections, and the negative impacts of across-life domain stressors. In considering Dörnyei’s (2014) L2 motivational self system with its ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self, Louisa aligns with the former. However, as Dörnyei explains, the critical component for both categories relate to the individual’s learning experiences and the motivational drivers demonstrated within their specific educational contexts. Critically, Louisa’s academic ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ journey direction incorporates what Dörnyei refers to as future-self guides, the strategic roadmaps or visions that drive L2-related aspirations, dreams, and goals (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014). Given the significance of these guides in managing, navigating, and transitioning from the present to the future (Stenner, 2018a), the academic ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ journey construct epitomises and symbolises Louisa’s layperson perceptions of a SA journey (Maslow, 1943). In relation to the ideal L2 self journey, Dörnyei (2014) concludes that “where there is a vision there is a way”, considering that visionary thinking “represents one of the highest-order motivational forces” (p. 11). However, in terms of Louisa’s ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ L2 academic drivers, Dörnyei (2014) contends that visionary thinking “transfers from one domain to another relatively freely” (p. 15). Importantly, Dörnyei’s theoretical L2 ideal, future-self construct aligns with Louisa’s unequivocal statement: “Whatever I think that I want to do, I make it happen”. Crucially, Dörnyei explains that turning the L2 ideal and future-self visions into realities must be supported by nine, sense-of-self prerequisites, all of which emerged in Louisa’s study findings. Accordingly, as the fourth interview discussions involved ‘visioning’ and future-framing, Louisa viewed 2020 as the Year of Liberation:

2020 will be probably liberation I guess. Because my daughter graduates at the end of 2020. I will hopefully graduate at the end of 2020…I don’t know. I was thinking about it. I remember that when I was 20 something years old and I broke up with [daughter’s father] and all that, I was thinking I don’t want to go into my 50s and into my 40, into my 30s, and still be trying to look for the person that is going to be with me for the rest of my life. When I decided to end the relationship, it was coping with the loss of that dream, because even though our relationship was absolutely disastrous, it was in a way the fulfilment of what I wanted. I wanted a family. And it was really hard because not only I lost him as a partner, as a husband, but my daughter lost him as a father figure. Now I’m 41 soon…So, what does it [the future] look like for me when I graduate? What is it going to be?
I can, I don’t know, take a break from work and do the other units. I don’t know how it works, but when that comes then I’ll figure it out. But it’s something that I’ve been thinking about. Okay, I want to do a Master’s so I can learn about how to research. And then, after that I’m going to do a PhD. I know that I want to do those things. And most probably that’s what I will do. Because when I set an idea…it’s just a matter of time. It’s not if I’m going to do it. It’s when I’m going to do it. Because I’m going to do it…So, I want to do that. I want to definitely keep on studying and learning more. Yes, wherever I go I will try to continue to grow as a professional…I think the joy that I get of studying, it’s very powerful.

With Louisa’s visions and future-self framing in mind, it is opportune to recall Carl Rogers (1967, p. 163) in relation to achieving personal goals in life, taking that journey “To Be That Self Which One Truly Is”. In taking these viewpoints into account, the discussion now focuses on self-transcendence (ST).

Self-Transcendence Considerations

Irrespective of the dichotomies, dualities, and paradoxes implicit in the study findings, Louisa confirmed her academic ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ journey was SA-driven. Reflecting on her SA journey obstacles, Louisa explained: “I had to wait…I had to push away my dreams”, along with expressing the sense of urgency: “Let’s go. Let’s do it”. However, the 2020 Year of Liberation and the 2021 Year of Opportunities study findings indicated post-SA journey orientations. These findings aligned with Koltko-Rivera (2006) in that Maslow considered his original hierarchy of human needs with SA being the optimal level as being inadequate as originally developed and interpreted. In discussing Maslow’s transhumanistic psychology, Koltko-Rivera suggests a regenerated and revised hierarchy of needs, introducing Maslow’s ST considerations as a motivational level residing above SA. According to Koltko-Rivera (2006), ST factors are underpinned by a motivational drive that includes putting aside individual needs in favour of services to others. In seeking a greater purpose in life through achieving social progress, developing altruism, and gaining wisdom, these factors contribute to a more comprehensive, encompassing, and inclusive worldview.
These ST considerations align with Louisa’s Colombian cultural influences, her identity and immigration-influenced survivalist worldview, and her wanting to live a life that is “fulfilling” and governed by “giving your best in everything you do in life”.

**Learner Profile Typology: The Pyrrhic Learner**

This Generation 1.5 Pyrrhic Learner profile describes students who have high academic aspirations and expectations, genuinely believing they can achieve success. However, in achieving victory through education, these learners must also deal with under-developed CALP and minimal formal L2 instruction that includes the important reading-to-writing connection (Hinkel, 2004). With inadequate L2 academic writing process instruction and practice, the lack of accessible, targeted, and timely L2 academic literacy support presents additional learning hurdles to overcome. As the study findings illustrated, Louisa is a pyrrhic victor. However, ‘winning’ the 2018 ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ Academic Highway Journey ‘battle’ and ‘fight’ for survival and victory generated impacts and repercussions that can be likened to defeat in across-life domains. Accordingly, this approach establishes the Pyrrhic Learner category residing within the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. As Louisa’s triadic, life chapter years demonstrated, her pyrrhic victory exacted a heavy toll in terms of losing the family and home-life dreams, goals, and stability that influenced her immigration to Australia in 2011.

**Epilogue**

Louisa’s narrative identity reconstructions of the 2018 Year of Wanting-It-All-Regardless with its book-ended prequel and sequel life story chapters, considered the factors and influences that shaped her L2 future-self journey. Using an arts-informed, bricolage-like writing praxis (Wibberley, 2012), Louisa’s narrative integrates the key personal, philosophical, religious, and theoretical life story reference points (McAdams,
2001). In doing so, this storied-journey account highlights the importance Louisa attached to being a pyrrhic victor, regardless of the across-life domain losses along the way. Fittingly, the closing narrative frame captures Louisa’s worldview:

**Porque no importa donde se nace ni donde se muere, Si no donde se lucha**

There is a song in Spanish that says, it doesn’t matter where you were born, and it doesn’t matter where you die, but it matters where you fight. And in every country that I’ve been, including my own, I feel very, very much connected to the country because I’m there. This is where I’m doing my stuff, and this is where I’m making a difference now. And for me, the now is very important. So, that’s why, when you asked me, do you feel Colombian or Australian, I said, no, when I’m here I feel Australian, because this is where I’m from now. This is where I fight, where I’m educating myself, where I work, where my dreams are invested in, where I want to make a difference.

**Conclusion**

This chapter concluded the two-staged approach to providing narrative identity reconstructions of the six participants in this Generation 1.5 learner study. The previous chapter presented the narratives of Daniel, Randy, and Sarah. While Daniel withdrew from the study after the first interview, Randy and Sarah failed their semester one and two courses and were unable to complete their Academic Highway Journeys as scheduled. This chapter provided the narratives of the three participants who were known to have completed their year-long academic journeys. Collectively, these narratives illustrated the participants’ multiple, interrelated journeys that took place from pre-immigration through to L2 future-self aspirations and learner profiles. Working with the participants’ words, study findings, and literature alignments, the researcher gave theatrical and theoretical voice to the turning-point moments, those “nuclear episodes” (McAdams, 2001, p. 108) in participants’ lives that captured their unique, self-defining memories, perspectives, and worldmaking experiences. While dealing with L2 situational inequalities in distinct, diverse, and personalised ways (Flowerdew & Miller, 2008), participants’ storied-journey accounts encompassed who they
were, who they wanted to become, and what factors drove their L2 future-self goals and visions (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Scott, 2015).

Representative of the study’s contemporaneous, arts-informed research and writing praxis, these narratives provide the contextual and theoretical foundations for Chapter 6 which discusses the development of the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. In examining the Academic Highway Journey as the core category and the academic, coping, identity, learning, and immigration systems as the major categories, the empirical and theoretical impacts and interrelationships are explained. As part of the discussion, the Theory is framed, modelled, and positioned within Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation. In keeping with the spirit of the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory, Rainer Maria Rilke’s (1905/1996) poetry draws attention to the quest for fulfilment, meaning, and purpose in life:

You see, I want a lot.
Perhaps I want everything, the darkness that comes with every infinite fall and the shivering blaze of every step up.
So many live on and want nothing.
Chapter 6
Theoretical Development

Theoretical sensitivity represents an important creative aspect of grounded theory. This sensitivity represents an ability not only to use personal and professional experience imaginatively, but also literature. It enables the analyst to see the research situation and its associated data in new ways, and to explore the data’s potential for developing theory. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 44)

In keeping with an arts-informed research and writing praxis, Chapters 4 and 5 provided narrative identity reconstructions of the six study participants. As part of a more contemporaneous analytical and theoretical development approach, these six narratives contributed to “theory about individuals” (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 278). Building on these narratives, Chapter 6 discusses the theoretical development that resulted from investigating the central research question: How do participant students who meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile manage their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based, public university in Western Australia over an academic year? Given the researcher is positioned within the empirical world (Punch & Oancea, 2014), the grounded theory (GT) methodology, as discussed in Chapter 3, provided a comprehensive, rigorous, and systematic framework for ‘discovering’ and developing substantive theory. As Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 23) point out, the GT researcher “does not begin with a theory, then prove it”, the researcher “begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge”. Accordingly, this chapter discusses: (i) the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory (the Theory); (ii) its theoretical components, the core category, the Academic Highway Journey (the academic journey), and the five major categories that comprise academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems (the satellite systems); (iii) the academic journey theoretical considerations; (iv) the academic journey stages; (v) substantive theory modelling and positioning in terms of the journey construct and its relationship with the academic journey and the satellite systems; and (vi) final commentary.
The Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory

The importance of being ‘grounded’ and ‘immersed’ in the data, questioning the data, and allowing findings to emerge from the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) resulted in the arts-informed, empirically-underpinned, and inductively-constructed Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. In exploring participants' academic aspirations, expectations, and experiences over an academic year, the study findings highlighted the importance of their immigration-influenced worldviews in managing their studies and educationally-related parallel journeys. Accordingly, the Theory is complex and multi-dimensional in origin and in practice, acknowledging participants’ immigration past, dealing with their present academic studies, and being future-focused in terms of their Academic Highway Journeys symbolising the starting points and springboards from which to achieve their life goals. As building better futures requires participants to maintain on-going attitudinal, behavioural, and cognitive attention, along with academic grit (Duckworth, 2017), resilience (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2018), and tenacity (Dweck et al., 2014), these shared academic journey goals and objectives were empirically and theoretically ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ driven.

With difficult, disjointed, and diverse educational experiences in their home countries and in Australia, wanting academic success ‘regardless’ involved participants dealing with complex, multi-faceted navigational issues that involved a combination of negatively-orientated educational scarcity and abundance factors. To demonstrate this theoretical significance, all participants were studying under extreme time scarcity constraints (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) while attempting to overcome an abundance of ‘built-in’ institutionally-positioned academic literacy support disconnections and learning barriers (Arkoudis et al., 2019). In turn, these constraints were exacerbated by having to manage an abundance of English as a second language (L2) academic limitations that were further
compounded by their across-life domain demands and responsibilities (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013; Witkowsky et al., 2016). Importantly, these theoretical elements also established and highlighted the impacts associated with managing parallel journeys. As the data findings demonstrated, the scarcity of L2 academic abilities was a critical component given all participants acknowledged having under-developed cognitive academic learning proficiency (CALP) levels, a pre-requisite for successful university studies (Roessingh & Douglas, 2003). In managing regardless of limited formal L2 writing instruction and practice, participants had an inadequate understanding of the critical reading-to-writing connection, insufficient or non-existent writing process experience, and lacked awareness of the skills necessary to demonstrate knowledge-transformation rather than knowledge-telling in their academic writing (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Hinkel, 2013; Roberge, 2009). Importantly, with immigration-influenced worldviews, Generation 1.5 learners are considered neither ‘insiders’ nor ‘outsiders’, caught between two academic, liminality-influenced learning worlds while wanting to fulfil their L2 future-self aspirations, goals, and needs (Davison, 2005; Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Stenner, 2018). Accordingly, all participants are dealing with liminality-influenced academic hotspot issues and acculturative transitions associated with paradox, paralysis, and polarisation in their learning and literacy situations (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a). In a further example of situational inequality, these participants with their diverse L2 academic literacy needs are seemingly ‘invisible’ in the undergraduate student community (Harvey & Mallman, 2019). Collectively, these ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ and ‘against-all-odds’ factors represented significant attitudinal, behavioural, and cognitive challenges that were intensified by positioning within stressful and uncertain L2 academic learning and literacy environments.

With wanting academic success ‘regardless’ being inextricably linked to the participants’ anticipated ideal or ought-to L2 future-self visions (Dörnyei, 2014), and with their reinventive self-identity outcomes considered as “empowering, liberating and transformative” (Scott, 215, p. 177), these journeys were significant life-changing educational undertakings.
Accordingly, Louisa described her future-self visions: “I feel that because this is what I wanted all along from the beginning since I arrived here”, emphasising that: “Whatever I think that I want to do, I make it happen”. Similarly, Maria confirmed and explained her academic-achievement urgency: “…I am willing to do it other ways and to cooperate and try out different things”. As Maria resolutely pointed out: “If it doesn’t work out if it’s not good enough, I will do it on my own terms”. In Rebecca’s situation, driven by her bold decision to commence undergraduate studies without having completed high school, she explained: “I wanted to do something positive for myself and my experiences here in Australia. By studying and getting a degree I want to prove to myself that I can actually do something even if I am far away from home”. In the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory, participants’ ultimate journey outcomes are signalled by completing their university degrees. This Theory finds parallels in Moshin Hamid’s (2017) novel Exit West that explores contemporary immigration and refugee issues. Like the protagonists Nadia and Saeed, the participants’ Academic Highway Journeys provide the ‘keys’ to what “could become a special door…”, the magical door that once opened promises entry to their L2 future-self goals and visions.

In accordance with the dynamism implicit in managing their academic journeys, the participants’ ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ urgency underpins an immigration-influenced pathway to their L2 future-self visions. These ‘visions-for-the-future’ are situated within the liminality and transitioning constructs (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) that frame and position the Theory. However, in order to manage their liminality-aligned social worlds, participants require significant subjective motivational and psychological resources that include active citizenship, confidence, and creativity (Greco & Stenner, 2017). As Maslow (n.d.) points out: “One can choose to go back toward safety or forward toward growth. Growth must be chosen again and again; fear must be overcome again and again.”

Accordingly, analytical and coding processes ‘discovered’ and identified the core category as the Academic Highway Journey. As previously discussed, this construct drives
and epitomises the theoretical focus of participants’ ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic journeys. In terms of the participants’ data findings-generated parallel journeys, GT analysis, coding, and theoretical processes delivered five major categories: academic systems, coping systems, identity systems, immigration systems, and learning systems. A Theoretical Memo that demonstrates the evolution of the systems coding processes is provided in Appendix F. With these major categories in mind, and aligning with Mele et al. (2010, p. 126), a systems theory approach provided an analytical framework that allowed phenomena to be investigated holistically, facilitating an analytical, cognitive, and theoretical "shift in attention from the part to the whole [original emphasis]". Highlighting the significance of the system lens, Meadows (2008, pp. 1-2) advises that in a complex and rapidly changing world:

Systems thinking will help us to manage, adapt, and see the wide range of choices we have before us. It is a way of thinking that gives us the freedom to identify root causes of problems and see new opportunities.

Collectively, the rigorous and systematic processes and techniques synonymous with GT methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) developed the Theory or the “theoretical coat hanger” (Kivunja, 2018, p. 45) that emerged from data-generation and analysis, literature-informed study findings, and story line expansion. In order to demonstrate the complexities and crucial components of this Theory, it is modelled within a revised Maslow (1943) five-tier hierarchy of human needs that includes Koltko-Rivera’s (2006) additional sixth level, self-transcendence (ST). As a way in which to explain, extend, and frame this Theory, O’Donoghue (2019, p. 51) defines a model as “a simplified representation of something existing in the world. Its function is to provide a fairly clear picture of something which in reality is somewhat more complicated”.

It is considered that the Theory: is as complete as the micro-level, empirically-collected and analysed ‘unforced’ data findings permit; is situated within arts-informed, non-technical, and technical literature; and aligns with GT theoretical creativity, discovery,
saturation, and sensitivity constructs (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Importantly, the Theory is strengthened by "systematic techniques and procedures of analysis" that generated substantive theory that met the criteria for “doing "good" science” that included precision, rigour, and significance (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 31). In being empirically and theoretically-underpinned, this Theory was developed from an interpretivist understanding of participants being the “manager of his or her environment” (O'Donoghue, 2019, p. 31). In addition, underlying symbolic interactionist principles ensured that these understandings, as modelled and represented in the resultant Theory, were generated directly from Generation 1.5 participants’ aims, intentions, and strategies, what they considered as being significant in their circumstances, the reasons they gave for their actions, and the expected outcomes as they managed their undergraduate studies (O'Donoghue, 2019). As pointed out in Chapters 1 and 2, given increasing forced and unforced, legal and illegal asylum seeker, immigration, and refugee flows worldwide (International Organization for Migration [IOM], 2020; OECD, 2018), it is considered that the theoretical understandings implicit in this study will make original and substantive contributions to educational areas in which limited knowledge presently exists in Australia and overseas.

**The Theoretical Components: The Core Category and the Five Major Categories**

Immigration-driven and empirically-based, along with GT-generated and literature-informed study findings, the Academic Highway Journey is the core category in the overarching Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 116), the core category is the “central phenomenon around which all the other categories are integrated”, or in keeping with the astronomy metaphor, are ‘orbited and influenced’. Gravitationally and inextricably linked, these analytically and inductively-developed major categories comprise academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems. Figure 6.1 below represents the Theory components. Importantly, given the positioning of the core
category as the key planetary driver, multiple interrelated journeys operate and overlap within these major categories as satellite systems’ influences. Collectively, these coupling influences confirm, validate, and underpin the Theory.

**Figure 6.1**

*The Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory Components*

![Diagram](image)

*Note.* This figure represents the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory components, the GT core category or planetary driver being the Academic Highway Journey. In turn, the five GT major categories are likened to satellite systems.

In terms of adopting a world-embracing optimism about experiencing, exploring, and living life (Hunt, 2014), the spirit of this Theory is creatively captured in Rainer Maria Rilke’s (1905/1996) poetry: “You see, I want a lot. Perhaps I want everything…”. This arts-informed and theoretically-aligned view considers life journeys as periods of adaptive and optimal psychological growth (Marcia & Josselson, 2013) that develop in functional shifts that take place within ever-widening and overlapping circles and cycles of empowering and liberating change. In turn, these self-identity transformative and transitional changes interconnect, intersect, and interweave in cognitively complex and challenging ways (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). Aesthetically, it is considered that the theoretical components align with the Wassily Kandinsky artwork depicted in Figure 6.2. As Goodman (1978, p. 102)
points out, “the arts must be taken no less seriously than the sciences as modes of
discovery, creation, and enlargement of knowledge in the broad sense of advancement of
the understanding.”

Figure 6.2

One Square from the Squares with Concentric Circles (1913)

Note. This extract from a larger artwork by Wassily Kandinsky is used to represent the
Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. The blue centre signifies the Theory’s core category, the
Academic Highway Journey, with the surrounding five major categories or satellite systems
in its sphere of influence. This image is reprinted from the Wikiart public domain website.
https://www.wikiart.org/en/wassily-kandinsky/color-study-squares-with-concentric-circles-
1913

Importantly, given the rapid world-shrinking processes well-underway in today’s
increasingly globalised communities, Stenner (2018a, 2018b) discusses change and
transitioning as the only constants (Czura, 2016; OECD, 2018). In turn, this hegemony
validates the Theory in terms of participants’ ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ commitment in
managing their Academic Highway Journeys. This is evidenced by the Chapter 4 and 5
storied-journey accounts or story lines that detailed the participants’ L2 future-self narratives
that were evolutionary in nature and world-embracing in terms of optimism for transitional
and transformative change and growth (Hunter, 2014; Maslow, 1943). As Carter Phipps
(cited in Hunt, 2014, p. e993267-1) points out: “We live in a dynamic changing, evolving
universe instead of a static, fixed, unchanging one”, sentiments aligning with Dweck’s (2012)
academic growth and fixed identity mindset constructs. However, in acknowledging the
inherent ambiguities, complexities, connections, and paradoxes in operation within these theoretical components, the forces of change and transition are many and varied. Accordingly, the following narrative frames demonstrate the depth, dilemmas, and diversity of the data that supported and structured the Academic Highway Journey as the core theoretical construct and the five major categories. Collectively these components symbolise participants’ escape routes, lifelines, or ‘springboards’ to greater across-life domain opportunities.

**Daniel:** Mom and Dad wanted to bring us to Australia. First primary reason is for education because education here is good…my Mom and Dad said to me that you don’t have to get a degree. You can do whatever you like…But I still feel like if you don’t get a degree what’s the point of you coming to study overseas, why don’t you just study in [your home country].

**Louisa:** It’s like, regardless of what happened before, all the things that didn’t go well, all the things that were negative in my life…Regardless of what happened to me emotionally or at work or anything else, this degree or this uni experience is a gift to myself…It’s like going to a spa but coming to uni. It’s like giving myself a present that I really cherish and appreciate.

**Maria:** We’ll all be in the same position in ten years down the road if we don’t do uni…it has an end and it has a purpose and it just has to happen…It might, you know, it might be tiring but at some point there is an end date…Put the effort in as well. Like you have to.

**Randy:** We decided to move because my Dad managed to get a job over here…I really don’t think about it much. I moved to Perth and I processed it and that’s it… I don’t really like aiming too high. I’m that sort of student that a pass will be good enough, sort of thing.

**Rebecca:** It has very complicated roads with my goals and interests far away from me and difficult to reach. The roads for now are all uphill…I have learned that everything is possible, that life can change suddenly…By studying and getting a degree I want to prove to myself that I can actually do something even if I am far away from home.

**Sarah:** I just wanted to fit in. There was that stigma of being one of those awful boat people…Seeing as I’ve been struggling with my studies for a long time, I could very easily just give up and get a full-time job or something. But I’ve learnt from Islam that there is a beauty in the struggle and that gives me motivation to keep going, no matter how long it takes me to finish what I started.

Given the significance of the Academic Highway Journey as the empirical driver in this Generation 1.5 learner study, the following section discusses the associated theoretical
considerations. This discussion focuses on the meanings and purposes associated with the participants achieving their L2 future-self goals (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014).

The Academic Highway Journey Theoretical Considerations

The Metaphor of the Journey

It is important to acknowledge the extensive literature on metaphors. Pervasive in everyday life, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) point out that the language used in metaphors may hide, hinder, or mask aspects of the communicative and meaning-defining processes that are embedded in our social worlds. However, Goffman (1959, p. 246) contends that in ordinary everyday life performances, “the language and mask of the stage will be dropped”, in that sociological research:

...is not concerned with aspects of the theatre that creep into everyday life. It is concerned with the structure of social encounters – the structure of these entities in social life that come into being whenever persons enter one another’s immediate physical presence.

Accordingly, it is considered that Goffman’s (1959, 1974) dramaturgical metaphor or model provides a framework for discussing the sociological perspectives and worldmaking experiences integral in Generation 1.5 learners’ Academic Highway Journeys (Goodman, 1978; Manning, 1991; Scott, 2007, 2015). In addition, Goffman’s (1971) civil inattention construct in public relations has relevance in terms of participants’ data findings-derived metaphor of the journey that demonstrates the difficulties in navigating everyday social interactions that include face-to-face and those at a distance. However, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) assert, the “essence of a metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another [original emphasis]” (p. 5), providing linguistic containers constructed, designed, and intended to make sense of social interactions in everyday life (Goffman, 1959). In considering metaphors as “carriers of theory” (Maher, 1989, p. 27), the
participants’ assumptions, experiences, and perspectives that are implicit in the metaphor of
the Academic Highway Journey are examined and evaluated. In doing so, study findings are
heightened in terms of informing and directing interpretive attention and focus to the specific
dimensions contained within the Generation 1.5 learner phenomenon being investigated.
The Academic Highway Journey metaphor builds on the detailed story lines presented in
Chapters 4 and 5. As metaphors contributed to participants’ narrative identity scripts
(McAdams, 2018), to their performances in academic social interactions (Goffman, 1959,
1974), and to their ‘becoming who they want to be’ self-journeys (Scott, 2015), the Academic
Highway Journey metaphor had across-systems’ impacts and influences. These satellite
systems comprised: academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning. Accordingly, the
metaphor of journey became the theoretical tool for capturing, analysing, and interpreting
participants’ concrete, ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ driving forces and the worldmaking
experiences (Goodman, 1978) inherent in managing their academic journeys. In a
picaresque-like narrative fashion, the journey metaphor with its intrinsic symbolism is
complex in description, complicated in terms of the participants’ personal and educational
experiences and perspectives, and convoluted in relation to adhering to the originally
planned academic schedules. Given the participants are dealing with distinct and
individually-situated L2 academic learner abilities, skills, and strategies, it follows that their
Academic Highway Journey decisional elements, designs, and experiences are
correspondently diverse. However, while there were journey differences, there were
commonalities in terms of emergent themes that resulted from the inductive research
processes that required discussion.

The Journey Motivators: The Importance of Being Future-Focused

Given Goffman’s (1967) interactional order and situational strategies, and in
considering highway journey ‘learner drivers’ as “embodied individuals” with “vehicular
elements” (Scott, 2011, p. 3), participants’ L2 future-self (Dörnyei, 2014) aspirations were
identified in the findings as a significant framing concept. Accordingly, the Future Self Identity Project framing concept emerged as a way in which to capture and interpret participants’ storied-journey accounts, experiences, and learning performances (Goffman, 1974). This concept was discussed in the Chapter 4 and 5 story lines, along with key ‘bird-on-the-wing’ situationally-driven perspectives. In considering and recalling these highly-patterned interactional perspectives as theoretically significant, this term originated in Sarah’s story line. Arts-informed and derived from lines from quatrain seven of the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*: “The Bird of time has but a little way to flutter—and the Bird is on the Wing” (In Main, 1889/1976, p. 154), these words convey the participants’ sense of purpose and resolve in managing their Academic Highway Journey difficulties, overcoming obstacles, and dealing with breakdowns along the way. It is considered that the *Rubaiyat’s* enigmatic, highly spiritual, and symbolic verse addresses the timeless, universal themes that reverberated in participants’ journeys that sought aspirational and inspirational, transformative and transitional life stage developmental change (Marcia, 2002; Marcia & Josselson, 2013; Scott, 2010, 2015; Stenner, 2018b).

As the study data and findings demonstrated, the metaphor of the Academic Highway Journey resonated with all participants. With the journey considered in terms of processes that all participants experienced, albeit in diverse ways, all are navigating and negotiating, with varying degrees of difficulty, an uncertain and unknown undergraduate university landscape. Collectively, and as discussed in participants’ immigration-influenced Chapter 4 and 5 story lines, the L2 future-self drivers (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014) were important components in managing their Academic Highway Journeys. While immigration was confirmed by all but one of the six participants as an escape route or lifeline to better life opportunities in Australia, all academic journeys were uniformly aligned in terms of ways in which to achieve their future-self life goals. As Louisa reflected:
I’m very ambitious…the things that I can do with this [degree] in the future. The things that I can teach, the things that the students can do with all of this that I’m learning and how I can help them…I literally can go anywhere really, wherever I want.

In turn, Rebecca advised that “to be honest I did not have a lot of expectations at the beginning of my studies. Now I’m starting to realise how important university is and how much I want to finish it”. Subsequently, Rebecca considered her major life goals and motivational drivers are “getting a degree and becoming a Mum and having a family”, collectively “feeling fulfilled as a person”. However, for Sarah, university education “was a given”, considering that “you’re here in this country where you have the opportunity for education, to advance yourself…So why wouldn’t you? I mean, it was a no-brainer almost”. Importantly, these data frames acknowledge the spirit of the academic bird-on-the-wing drivers and Scott’s (2015) reinventive institution concept in which its voluntary members seek future-self reinvention and transformation in terms of role-identity salience and status. As successful Academic Highway Journey outcomes are central to realising their L2 future-self aspirations, quatrain forty-two of the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* aligns with participants search for meaning, purpose, and self-fulfillment (Frankl, 1992). In turn, this search parallels their self-styled self-actualisation (SA) journeys (Maslow, 1943):

> And if the Wine you drink, the Lip you press,  
> End in that All begins and ends in—Yes;  
> Think then you are To-day what Yesterday  
> You were—To-morrow you shall not be less. (In Main, 1889/1976, p. 171)

With “academic hothouses” (Scott, 2015, p. 177) considered an example of reinventive institutions, Scott (2010, p. 224) advises that universities are “designed to educate, enrich and develop people’s talents or abilities”. In line with the findings-aligned liminality construct (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), participants view their Academic Highway Journeys as transitional passages in which they are betwixt and between two social identities, their current selves, and their Future Self Identity Project aspirations, “the selves they will become after they graduate” (Scott, 2010, p. 234). With these theoretical
considerations in mind, the Academic Highway Journey stages are discussed and evidenced with a sampling of participant-provided data frames. It is important to note the reciprocal coupling effects and the varying degrees of interconnecting, intersecting, and overlapping influences that exist between and within the different journey stages. Collectively, these effects and influences are generated by the interplay between the core category, the Academic Highway Journey as the planetary driver, and the five major categories, the academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems as the satellite systems’ influences.

**Academic Highway Journey Stages**

**The Starting Out Journey Stage: Participants Self-Preparedness**

While all participants wanted to be as prepared as possible for the Academic Highway Journey ahead, they acknowledged the realities of their personal positioning. From the outset, Louisa “was very determined and very excited about doing everything and doing it to the best of my abilities”. While recognising that the “motivation is there…because eventually it [teaching] will be so fulfilling and so good”, Louisa acknowledged the “battle” and the exhausting “uphill job” ahead of her in attempting to be “100 percent the best person I can be”. Similarly, Maria made her starting out situation clear: “I did non-TEE [vocational studies] subjects…So, I didn’t really write…there were no essays, or anything written. I’ve not really done any writing until now [at university] really”. Cognisant of having an inadequate understanding of the important reading-to-writing connection and lacking awareness of L2 academic writing conventions, Maria enrolled in a university preparation course. However, Maria considered the course was “a waste of time”. In reflecting on her starting out experiences, while knowing that she “needed to buckle down and just read and study”, María acknowledged that “university was the scariest thing ever…I was just in over my head. I probably am in over my head”.
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For Rebecca, arriving in Perth with limited L2 abilities and leaving high school after six months, her “study journey began in a very messy way”. As Rebecca pointed out, “I started without even knowing where to start and what the unit plans were…I still have a lot of things to learn and especially to improve”, concluding that “I think my study journey for now is ok not great. I know I can do more, and I can achieve higher results”. However, in Sarah’s starting out circumstances, having completed her primary and secondary schooling in Australia, she expected to “do great from the get-go”. However, in line with her high school situations, Sarah experienced ‘stage fright’ in her academic learning performances (Scott, 2007), feeling “very stressed which resulted in very poor-quality work” and grades. As these participant perspectives confirm, while all highway journeys were “made under one’s own volition” (Scott, 2015, p. 178), matching aspirations and expectations with academic achievement revealed the realities of situational difficulties and inequalities in their L2 academic worlds.

**Dealing with Academic Literacy Demands: Situational Difficulties and Dilemmas**

While Generation 1.5 learners typically have well-developed basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS), their CALP levels are generally under-developed (Roessingh & Douglas, 2012). Accordingly, this cohort of learners display distinct and differing L2 academic learning approaches and difficulties. Mirroring the experiences of other participants, Maria explained the difficulties in “just trying to manage my time” and feeling that she was “kind of just drowning” in dealing with the L2 academic literacy demands. In turn, Louisa described her academic writing pressures: “I don’t know how to start…because I’m anxious or scared of making mistakes”, coneding that: “I think every semester, as I gain more knowledge and skills, I tend to delay less, yes…be more proactive”. However, in Randy’s situation, his academic learning disengagement was clear from the outset. As Randy explained: “If it doesn’t grow my interest sort of thing, I tend to lose focus”,


rationalising that he “could have put more time into it [studying]...I don't try to overthink it too much when I do have problems”. Conversely, Rebecca pointed out that in dealing with her studies she “tried to make plans for assignments and studying”, along with “making lists of what I had to do”. In acknowledging her difficulties, Rebecca made it clear: “I feel I still need a bit of support when it comes to write assignments with an academic English”.

In undertaking her writing tasks, Maria outlined the processes: “Pretty much I find the resources...I write it as I'm speaking to explain it to someone, and then I go back and try and put them into a professional wording or, you know, grammatically correct order”. While Daniel graduated from high school, it is important to note that he failed his pre-Year 12 English exams four times. Accordingly, Daniel's L2 writing difficulties continued: “I can read in general. I just can't do essay writing”. As Hinkel (2004, 2013) explains, this cohort of learners may have difficulty distinguishing between verbal and written registers in L2 writing, emphasising that having formal instruction and on-going practice is crucial in meeting academic literacy challenges, as well as across-life domain demands. While Sarah completed all her education in Australia, she explains: “I've yet to become confident in my skimming through texts skill, so I will usually have to read a text word for word”. This finding illustrated a lack of reading comprehension skills, strategies, and techniques, a crucial learning obstacle given Sarah was studying law, a degree course characterised by significant reading-for-writing demands that required higher-order thinking skills (Nation, 2009). These cognitive skills include analysis, synthesis, integration, reasoning, and the ability to generalise and transfer skills, collectively challenging academic literacy issues for all study participants, irrespective of their degree choices (Cummins, 1984, 2005, 2008, 2011; Hinkel, 2004, 2013; Roessingh & Kover, 2003; Roessingh, Kover, & Watt, 2005). These study findings validated Generation 1.5 learner research in that L2 written communication skills require instruction and considerable practice in using grammatical and syntactical constructions that demonstrate the differences between academic writing conventions, formal, and informal discourse (Hinkel, 2004, 2013).
While Sarah acknowledged “struggling with my studies for a long time”, she revealed the on-going academic, cultural, psychological, and social impacts of her refugee positioning. As Sarah explained, her L2 fluency was achieved at a high personal cost: “I really struggle with my native language and that has a lot to do with growing up [in Australia]”, dealing with the “stigma of being one of those awful boat people”, and using English “to bridge that gap” because she “just wanted to fit in”. This finding supports Roessingh and Douglas (2012) in that Sarah is not fully proficient in either her first language or her L2 as demonstrated by adverse high school and university assessment outcomes. In addition, Sarah’s L2 educational circumstances corroborate the existing literature in that BICS or conversational fluency is an unreliable predictor in terms of academic success (Hinkel, 2004, 2013).

Importantly, while four of the six research participants graduated from Australian high schools, the data findings revealed that these students were managing their academic studies with varying degrees of difficulty. These findings echoed those of Roberge (2009) in that many Generation 1.5 high school graduates may be inadequately prepared to meet the cognitive challenges associated with academic reading and writing demands. Collectively, these Academic Highway Journey findings support Roessingh et al. (2005, p. 4), confirming and validating that developing CALP is a “long and uneven process”, one in which L2 learners “are continually chasing a moving target in their effort to close the gap between themselves and their NS [native speaker] classmates sufficiently to compete academically: many, if not most, never do”.

*Managing Academic Highway Journey Learning Performances: The Personal Dimensions*
In terms of participants’ managing their starting out journeys and dealing with their L2 academic literacy demands, these responsibilities presented significant identity-defining challenges and learning demands. Accordingly, these responsibilities supported the Goffmanian view of social interactions in everyday life as a series of dramaturgical performances (Goffman, 1959, 1974). For that reason, participants’ L2 academic performances are considered, constructed, and delivered for self and reinventive institution teaching staff ‘others’ who in turn, examine and scrutinise these learning journey deliveries (Scott, 2010, 2015). As study findings demonstrated, participants’ individual-difference affective learner dimensions were crucial components in relation to their current L2 proficiencies and their specific academic goals (Brindley, 1989). Cacioppo and Berntson (1999, p. 133) highlight the significant role that the affect system plays in educational domains, operating in conjunction with the cognitive system in terms of positive and negative information processing that “directs attention, guides decision making, stimulates learning and triggers behavior”. These affective dimensions include: age; anxiety; attitudes; extrinsic, instrumental, integrative, and intrinsic motivation; personality; psychological attributes; self-efficacy; and self-esteem (Brindley, 1989). While Ainley (2006) discusses these crucial inter-relationships in terms of impacts on students’ learning experiences, Gardner (2005) explains the importance of motivation in terms of its affective, behavioural, and cognitive components.

In terms of participants’ managing their learning performances, Krathwohl (2002) notes the importance of Bloom’s revised taxonomy. This taxonomy comprises: the knowledge dimensions that cover factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive; and the cognitive process dimensions that involve remembering, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating, and creating. For example, in feeling intimidated and overwhelmed in dealing with complex, learning performance situations, Maria considers: “My writing is the worst...And I can do tests. I can do practical work, everything and I get really good grades. But, when it comes to essays...I just do it. I read it over once and I just want it over and done with”. However, Randy expresses the cognitive dissonance-informed view that: “it’s more got
to do with, again, with the interest and disinterest...But in terms of remedy, I don’t [think] there were short-term remedies”. In terms of Rebecca’s performative situation: “A big issue for me that impacted a lot on my studies, is the belief that my English is not so perfect in order to finish or getting good results”, while Sarah is “trying to keep on top of everything in my life, and failing at it...trying to make it to the end of each semester before burning out”. On the other hand, while Louisa concedes that the journey has: “been an uphill job”, she considers that in terms of learning performances “every semester is a confirmation, yes, you’re doing the right thing. Yes, you’re doing the right thing”.

Accordingly, the Academic Highway Journey data findings established the complexities inherent in participants’ immigration-informed dramaturgical performances that were situationally-dependent and influenced to varying degrees by a combination of factors. These factors include individual-difference affective dimensions; across-life domain demands, challenges, and responsibilities; and resultant time constraints. With these considerations in mind, Rebecca’s studies were motivated by “wanting to do something positive for myself and my experience here in Australia”, while Maria pointed out that “I could do it [manage my studies] better but I have…I guess I make up excuses, but at the end of the day it’s really tiring”. However, in Louisa’s situation, in dealing with difficult family matters and juggling employment demands, she wanted “to be efficient...I want to be in better control of my emotions” in learning and social interactional performances. As Daniel cognitively downplays his L2 academic writing delivery challenges, an important component in the reading-to-writing connection (Hinkel, 2004), he advises that “reading is not a problem for me. It’s just writing is a problem for me”. These findings typify the BICS and CALP dichotomy and its resultant impacts in terms of the affective and cognitive dimensions within the performative aspects of participants’ academic journeys (Cummins, 2008). In addition, these findings highlight the requirement for formalised L2 writing instruction and practice. Cognitively-complex, this requirement would enable participants’ academic writing skills to progress from knowledge-telling, providing information on a topic available to them through
their existing familiarity, to knowledge-transformation that involves obtaining and integrating additional information to create ‘new’ knowledge (Hinkel, 2004). It is important to note that the knowledge-transformation writing model is considered crucial to academic success (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Hinkel, 2004, 2013). In explaining her writing dilemmas, Maria concludes that: “I think my writing has improved. But I don’t know how to fix it”. In a similar fashion, Louisa acknowledges her writing process difficulties, making it clear that: “even when I have everything ready, I feel this thing, how do I start, how do I start?”

These data frames illustrate the crucial performative aspects of academic learning as Goffman’s (1959, 1974) dramaturgical framework components come into play. In the learning performances stage of the Academic Highway Journey, the participants gave priority to balancing the role-distancing tensions that existed between the ‘back-stage’ academic study preparations and the ‘front-stage’ learner performances that are crucial in delivering verbal presentations, preparing written assignments, and sitting examinations. In identifying the difficulties inherent in participants’ future-focused, self-authorship, and identity work matters (Scott, 2015), the impact of dealing with inadequate CALP-influenced academic resources (Hinkel, 2004) was collectively experienced. These experiences were evidenced by Maria’s “having-a-go” attitude towards learning performances, metaphorically ‘throwing herself in at the deep end’ and ‘treading water’ to stay afloat in challenging learning and literacy situations described as being the “scariest thing ever” and being “in over my head”. As language shapes the way in which individuals consider, view, and act towards a phenomenon, Maria visualises her emotional and symbolic responses to Academic Highway Journey demands by using the “drowning” metaphor with its ‘sink-or-swim’ behavioural and cognitive components. In turn, Louisa uses her culturally-informed learning performance mantras that include the “battle” and “struggle” motifs with their ‘what-matters-is-the-fight’ messages. In considering her Academic Highway Journey as a world-changing one that is worthy of her fighting spirit, Louisa introduces a further affirmation-like Colombian saying “fake it until you make it”, meaning that “you do it until it is true, until [you make it happen]”. 
In keeping with Louisa’s intrinsically underpinned resilience resources, she discusses the ‘just-showing-up’ life journey driver when dealing with adversity, making the necessary adjustments, and managing transitional change. As Louisa contends: “The only thing you have to do in life is actually show up…it’s actually 80 percent of the job done because you’re showing up…the other 20 percent is making the effort”. In a similar fashion, Rebecca’s academic highway navigation involves self-belief: “I learned that if you really focus and if you believe just a bit that you can do it, you will achieve great results”.

However, in dealing with Academic Highway Journey challenges and responsibilities, Sarah uses the “burning out” metaphor that symbolises negative affective responses to her learning journey experiences and performances. As Maher (1989) points out, this metaphor is multidimensional in terms of impacts, with a long association with feelings of depression, hopelessness, meaninglessness, and pessimism. While seeking to realise her full, unique academic potential (Maslow, 1943), and in “trying to keep on top of everything”, Sarah ends up “failing at it” on the micro-, macro-, and mesosystems’ levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Consistent with academic and theatrical journey metaphors (Goffman, 1959, 1974), failure includes being unable to navigate, negotiate, and manage the learning performances and staging demands. Accordingly, participants’ affective responses when dealing with varying levels of Academic Highway Journey-influenced stage fright and performance dilemmas are crucial (Scott, 2007). In Maria’s words: “I had my own struggles like, you know, you freak out before exams, you freak out before essay”, pragmatically advising that you have to “just go with the flow and do what you need to do all through it [the learning journey]”. In turn, managing these individually-experienced factors are critical given participants’ learning performances are assessed and graded by reinventive institutional teaching staff (Goffman, 1959, 1974; Scott, 2010, 2015). However, in terms of participants dealing with their Academic Highway Journey progress, as Scott (2010, p. 213) points out, being a voluntary member of a reinventive institution does not signify having complete control in the “authorship of the re-invented self” processes.
**Dealing with Learning Journey Disruptions: Traffic Flows and Roadblocks**

In accordance with the metaphor of the journey coding, analysis, and study findings, participants are considered as learner drivers or ‘vehicles’ following their scheduled semester-by-semester academic routes. This theoretical concept aligns with Scott (2015, p. 26) in terms of “embodied individuals…‘vehicular elements’ or ‘ambulatory units’, moving around social space and negotiating a path around others…They follow a set of tacitly understood ‘traffic rules’ to protect their personal territories and avoid encroaching into others’ spaces”. In relation to managing the learner-driver situational processes, Maria’s journey objective is to “finish and pass the units…I want to say to be the best in class but that’s a lie”. This viewpoint aligns with Randy whose highway positioning involves being “that sort of student that a pass will be good enough, sort of thing”. Accordingly, findings confirm that participants’ Academic Highway Journeys involve ‘keeping up’ with traffic flows, conforming to the ‘rules’, and monitoring other highway vehicles. This driver-monitoring activity involves competing with and being overtaken by fellow learners, along with dealing with teaching staff as elite, professionally-driven vehicles comfortably navigating the academic highway (Collins, 2000).

Importantly, in terms of becoming ‘stuck’ in liminality hotspot traffic jams and dealing with disruptive detours, distractions, and diversions (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), Maria explains that: “I don’t speak out, much…If I struggle but I’m still managing, I will just keep managing. I won’t [complain to teaching staff]”, while Sarah would “rather not burden others with my problems”.

While Louisa’s academic journey expectations are unchanged from the outset, her positioning has evolved over time in that her learning and learner-driver approach has taken a different direction since starting out. While initially thinking that: “I’m going to ace everything and nothing is going to be under 85 percent and it has to be perfect”, Louisa concluded that “now my thinking is along the lines, I need to learn this the proper way and
even if I get 70 or less, if I did my very best and I learned it the right way, then it’s okay”.

However, Louisa’s ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ drive remains intact: “So now it’s like, okay, let’s go. Let’s do it”. This positive Academic Highway Journey realignment in terms of anticipated achievement outcomes encompasses learning approaches, directional attention, and maintaining study flows. Collectively, Louisa is endeavouring to balance her commitment to maximising learning outcomes while reaching the destination point as originally planned. Importantly, this view is at odds with participants relegating themselves or feeling that reinventive institution staff are consigning them to specific highway lanes considered as representative of their perceived L2 academic abilities. To demonstrate this finding, Randy explains that: “I wouldn’t call myself I suppose like a top, high distinction student. I’ll be just like an average Joe student, sort of thing...I’m getting what I want from the course pretty much”. However, Randy adds a caveat: “I suppose it’s got to do more about how much time, like, how a person can invest in it to improve, so specifically study-wise”. In turn, Maria maintains that the Academic Highway Journey can be managed, that “it can be done even if you put a minimum effort and you just want to do it”, validating the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory.

In managing the psychological impacts inherent in their journeys, the participants as learner drivers are mindful that being less academically-prepared typically restricts them to the ‘slower’ academic highway lane. However, the more academically-prepared generally access the ‘faster’ lane, usually encountering fewer highway journey disruptions. Importantly, these self-delivered categorisations parallel the existing literature that discusses educational framing dichotomies and the ways in which teaching staff make, misframe, or mismatch learner frames in relation to struggling students’ perceived abilities (Goffman, 1974; Hand et al, 2013). Subsequently, for a myriad of academic, cultural, economic, family, learning, navigational, and social reasons (Yosso, 2005), ‘slower’ lane L2 learners typically contend with greater highway journey transitional barriers along the way (Roberge, 2009; Stenner,
The metaphor of the Academic Highway Journey now considers situational inequality in terms of perceived driver affront, deference, and domination (Collins, 2000).

**Dealing with Situational Inequality: Institutional Practices and Processes**

In keeping with the metaphor of managing the Academic Highway Journey, the participants, as learner drivers, faced situational inequalities along the way. Being overtaken, forced to give way, or feeling obliged to defer to more academically, culturally, economically, and socially 'enriched' staff and student vehicles, was a crucial study finding and coding construct. In terms of seeking direction and guidance from authority-figure vehicles, Louisa explains: “Sometimes when they [teaching staff] are busy, I ask somebody else [fellow student]”. However, Maria considers her academic positioning in terms of dealing with the impacts of managing across-life domain journeys: “Because I thought, can’t get any better. Too much going on. Just submit it. It’s all done”. On the other hand, Randy admits misreading academic journey timetables and missing a scheduled end-of-semester examination: “Bad time management from my side of things”. However, Sarah considered that her cultural beliefs provided the “motivation to keep going”, regardless of self and institutionally-attributed procedural barriers, delays, and difficulties encountered along the way.

In relation to authority-figure vehicle clashes, collisions, and crashes, Maria sets the assignment accident scene: “On the morning of the due date, I got up at 6am...just [to] fix up those couple of things. And my kids started screaming. And I just submitted the file. But it was the wrong file”. In terms of the institutional processes and outcomes, Maria advises that “it was my mistake”, adding that “because I submitted the wrong document and lost 40 percent of my final mark. I failed that unit. At 48 percent”. However, despite on-going discussion between the vehicle drivers: “We were emailing about the essay. And she said, don’t worry we’ll give you a supp exam and you can get your points there”, the outcome was
unchanged. As Maria points out: “When I went to review the supp exam, there was a couple of questions that were correctly answered, but not in the way she wanted them answered. And she just said that I failed. At 48”. Consequently, this study finding highlights procedural matters that include inequity, power dynamics, and socio-economic positioning, along with knowledge transmission limitations and learning and literacy structures, that collectively call for reinventive institutional change (Hand et al., 2013; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Scott, 2010, 2015). This highway assignment accident or critical incident report also recalls Goffman’s (1974) frame analysis in which frames serve as cognitive schemas that guide social action and understanding, representing an interactional ‘roadmap’ or future-self guide (Dörnyei, 2014) that sets the scene and directs the interactions that follow. In Maria’s contested assessment frame, in terms of defining, interpreting, and making sense of the situation, asking a Goffmanesque framing question in terms of ‘What is going on here?’ is appropriate. In answering this dramaturgical question, the data findings highlighted the (i) lack of authority-figure vehicular understanding in terms of the coupling effects of failing a unit by a small margin; (ii) relational inequity in dealing with Maria’s essay submission mistake and its unintentional but ultimately critical study frame disruption; (iii) unwillingness to explore alternative roadmap learning options that may have enabled the Academic Highway Journey to continue as scheduled; and (iv) absence of collaborative and cooperative learning and teaching approaches that have the capacity to reframe and reshape educational opportunities for non-traditional undergraduate students from a range of backgrounds (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Hand et al., 2012; Harvey & Mallman, 2019).

Subsequently, this academic assessment process is interpreted as an example of the psychological phenomena of road rage. Sansone and Sansone (2010, p. 14) describe road rage as encompassing “a variety of aggressive behaviors by the driver of a motor vehicle, which seems well beyond the perceived offense committed by the victim”. In alignment with critical learning incident data, failing the semester one unit by two points had a domino effect, with a series of future-self and academic journey repercussions that are considered
“well beyond the perceived offense” (Sansone & Sansone, 2010, p. 14). As the data findings indicated, Maria’s road rage incident resulted in unnecessary psychological anxiety and distress for this learner driver. It is worth noting that the academic impact resulted in learner disengagement: “The unit that I failed…Because I held a grudge, I didn’t even touch it through the whole semester. I just didn’t go back to it. I did the basic minimum [to pass]”.

Failing this unit disrupted planned semester two enrolment choices, delayed the overall journey schedule by a further semester, and impacted financially in terms of re-enrolment fees. As Maria explained, she was: “Angry, but angry at myself. Angry at them as well…angry that I wasted six months and $1000 pretty much”. This critical incident data can be likened to a frame dispute involving Maria’s academic worldmaking experiences, performances, and scripting that conflicted with institutional ones (Goffman, 1959, 1974). This incident also raised the issue of teaching staff who may lack awareness of or be unwilling to acknowledge and address non-traditional students’ academic literacy needs and the broader situational inequalities that exist in contemporary university learning environments (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Collins, 2000; Hand et al., 2013; Harvey & Millman, 2019; Scott, 2010, 2015).

These Academic Highway Journey experiences recall the Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986), a term coined by sociologist Robert Merton that in this study refers to the power dynamics that exist in the ‘vehicular hierarchy’ within reinventive institutions (Collins, 2000; Scott, 2010, 2015). The Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986) is based on Matthew 25:29 in the New Testament which states: “For to everyone who has, more will be given, and he will have abundance; but from him who does not have, even what he has will be taken away” (King James Bible, cited in Elihai, 2005, p. 220). Accordingly, students with greater life abundance, opportunities, and resources tend to achieve further life journey successes. As demonstrated in Maria’s road rage situation, an abundance of negatively-orientated authority-figure vehicular power was identified in the data findings. These power dynamics included connectional, expert, informational, personal, and relational
(Hand et al., 2013). However, with the Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986) in play, this construct tends to favour the more academically 'enriched', ‘faster’, and well-supported learner drivers who may outpace and overshadow the less able, less ‘enriched’ and under-supported student drivers (Collins, 2000).

As evidenced in the assignment accident situation, Maria’s self-esteem and self-worth was undermined by situational affront, generating a sense of exclusion that negated any feelings of belongingness as demonstrated by her subsequent learning disengagement. In relation to Maria feeling unsupported academically, emotionally, and psychologically in terms of academic direction and guidance from teaching staff, Hand et al. (2013) refer to this absence of teaching support in terms of the “coaching frame [original emphasis]” (p. 259). The authors consider this frame is crucial in learning situations in which students 'mess-it-up', make mistakes, or take missteps that disrupt their “doing school frames [original emphasis]” (p. 255). These views recall Maria’s preferred learning frame: “I just wish, I guess, that school is old school...listening to a lecture and spending time in a classroom.” In turn, these educational impacts were exacerbated by data findings that confirmed further learning disconnections in terms of ‘Claytons’ learning and literacy support services. In the Australian context, ‘Claytons’ is used in an idiomatic sense to represent something that while existing is largely illusionary or functioning as an inferior substitute for the product or service that is being promoted. In this study, academic learning support is available but largely inaccessible for several reasons that are discussed in the next journey stage. However, in being Academic Highway Journey-driven, this cohort of learners, as demonstrated in the story lines in Chapters 4 and 5, have typically experienced multiple levels of adversity and learning disadvantage in their home countries and in Australia as their host country. As the findings reveal, this learning disadvantage continues.

Once again, the Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986) has relevance in relation to scarcity and abundance impacts and influences (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013).
Paradoxically, participants’ scarce resources in terms of L2 abilities, support services, and time, generates an abundance of additional navigational difficulties in negotiating their academic journey landscapes (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). As Rebecca explained: “I see the roads even more challenging for me…I am trying to overcome these roads with a positive attitude and by trying to face the difficulties”, emphasising that her journey “has very complicated roads with my goals and interests far away from me and difficult to reach”. In acknowledging her academic struggles, Sarah considers that her Islamic beliefs, customs, and faith intrinsically motivate, support, and underpin her “golden career” choice that drives her ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ becoming-a-lawyer journey. The findings make it clear that there is a connection between Sarah’s refugee background, her career choice, and her learning approach to dealing with Academic Highway Journey-influenced personal and situational inequalities: “Being a good Muslim…to seek knowledge from cradle to grave…to fulfil my religious obligations”. Sarah’s views align with religious comfort theories (Kool et al., 2017; Peek, 2005) in terms of generating the “motivation to keep going no matter how long it takes me to finish what I started”. Paradoxically, Sarah’s stance demonstrates situational dominance and inequality in terms of covering and crossing journeys that are impacted by intersectionality and passing constructs (Collins, 2000; Greco & Stenner, 2017). However, in dealing with the liminality-influenced positionality difficulties that are integral in making academic learning transitions (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), these issues are crucial given Sarah has joined the highway journey elite vehicles pursuing a law degree. As Preston et al. (2014, p. 1054) contend, in “thinking like a lawyer”, students require well-developed metacognitive skills in order to deal with the intellectual challenges and demands implicit in this profession.

However, throughout this journey Sarah’s ought-to L2 self (Dörnyei, 2014) feels obliged to meet her L1 community expectations, despite being inadequately prepared academically and psychologically to manage the associated learning and literacy demands and difficulties. Likewise, Randy explains a similar inattention to highway journey scheduling
responsibilities: “I think I definitely can [improve literacy skills] with the more time that I invest in it...I’d probably put it as not a priority”. In turn, these collective findings align with liminal hotspot transitioning and the associated paradox, paralysis, and polarisation characteristics (Greco & Stenner, 2017). As Greco and Stenner explain, the concept of permanent liminality with the intersecting and overlapping influences inherent in ‘becoming journeys’ are characterised by a “set of paradoxical injunctions”. Accordingly, these injunctions or restrictions serve to frame modern societies, requiring subjective motivational and psychological components such as active citizenship, confidence, and creativity in “living the paradox [original emphasis]” to manage them (Greco & Stenner, 2017, p. 162). Additionally, these ‘misframed’ Academic Highway Journey and learning experiences and performances align with frame analysis (Goffman, 1974), a construct that is crucial in defining, interpreting, and meaning-making in participants’ worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978). However, in terms of navigational journey aids, Maria demonstrates an adaptive and determined approach: “Do what you need to do”. Given these journey perspectives, and in keeping with the Goldilocks dilemma, managing L2 literacy demands set within institutional practices and processes while maintaining positive and proactive affective, attitudinal, and cognitive learning momentum over an academic year is challenging. Accordingly, the Academic Highway Journey metaphor is underpinned by participants’ efforts to achieve the ‘just right’ balance in terms of having positive academic experiences that result in competent learning delivery performances (Scott, 2007). However, given the range of institutional practices and processes underpinning situational inequality, achieving this balance represents significant challenges for participants to achieve, implement, and sustain (Hand et al., 2013; Scott, 2010, 2015).

**Situational Inequality: Dealing with Academic Learning Support Disconnections**

In terms of learner driver statuses and learning frames (Hand et al., 2013), study findings identified L2 literacy support disconnections and time scarcity as being
representative of major Academic Highway Journey situational inequalities. As all six participants were unable to access or were reluctant to use the university-provided face-to-face or online academic literacy support services during their Academic Highway Journeys, situational inequality continued. In terms of meeting academic writing demands, Maria concluded that “I think my writing has improved. But I don’t know how to fix it”, advising that “I have done the online module, but it didn’t really…Like I did it and I completed it but it didn’t really change a lot that I do”. In Maria’s academic, employment, and family situation, she emphasises time scarcity issues: “Maybe if I did uni after high school with no kids and no other obligations it might be different…I think both me and my husband are just kind of like you need to finish this to get further”. Similarly challenged in terms of course scheduling conflicts and reluctance to contact teaching and learning support staff, Rebecca seeks literacy support “from some of my friends that read my assignment and helped me with the English grammar”. In addition, Randy points out that “scheduling is always a problem, and also other days I’ll be working part-time as well”. In terms of academic literacy support formats, Maria favours face-to-face, ‘just-in-time’ sessions, and targeted literacy support rather than online:

Most of the time my readings I will print off and I will have my harder copy even though I could just sit and read it on the computer…And then internet dropping out and it’s just so frustrating that everything is [online]…And you go and talk to somebody about something and they’re like, oh you can find it online. It’s like I don’t want to find it online.

While Daniel was aware of university-provided literacy support, both face-to-face and online, he explains his non-participation: “Not enough time, I think. I really feel like now my work gets too get packed up a lot more”. While confirming the value of face-to-face academic support sessions: “Like maybe after three or four [pm]”, cognitive dissonance, in the form of rationalisation and making contradictory, counter-intuitive statements, Daniel considers that he: “Likes to do it myself, like self-learning kind of thing. I can’t really study when someone is around me, that kind of thing”. However, this aspirational aim to become a
self-regulated learner has yet to be achieved, as Daniel points out that he has difficulty managing his pre-reading demands, advising that: “I can read in general”. Importantly, Alderson (2005) reports that while reading comprehension results from the interaction between the reader, the text, and the tasks associated with the reading purpose, this interaction also involves the learner’s affective, cognitive, demographic, metacognitive, and socio-cultural dynamics in terms of information processing. In Louisa’s situation, studying and working full-time, along with managing family responsibilities, she explains that being able to access literacy support programs would be like “a gift”. While advocating for evening, night, or weekend L2 support sessions, Louisa advises: “that would be awesome…fantastic and I reckon there would be a crowd for that”. Collectively, and aligning with the literature (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Hand et al., 2013; Harvey & Mallman, 2019), this L2 learning support disconnection reflects all participants’ Academic Highway Journey experiences.

Given the staff and student identity and power dynamics that are inherent in the highway elite hierarchy with its highly-patterned and structured interactional affront and deference factors (Collins, 2000; Goffman, 1959, 1974), the situational and theoretical considerations are many and varied. As evidenced by data findings that range from Maria feeling unable to ask questions of the staff: “Sometimes when they are busy. I ask someone else…but there are so many people like me asking questions”, to Louisa being reluctant to question assignment grades or query course unit results. As Louisa explains:

> Usually I don’t contest the teacher’s [grades]...Whatever you give me, I’m happy, because…I know it’s wrong, but I always think, okay, this person sat down and went through my work, and at some point they identified that I didn’t meet the criteria. And if this person that is so knowledgeable, and is my teacher, and is doing the right thing by me says I didn’t do it, then probably I didn’t do it.

With study findings indicating a generalised uneasiness in delivering ‘standing out’ rather than ‘fitting in’ messages to fellow students and teaching staff, Louisa contends: “I think it’s also one of those things when you don’t want to get into a debacle, I guess”. In part,
this uneasiness or reluctance to seek assistance may be attributed to felt, perceived, or past home country teaching methods that were teacher-focused rather than student-focused (Brown, 2007; Swan & Smith, 2010). Consequently, Western-style communicative language teaching methods with L2 tasks that require original thought and opportunities to express personal opinions may not be received positively, may be rejected, and may be difficult for participants to maintain over time (Brown, 2007). However, the study findings are clear. The combination of participants’ reluctance to discuss learning barriers, along with teaching staff labelling in terms of students’ perceived L2 proficiencies, delivers major learning consequences. As Witkowsky et al. (2016, p. 30) point out, “students with families and students of nontraditional age” represent “one of the underserved student populations in higher education” in terms of receiving targeted institutionally-provided support programs that meet their needs (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019). Additional self-identity issues include impression management, losing ‘face’ in learning and home country community environments, and dealing with sense-of-self issues that include self-esteem, self-identity, and self-worth (Dörnyei, 2014; Scott, 2015). As Malaysian-born Daniel asserts: “Since coming to Australia because if you study in Australia you have to do good. That’s the overseas person thinking”.

In capturing the L2 literacy difficulties and learning disadvantages existing in participants’ Academic Highway Journey experiences, overcoming these barriers is hampered by an additional situational inequality in terms of being seemingly ‘invisible’ in the undergraduate student community, neither insiders nor outsiders (Davison, 2005; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). As Harvey and Mallman (2019) confirm, migrants, particularly those from refugee backgrounds, face additional, specific, and currently unmet academic support challenges. Fundamentally, the authors argue that university access without appropriate learning and literacy support is counter-intuitive, as well as being at odds with Australian institutions’ marketing programs that promote educational opportunities for all students, irrespective of their cultural, educational, historical, linguistic, and socio-economic
backgrounds. It is considered that Maria’s rationale for her university enrolment demonstrates the marketing mismatches and mixed messages that exist in Australia’s tertiary education sector (Bunce et al., 2017):

So always in the back of my mind I was like, well I did get into university and I could possibly do it…I started working in the nursing home and just being older, and I’m like what am I going to do with an arts degree…And I always kind of knew that I didn’t think it happened… I’m smart enough or good enough to do, to be a nurse…Like in Europe you have to be a great student to get into nursing…Like as I said you don’t have those opportunities in Europe. You just don’t.

Sowing the seeds of high academic aspirations and expectations, Maria’s university acceptance also signalled academic ability and suitability, irrespective of her acknowledged under-developed CALP, limited formal L2 instruction, and inadequate L2 reading-to-writing practice. In Maria’s words, her Academic Highway Journey was driven by her conviction that “we’ll all be in the same position in ten years down the road if we don’t do uni…it has an end and it has a purpose and it just has to happen”. Accordingly, Arkoudis et al. (2019) and Harvey and Mallman (2019) contend that improved Australian university enrolment processes would provide a way in which to identify potentially at-risk learners in a whole-of-student life cycle approach to learning and literacy support. It is worth noting that nearly thirty years ago, Stevenson (1991, p. 94) asserted that “…when we educators speak of at-risk students”. We fear for their economic competitiveness. We fear for their ability to survive in a complex and hostile world. We worry about them, and we want to help”. Decades later, Arkoudis et al. (2019) and Harvey and Mallman (2019) continue this ‘fear’ message, asserting that given on-going inaction, irrespective of a radically-changed higher education landscape (Productivity Commission, 2019), students are obliged to ‘fit’ into existing learning and literacy support models that may be Claytons-like in reality, rather than providing specific, targeted, and timely programs. Paradoxically, this pedagogical situation also highlights the current ‘student-as-consumer’, business sector approach to tertiary education (Bunce et al., 2017; Schwartzman, 1995; Snowden & Lewis, 2015) without
addressing the academic support requirements of all its ‘consumers’. Consequently, these manifest metaphorical mismatches ‘fail’ and further disadvantage students from non-traditional backgrounds such as Generation 1.5 learners.

The final words in this learning support disconnection stage of the Academic Highway Journey belong to Louisa whose ethos epitomises the spirit of the meaning-making metaphor and its over-arching Theory: “I want to be better for my students. I don’t want to be that teacher that doesn’t know… I want to be overall a better professional… I will try to be 100 percent the best person I can”. However, in line with the data findings, motivational drivers alone are insufficient if participants are to counter the collective learning and literacy challenges inherent in their academic journeys. Importantly, if participants are to achieve their L2 future-self life goals, the data findings clearly demonstrate that university access without ‘just-in-time’, targeted academic literacy support does not constitute educational opportunities for this cohort of learners. Accordingly, the next stage, exiting the journey, is viewed in terms of Stenner’s (2018a, 2018b) liminality construct. This construct considers participants’ journeys as transitional passages in which they are caught between two social identities and worlds, their current selves, and “the selves they will become after they graduate” (Scott, 2010, p. 234). However, given the differences between participants’ worldview-influenced Academic Highway Journey aspirations and the realities of dealing with learning inequalities in reinventive institutions, the challenges are complex and considerable (Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Scott, 2010, 2015).

**Academic Highway Journey Exiting Options**

In keeping with the empirically-underpinned academic journey stages, if learner drivers’ academic and self-repair works are considered manageable, making study adjustments and modifications ensure that their studies continue. However, should learner drivers be unable or unwilling to continue the scheduled journey, decision-making involves
delaying or discontinuing the Academic Highway Journeys for specific periods. These exiting options include withdrawing from one or more semester units or withdrawing from all semester units in order to reconsider journey scheduling. On the other hand, if major academic repairs are required, and if the associated damage is substantial, complete withdrawal from the university course may be inevitable. In Randy’s journey situation, he “dropped a couple of units” in semester one, studying two units part-time when offered full-time employment. However, the journey became more difficult to manage as Randy explains in failing one unit: “I could have put more time into it. I could have, you know, I could’ve, could’ve, could’ve sort of thing… I didn’t action on it and that lead to not having a successful semester…I suppose, [not] rational decision-making”. Ultimately, Randy withdrew from university, explaining that he “didn’t find it too difficult… It was a decision that I thought about for a long time… I think probably next semester I’ll be going on with my studies [off-campus at a different university]… doing fulltime work at the same time”. The data findings make it clear that Randy is taking the Academic Highway Journey exit route because he considered he was on the wrong pathway. In explaining that the course “doesn’t grow my interest sort of thing”, wanting to take a different road and wanting to start afresh in his third university enrolment, Randy was cognitively-avoidantly on-track with his decision. In being determined not to “overthink” the situation, Randy conceded that “in terms of decision-making, I think I need to make a bit more affirmative action, because I can't stay in universities forever”.

Struggling with her Academic Highway Journey from the start, study findings liken Sarah’s situation to an educational jihad that is in keeping with her refugee past, her cultural heritage, and her Islamic faith-influenced conviction that there is “a beauty in the struggle”. Importantly, given this conviction, Sarah considers that her culturally-situated beliefs are sufficient to support and sustain her academic pursuits, regardless of the continual challenges and stressful situations experienced along the way. In aligning with the ought-to L2 self (Dörnyei, 2014), and as the findings confirm, Sarah places great significance on meeting self, family, and L1 community expectations: “My parents came here to give me a
chance at a better life through peace and knowledge. I can’t bear to put their struggles and sacrifices to waste”. In choosing a law degree, driven in part by the expectations of significant ‘others’, Sarah advises that “the “golden careers…doctors, lawyers, engineers, dentists” are highly-valued in her Hazara community. This ‘ought-to’ academic decisional dilemma creates the cognitively challenging dichotomy of avoiding negative educational outcomes such as failing her law course, while being aware that meeting these academic expectations are compromised by her inability to manage the associated literacy demands and the accompany academic stressors.

Sarah’s cognitive challenges are referred to as dichotomous thinking, with Oshio (2009, p. 730) describing it as the “propensity to think of things in terms of binary opposition: “black or white”, “good or bad”, or “all or nothing”, an approach that is “useful for quick comprehension and decision making”. However, this cognition is underpinned by fear-of-failure and perfectionism (Conroy et al., 2007), which in turn, undermines self-esteem, self-identity, and self-worth and generates feelings of anxiety, depression, and inadequacy (Maher, 1989). In due course, Sarah withdrew from her first semester studies, explaining that “it was awful. I thought having a change in environment and studying my dream course would make things easier, but it didn’t. I was gutted that I had to withdraw”. However, Sarah resumed full-time studies in semester two, vowing not “to put pressure on myself by expecting amazing grades”, hoping instead to “just pass”. However, in endeavouring to ‘pace’ her Academic Highway Journey in terms of managing the study load and “trying to make it to the end of each semester before burning out”, Sarah ultimately abandoned her law studies. As Sarah explains: “The increased pressure and the health issues played a role in having to withdraw”. While Maher (1989) discusses the burnout metaphor in terms of social-structural considerations, the study findings demonstrated that Sarah failed to meet self-oriented perfectionism in terms of avoiding learning performances that resulted in feelings of failure, shame, and stigma (Conroy et al., 2007; Goffman, 1959, 1963). These feelings were exacerbated given significant ‘other’-orientated high academic expectations for
Sarah, fuelling her “burn out” in terms of emotional exhaustion, psychological distress, and a lack of situational control in managing stressful academic learning situations. The metaphor of managing the Academic Highway Journey resonated and reverberated in the data findings that demonstrated the multiple forces, both positive and negative, that influenced and underpinned participants’ evolving story lines. However, as Duckworth (2017, p. 14) points out in relation to people’s intrinsic grit, resilience, and tenacity, “Our potential is one thing. What we do with it is quite another [original emphasis]”. Accordingly, the final Academic Highway Journey stage, staying the course, discusses these sentiments.

**Staying the Academic Highway Journey Course**

In demonstrating the impact of the various intersecting, interconnecting, and overlapping satellite systems’ influences that existed and operated within the Academic Highway Journey stages, all participants managed with great difficulty. This view is evidenced by the fact that the journeymen and journeywomen in this study confirmed the urgency of their academic journeys and the validity of the Theory’s overarching ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ motivation. However, in terms of staying the journey course, three remained, Louisa, Maria, and Rebecca. While Randy and Sarah withdrew from their courses, as Daniel’s study commitment ended after the initial interview, his journey outcome is unknown. As discussed in the detailed story lines in Chapters 4 and 5, participants’ abilities to cope and deal effectively with stressful learning situations were individually-situated and across domain-influenced (Idan et al., 2017). However, given participants’ immigrant backgrounds, Yosso’s (1995) cultural wealth capital model that comprises aspirational, familial, linguistic, navigational, social, and resistance resources were evident in the participants’ approaches to managing their academic journeys. Similarly, in relation to L2 academic decision-making processes, participants’ coping strategies include: (i) fast and slow cognition (Kahneman, 2011) in which the former is more impressionist, associative, and instinctive, while the latter
is more considered, deliberate, and effortful; (ii) salutogenesis (Antonovsky, 1980; Idan et al., 2017) with its generalised resistance resources that contribute to role-identity salience, effective functioning, meaning-making processes, and having a sense of coherence that frames and shapes life outcomes; (iii) the satisficing construct (Simon, 1979) in terms of satisfying and sufficing in arriving at ‘good enough’ outcomes; and (iv) the transactional theory of stress and coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987) in terms of appraisal, adaptation, and coping.

However, for all participants, the dominant coping strategy emerging from the study findings was the scarcity and depletion theory (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). The authors argue that having a scarcity mindset erodes cognitive coping function or ‘mental bandwidth’ in terms of dealing with stressful issues that result in seemingly irrational, counter-intuitive, and counter-productive attitudinal, behavioural, and decisional outcomes (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). In terms of participants' managing with inadequate academic L2 abilities, learning and literacy support services, and time, this construct dominated and permeated all aspects of the participants' Academic Highway Journeys. In turn, this scarcity mindset was countered by an abundance of related issues, which for all participants, impacted in negative ways on already scarce cognitive, functional, and time resources. However, these scarcity issues also ‘drove’ all participants to adopt and use personalised academic coping strategies. These strategies included: Louisa’s ‘faking it until you make it’ in terms of becoming a more competent student; Maria’s selectively-proactive approach to managing assignments by submission dates rather than by the degree of difficulty and time requirements; and Rebecca’s unresolved “stay-in-Perth” or ‘return-to-Italy’ dilemma that resulted in a pass-or-fail approach that determined semester-by-semester decision-making. Collectively, adopting these coping approaches assisted learner drivers in navigating and negotiating the on-going decisional processes that were implicit in managing their academic journeys. Discussion now turns to the three participants who stayed the Academic Highway Journey course.
Staying the Course.

In Louisa’s 2017 Year of Wreckage story line discussion in Chapter 5 that provided the prequel to her Academic Highway Journey, coping required a range of resistance resources to deal with across-life domain impacts. Given her marriage breakdown situation, making pit stops for immediate self-identity adjustments, repairs, and life journey script changes, along with ‘re-charging’ and ‘re-fuelling’ contributed to Louisa’s revised salutogenic-informed praxis of living framework (Guidano, 1991). Importantly, this framework focused on Louisa maintaining her journey schedule ‘regardless’ of the consequences. With these coping measures in place, and once the emotional damage had been assessed as ‘beyond repair’, irreconcilable, and irretrievable, Louisa’s academic journey continued. In managing despite increased educational, family, personal, and work overspills, pressures, and strains, Louisa maintained her demanding journey as originally scheduled. As she reflected: “Probably if I wasn’t in uni, it would have been terrible for me to deal with all these things”. In staying the course and overcoming all academic traffic battles and barriers along the way, Louisa’s breakthroughs were considerable in terms of the theoretically-aligned complexities and difficulties situated within her academic journey landscape. These academic challenges included: managing liminality-influenced hotspot issues (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b); re-establishing positionality; dealing with intersectionality; and incorporating passing, covering, and crossing constructs (Goffman, 1959, 1974; Marcia & Josselson, 2013; Scott, 2010, 2015). In staying the course, Louisa maintained her achieved university student identity status (Marcia, 2002). However, throughout the marriage breakdown period, Louisa gave “priority to being a Mum than to being a wife”, retaining her future-self framing focus, making it clear that she wants to “keep on studying and learning more…I think the joy that I get from studying, it’s very powerful”.
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While Louisa’s marital breakdown during the Academic Highway Journey evolved into almost crash scene-like proportions on an affective, emotional, and psychological level, Rebecca’s situation differed but the impacts were similarly significant. In dealing with her year-long staying-in-Perth or returning-to-Italy decisional dilemma, Rebecca’s ambivalence and indecision generated on-going affective, behavioural, and cognitive challenges that resulted in academic journey disruptions and distractions. As Rebecca explained: “I tried to combine my studies with difficult times and not so much time to do assignments and study…with family-related problems and other problems I haven’t been able to get very good results”. However, Rebecca emphasised the pervasive, negative impacts: “I have been thinking about it [staying or leaving Perth] daily”. In dealing with a heavy course load, the emotional distress and psychological anxiety inherent in mentally debating whether to continue her studies as planned or take the exit route back to Italy, Rebecca failed a semester one unit. As she explains: “The consequences are that I become more undecided and that I feel I have to make a decision and finally to a conclusion of where I want to live”. Ultimately, in keeping with a scarcity identity mindset, Rebecca deferred decision-making, relying instead on her academic journey results to determine her plans: “Every new semester I have to decide if I really want to continue with this life or going back to my life in Italy”. However, Rebecca conceded that over time, her initial highway journey expectations have “changed a lot” in terms of realising “how important university is and how much I want to finish it and find a job…I have more expectations”. Regardless of highway journey difficulties, and in acknowledging her family-influenced dilemmas, Rebecca considered that while: “I doubt myself a lot, they made me realise that I will be able to finish the course”.

Consequently, Rebecca’s studies continued, staying the course, and emphasising that: “This indecision affects a lot [of] my life at the moment…I hesitate a lot and I think ‘what if I really go back home’, so that stops me to do a lot of things including my studies”. Additionally, Rebecca makes it clear that her indecision “is also very difficult for my family because they can see that I am not happy here”. While this decisional ambivalence
continued throughout Rebecca's Academic Highway Journey, she passed all her semester two units. Paradoxically, if Rebecca completes her university degree, and arrives at her ultimate journey destination point, this achievement would provide the educational opportunity for reverse immigration (Cassarino, 2004) in terms of returning to Italy to live and work.

In Maria’s situation, ‘moving on’ from her semester one assignment accident with its multiple, negative Academic Highway Journey impacts and repercussions demonstrated her identity growth mindset (Dweck, 2012). In displaying academic grit (Duckworth, 2017), resilience (OECD, 2018), and tenacity (Dweck et al., 2014) to achieve her highway journey goals regardless of the obstacles and setbacks along the way, Maria explained: “Uni will end. It’s only a three-year thing or four years or five years, however long it takes us…it has an end and it has a purpose and it just has to happen”. However, staying the course and completing her academic journey was impacted by her across-life domain responsibilities: “I sometimes write my essays at work. Or at 11 o’clock at night when we have come back from work…or when we’ve picked up the kids from daycare”. In a theoretical context, Maria’s liminality-influenced hotspot transitional issues dominated the study findings. In confirming the importance of her academic journey drivers, Maria’s determination, drive, and perseverance was unwavering: “It’s always going to be number one because it’s got an end date…But like even our university is for our kids”.

The previous discussion demonstrated the significance of the Academic Highway Journey as the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory’s planetary driver. This discussion ranged from theoretical considerations and the metaphor of the journey, through to dealing with learning disruptions and staying the Academic Highway Journey course. Discussion now turns to the coupling effects and the interplay between the five major categories or satellite systems that comprise academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning. To
demonstrate this positioning and situational influences, the theoretical model is presented and discussed.

**Substantive Theory Modelling and Positioning: The Academic Highway Journey Driver and the Five Satellite Systems**

As the previous Academic Highway Journey discussion demonstrated, the coupling effects that existed between the core category and the five major categories or orbiting satellite systems were evident. To aid recall and for ease of reference, Figures 6.1 and 6.2 illustrated these theoretical components. In turn, Figure 6.3 below will demonstrate the influences of these combined theoretical elements and modelling within Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs. This is in keeping with the detailed previous and subsequent theoretical discussion on the way in which the satellite systems impacted in various ways and in different stages of the participants’ Academic Highways Journeys. These systems comprise academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning, all exerting and generating significant across-systems’ and intra-systems’ impacts and influences. Table 3.3 (p. 103) listed the systems’ fundamental areas of influence, while the tables in Appendix F depict the evolution of systems as major categories during the data-generation and analytical period. In keeping with data analysis and the emergent systems theory-influenced approach (Mele et al., 2010), the literature-informed study findings and story lines generated a holistic and integrative Theory. In considering systems as complex, coherent, and defined entities, Mele et al. (2010) emphasise that in terms of analytical processes and theoretical perspectives, the focus resides within “the interactions and on the relationships between parts in order to understand an entity’s organization, functioning and outcomes” (p. 127). In highlighting these perspectival influences, Mele et al. (2010) draw attention to the embedded interrelationships and corresponding debate, dialogue, and dilemmas that exist between the holism and reductionism constructs. Additionally, related considerations include collectivism and
individualism dimensions, along with uncertainty avoidance in terms of the tolerance of ambiguity and power distance or inequality issues in educational environments (Cortina et al., 2017). Accordingly, it is considered that using a systems approach informs analytical framing, interpretation, and positioning in the research processes, and in turn, the resultant Theory. Importantly, these processes are safeguarded by the researcher’s positionality (Bourke, 2014) or theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) when working with participants' words to develop substantive theory that reflects the diversity of experiences, interpretations, and understandings implicit in their academic worldmaking undertakings (Goodman, 1978).

Stornaiuolo (2015, p. 561) describes worldmaking as a process of “constructing shared worlds through symbolic practices that intertwine the creative, ethical, and intellectual in the act of making meaning from multiple and dynamic resources at hand”. In addition, Stornaiuolo and Whitney (2018) discuss the ways in which ableism, identity, and racism intersect and position young students within educational practices. Accordingly, Stornaiuolo and Whitney consider that worldmaking provides a collaborative “generative lens”, along with processes for “understanding the ways people construct and negotiate these social frames of meaning from existing cultural and historical resources” (p. 206). It is considered that the Theory effectively captures the dynamism of these worldmaking considerations. In many respects, these worldmaking views align with Yosso’s (2005) critical race theory and the contention that non-traditional university students possess alternative and undervalued forms of capital that are reconceptualised and reframed as the cultural wealth model. Yosso’s six forms of cultural capital comprise aspirational, familial, linguistic, navigational, social, and resistance. Importantly, research findings confirm that these culturally-situated resources are central to the Academic Highway Journey as the planetary driver and its interrelationships with the five satellite systems in the theoretical modelling. Importantly, participants’ linguistic and navigational abilities (Yosso, 2005) played crucial roles given that staying the course over the academic journeys involved managing situational inequalities
and maneuvering within often hostile and unsupportive environments that included teaching staff attitudes and L2 academic learning and literacy support disconnections (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Collins, 2000; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Yosso, 2005; Yosso et al., 2009).

In accordance with Greco and Stenner’s (2017) liminality construct, the arts-informed circles and cycles of change, passage, and transition worked well with the pragmatic, self-generative, and paradoxical nature of this study’s Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. Additionally, the concept of participants being ‘stuck’ in liminal hotspots demonstrated the need for cognitive flexibility in self-managing across-satellite systems’ transitional paralysis, passages, pattern shifts, and polarisation (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). These complexities are captured and explained within the Theory. Importantly, the Future Self Identity Project, an integral component in the Chapter 4 and 5 story lines, recalls Dörnyei’s (2014) ideal L2 motivational self model with its future-self guides and visions, along with the difficulties inherent in the participants’ ‘becoming’ journeys (Scott, 2015). As the study findings demonstrated, this Theory provided the collective and systematic analytical focus that generated theoretical direction, meaning, and unity of purpose in understanding participants’ Academic Highway Journeys.

**Design Forces, Impacts, and Influences**

Within the theoretical design landscape, the core category as the planetary driver and the five major categories as satellite systems were reconceptualised and reconstructed within the Theory and in the resultant model. Working creatively within this data findings-driven and developed Theory, the renewal, renovation, and revitalisation processes were underpinned by design elements as theoretical considerations. These considerations, in keeping with the researcher’s positionality (Bourke, 2014) and theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) in terms of having an fine arts background, explored and incorporated balance, contrast, and emphasis, along with a sense of hierarchical design, movement,
pattern, proportion, rhythm, and unity of purpose. In being aesthetically, empirically, symmetrically, and theoretically coherent and cohesive, the Theory incorporated and positioned the participants’ academic journey experiences, perceptions, and outcomes within the model. Importantly, this theoretical positioning is validated by findings that liken participants’ journey undertakings to the layperson’s understandings of self-actualisation (SA). This finding aligns with Maslow’s (1943, p. 382) theory of human motivation, its SA focus, and the individual’s “desire for self-fulfillment”. In terms of empirical, symmetrical, and theoretical significance, the Theory models and parallels Maslow’s hierarchy in that the five motivational levels equate to and support the same number of satellite systems. As the data findings demonstrated, these satellite systems’ components meet Maslow’s five-tier hierarchy of human needs. Importantly, Maslow describes goals as the “centering principle in motivational theory [original emphasis]” (1943, p. 392), with each ‘goal’ representing five human needs.

In developing the Theory and components, Koltko-Rivera’s (2006) deliberations in relation to applying Maslow’s original theory to other constructs were significant. Consequently, including Koltko-Rivera’s ST as the level beyond SA generated an integrated theoretical model that demonstrated, explained, and interpreted participants’ Academic Highway Journeys in relationship with the five satellite systems. This theoretical relationship provided balance, meaning, and purpose in participants’ life stage developments (Marcia, 2002; Marcia & Josselson, 2013). In relation to an overall sense of direction and unity in the Theory design, Goffman’s (1959, 1971, 1974) dramaturgical model, frame analysis, and impression management constructs influenced the way in which participants defined, interpreted, and made sense of their worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978; Stornaiuolo, 2015). As Koltko-Rivera (2006, p. 310) contends, Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of human needs “provides a theoretical tool with which to pursue a more comprehensive and accurate understanding of human personality and behavior”. Accordingly, it is considered that this Theory and its model extends Maslow’s theory, providing a generative connection
that demonstrates participants’ “ongoing dynamic interaction between internal motives and their functional links to ongoing environmental threats and opportunities” (Kenrick et al., 2010, p. 26).

**Making Meaning-Making Connections**

With empirically-discovered and theoretically-informed planetary and satellite systems’ considerations in mind, remodelling, reconceptualising, and reconstructing the Theory within Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy has five important aims. Firstly, and most importantly, it explains and supports GT-generated substantive theory as to how participants who met the Generation 1.5 learner profile managed their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based public university over an academic year. Secondly, it fosters greater academic awareness, knowledge, and understandings of standalone theoretical constructs and their relevance in undertaking contemporary research studies in various disciplines. Thirdly, it acknowledges Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) notions of ‘good science’ that includes compatibility, rigour, significance, and transferability. Fourthly, it salutes the “pioneer, the creator, the explorer” attitudes, motivation, and spirit of researchers and theorists—past, present, and future—whose focus has always been the advancement of knowledge (Maslow, 1969, p. 724). Fifthly and finally, remodelling, reconceptualising, and reconstructing the Theory within Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs delivers research approaches and connections that provide fresh and unique insights integral to data findings situated within existing, established theoretical constructs. It is considered that using an arts-informed research and writing praxis aligns with Strauss and Corbin (1990) in terms of creatively and imaginatively using rich, ‘thick’ data descriptions (Geertz, 1973) in theoretical development processes and practices in order to make innovative linkages with literature resources.

Collectively, the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory and its resultant model acknowledges and builds on Maslow’s original motivational theory, making connections
between “bodies of theory that are currently isolated” (Kolko-Rivera, 2006, p. 313).

Importantly, including ST as the sixth hierarchical level in the theoretical model “allows for a richer conceptualization of the meaning-of-life worldview dimension” (Kolko-Rivera, 2006, p. 310). The author’s reference to worldview is significant given the Future Self Identity Projects discussed in the Chapter 4 and 5 story lines captured this dimension. Additionally, discussion in the Academic Highway Journey stages made the connection between immigration-informed worldview influences and subsequent academic L2 learner profiles. In providing linkages to the Generation 1.5 learner research area, this Theory is “building bridges between formerly unrelated theories” (Kolko-Rivera, 2006, p. 309). Similarly, Kenrick et al. (2010) offered a Maslow-based ‘renovated’ hierarchical framework that aims to capture individual’s fundamental goals and motives in life-history development in ways that afford opportunities for future empirical research. In relation to the coupling effects, gravitational forces, and the interplay that exists between the planetary driver and the satellite systems that support the Theory, Maslow (n.d.) argues: “The human being needs a framework of values, a philosophy of life, a religion or religion-surrogate to live by and understand by, in about the same sense that he [sic] needs sunlight, calcium or love”.

**The Model: Participants’ Reconceptualised and Reconstructed Motivational Journeys**

The Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory involves aligning and positioning the Academic Highway Journey with the five satellite systems in a theoretical model that incorporates Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of motivational needs. As Maslow (1943) points out, to exist and transition in the five-tier hierarchy, an individual must have the following needs met: physiological or survival; safety; belonginess and love; esteem; and SA. While there has been considerable debate, discussion, and revision of Maslow’s highly influential theory since inception (Acevedo, 2018; Kenrick et al., 2010), its continuing legacy to psychological and sociological research is incontestable (Acevedo, 2018; Kolko-Rivera, 2006). This legacy of revision continues with the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. Figure 6.3 below
demonstrates the key components and connections between the Theory and its modelling within Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of human needs and Koltko-Rivera’s (2006) ST.

**Figure 6.3**

*The Academic Highway Journey Driver and the Five Satellite Systems in Relation to Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and Self-transcendence*

Note: This figure demonstrates the relationship between the Theory components, the Academic Highway Journey and the five satellite systems, to modelling within Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of human needs. The sixth level, ST (Koltko-Rivera, 2006), sits above it, a new capstone level to that of Maslow’s originally conceived framework. Pyramid image reproduced from Simply Psychology. [https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html](https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html)

However, it is important to note that Maslow (1969, p. 724) discussed ST as an additional motivational level in terms of developing “what might be called a fourth psychology of transcendence”. Subsequently, Koltko-Rivera (2006, p. 306) situates ST as the sixth level at which “the individual’s own needs are put aside, to a great extent, in the favor of service to others and to some higher force or cause conceived as being outside the personal self”.

With these considerations in mind, the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory is presented in Table 6.1. In this table, as in Figure 6.3, ST, as discussed by Koltko-Rivera (2006), is incorporated as the ultimate level above Maslow’s (1943) SA level.
Table 6.1
The Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory in Relation to Motivational Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Levels</th>
<th>Dominant Systems</th>
<th>Related Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maslow (1943) and Koltko-Rivera (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-transcendence</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self-actualisation</td>
<td>Academic Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Esteem needs</td>
<td>Academic Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Belongingness and love needs</td>
<td>Academic Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safety needs</td>
<td>Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physiological needs</td>
<td>Immigration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table enlarges on the connections made in Figure 6.3. This figure also builds on Table 3.3 that noted the five satellite systems and their fundamental areas on influence.

In terms of the academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems positioned within the Theory and its model, these will be explored in terms of how they contribute to participants meeting and transitioning between Maslow's (1943) five motivational levels and Koltko-Rivera's (2006) sixth level, ST. However, it is important to note the liminality-influenced interconnections, interrelationships, and intersections (Greco & Stenner, 2017; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) that operate and overlap within the satellite systems orbit, exert varying degrees of coupling forces and impacts. Accordingly, while there is typically one dominant system aligning with the six motivational levels, other related satellite systems influence participants' progress in the theoretical hierarchy and will vary in terms of impact (Mele et al., 2010; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). It is also important to note that after the third round of data collection and analysis for the three surviving academic highway journeywomen, identity systems, by significant margins, was the highest-ranked satellite system. In terms of the second and third-highest ranked systems: Louisa's indicated academic then coping; Maria's coding determined academic then learning; and Rebecca's
generated immigration then coping. Tables demonstrating the evolutionary systems coding for all participants is provided in Appendix F. Importantly, this Theory is supported by the Chapter 4 and 5 story lines that discussed participants’ multiple, educationally-connected journeys in which all five satellite systems had varying degrees of impact in terms of duration, significance, and timing. In addition, this chapter’s Academic Highway Journey discussion underpins the Theory’s empirical and theoretical modelling and positioning. In alignment with an arts-influenced research and writing praxis, Eisner (1997, p. 4) discusses “new ways of seeing and saying” that provide alternative forms of data representation (Goodman, 1978). Accordingly, Figure 6.4 provides an artwork that represents the Theory’s empirically-generated structural and theoretical significance.

**Figure 6.4**

*Circles in a Circle (1923)*

*Note.* This artwork by Wassily Kandinsky aesthetically aligns with the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. This work represents the core construct, the Academic Highway Journey, and the interplay between the five major categories or satellite systems that influence, intersect, and overlap. This image is reprinted from the Wikimedia public domain website. [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Vassily_Kandinsky,_1923_-_Circles_in_a_Circle.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Vassily_Kandinsky,_1923_-_Circles_in_a_Circle.jpg)
The green band in Kandinsky’s artwork signifies the participants’ pathways while the intersecting yellow band symbolises the Academic Journey Highway. In keeping with the filmic associations of following the ‘yellow brick road’, this highway represents the participants’ journeys to academic success and the resultant across-life domain outcomes that align with their L2 future-self goals. However, in providing balance and unity, the wide black band or circle that encapsulates the Theory and highlights the Academic Highway Journey intersection with its differently-proportioned and positioned satellite systems. However, all orbiting systems overlap and influence participants’ academic journeys. Importantly, these design components are overlaid with thin, black lines that denote the traditionally-used pyramid shape used to represent Maslow’s (1943) human needs theory. Using the visual language of colours, forms, lines, and shapes to achieve its effect, this artwork evokes the Theory’s dynamism in terms of movement, pattern, proportion, rhythm, and unity of purpose. Conceptually, this artwork is considered as being aesthetically, empirically, symmetrically, and theoretically coherent and cohesive.

The Immigration Satellite System: Meeting Maslow’s Level One and Level Two Physiological and Safety Needs

As research confirms, immigration is a major life-changing transition that presents multiple across-life domain cultural and environmental challenges, clashes, complexities, and conflicts (Casado et al., 2010; Ludwig, 2016; OECD, 2018; IOM, 2020; Parkes, 1965; Roblain et al. 2017). While Roberge (2009) explains that immigrant families’ arrival experiences are informed by the situations that triggered their home country departures, Segal (2002) highlights immigrants’ rationale for selecting host countries. Accordingly, the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory and its model extends these viewpoints. In relation to the theoretical model’s hierarchy, the first level introduces the dominant immigration systems’ components that meet Maslow’s (1943) basic human needs. Related satellite systems’ influences include coping, identity, and learning. In initiating life journey transitions that fulfil
the physiological or survival needs, successful post-immigration acculturation journeys in
host country situations equates to obtaining the necessities of life. These basic needs are
having clothing, food, shelter, sleep, warmth, and water resources (Maslow, 1943). In
relation to meeting Maslow’s second level safety needs, given Australia is a democratic and
politically stable Western country (Counted, 2019), one of the major English-speaking,
immigration destination countries worldwide (Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017), the Federal
Government’s immigration system also ensures that law, order, and security needs are met.
Collectively, meeting these physiological, psychological, and safety needs involves the
Australian Federal, State, and Territory levels of Government, non-governmental agencies,
and local community groups that provide support services that address employment,
facilitate freedom from fear, manage health and well-being matters, and support personal
safety, security, and stability issues. Effectively, having these needs met enables
participants to have control, order, and predictability in their everyday lives.

In line with immigration impacts and influences, Roberge (2009) dispels the widely-
held belief that immigrant children readily adapt to the cultural and linguistic situations within
English-speaking host countries. As four of the six study participants immigrated to Australia
in their early-to-middle adolescent years, Ko and Perreira (2010, p. 465) point out that
“migration can turn an adolescent’s world upside down”. In keeping with participants’
empirically-underpinned and theoretically-rigorous Chapter 5 story lines, for Rebecca,
arriving when aged sixteen, immigration was a “nightmare…I cried for a week and a part of
me did not want to believe that I had to leave everything behind”. In emphasising her deep
sense of cultural, extended family, and personal loss, collectively considered as migratory
loss (Casado et al., 2010; Parkes, 1965), Rebecca emphasised that “sometimes I think in
the future I will miss the years that I did not live as a teenager [in Italy] and regret all the time
that I spent here in Australia”. However, for her parents, along with those of Daniel, Maria,
Randy, and Sarah, migrating or seeking refuge in Australia represented an escape route or a
lifeline from home country adversities to better economic, educational, and social
opportunities for their families. Ironically, if Rebecca is successful in gaining her tertiary degree, academic success will provide the vehicle for reverse immigration (Cassarino, 2004), a self-rescue option that would enable her to return to her home country Italy. Arriving in Australia from South Korea when eleven years old, Randy’s immigration was a positive life-changing event: “Moving was beneficial for me, I think 100 percent it was beneficial…I really call Perth my home”.

However, Segal (2002) argues that experiencing multiple pre-immigration and post-immigration adversities can influence acculturation processes, which in turn are impacted by individually-situated cultural, individual, family, linguistic, personal, political, religious, and socio-economic circumstances (OECD, 2018) that may result in negative, on-going emotional and psychological health issues (Rogers-Sirin et al., 2014). Illustrating this research, Maria was sixteen years old when her father immigrated to Australia under the Australian Government’s Marriage Visa Program. In recalling her Serbian-Croatian childhood that was dominated by adversity on multiple levels, Maria points out that “I think no child’s life should be like that”. With the benefit of hindsight, Maria understands the current and future advantages associated with her immigration: “As a little kid in a third world country that has never known better and has been told, you possibly won’t ever do better. I’m just grateful to be out of there”.

It is important to note that all participants struggled to make the adaptive changes necessary for ‘flourishing’ (Seligman, 2011) and managing in host country situations given the pressures inherent in their multiple immigration-related journeys (Dockery et al., 2020; Roblain et al., 2017; Rogers-Sirin et al., 2014). This adaptive consideration is made clear as Louisa advises:

We all have unique experiences but there are a lot of people that, like me, have lived in other countries and that have shaped in a way… not equally…but in a way [that] has influenced the way we do things and [our] take on the world.
In reflecting on her life in Perth, Maria considers that “as hard as it is, I love my life. I do. I love what we’ve achieved and I love what we’re working on. There is always hard bits but you just have to take the good and the bad”. In terms of survival psychology and the cognition that underpins positive affective, behavioural, and cognitive functioning, Leach (2011, p. 26) asserts that when dealing with adversities “a mental tipping point is reached: living is hard, dying is easy”. In discussing immigration-related research, Roberge (2009) indicates that children may experience psychological and social challenges that include anxiety, cognitive and emotional stress, depression, discrimination, inter-generational value conflicts, and undertaking greater family responsibilities than their native-born counterparts. These theoretical considerations are evidenced by Sarah’s refugee background in referring to herself as a “boatperson” and a “queue jumper”. In describing her journey as being: “An adventure, exciting, stressful, scary and uncertain throughout various times…”, Sarah points out that “it was a specific time in my life, it came and went, I’ve lived and learnt from that experience. I don’t dwell too much on it as much as I used to”. However, the words “as much as I used to” acknowledge that Sarah’s refugee-positioned and ascribed role-identity status continues to be challenging, heightened by on-going media coverage that conflates being a Muslim with terrorism (Stenner, 2018b).

For all participants, making the necessary emotional, psychological, and social adaptations and adjustments in culturally-challenging environments required cognitive flexibility (Kim et al., 2009). Louisa’s situation differed in that she immigrated with her family to the United Kingdom as a thirteen-year-old, then two decades later moving to Australia under the Marriage Visa Program. In this instance, Louisa’s immigration journey was influenced by seeking across-life domain opportunities that promised “the family values” and the stable family life that she sought. As Louisa emphasised: “I wanted a family. That’s what I wanted”. In reflecting on her difficult immigration experiences, and in relation to the
necessary cognitive flexibility (Kim et al., 2009), Louisa adds that “what might be a bit different is that I come from a country that has a lot of issues…it’s like a mindset that is part of my culture, the ability to be resilient despite the difficulties”. However, after a lifetime of hard-fought battles in her home country of Colombia, her positive survivalist worldview shone through.

Malaysian-born Daniel accepted his parents’ educationally-motivated immigration decision as a fourteen-year-old. Subsequently, Daniel’s ‘regrounding’ influenced worldview signifies his immigration-influenced ‘past’ driving the ‘future’ in restoring balance, meaning, and purpose in his post-immigration life in Australia (Frankl, 1992). Essentially, Daniel’s immigration journey delivered and supported his need for certainty and permanence, along with psychological stability and stasis in Australia. In doing so, attention is drawn to the significant identity systems’ influences in meeting Maslow’s levels one and two needs, as well as those in level three, belongingness and love. Similarly, in dealing with immigration systems’ impacts and influences, Maria is redemptively ‘salvaging’ from her past home country adversities, building her L2 future-self journeys in a host country that provides greater opportunities for optimal physiological and psychological adaptation, growth, and personal development.

As data frames, study findings, and story lines confirmed, immigration systems met Maslow’s (1943) level one and two needs in terms of delivering and meeting physiological, psychological, and safety requirements. However, in doing so, interconnections and intersections with coping, identity, and learning systems illustrated highway journey impacts that included marginalisation and stigma, selfhood and becoming journey dilemmas, and situational inequalities (Collins, 2000; Dörnyei, 2014; Ludwig, 2016; Morrice, 2013; Rogers-Sirin et al., 2014). However, as Maslow (1943, p. 935) argues, when each level of need is “fairly well satisfied, the next prepotent (‘higher’) need emerges”, which in turn, directs and dominates subsequent motivational behaviour that is inherent in being a “perpetually wanting
animal”. In making the connection between liminality and immigration systems, Stenner, 2018a) contemplates the situation of “…those multitudes facing the seemingly endless transitions of migration…or those facing the now routinely permanent ‘wars against terror’…” (p. 53).

The Academic and Identity Satellite Systems: Meeting Maslow’s Level Three Belongingness and Love Needs

In relation to the theoretical model’s hierarchy, the dominant academic and identity satellite systems operate in close association with those of coping, immigration, and learning. These systems combine in ways that enable participants to meet Maslow’s level three psychological needs that comprise belongingness and love. In keeping with Carl Rogers (1951, 1967) in that belonging is a complex and dynamic construct in which peoples’ potential develops in different ways, Allen (2019, p. 1), defines belonging as “a unique and subjective experience that relates to a yearning for connection with others, the need for positive regard and the desire for interpersonal connection”. Accordingly, a sense of belonging is considered an essential human motivation and need that is multifaceted (Maslow, 1943). In feeling accepted, included, loved, welcomed, and worthy, these emotional and spiritual needs involve social affiliations and relationships developed and fostered within educational, employment, family, and friendship domains. Importantly, experiencing positive, stable social connections and interactions involves participants’ individual factors, along with microsystem-to-chronosystem considerations (Allen, 2019; Allen et al., 2016; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Koltko-Rivera, 2006; Maslow, 1943). Collectively, these psychological needs are met by participants’ Academic Highway Journeys that are typically encouraged, guided, and supported by family, extended family, friends, university and across-life domain friendships, and reinventive institution teaching staff.
As discussed in participants’ story lines in Chapters 4 and 5, and in conjunction with this chapter’s Academic Highway Journey discussion, the impact of academic satellite systems is empirically and theoretically significant. This highway journey significance involves participants having their individual-difference affective dimensions such as age, motivation, and self-efficacy needs met, along with their psychological and psychosocial needs (Brindley, 1989; Marcia & Josselson, 2013). In the academic domain, this involves the positive feelings associated with being accepted, belonging, and ‘fitting-in’ rather than ‘standing-out’ for negative reasons in reinventive institutional settings (Ludwig, 2016; Morrice, 2013; Roblain et al., 2017; Scott, 2012, 2015). Given the academic, identity, and immigration satellite systems’ influences, intersections, and interconnections, these combined forces involve participants’ individual-difference factors.

In terms of individual-difference factors, Louisa considers that: “even though I’m a mature age student, I can deliver just as good as a 20 year old or a 19 year old”, suggesting that her university belongingness is “more about the commitment you make to yourself and to the subject, or to the course that you’re doing”. However, while Maria is similarly positioned in terms of having full-time academic, employment, and family commitments, her sense of belonging as a university student is implicit rather than explicit: “Maybe if I did uni after high school with no kids and no other obligations it might be different”, Maria adds that “at this stage in our life, I think both me and my husband are just kind of like you need to finish this to get further”. However, in Maria’s adversity and immigration-influenced worldview, her sense of belongingness parallels being ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ journey-driven to successfully complete her degree. As Maria foreshadows: “I think the more I learned while I’m at uni, it will give me a better head start where I want to be”. Conversely, in Sarah’s positioning, her literacy struggles and her negative learner performances overwhelmed her sense of belongingness and connectedness at university. However, while pointing out that she: “tried to be consistent in attending a study group, [to] discuss topics with my peers more”, her objective was to “make it to the end of each semester before
burning out”. The data findings demonstrate that Sarah’s cultural and religious convictions dominated her university experiences and sense of belongingness. Having “learnt from Islam that there is a beauty in the struggle”, Sarah’s stance also signals religiosity as a complex, individual difference affective dimension in her individualism versus collectivism dichotomy (Cortina et al., 2017; Holdcroft, 2006). As Allport and Ross (1967, p. 434) contend, there are two types of religiosity, extrinsic and intrinsic: “The extrinsically motivated person uses his religion, whereas the intrinsically motivated person lives his religion”. Accordingly, and in keeping with Allport and Ross (1967, p. 434), Sarah finds her “master motive for life in religion”, with the consequences that her “other needs are brought into harmony” with these religious beliefs. Conversely, in Rebecca’s situation, while struggling academically she valued her university friendships that provided acceptance, connection, and support: “Some of my fellow students said that my results improved compared to my first semester and they gave me courage to keep going with my studies…I feel good every time I go to university”.

Having discussed the participants’ individual-difference affective factors, it is important to note that on the microsystem level (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), these contributing belongingness influences include support from parents, peers, and teaching staff (Allen et al., 2016). In relation to support, Maria’s previously-reported assignment accident, failing a unit by two points, would not constitute teaching staff encouragement, fairness, and support. Failing this unit served to diminish her feelings of connectedness to the university community, being respected, and receiving guidance in her academic highway journey (Cortina et al., 2017; Hand et al., 2012). In relation to receiving parental support, four of the six participants received words of encouragement. However, their parents were unable to address the L2 literacy scarcity issues in terms of providing practical, learning assistance in their home environments. As Daniel related: “Mom and Dad gave me a lot of support. They did help me as they can, but because some of the English terminologies they haven’t heard before so they couldn’t help me as much”. In Rebecca’s situation, her semester two achievements were acknowledged: “More with family and friends, and the feedbacks were
that I did well and even though I doubt myself a lot, they made me realise that I will be able to finish the course”. Adversely-situated in terms of family support, Louisa considered her studies as a coping resource, with university becoming a place of sanctuary, a “mental escape from everything that was happening at home”. Providing emotional comfort and solace, together with offering a psychologically safe and secure learning environment, Louisa considers her studies as:

A very powerful driving force in my life. I feel successful, I feel complete, like I’m doing what I want to do, and like I feel that I’m doing something for myself...When I come to uni, it’s like I’m doing something for myself. I’m going on a binge, indulgent thing of knowledge, I guess. I don’t know. Something like that. But it’s nice. It’s a nice feeling when I’m in uni.

As Louisa felt supported by staff and peers in her studies, this mesosystem level interaction generated a sense of community and belonging that provided cognitive and emotional connectedness (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Maslow, 1943). However, as institutional policies, practices, and procedures are also situated at this level, the construct of role distance is significant. As Cortina et al. (2017) point out, this educational construct is important in relation to students’ feelings of belongingness, inclusion, and social connectedness. As the authors explain, low-power distance situations with teaching staff align with a higher sense of belongingness, while high-power distance ones provide a lower sense of belongingness (Cortina et al., 2017). In recalling Maria’s assignment accident, the findings are clear. In this high-power distance situation, the procedural outcome, failing a unit by two points, resulted in lower feelings of belongingness and connectedness, along with educational disengagement. However, in highlighting institutional practices designed to improve students’ sense of belonging and inclusion, Allen et al., (2016) discuss environmental, motivational, and relational strategies that include providing academic support. As previously discussed, the learning access and literacy support disconnections experienced by all participants in their Academic Highway Journeys detract from feelings of being included and supported, welcomed and worthy of university student identity status.
(Arkoudis et al., 2019); Harvey & Mallman, 2019). In turn, these negatively-aligned outcomes are exacerbated by increasing situational learning inequalities and injustices that demonstrate Mullainathan and Shafir’s (2013) scarcity mindset that is typically counterbalanced by an abundance of additional, negatively-orientated results. In contributing to participants’ collective belongingness uncertainty, Allen (2019, para. 4) observes that in relation to negative impacts on psychological health and well-being: “Social rejection is at odds with belonging”. In line with the Chapter 4 and 5 story lines and the Academic Highway Journey stage discussion, identity systems’ impacts and influences play crucial roles in meeting Maslow’s level three psychological needs. Accordingly, achieving the Goldilocks ‘just right’ belongingness balance is complex. This complexity is due, in part, to: individually-experienced immigration systems’ repercussions; identity systems’ factors that comprise individual-differences in terms of affective, behavioural, and cognitive dimensions; and institutional policies and practices.

The Academic and Identity Satellite Systems: Meeting Maslow’s Level Four Esteem Needs

In this theoretical model, the dominant academic and identity satellite systems’ components, along with related coping, immigration, and learning influences, align with Maslow’s level four psychological needs, those of esteem. While acknowledging the vast literature that exists on this subject area, Maslow (1943) discusses two types of esteem needs, self-orientated and other-orientated. Esteem for oneself or self-esteem is the need for achievement, dignity, independence, and mastery, described by Rosenberg (cited in Burnett & Demnar, 1996, p. 124) as the “totality of the individual’s thoughts and feelings having reference to him/herself as a person”. Crucially, this self-concept involves internal and external locus of control orientations that include an individual’s belief system that functions to make causal connections between their experiences and the way in which they attribute success or failure. The second type of esteem focuses on external, environmental factors.
and the individual’s need to be appreciated and respected by others in terms of recognition for across-life domain achievements, accomplishments, respect, and status. However, other-orientated status can be categorised in terms of generalised and significant, with the latter described as applying to “persons who occupy high rank on the importance’ continuum, and whose opinions are considered meaningful. Given this importance, significant others are a source of great influence” (Lackovic-Grgin & Dekovic, 1990, p. 839). In relation to the study findings, significant ‘others’ include parents, peers, and teaching staff. However, the influence employed and exerted can be negative or positive or symmetrical and asymmetrical, dependent on the participants’ individual-difference affective dimensions, along with cultural, environmental, relational, and situational contexts (Dörnyei, 2014; Lackovic-Grgin & Dekovic, 1990). While participants’ self-esteem needs can be met by completing their undergraduate studies, gaining the respect of significant ‘others’ may be an equally challenging undertaking.

However, successfully managing the Academic Highway Journey involves dealing with crucial identity systems’ components in terms of sense-of-self, self-value, self-worth, and social standing that are gained through both achieved and ascribed identity statuses. The importance of the duality of esteem and its interconnections with role-identity and role theory, combine in terms of the complex nature of behavioural responses, duties, expectations, norms, obligations, and rights that participants are obliged to meet and match (Rogers, 1951). In terms of achieved identity status gained through becoming a university student, and ascribed status in terms of being a daughter, son, mother, or parent, these constructs are paramount given participants’ L2 future-self aspirations that are implicit in the Theory’s functional design. In terms of the parenthood status, a multifaceted status with reciprocal responsibilities that impact emotionally and psychologically in participants’ academic journeys, Maria makes it clear that her relationship with her father has always been damaging in terms of self-esteem: “Dad doesn’t cuddle, Dad doesn’t give hugs, Dad doesn’t say a nice word. Even when I got into nursing [in Australia], there was not...He’s not
supportive”. In emphasising her on-going relational difficulties, Maria explains that: “My husband knows that my Dad is my biggest enemy pretty much”. In Daniel’s situation, the data findings indicated that while he received familial support during his studies, he considered he was expected to undertake university studies, a perspective that recalls Dörnyei’s (2014) ought-to L2 construct:

But my Mom and Dad said to me that you don’t have to get a degree. You can do whatever you like. You can get an apprenticeship and all that. But I still feel like if you don’t get a degree what’s the point of you coming to study overseas, why don’t you just study in [your home country].

In discussing the pressures associated with her academic studies, Rebecca highlights the importance of: “Believing in myself and always wanting to do better motivated me”, concluding that while: “Satisfied and proud of my achievements but not a happy life. I miss a lot of things in my life, I am still strongly attached to my [home] country and my Italian culture”. Importantly, Rebecca received recognition for her academic achievements in semester two from family and friends. However, in acknowledging the inherent cognitive complexities in meeting Maslow’s (1943) esteem needs, Seligman (2006, p. vi) makes the point that: “I am not against self-esteem, but I believe that self-esteem is just a meter that reads out the state of the system”. In keeping with the Theory’s design, ‘state-of-the-system’ data analysis and findings confirmed the cognitively complex sense-of-identity system issues and the urgency that participants conferred on their Academic Highway Journeys (Meadows, 2008; Mele et al., 2010). These findings also demonstrated the strengths of participants’ cultural and immigration-influenced worldviews that were symbolised by their bird-on-the-wing and their Future Self Identity Project drivers in the Chapter 4 and 5 narrative identity reconstructions. Importantly, Maslow (1943) also considered that each stage in the motivational theory had a corresponding worldview that facilitated progression.

Acevedo (2018) makes the point that Maslow’s (1943) psychological theory of motivation involves having both ‘deficiency’ and ‘being’ needs satisfactorily met. Accordingly,
hierarchical progression involves meeting the deficiency needs of physiological, safety, belongingness and love, and esteem, before journeying towards the being or personal growth needs associated with SA. With full-time academic, employment, and family responsibilities, Maria admits that her studies are: “Just one step at a time pretty much…Do what you’re doing…it might be tiring but at some point there is an end date”, advising that: “There’s something that waits after that that will possibly improve the way of life”. That “something that awaits” Maria is discussed in the next Theory level, that of SA. In closing, participants’ immigration and worldview-informed sense-of-self conceptual challenges and complexities are well-positioned within level four of this theoretical model. In turn, this positioning recalls Mahatma Gandhi’s (n.d.) life journey observations: “Your beliefs become your thoughts. Your thoughts become your words. Your words become your actions. Your actions become your habits. Your habits become your values. Your values become your destiny”.

The Academic and Identity Satellite Systems: Meeting Maslow’s Level Five Self-Actualisation Needs

Next in this theoretical model’s hierarchy, this fifth level is designed to meet intrinsically-generated growth or self-fulfillment needs. The academic and identity satellite systems’ influences are paramount in this level, in conjunction with related coping, immigration, and learning systems’ forces. Collectively, the interplay between these systems enables participants to attain Maslow’s (1943) highest motivational level, that of SA. In doing so, this on-going being or becoming journey that is situated within the Academic Highway Journey, considers that life provides limitless opportunities for creativity, experiencing peak moments or experiences that are underpinned by being emotionally ‘healthy’ and realising positive personal, psychological, and spiritual growth (Koltko-Rivera, 2006; Maslow, 1943; Scott, 2015). Maslow (1943, p. 383) describes SA as the “desire for self-fulfillment, namely, to have the tendency for him [sic] to become actualized in what he [sic] is potentially…to
become everything that one is capable of becoming”. However, Maslow provides a disclaimer, pointing out that irrespective of whether the needs in the previous levels are met, SA may not be achieved. Importantly, Maslow considers that “unless the individual is doing what he is fitted for”, dissatisfaction and disquiet may result, explaining that “What a man [sic] can be, he must be [original emphasis]. This need we may call self-actualization” (Maslow, 1943, p. 383).

As discussed, participants’ academic journeys and their experiences and outcomes in the various highway stages align with the layperson’s conceptual understandings of SA. Importantly, Maslow (1943, pp. 383-384) makes the point that “the specific form that these [SA] needs take will of course vary greatly from person to person”. This view is evidenced in the comprehensive story lines provided in Chapters 4 and 5, collectively acknowledging and demonstrating participants’ unique life experiences, their affective individual-difference dimensions, and their L2 future-self orientations (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005, 2009, 2014).

Importantly, these theoretically-significant storied-journey accounts focus on crucial aspects of academic and identity satellite systems’ influences, culminating in the Future Self Identity Project components. In terms of meeting SA needs, this Theory’s fifth level considers the ways in which identity is constructed, negotiated, and shaped through pragmatic, strategic self-presentations and performances that take place in reinventive institutions (Goffman, 1959, 1974; Scott, 2010, 2015). In turn, its voluntary members actively seek to cultivate a new social role-identity and status. As Scott (2011, p. 3) points out, cultivating identity involves processes of “reinvention, self-improvement or transformation”, concluding that these outcomes are “achieved not only through formal instruction in an institutional rhetoric, but also through the mechanisms of performative regulation in the interaction context”. Collectively, these communicative processes, dramaturgical needs, performances, skills, and strategies, along with subsequent interactional social tasks, act to frame, influence, and position participants’ SA-aligned actions and goals (Goffman, 1959, 1974; Scott, 2007, 2015). As the culmination of the Theory’s previous four motivational levels, for the three
surviving academic highway journeywomen, their collective goal is to complete their degree courses. In doing so, these participants meet Maslow’s self-fulfilment needs in terms of achieving their academic potential. Accordingly, an overview of the three SA-like academic journeys is provided.

**Self-Actualisation Aligned Academic Highway Journeys**

For Louisa, overcoming her childhood adversities in Colombia and coping with difficult immigration experiences in the UK and later in Australia, demonstrated the depth of her intrinsically-generated motivation, resilience, and tenacity. In Louisa’s words:

One of the reasons why I’m here is because I always wanted to do this [tertiary study] when I was back at home, but circumstances and time, and things that happened, got in the way of being a teacher, or becoming a teacher. And then when I got here, I knew that I wanted to do it, but my husband and I had goals, like building a house, and being financially secure…I had to wait.

However, ‘waiting out’ her L2 future-self goals recalls Maslow’s (1943, p. 383) view that: “even if all these [SA] needs are satisfied, we may still often (if not always) expect that a new discontent and restlessness will soon develop, unless the individual is doing what he [sic] is fitted for”. In relation to goals, Maslow (1943, p, 392) describes these as the “centering principle in motivational theory [original emphasis]”, with each ‘goal’ representing his five human needs. As the data frames and discussion in Louisa’s Chapter 5 story line makes clear, this discontent and restlessness became evident with the adoption of a “whatever I think that I want to do, I make it happen” approach to her academic journey. While motivationally positive on one level, there were negative repercussions associated with across-domain situations that culminated in becoming a pyrrhic victor in her Academic Highway Journey. While being “fairly well satisfied” (Maslow, 1943, p. 395) with ‘winning’ the 2018 ‘battle’ and ‘fight-for-survival’, Louisa’s victory exacted a heavy personal toll. Ironically and paradoxically, winning resulted in Louisa ‘losing’ her family and home-life dreams and
goals that influenced her immigration to Australia in 2011. However, in displaying her survivalist worldview, Louisa makes it clear: “When I’m here I feel Australian…This where I fight, where I’m educating myself, where I work, where my dreams are invested in, where I want to make a difference”.

Aligning in many respects with Louisa’s life journey, Maria’s Chapter 5 story line is dominated by her adversity-filled childhood in Serbia/Croatia symbolised by her recurrent ‘drowning-in-snakes’ dream that drives her SA-like worldview. Accordingly, Maria’s ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic studies approach is fuelled by her SA-aligned conviction that “we’ll all be in the same position in ten years down the road if we don’t do uni…it has an end and it has a purpose and it just has to happen”. However, in discussing the academic demands and difficulties along the way, Maria observes that “in talking about my Dad in the dream…it made me realise a couple of things [about] just how far I’ve come as well and how strong I am”. In reflecting on her adaptive self-growth identity mindset (Dweck, 2012) and her generative psychosocial identity development (Marcia & Josselson, 2013), the implications in Maria’s SA-like academic journey outcomes are clear. In Maria’s worldview, her goal to become a nurse presents another challenge that must and will be managed. As Maria explains:

I’ve been offered jobs at [my nursing practicum] prac and like I have written by my tutorial, my clinical facilitator that, you know, I’m doing something right, and that makes me happy…because my Dad always told me that I was just going to get married and work in the bar, so anything that is above that makes me happy.

With the benefit of hindsight, Maria asserts, immigration was “probably the best thing that has ever happened…Like I don’t know where I would be…I wouldn’t have had opportunity…I wouldn’t have met my husband…Like none of this would have happened if we had not come”. Maria concludes that “I would never go back to live there…I’m Australian”. Maria’s immigration-influenced drive and the urgency she attaches to her ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ academic journey is clear, in line with McAdams (2008, p. 20): “I offer a unique
contribution. I will make a happy ending, even in a threatening world”. Maria is striving to turn her L2 future-self world positive-side-up (Ko & Perreira, 2010) and SA-orientated (Maslow, 1943).

Just as Maria’s recurrent drowning-in-snakes dream had continuing relevance in her journey towards SA, Rebecca’s “nightmare” immigration positioning has parallels. As demonstrated in her Chapter 5 story line, Rebecca’s emotional disequilibrium, evidenced by on-going ambivalence, indecision, and uncertainty regarding ‘staying-in-Perth’ or ‘returning-to-Italy’ resulted in being ‘paralysed-by-fear’ when dealing with post-immigration adjustments. As this on-going situation impacted in terms of meeting Maslow’s levels three and four hierarchy of needs, these impacts were experienced in terms of achieving her full potential and seeking self-fulfillment in her Academic Highway Journey. In Rebecca’s words: “I do not think that I moved on completely from these [post-immigration] situations. I had so many difficult situations and bad experiences that now I remember them in everything that I do”, emphasising that “sometimes the bad experiences that I had, stop me to do things that I would like to do or try, talking about university or life in general”. In feeling overwhelmed by her staying-or-leaving decisional dilemma and its inherent paradoxes, Rebecca’s planning for the future is paradoxical and problematical: “I didn’t want to continue [living here], but then I’ve got my family here, I don’t want to go back, and I also said, if I don’t try, I will never know”.

Consequently, Rebecca’s convoluted SA-orientated journey involves making pivotal movements or passages from her on-going immigration-related difficulties and dilemmas that resulted in academic decisional paralysis and polarisation (Greco & Stenner, 2017). Inviting comparison with rites of passage transitioning (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), looking-to-the-future requires Rebecca to build on the past and reconstruct her future in ways that reflect the subtle self-identity pattern shifts that are framed by a growth rather than a previously fixed or paralysed-by-fear academic identity mindset (Dweck, 2012). Accordingly, Rebecca’s
progress in the model’s SA-positioned level is paradoxical in nature: “I do not believe a lot in myself and in what I can do and achieve”, while adding that: “I always want to challenge myself and prove to myself that I can achieve things in my life”. These views recall Viktor Frankl’s (1992, p. 116) words: “When we are no longer able to change a situation…we are challenged to change ourselves”. As one of the three successful academic highway journeywomen, the study findings demonstrated that Rebecca’s L2 future-self goals, motivations, and needs reflect her determination for positive change:

I know I have to succeed in my uni studies first…uni studies are definitely important as part of learning a lot of new things and to grow as a person…Life goals that are important for me at the moment are getting a degree and become a mum and have a family. Feeling fulfilled as a person.

In discussing Louisa’s, Maria’s, and Rebecca’s motivational goals and needs, as Maslow (1943) predicted, the participants’ specific SA scope and dimensions varied. However, what typifies and unites these SA-aligned perspectives in the model’s fifth level are the intrinsically-underpinned growth and motivational mindsets that ultimately prevailed. Subsequently, the study findings demonstrated that the three academic journey survivors were “fairly well satisfied” (Maslow, 1943, p. 395) with their passage through the theoretical model—from the basic needs of physiology and safety, and the psychological needs of belongingness, love, and esteem—to SA as Maslow’s highest motivational level. In discussing people’s motivation to self-actualise, Maslow (1968, p. 155) considers that this passage involves: “good values toward serenity, kindness, courage, honesty, love, unselfishness, and goodness”. Importantly, Maslow (cited in Koltko-Rivera, 2006, p. 304) discusses SA as an identity goal, one which paradoxically is also an “end-goal in itself, a transitional goal, and a rite of passage” in life journey trajectories that may lead to identity transcendence. However, while Koltko-Rivera (2006) contends that SA precedes ST, Frankl (1992) considers that SA is only possible as a side effect of ST.
Identity Satellite Systems: Meeting Koltko-Rivera’s Level Six,

Self-Transcendence

The final level in the theoretical model’s hierarchy is achieving ST. In relation to the Theory, the identity system dominates, in close alignment and overlap with academic and learning. Collectively, these systems enable participants to reach the ST level. As the Theory’s capstone level, ST, as distinct from SA, involves seeking a “cause beyond the self and to experience a communion beyond the boundaries of the self through peak experience” (Koltko-Rivera, 2006, p. 303). Of the three surviving academic highway journeywomen, only Louisa seems to have been more than “fairly well satisfied” (Maslow, 1943, p. 395) with her achievements in the SA level, with the “next prepotent (‘higher’) need” (Maslow, 1943, p. 395) emerging as Koltko-Rivera’s (2006) ST. Accordingly, Louisa’s developing ST goals and needs were discussed in her Chapter 5 story line that included the 2020 Year of Liberation and the 2021 Year of Opportunities perspectives. In turn, Louisa’s findings-driven story line aligns with ST factors that are supported by a motivational drive that corresponded to: putting aside individual needs in preference to those of others; exploring and seeking a greater meaning and purpose in life through achieving social progress, altruism, and wisdom; and contributing to a more comprehensive, encompassing, and inclusive worldview (Koltko-Rivera’s, 2006). Importantly, Maslow (1943, p. 376) highlights the significance of the worldview construct, noting that as these relate to identities organised around meaning-making and meaning-of-life processes (Frankl, 1992), each stage of the motivational theory is typically accompanied by a distinctive worldview. These theoretical groundings recall Louisa’s earlier social justice positioning in being influenced by a popular, late 1960s Colombian song Cafe y Petroleo by Ana and Jaime (2020), interpreting the lyrics as encouraging greater “brotherhood” and “sisterhood” connections and solidarity with neighbouring South American countries.
However, with the benefit of tripartite immigration and acculturation journeys, Louisa considers she has become a more “positive, resilient, accepting, patient, and compassionate” person with a suitably realigned and refocused magnanimous worldview. Accordingly, Louisa interprets the song lyrics as encouraging greater personal obligations and developing global perspectives that reach beyond her continuing Academic Highway Journey and its immediate significance to herself and her family. Importantly, in terms of her 2021 Year of Opportunities reflections, Louisa flags moving “anywhere far away”, recalling her third interview comments about making a difference in her students’ lives, adding that she “would love to go and work in a different country every year”. Consequently, Koltko-Rivera’s (2006) ST considerations call to mind Sternberg’s (2001) balance theory of wisdom in that using one’s innate creativity, intelligence, and knowledge enables individuals to balance their interpersonal, intra-personal, and extra-personal life domains over the shorter and longer term. In achieving this wisdom balance, Sternberg argues that individuals are better positioned to adapt and shape existing environments, as well as selecting and thriving in new situations. In making connections in the data findings, Louisa is striving to achieve Sternberg’s life journey balance. While using her 2020 Year of Liberation positioning to shape strategies that align with her SA-like academic endeavours, her 2021 Year of Opportunities contemplations signal an awareness of post-SA openings that may include ST. In terms of future-self aspirations and ‘getting-of-wisdom’ visions, Louisa explains: “I want to do a Master’s so I can learn about how to research…after that I’m going to do a PhD”. Louisa adds that “I know that I want to do those things. And most probably that’s what I will do”, emphasising that “when I set an idea…it’s just a matter of time. It’s not if I’m going to do it. It’s when I’m going to do it. Because I’m going to do it”. Importantly, Sternberg (p. 227) asserts that while intelligence-related attributes and skills are “certainly important for school and life success”, additional resources are necessary. While Sternberg emphasises that “wisdom-related skills are at least as important or even more important” in making correct, just, and meaningful life journey decisions, Aristotle refers to these attributes as an essential component in having a ‘good life’ (Kenny & Amadio, 2020). In terms of eudemonian ethics
and ideals, Aristotle considers these as being achieved when an individual is in harmony with her or his intellectual and moral virtues (Kenny & Amadio, 2020; Krems et al., 2017).

**Conclusion**

Expanding on the theoretical foundations established in the story lines in Chapters 4 and 5, this chapter introduced, discussed, and explained the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory and how it was developed. Neither insiders nor outsiders, the participant Generation 1.5 learners were caught between their past, home country worlds and their present, host country ones. Importantly, the participants’ immigration-influenced worldviews found theatrical and theoretical voice in their L2 future-self academic aspirations, goals, and motivational needs that underpinned the Theory (Davison, 2005; Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Goffman, 1959; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). Data-derived and findings-driven, these L2 future-self factors and forces included positive and negative pre- and post-immigration influences, across-life domain impacts, and self-orientated and significant ‘others-orientated’ expectations. Collectively, these considerations energised and galvanised participants’ ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ Academic Highway Journeys, the core category in the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory. Driven and affected to varying extents and ways by the major categories, the academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems, this theoretical interplay was examined and explained. In demonstrating its inherent dynamism and functionality, the Theory was positioned within a model developed from Maslow’s (1943) original five-tier motivational theory, along with Koltko-Rivera’s (2006) ST contribution as the sixth level. In discussing this model, the theoretical complexities, connections, and paradoxes, along with demonstrating the depth and diversity of the difficulties and dilemmas implicit in this Theory, were described and defended. Collectively, this chapter discussed the aesthetically and empirically-supported, inductively-reconstructed, and theoretically-
positioned Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory that developed in tandem with adopting an arts-informed research and writing praxis and a rejuvenated GT methodology.

The next chapter, the concluding chapter, reviews the aims, findings, and outcomes of the study. In discussing the justification for this study, the implications and limitations of the Generation 1.5 learner performance are explored. Importantly, future study directions are showcased. This is in line with the words and sentiments of the astronomer, mathematician, and philosopher Galileo di Vincenzo Bonaulti de Galilei’s (n. d.): “All truths are easy to understand once they are discovered; the point is to discover them”.
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Chapter 7

Concluding the Thesis

It is my personally chosen task to “speculate freely”, to theorize, to play hunches, intuitions, and in general to try to extrapolate into the future. This is a kind of deliberate preoccupation with pioneering, scouting, originating, rather than applying, validating, checking, verifying. Of course it is the latter that is the backbone of science. And yet it is a great mistake for scientists to consider themselves merely [original emphasis] and only verifiers. (Maslow, 1969, p. 724)

Under the mantle of an individualist, creative, and innovative arts-informed research and writing praxis (Leavy, 2017; 2019a, 2019b; Tracy, 2013), the researcher used instinctive and learned skills, strategies, and techniques throughout the study performance. Collectively, the seven thesis chapters created a theatrical and theoretical stage that informed deliberations and determined theoretical decision-making. This discussion, with its eclecticism, its sense-of-place and purpose, and its clearly signalled destination points typified the dynamism and vibrancy of the study approach. Accordingly, this chapter lowers the curtain on the study production that responded to the central research question: How do participant students who meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile manage their undergraduate studies in a Perth-based, public university in Western Australia over an academic year?

Echoing the climax in Patricia Leavy’s novel Spark (2019a, p. 20) when Peyton in her ‘scribe’ role delivers her written report to the seminar’s “What is the answer?” question, the researcher’s own response is captured in the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory (the Theory). As comprehensively detailed and discussed in the previous chapter, in keeping with the metaphor a journey, the Academic Highway Journey dominated. Given its positioning, and with liminality-driven hotspot transitioning constructs (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) and managing ‘worlds-on-the move’ in terms of meaning-making connections (Goodman, 1978), multiple interrelated journeys operated and overlapped within and between the influential academic, coping, identity, immigration, and learning systems. Crucially, the Academic Highway
Journey represents participants’ escape routes, lifelines, and springboards to greater across-life domain opportunities in Australia. This resolve is embodied in the Theory.

Having produced the theatrical and theoretical performance to the seventh stage, the following close-of-play deliveries showcase the research contributions generated in this Generation 1.5 learner study. In discussing the aims, findings, and outcomes of this study, its justification is established and the implications that extend in and beyond the realm of tertiary education are presented. Importantly, the research limitations are considered, suggestions for future studies are made, and final commentary is provided. However, before beginning this discussion, it is opportune to acknowledge Maslow’s (1969, p. 724) epigrammatic chapter-opening observations in relation to his theoretical “adventures” in psychological and sociological research. While valuing “the pioneer, the creator, the explorer” roles enacted in research, Maslow (1969, p. 724) draws attention to the underplayed and undervalued ‘parts’ in these study performances. These underrated personal components include being guided by creativity, instinct, and intuition, working in ways that generate credible study findings and constructive theoretical contributions (Leavy, 2017). In adopting Maslow’s (1969, p. 724) self-determination to “speculate freely” and Leavy’s (2017, 2019a) gift to wonder and explore possibilities, the rigour of the grounded theory (GT) procedures and processes (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) were strengthened and supported. Collectively, these research roles mattered.

**Reviewing the Study Aims, Findings, and Outcomes**

This Western Australian-based study has achieved its three-fold aims. Firstly, the researcher comprehensively addressed and answered the central research question, gaining an in-depth understanding of how the participants in this study managed their undergraduate studies over an academic year. While there is North American-based research examining
the English as second language (L2) academic needs and pedagogical implications for this cohort of learners (Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012), there is little Australian-based research. Developing substantive theory, the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory, rectified an identified L2 educational research gap, accounting for the differing and diverse degrees of difficulty that all six participants encountered and dealt with during their Academic Highway Journeys. To date, the researcher has been unable to locate any Western Australian-based studies in this Generation 1.5 learner area. Secondly, the socially-produced theoretical knowledge was constructed through mutual respect, negotiation, and trust that developed between the participants and researcher. Specific to the phenomenon being investigated (O’Donoghue, 2019), the degree of complexity and extent to which participants shared their personal stories with the researcher was extraordinary, a decisive determinant in achieving and exceeding this study aim. Thirdly, in building on solid GT foundations (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), the researcher’s rejuvenated coding practices dovetailed with an emerging and evolving arts-influenced writing praxis. Using this revised GT approach was justified in relation to matching the study requirements with the researcher’s skill sets. In generating rich, thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973), analysis delivered considerable depth and comprehensive detail that in tandem with literature access shaped the findings informing the story lines and theoretical development. Collectively, achieving these study aims explained, linked, and positioned the participants’ academic journey interactions, sequences, and the consequences of their social actions and behaviour (O’Donoghue, 2019) in developing the substantive Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory.

These study findings were grounded in the voices and the worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978) of the six participants with an immigrant background. For all participants, their home country circumstances impacted on their present situations and influenced their L2 future-self aspirations, goals, visions, and worldviews (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014). Importantly, the study outcomes revealed the learning and teaching inequalities that existed in the participants’ academic discourse communities. This finding recalled Yosso’s (2005) cultural
capital model with its aspirational, linguistic, familial, social, navigational, and resistance resources that were ‘invisible’ to teaching staff. Throughout their academic journeys, all participants experienced L2 learning and literacy disadvantages and disconnections. These difficulties were exacerbated by on-going, across-domain transitional factors (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) and time scarcity impacts (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). Consequently, these collective influences further emphasised and heightened the L2 academic journey delays and disruptions that the participants experienced along the way. In dealing with inadequate L2 academic literacy support services (Harvey & Mallman, 2019), these learning disconnections were intensified by participants’ overall unpreparedness to manage their studies (Hinkel, 2004, 2006, 2013) and situational inequalities (Collins, 2000; Harvey & Mallman, 2019). Given these findings, the Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986) was found to be ‘alive-and-well-and-living’ in this Perth-based, Western Australian university study. To recall, this construct is derived from Matthew 25:29 in the New Testament which states: “For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath” (King James Bible, cited in Elihai, 2005, p. 220). These pronouncements suggest that for students who are well-resourced and supported, the more likely they will receive opportunities that lead to further success. However, for the students who are under-resourced and inadequately supported, the more likely they will be deprived of existing and future opportunities necessary to achieve academic success (Stanovich, 1986). This interpretation, albeit negatively, aligns with Mullainathan and Shafir (2013) in terms of scarcity begetting scarcity. For all participants, an abundance of L2 difficulties generated by a scarcity of academic resources resulted in further learning dilemmas.

In producing a less than favourable report card on the current uncapped, demand-driven tertiary education system, the Australian Government’s Productivity Commission (2019) report aligns with many of this study’s findings and outcomes. The critical issue identified by the Commission relates to the Australian Government’s university funding
system that is based on the number of student enrolments rather than being performance-based and tied to the quality of the teaching provided. As this highly contentious enrolment issue and its pervasive influences remain unresolved, this finding is discussed later in this chapter. Given the participants’ acceptance into university courses, irrespective of their prior educational attainments and their current L2 academic limitations, the Commission report makes it clear that students with poor literacy and numeracy skills are disproportionately those from disadvantaged backgrounds. Consequently, academic success for these students is more elusive and illusionary than real (Productivity Commission, 2019). As research indicates, university education is transformative and transformational in terms of the reinventive institutions concept (Scott, 2010, 2011, 2015). Steering a course for reinvention was embedded in the L2 future-self aspirations (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014) that symbolised the spirit of participants’ ‘wanting-it-all-regardless’ Academic Highway Journeys. However, the study outcomes illustrated the problematic nature of participants’ transitional processes. Becoming ‘stuck’ in transition (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b) in terms of improving their L2 academic literacy skills, this liminality hotspot issue (Greco & Stenner, 2017) impacted adversely for all participants. Consequently, the participants’ inability to transition in their L2 literacy worlds in a timely fashion represented an on-going barrier given achieving their across-life domain aspirations hinged on completing their academic journeys. In becoming the rule rather than the exception, Stenner (2018a) considers that in paradox-driven modern societies, the liminality and transitional markers of ambivalence, change, instability, and uncertainty are constant travelling companions. However, in order to deal with rapidly changing societies, Stenner explains that individuals must be cognitively flexible, creative, innovative, and world-embracing in outlook if they are to become effective self-managers in all areas of their lives. In this study, the emotional, physical, and psychological pressures associated with being ‘trapped-in-transition’ were “exhausting”. Accordingly, the academic, economic, financial, personal, and time and effort costs to both successful and unsuccessful highway journey travellers were high (Productivity Commission, 2019).
This study has made an original contribution to knowledge, developing substantive theory that presented unique insights in an area where no such Australian theory presently exists. Given the assertion that educational policy decisions, program structuring, and pedagogical practices are best made when informed by evidence-based research (Bharuthram, 2012; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012a; Harklau, 1998; Sternberg, 1998; Vincent & Idahosa, 2014), the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory findings are relevant and timely. Subsequently, further discussion and decision-making is necessary in order to meet the educational needs of Generation 1.5 learners. However, these findings cast doubt on the ability, the awareness, and the capacity of tertiary institutions to adequately support these learners as they navigate and negotiate their uncharted L2 undergraduate studies (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Productivity Commission, 2019). Additionally, these findings are relevant in terms of reviewing the secondary schooling policies, programs, and pedagogical practices. This review is vital in order to ensure that L2 high school graduates have the academic capacity to meet the learning and literacy challenges, demands, and responsibilities inherent in tertiary studies. While exploring and understanding participants’ L2 academic aspirations and expectations, along with their experiences and perspectives during their Academic Highway Journeys, the findings and outcomes raised several study implications. These implications, many of which were framed and positioned by tertiary education ‘inconvenient truths’ in search of ownership, resounded and ricocheted in the findings. However, if addressed, dealing with these issues will facilitate and foster the L2 academic potential of future undergraduate students with an immigrant background (Allison, 2009; Arkoudis et al., 2019; Bharuthram, 2012; Goldschmidt & Miller, 2005; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a; Vincent & Idahosa, 2014).
Extrapolating into the Future: Study Implications Matter

While findings from this Generation 1.5 learner study are not generalisable, the study implications that highlight the educational inconvenient truths are transferable. Recalling Nietzsche’s (2017) life lesson words about the importance of having a ‘why’ and a ‘how’ to find meaning and purpose, the term inconvenient truths (Gore, 2006) is used as aphoristic marker (Phillips, 1993) that supports a call-to-action (Gore, 2017). One key inconvenience is that one third of the participants in this study were unable to complete their Academic Highways Journeys. In becoming casualties rather than survivors, the participants’ differently-skilled, diverse and equally disruptive journeys passed without notice by the teaching staff with whom they had contact. In turn, the participants’ earlier than scheduled journey departures added to the university’s attrition rate, possibly the only way in which these participants were recognised. In terms of inconvenient truths, becoming a casualty could have been averted at several stages of their academic journeys. Similarly, the difficulties and the dilemmas experienced by the survivors’ dealing with their L2 literacy burdens could have been lessened and lightened by targeted and timely university-provided learning support along the way. Providing insights aimed at raising awareness and re-energising educational discussion and ownership in the Generation 1.5 learner area, these inconvenient truths matter. This discussion begins by considering the complex contextual considerations that frame and position the study implications.

Global Backdrop Matters

Given on-going global civil, economic, military, political, social, religious, and recurrent wars, it is inevitable that increased legal and illegal migration and humanitarian programs will follow (Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012; Betts, 2009; Fargues, 2011; Kicinger, 2004; McBrien, 2005; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD],
Importantly, The World Migration Report (International Organization for Migration [IOM], 2020) estimates the number of migrants worldwide to be approximately 272 million. In an era of demographic scarcity and globalisation-driven upheavals, these migratory flows are a worldwide phenomenon that present substantial educational impacts and implications for major English-speaking, immigration-destination countries such as Australia, Canada, and the United States of America (USA) (Fargues, 2011; OECD, 2017; Phillips & Simon-Davies, 2017; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011; Rudolph, 2003; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). Based on the study findings and outcomes, universities must adopt pedagogical practices that accommodate these teaching and learning challenges. In recalling the ‘dreamers’ situation in the USA with unauthorised and undocumented immigrants (Becerra, 2019), this predicament is indicative of future, highly polarised and politicised immigration-related educational issues that are likely to be faced by other Western governments (Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2011). As research indicates, Generation 1.5 learner-related university demands will increase globally given children and young people form a significant proportion of legal and illegal migration flows (IOM, 2020; OECD, 2017, 2018). Significantly, on arrival in their host countries, these immigrants will fit this learner profile.

High School Matters

As increasing numbers of students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile begin their education in Australia, those arriving in the cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) danger zone period between the ages of 12 and 14 will face increased L2 learning and literacy pressures (Roessingh & Kover, 2003; Roessingh & Douglas, 2012a). Importantly, research emphasises that high school is no longer considered the educational ‘finish line’ in rapidly changing societies (Harklau & Siegal, 2009). However, research also indicates that many Generation 1.5 high school graduates are inadequately prepared to manage the L2 academic literacy challenges and demands inherent in tertiary education (Allison, 2009; Crosby, 2009; Roberge, 2009; Roessingh & Douglas, 2011). Of the six
participants in this study, five attended Australian high schools and all had, to varying
degrees, adverse L2 learning and literacy experiences. Constituting an inconvenient truth,
the educational system ‘failed’ these students by not satisfactorily assessing and addressing
their L2 needs. In failing to provide the targeted and timely L2 reading and writing instruction
and practice, these students were ill-equipped for post-secondary studies (Roberge, 2009).
Findings confirmed that the five participants felt insufficiently prepared for subsequent
studies, either vocationally at Technical and Further Education (TAFE) centres or
academically at universities.

Tertiary Education Matters

Arkoudis et al. (2019) and Harvey and Mallman (2019) contend that improved
Australian university enrolment processes would provide a constructive way in which to
identify potentially at-risk learners. The authors argue that a reinventive, whole-of-student life
cycle approach to L2 learning and literacy support provision is crucial. A related issue
evidenced in the findings, and crucial to all university students, is that ‘just’ passing the
degree requirements is no longer acceptable. Given the increasingly competitive recruitment
processes, prospective employers may request copies of applicants’ official academic
transcripts. These transcripts matter given they include full enrolment details of units, results,
course completion and conferral of award details, along with any fails or withdrawals.
Accordingly, this recruitment-related issue may diminish the participants’ ‘wanting-it-all-
regardless’ academic journey approach in that the quality and worthiness of their degrees
may be ‘devalued’. While a possible, future inconvenient truth, the participants determination
and focus on L2 reinvention was relentlessly pursued, regardless of these implications. As
reflected in the study findings and outcomes, and as part of imagining an ideal academic
world, the following discussion points range from participating in university preparation
courses through to dealing with unpredictability in tertiary education.
University Preparation Courses

The Realities: Three Stories.

In this study, three participants completed a university preparation course. However, only one participant, Maria, completed this course at the study site university. Randy and Maria considered that the course was ‘easy’, lacked focus and direction, and that with the benefit of hindsight, was inadequate preparation for their subsequent studies. Randy commented that the only benefit gained was university access, while Maria begrudged spending time on academic tasks that subsequently had no relevance to the realities of her nursing studies. To emphasise this point, Maria commented: “I think my writing has improved. But I don’t know how to fix it [present writing difficulties]”. However, while Sarah regarded the course as useful, she continued to struggle with developing and mastering L2 academic reading comprehension and analytical skills, crucial proficiencies when studying law. These study findings and implications demonstrate a further enrolment-related inconvenient truth in that university preparation courses lacked the academic and intellectual rigour and structure that assesses and challenges prospective students’ capacity for L2 academic learning. Randy, an Academic Highway Journey casualty, put forward his views:

…I didn’t find it comprehensive. In fact, it was very relaxed. As long as you just turned up to class and then did your work…The only benefit I probably got was admission to [name of university]. Other than that, no, I don’t think I benefited too much from the actual course.

Paradoxically, whether completing preparatory courses or enrolling directly, findings confirmed that while all participants acknowledged their L2 academic limitations, acceptance into a university course was conflated with having the abilities, knowledge, and skills necessary to manage their studies.
Providing Educational Pathways That Matter.

Given the L2 reading and writing problems that the participants in this study experienced at Australian high schools, there are important implications for university preparation courses. In imagining an ideal Generation 1.5 learner world, these enabling courses provide rigorous and targeted academic learning and literacy support for non-traditional university students. These courses deliver a modified and pragmatic L2 needs analysis-based approach that includes: the crucial academic reading-to-writing connections; understanding the differences between knowledge-telling and knowledge-transformation in written composition; and receiving instruction that provides extensive practice opportunities (Hinkel, 2004, 2006, 2013). Tasks within these courses replicate the real-life L2 academic situations and the literacy skills and knowledge crucial to educational achievement (Hinkel, 2004). Activities that foster, demonstrate, and develop an academic growth identity mindset (Dweck, 2012) that encompasses grit (Duckworth, 2017), resilience (OECD, 2018), and tenacity (Dweck et al., 2014) are also crucial. As discussed in the storied-journey accounts in Chapters 4 and 5, all participants struggled with their L2 academic reading and writing demands, the mainstay of tertiary studies. Prospective L2 undergraduate students enrolling in these ideal world university preparation courses should not expect that attendance will automatically guarantee enrolment and subsequent academic success. Consequently, the pass grade should be set at a higher level and all attendees should be given a follow-up appointment with the learning support team as part of completing the course. This linked-in and connected approach would send a strong message to prospective students that mastering L2 academic literacy demands takes time and effort, on-going persistence and practice, and targeted and just-in-time learning support. In this ideal academic learning world, these preparation courses are an integral component of a larger, across-university literacy program that prioritises the on-going assessment and development of students' written communication skills (Arkoudis, 2019; Arkoudis & Kelly, 2016). As a program component in all undergraduate units in all disciplines, this academic skills development
program applies irrespective of whether students attended university preparation courses or enrolled directly in their units of study. Most importantly, L2 students completing the university preparation courses should be restricted in terms of the undergraduate study options open to them. Available enrolment options should be aligned with the Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR) that is the primary criterion for entry into undergraduate courses in State and Territory jurisdictions. For example, studying law is highly selective, requiring high-achieving students with an ATAR in the high nineties out of a possible one hundred (Tertiary Institutions Service Centre, n.d.).

In this study, Sarah, a participant with a low ATAR, completed a university preparation course at another institution in order to gain tertiary education access. Having already studied in two Perth universities, Sarah enrolled in law at her third tertiary institution. While Sarah had a high interest level partly driven by home country cultural drivers that regarded law as a ‘golden profession’, she did not have the L2 academic skill sets necessary to complete this cognitively demanding degree. As Sarah put it, she felt as though she had been thrown in “at the deep end”, unable to cope with the learning demands. This inconvenient truth is inextricably linked to the Australian Government’s demand-driven tertiary education system where student enrolment numbers determine funding allocations. It seems clear that determining an applicant’s academic suitability for university enrolment and ‘best interests’ decision-making is not the principal priority. Struggling with heavy reading loads from the outset in semester one, Sarah failed all units. While enrolling in semester two, ill-health and learning-related stress resulted in Sarah withdrawing from her studies. In a second example, Maria had no ATAR, a TAFE accreditation in the visual arts, and completed a preparation course in order to qualify for university admission. However, from the outset of her nursing degree studies, Maria considered she was “drowning” in the heavy reading and writing requirements. While ‘treading water’ throughout her academic journey, Maria’s home country adversity-influenced resilience and tenacity enabled her to ‘just’ stay afloat and on course despite her CALP-underpinned L2 difficulties. In a third example,
Rebecca, with six months formal L2 instruction at high school, no ATAR, and a subsequent private organisation accreditation in beauty therapy, was accepted into a psychology degree. Importantly, L2 academic study in these areas requires substantial reading comprehension skills as prerequisites to understanding the rhetoric of the highly technical language that is positioned within complex legal, nursing, and psychological professions respectively.

In choosing a nursing career, Maria must be able to express her knowledge verbally, in practical application, and in writing. In all communication mediums and in all situations, language is vital in order to ensure “commonality of understanding, and professional nursing accountability” (Allen et al., 2007, p. 48). Accordingly, in Maria’s situation, the L2 communicative competence components of actional, discourse, linguistic, sociocultural, and strategic (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995) are crucial. However, developing these L2 skills is complex in terms of dealing with cultural and linguistic misconceptions and misunderstandings that may arise (Czura, 2016). Consequently, Maria’s L2 developmental concerns are significant and problematical in terms of maintaining professional nursing standards that rely on staff having high educational qualifications (Allen et al., 2007). These standards are crucial in managing real-world nursing situations, and critical when dealing with life-and-death health care practice. Collectively, these study findings and implications emphasise the need for well-developed cognitive and learning abilities, together with the L2 skill sets necessary to maximise knowledge-building and delivery in these cognitively demanding professions. Maria, Rebecca, and Sarah’s L2 academic situations represent significant inconvenient truths. These inconveniences demonstrate the real-life repercussions for the students left to deal with the inadequacies of an enrolment system that values funding over judicious decision-making made in the best interests of prospective students. As the Productivity Commission (2019, p. 2) reports: “…people that enter university with lower literacy and numeracy and a lower ATAR drop out at higher rates…many are entering university ill-prepared and struggling academically…students need greater academic support to succeed…”
Data Matters: Improving Whole-of-Student Life Outcomes

Given the demonstrated inadequacies of the university preparation courses and enrolment processes, providing realistic and relevant educational pathways for learners meeting the Generation 1.5 profile matters on multiple levels. Data-generation at the time of enrolment could be expanded to capture greater demographic information that included students’ home country information and the languages spoken at home. In this manner, details of first, second, and possibly third languages would identify potentially at-risk L2 students. Having a mandatory field for L2 academic literacy support as the default position would send an unequivocal message that the university takes a proactive stance in supporting its students. This is in keeping with Mullainathan and Shafir’s (2013) scarcity depletion theory and Thaler and Sunstein’s (2009) choice architecture concept of nudging. A form of decision-making manipulation and marketing, nudging works by making it easier for people to make positive behavioural choices that are more pragmatic, rational, and self-supportive. Signalling support needs at enrolment is easier, lessening the cognitive load in decision-making, and reducing the stigma students may feel in acknowledging their L2 academic limitations. The data collected would provide university administrators with the information necessary to manage its student support services from enrolment through to graduation. Using nudging techniques designed to help lower undergraduate attrition rates would also instigate positive organisational changes that would reduce the silo mentality that tends to stifle staff creativity, morale, and productivity. Collectively, nudging-related initiatives and policies, in association with pedagogical practice and procedural changes, would counter organisational dysfunction and decrease mixed-messaging to internal and external stakeholders. These enrolment processes are part of an imagined across-university approach that uses ongoing L2 development and assessment of students’ academic learning skills (Arkoudis & Kelly, 2016) that are built into all undergraduate units. These imaginings are key to developing a supportive whole-of-student life cycle approach to
university teaching and learning in which all students would benefit (Harvey & Mallman, 2019).

**All Students Matter**

While the participants in this study successfully enrolled in undergraduate programs, awaiting them were scarcity-driven L2 academic literacy obstacles and an abundance of inequality-driven learning barriers (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013). Accordingly, the following commandment from George Orwell’s political fable *Animal Farm* (1945, p. 90) comes to mind: “All animals are equal. But some animals are more equal than others”. For the study participants, being ‘less equal than other students’ had critical academic journey implications. As the storied-journey accounts in Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrated, university access without L2 support does not constitute educational opportunity (Arkoudis, 2019; Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019) and access alone does not guarantee or increase the likelihood of future academic achievement (Productivity Commission, 2019). As the first, transitional year at university is typically the hardest for all students, for the study participants, their Academic Highway Journeys were difficult to navigate and negotiate from the outset. Indicative of the need for built-in, targeted learning support services, the findings revealed that participants sought assistance from their peers, many of whom were dealing with similar under-developed L2 academic literacy skills. While pro-socially positive, this support was also representative of Generation 1.5 ‘solidarity-in-action’ framed behaviour. With actions aimed at achieving common goals in terms of managing difficult L2 learning situations, this interaction was not informed from a position of well-developed academic literacy knowledge and practice. This solidarity-based support system recalls the Dunning-Kruger Effect, a form of self-enhancement, a cognitive bias or blind spot that signifies gaps in a person’s decision-making processes (Dunning, 2011). According to Dunning, when individuals are inexpert and when they are unable to accurately assess their true abilities, this inexperience is miscast and ‘misframed’ under the illusion of expertise and misguided by
domain-specific misunderstandings. Paradoxically, these misconceptions and misrepresentations result in people over-estimating the realities of their abilities and over-claiming knowledge in areas in which they are inadequately informed (Dunning, 2011). While an inconvenient cognitive truth, circuitously, these findings highlight another inconvenience that prompts the question: Why did the participants in this study choose their peers rather than consulting knowledgeable, university-provided academic learning support and teaching staff? The answer to this question is provided in terms of learning support disconnections that are discussed later in this section.

However, the *Animal Farm* (Orwell, 1945) inequality refrain continues in terms of the student-as-client phenomenon (Bunce et al., 2017; Snowden & Lewis, 2015). In raising additional inequality issues, the domestic versus international student status situation signifies an awareness, recognition, and learning support divide (Arkoudis & Kelly, 2016). Universities Australia-wide, from administrators to professional teaching and learning support staff, ‘value’ their highly ‘visible’, full-fee paying international students. Despite typically struggling with their L2 literacy demands, international students are worthy and welcomed members of the academic discourse community. With Coronavirus disease or COVID-19 (World Health Organization [WHO], n.d.) factors in play, this cohort of students receive specific, targeted incentives and interventions designed to ensure that they complete their studies in this country. However, the domestic Generation 1.5-aligned students remain ‘invisible’ and therefore unsupported in any meaningful way. Research supports this mantle of ‘invisibility’ finding, as the participants in this undergraduate student community are neither ‘insiders’ nor ‘outsiders’, caught betwixt and between two liminality-influenced L2 learning worlds (Davison, 2005; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b). As Harvey and Mallman (2019) point out, migrants, particularly those from refugee backgrounds, face additional, specific, and currently unmet L2 academic support challenges. As pointed out, university access without appropriate L2 learning and literacy support is counter-intuitive, at odds with providing educational opportunities (Arkoudis et al., 2019;
Harvey & Mallman, 2019). This access and opportunity-related research is also in conflict with Australian tertiary institutions that market and promote educational equality and opportunities for all students (Bunce et al., 2019), irrespective of their cultural, educational, historical, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds (Productivity Commission, 2019). A related study finding indicated that the participants were unaware of how to play the university student ‘game’, having little or no understanding of how the ‘rules-of-play’ might impact on their L2 academic studies.

**Teaching and Learning Collaboration Matters**

In travelling unexplored Academic Highway Journey terrain, the participants in this study were inadequately prepared for dealing with different teaching approaches and differing assessment ‘rules’. Given the unspoken but implicit teacher and student expectations and responsibilities, the power dynamics at play in tertiary education were evident throughout the participants’ academic journeys. Conversely, findings indicated that teaching staff had little or no awareness of the participants’ L2 learning backgrounds and their literacy needs. In highlighting the need for improved collaborative engagement, intervention, and academic support, Harvey and Mallman (2019, p. 1) advise that Australian institutions “frequently lack the willingness or capacity to recognize various strengths and forms of capital possessed by ethnically diverse students”. As a long-standing inconvenient educational truth, undergraduate students aligning with the Generation 1.5 learner profile require the opportunities and the possibilities to contribute their unique cultural capital resources in their learning situations (Yosso, 2005). These resources include their life experiences, their unique perspectives, and their culturally-underpinned strengths (Yosso, 2005; Yosso et al., 2009). Additionally, Witkowsky et al. (2016) discuss inclusiveness in the academic community, pointing out that non-traditional students’ personal ‘worth’ should be welcomed as a way in which to increase institutions’ capital resources. This cultural capital wealth model (Yosso, 2005) promotes a collaborative learning and teaching environment
that uses the students’ existing resources to empower their learning experiences and increase their sense of belongingness and inclusion (Witkowsky et al., 2016).

While Yosso (2005, p.69) devised the six-part cultural wealth model for “Communities of Color in order to serve a larger purpose of struggle toward social and racial justice” in the USA, there are analogies with the participants in this Western Australian study. Yosso argues that aspirational, linguistic, familial, social, navigational, and resistant or resistance resources collectively represent forms of cultural capital that university staff can use to frame and position their interactions with students. With shades of the Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986) in force again, Yosso (2005) makes it clear that if learning goals are to be achieved, university administrators and teaching staff must seek practical ways in which to connect theories with strategic actions. As study findings demonstrate, up-front nudging initiatives (Thaler & Sunstein, 2009) and pedagogical actions are necessary to ensure L2 academic support services are interconnected, the default position from enrolment rather than having students struggling from the outset. In seeking regeneration and reinvention in their L2 future-self transitions and transformations (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Scott, 2010, 2015; Stenner, 2018a), Generation 1.5 learners would benefit by having a greater sense of academic support, belongingness, and inclusion. However, this support requires greater collaboration with teaching staff, along with a reconfigured blended learning approach that values increased face-to-face instruction that enables students to achieve their L2 academic goals (Arkoudis, 2019; Arkoudis et al., 2019; Brindley, 1989).

**Steering Their Way: Understanding the Assessment System Rules**

In this study, all six participants expressed reluctance to query their L2 academic performances and results during their highway journeys. For example, Rebecca failed a unit by seven points and was unaware of appeal processes. On the other hand, Maria was aware of the ‘rules’ when failing a unit by two points. However, while participating in a
supplementary examination, and despite assurances from her course coordinator, Maria still ‘failed’ to ‘make up’ those crucial two points. Whether formally or informally pursued, these assessment examples highlight the impact of microsystem level (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) processes. Importantly, these appeal processes provide ways in which participants can raise awareness of their L2 student identity status, demonstrate academic engagement, and build positive relationships with their teaching staff. Instead, this study finding highlights procedural processes marked by inconsistency and inequality in terms of power dynamics, interactional repercussions, and socio-economic framing and positioning (Collins, 2000; Hand et al., 2013). In highlighting the participants’ restrictive L2 knowledge transmission boundaries within learning and literacy structures, this study calls for reinventive institutional change that reframes assessment processes as part of their cultural and educational opportunities (Hand et al., 2013; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Productivity Commission, 2019; Scott, 2010, 2015; Yosso, 2005). Whether knowledgeable or not about how to take part in the university game and observe the rules-of-play, assessment and learning inconsistencies and inequalities impacted adversely on the participants’ academic journeys, yet another inconvenient truth.

**Learning Support Disconnections: You Want It Darker...We Kill the Flame**

With under-developed CALP (Cummins, 2008) and minimal formal L2 instruction (Hinkel, 2004, 2013), dealing with inadequate formal reading-to-writing instruction and practice (Gallagher, 2011, 2014) added to the participants’ L2 academic literacy burdens. These learning loads were further exacerbated by a lack of accessible, targeted, and timely L2 learning support services (Arkoudis, 2019; Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019). In this study, none of the six participants accessed university-provided academic literacy support services at the outset or to any meaningful extent throughout their studies. While aware of these services, some on-campus and face-to-face, the strong focus on delivering online teaching and support approaches was a deterrent to this cohort of learners.
The reason for this limiting factor related to the participants’ under-developed L2 reading comprehension skills and the difficulties they experienced in dealing with large volumes of course material that included Blackboard, the university’s learning management system.

With a scattergun approach to providing L2 learning and literacy support (Arkoudis & Kelly, 2016), this generic response fails to 'meet-the-market' needs of all its student 'clients'. In discussing the problems associated with L2 literacy support, Maria pointed out that: “I have done the online module, but it really...like I did it and I completed it but it didn’t really change a lot that I do”. In line with the study findings, Generation 1.5 learners require targeted and timely literacy support that is readily accessible and provided in face-to-face learning environments. As Maria made clear: “Just not having that one-on-one...I don’t know...Like even when they write feedback and all this...takes them five days to reply...and you’re like oh just lost interest”. All participants cited clashes with their classes, family, and work commitments as reasons for being unable to attend the scheduled Monday-to-Friday, business hours approach to providing L2 academic support (Arkoudis, 2019). When discussing the scheduling of learning support services, all participants considered late afternoon and weekend drop-in sessions would be more manageable in terms of access. Regarding the possibility of improved scheduling, Louisa advised that it would be “like a gift”. Unequivocally, findings demonstrated the need to de-regulate learning support opening hours. If university students are considered clients (Bunce et al., 2017), it follows that universities as ‘businesses’ provide targeted services to their niche market segments. Paradoxically, mixed marketing messages abound as universities endeavour to expand their client base in terms of enrolling students from non-traditional and disadvantaged backgrounds (Bunce et al., 2017; Productivity Commission, 2019; Snowden & Lewis, 2015) while failing to provide the necessary L2 learning and literacy support (Productivity Commission, 2019). Inconvenient truths and linkages to previous ones become apparent as the rhetoric in branding and ‘telling-and-selling’ university stories are selective in their coverage. These marketing situations recall Goffman’s (1959, 1974) constructs of dramatic
editing and scripting, impression management, and mass-mediated communications as highly ritualised reworkings of self and situated realities. Accordingly, the marketing 're-tellings' reflect pseudo-reality in action. As Goffman (1969, p. 205) points out: “Commercialization, of course, brings the final mingling of fantasy and an action”. It seems that university re-telling stories are seldom accompanied by a strategic focus on L2 academic literacy support as a key marketing and promotional tool. For these Generation 1.5 learners, learning support disconnections represented ‘lost’ opportunities to engage in learning support services; to become ‘visible’ in terms of their L2 support needs; and to feel included, respected, and valued in the academic discourse community (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Witkowsky et al., 2016; Yosso, 2005).

These findings align with educational research emphasising the need for institutions to have a greater awareness of the L2 learning and literacy obstacles facing non-traditional students and actively working to minimalise them (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Harvey & Mallman, 2019; Witkowsky et al., 2016). Accordingly, these findings indicate the need for a future learning and literacy support model that factors in on-going L2 assessment and development processes in a whole-of-student life cycle approach to teaching methods (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Arkoudis & Kelly, 2016; Harvey & Mallman, 2019). As Arkoudis (2019) explains, this collaborative student-teacher approach should be scalable, sustainable, and suitable for all students. Until linked-in, strategic L2 action plans are in place, the *Animal Farm* (Orwell, 1945) chorus continues. Additional choral accompaniments include liminality hotspot transitioning (Stenner, 2018a), the Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986), and scarcity and abundance (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013), collectively framing participants’ worldmaking experiences (Goodman, 1978) in their L2 academic learning performances (Goffman, 1959, 1974).

For these participants, improving their L2 skills provides the key to accessing greater across-life domain opportunities (Arkoudis et al., 2019; Arkoudis & Kelly, 2016; Roessingh &
Douglas, 2012a, 2012b). While L2 learning support disconnections served to dampen-down participants’ academic ‘sparks’ and to ‘kill-the-flames’ of learning opportunities and possibilities, the flames refused to be extinguished, flickering and fluctuating on regardless. With learning support difficulties impacting in multiple ways in different stages of their learning journey performances (Goffman, 1959), this disconnection caused delays, disruptions, and derailments as the participants’ pursued their L2 future-self aspirations, goals, and visions (Brindley, 1989; Dörnyei, 2009, 2014; Yosso, 2005).

_The More Things Change the More They Stay the Same_

It is worth noting that nearly thirty years ago, Stevenson (1991, p. 94) asserted that “…when we educators speak of “at-risk students”. We fear for their economic competitiveness. We fear for their ability to survive in in a complex and hostile world. We worry about them, and we want to help”. Similarly, it is over 30 years since Rumbaut and Ima (1988) introduced the Generation 1.5 learner term identifying at-risk L2 learners. In turn, Arkoudis et al. (2019) and Harvey and Mallman (2019) continue these ‘at-risk’ and ‘fear’ messages, a long-standing inconvenient educational truth looking for rectitude and resolution. Consequently, irrespective of a radically-changed tertiary education landscape (Productivity Commission, 2019), students are obliged to ‘fit’ the existing L2 learning and literacy support models, rather than participate in customised programs that at-risk L2 learners typically require. The irony in the current pedagogical situation continues the student-as-client, business sector approach to tertiary education (Bunce et al., 2017; Schwartzman, 1995; Snowden & Lewis, 2015) while failing to provide academic support services to _all_ clients. The more things change the more they stay the same, an inconvenient learning support disconnection that while disowned in tertiary education (Productivity Commission, 2019) is acknowledged in this study. Consequently, these manifest metaphorical mismatches ‘fail’, devalue, and further disadvantage the seemingly invisible domestic students who meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile.
Planning for Tertiary Education: Unpredictability Matters

In considering the twenty-first century as a rollercoaster ride of uncertainty, unrest, and unparalleled globalisation that collectively impacts in all spheres of life, planning for unpredictability in tertiary education matters. In terms of positioning for greater certainty, the current and likely long-term impacts and implications of COVID-19 (WHO, n.d.) illustrate the nature and impact of unpredictability. Accordingly, disruption and recovery planning in Western countries should incorporate events such as these given their capacity to exacerbate the existing educational impacts arising from increased legal and illegal migration demands (IOM, 2020; OECD, 2018). Along with existing economic, environmental and climate change factors, military conflicts, political, and nationalism influences (Flaux & De Hass, 2016), COVID-19 is the latest migration displacement driver that has global educational implications. As the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees’ *Coming Together for Refugee Education* (2020) report makes clear, “children in every country are struggling with the impact of COVID-19. An entire generation has had its education disrupted, from nurseries and pre-primaries to universities and apprenticeships” (p. 5).

Accordingly, the pandemic may adversely impact and further disadvantage the Generation 1.5 learner-aligned students currently studying in high school and contemplating tertiary studies, along with university students meeting this profile. In conjunction with the Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986), the disruptive COVID-19 influences are complex and considerable. These, and any subsequent global drivers, will disproportionately widen and worsen the existing Generation 1.5 learning impacts and inequalities, together with exacerbating existing L2 learning support disconnections. Consequently, the more educationally-vulnerable, under-resourced, and inadequately supported students will have increased difficulties in managing COVID-19 related learning disruptions. With scarcity begetting scarcity (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013); the Matthew Effect (Briggs, 2013; Stanovich, 1986) in play; and transitioning between worlds of uncertainty becoming increasingly difficult (Stenner, 2018a, 2018b), this cohort of learners will be further
disadvantaged. As the aftermath of COVID-19 continues to deepen, these disadvantages will be experienced at the individual, micro-, meso-, exo-, macro-, and chronosystem levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). These unpredictability matters in tertiary education are transferable and relevant to other Australian universities and to those overseas who have students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile.

Collectively, these study implications matter. Evidence-based, these implications demonstrate the L2 literacy and learning disconnections, disparities, and inequalities experienced by the participants’ managing their academic journeys. They are offered in the spirit of re-energising educational discussion in the crucial Generation 1.5 learner area.

**Research Limitations**

Having reviewed the aims, findings, and outcomes of this study, along with the resultant implications, discussion now focuses on its limitations. In terms of possible intrinsic limitations, with the benefit of hindsight, no changes would be made to the research design, methodology, and data-generation methods selected and used in this GT study. However, the only setbacks experienced were those beyond the control of the researcher in that three participants withdrew at different stages during the study without opportunities to discuss the reasons for, and ramifications of, their decisions. While all were significant study departures, given Sarah’s refugee background and her self-deprecating references to that status nearly two decades on, her withdrawal was a crucial loss. As discussed in Chapter 3, in some qualitative research, including GT studies, there is no prearranged sample size given theory development is typically heightened and strengthened when developed and validated across a range of situations and variables (O’Donoghue, 2019). Accordingly, the small sample size in this study could be viewed as a possible research limitation. With six participants at the outset of the study, it was recognised that the findings might be difficult to generalise.
However, when the final number of participants was reduced to three, this made generalisability even more difficult.

Importantly, from the outset, the study’s main objective was transferability of findings and this was maximised in three ways. Firstly, as the central research question was thoroughly scoped and addressed in terms of the data-generation methods used, the contextual boundaries of the study were well-established. Secondly, participants were purposefully sampled, selected because they were closely linked to the “study of a phenomenon situated within one particular situational context” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 174). As the six participants in this study had diverse cultural backgrounds, differing home country experiences, and distinct L2 academic learning and literacy patterns (Roessingh & Douglas, 2011, 2012), their individually-experienced insights and perspectives about their academic journeys generated rich, thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973). Consequently, data-generation methods were maximised, with subsequent analytical processes and study findings reflecting the dynamism and ‘richness’ of the participants’ storied-journey accounts. In tandem with an arts-informed research and writing praxis, these findings provided a comprehensive understanding of the research problem being investigated (Punch & Oancea, 2014).

Thirdly, the research approach in this study was firmly focused on building depth rather than breadth, something unable to be achieved when using quantitative research methods. With considerable study depth as evidenced by generating tens of thousands of GT concepts, categories, and sub-categories in the analytical stages, this study was unequivocally ‘grounded’ in the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As discussed in Chapter 3, and given the findings generated in this study, GT provided a rigorous form of theory development when using qualitative research methods (Birks & Mills, 2011; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Collectively and comprehensively, this study achieved its aims in building Generation 1.5 learner knowledge.
that developed the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory and value-added to existing theories (Barbour, 2000). In generating substantive theory, transferability of findings was maximised in terms of relevance to high school and tertiary education environments. Importantly, these qualitative study findings are transferable to Australian Federal, State, and Territory jurisdictions and to overseas universities given all institutions will have undergraduate students meeting the Generation 1.5 learner profile.

Extrapolating into the Future: Study Staging Directions

Come on bring up the curtain and let the play begin
We are actors and here’s our gig…(Krall, n.d.)

The curtain has come down on this Western Australian-based, Generation 1.5 learner study. However, in an ideal educational research world, it is imagined that this thesis will generate interest in this under-investigated area, prompting further studies. In raising the curtain on future study directions nationally and internationally, the worldwide audience of Generation 1.5 learners will benefit from these study performances. With these considerations in mind, discussion now concentrates on ways in which to widen the evidence base.

With transferability of findings in mind, broadening the qualitative research contexts could be achieved by undertaking further studies in Western Australia as well as in other Australian States and Territories. These national studies could involve public universities or those privately-run. Variations, with transferability of findings in mind, include comparing one type of university with another, either in the same jurisdiction or another. Alternatively, expanding the range of participants to include academic literacy support, professional teaching, and student support service staff, or having a combination of these stakeholders on a specific topic of interest would be advantageous. In relation to international research,
given likely increased legal and illegal migration flows (IOM, 2020), qualitative studies will be increasingly relevant. Firstly, in large English-speaking, major immigration-destination countries such as the United Kingdom, studies involving students who meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile would be valuable. Secondly, in large, non-English-speaking, major immigration-receiving countries such as Germany, studies that examine how this cohort of learners manage their tertiary studies in their host country’s official language would be beneficial. Thirdly, in relation to the global immigration flows of refugee and asylum-seekers, it is imperative to consider the predicament of families and their children who are held in transit points. All aspects of these people’s lives are in limbo, an inconvenient truth that is being played out in Australian jurisdictions and internationally. In being detained indefinitely, this inconvenient truth searches in vain for ownership that provides direction, leadership, and solutions. However, irrespective of whether English-speaking or non-English-speaking countries open their immigration doors, the children and young people arriving as immigrants will meet the Generation 1.5 learner profile. Accordingly, the need for research will increase and the outcomes will be imperative.

To broaden the perspectives with generalisability of findings in mind, future Western Australian, national, and international research using quantitative or mixed method approaches will provide further study options. A quantitative approach surveying students or teaching staff at multiple university sites would provide large sample sizes, generating data that could be tested for patterns and verified against objective hypotheses. While Generation 1.5 learner research approaches and topics are many and varied, the study aims relating to the children and young people arriving as immigrants in host countries worldwide will be in harmony. These aims find theatrical and theoretical voice in a Tibetan saying (Proverbicals, n.d.) that considers: “A child without education is like a bird without wings”, recalling this study’s bird-on-the-wing academic drivers.
Conclusion

And now the end is near
And so I face the final curtain
My friend, I'll say it clear
And I'll state my case, of which I'm certain
(Paul Anka / Frank Sinatra, My Way, 1969)

In reviewing the aims, findings, and outcomes of this study, its justification was established and explained. The study implications that extended in and beyond the realm of tertiary education were discussed and the inherent limitations were considered. Importantly, in extrapolating into the future, study directions were suggested. This chapter lowered the curtain on the seventh and final stage of this Generation 1.5 learner study performance and thesis production. In developing the Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory, the central research question has been comprehensively considered, investigated, analysed, and answered.

As the final act in this thesis production, a researcher-reconstructed, free verse poem is presented as a way in which to pay tribute to the six participants’ valuable and valued study contributions. Using an epigrammatic writing approach, this stanza uses a literary offering from Voltaire as the poem’s sub-title, with data extracts from each participant as lines in the verse. Importantly, two significant theoretical influences in this study are acknowledged, with Goffman (1959) providing the introductory line and Maslow (1943) the final one. In reconceptualising the six participants’ Academic Highway Journeys, this poem recalls Cronin’s (Knight, 1995) epigram in Chapter 4 with the blind alleys, corridors, and mazes that are encountered in life’s journeys. It is imagined that Daniel, Louisa, Maria, Randy, Rebecca, and Sarah’s L2 future-self journeys will lead them to their special immigration-influenced doors (Hamid, 2017). Once opened, these doors will symbolise their passage from one world of opportunity, possibility, and performative achievement to another equally worthy world of wonder (Leavy, 2019a; Stenner, 2018a, 2018b).
The Wanting-It-All-Regardless Theory: We Must Cultivate Our Garden

Life is a series of performances…Self, then, is not an entity half-concealed behind events, but a changeable formula for managing oneself during them.

But my Mom and Dad said to me that you don’t have to get a degree. You can do whatever you like. You can get an apprenticeship and all that. But I still feel like if you don’t get a degree what’s the point of you coming to study overseas, why don’t you just study in [your home country].

My parents actually encouraged me to go to university, other than doing trades, so, yes, they were happy that I went to university…in terms of decision-making, I think I need to make a bit more affirmative action, because I can’t stay in universities forever.

My parents came here to give me a chance at a better life through peace and knowledge. I can’t bear to put their struggles and sacrifices to waste…Do good, say good, think good without expecting immediate rewards for the goodness you put out into the world, because goodness is never ‘wasted’.

I have learned that everything is possible, that life can change suddenly, but that I was able to overcome different experiences that made me stronger…I think we only have one life so we have to be happy in everything that we do.

As hard as it is I love my life…there is always hard bits but you just have to take the good and the bad—it made me realise a couple of things about just how far I’ve come as well and how strong I am.

Regardless of what happened before, all the things that didn’t go well, all the things that were negative in my life or difficult for me…whatever I think I want to do, I make it happen.

One can choose to go back toward safety or forward toward growth…What a man can be, he must be. This need we call self-actualization.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Informed Consent Information

Dear student

Research topic: Gaining an understanding about how Perth-based undergraduate university students with an immigrant background manage their academic studies

My name is Elizabeth Serventy and I am a Doctor of Philosophy student in the School of Education at Edith Cowan University (ECU). I am conducting research that involves undergraduate university students with an immigrant background who arrived in Australia as children and learned English as their second or even third language. As English can be a difficult language to learn, I am interested in obtaining a better understanding of how students with this immigrant background manage their undergraduate university studies in a Perth-based tertiary institution. I would greatly appreciate your assistance in this research study. This research has been reviewed and approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at ECU.

Your research contributions

- Three interviews over the 2018 academic year (i.e. week four or five in semester one; before semester two starts; and the end of semester two).
- If you would like to offer any university-related material such as writing assignments, this material can be discussed during interviews.
- Between scheduled interview sessions, you are welcome to contact me either by telephone or email. I would also welcome this opportunity to catch-up with you from time-to-time. However, this additional contact will only take place if you offer to make this contribution.
- Prior to the interview process, if you offer to provide background education and language information (e.g. the age you arrived in Australia; your first language; whether English is your second language; the number of years you have spent studying English; and the main language spoken at home), this information would be useful to me. This form would take approximately five minutes to complete.
- Participation in the research is voluntary. You can withdraw at any stage, without penalty, by contacting me.
- You must provide written consent to join this research project.

Your personal benefits

- You may find it useful to talk about the aspects of university studies that do or do not meet your expectations, how you go about your studies, and how you manage them.
- Talking about what your tutors and lecturers expect of you in terms of academic reading and writing requirements, conversation which may in turn help you with your current studies.
• You will be contributing to educational research that will help future students who share your immigrant background.

The interview process

• All face-to-face interviews will be arranged at a time and place you find convenient.
• During the one-hour interviews, you can decline to answer any questions that you may find distressing. Professional support will be available if it is required.
• All interviews will be recorded and transcribed by the researcher. However, there may be occasions when a third-party private transcription service is engaged.
• Interview transcripts will be provided to you to read/verify/amend to ensure accuracy.

Data collection, storage, privacy, and confidentiality considerations

• All information provided during interviews is confidential.
• Complete anonymity is guaranteed and codes or pseudonyms will be used in the data collection, analysis, and thesis development stages.
• Research data will only be provided to third-party transcription services when absolutely necessary, and subject to meeting rigorous privacy and confidentiality protocols.
• There are no foreseeable risks to you.
• Extracts from interview transcripts (coded to protect your identity) may be used in the thesis and subsequent publications
• All electronic data will be stored securely and access to this information will be password-protected. All research data will be stored in a locked cabinet for seven years and destroyed by shredding hard copy material and deleting computer files and electronic documentation.

Research outcomes

Research findings will be used to help other undergraduate students in similar situations managing their academic education in Australia and overseas. This will be achieved through publishing findings in research journals, and through presentations provided to high school principals, tertiary institution staff, and private agencies who provide educational support to immigrant and refugee children and young people.

Further information: If you would like to discuss any aspect of this study with a member of the research team, please contact me. However, should you prefer to speak with an independent person, please contact Ms Kim Gifkins on (08) 6304 2170 or email: research.ethics@ecu.edu.au.

Participating in the research: If you would like to participate in this study, please complete the Consent Form on the next page. This first section of the document is for you to keep.

Yours sincerely

Ms Elizabeth Serventy, PhD student,
Edith Cowan University, School of Education
Phone:
Email: [redacted]
Consent Form

Research topic: Gaining an understanding about how Perth-based undergraduate university students with an immigrant background manage their academic studies

- I have read and understood the information concerning this project or have had it explained to me in a way in which I fully understand.

- I acknowledge the invitation to ask any questions about this study before agreeing to participate. If I did ask additional questions, I am satisfied with the answers that I received.

- I understand that participation in the project is entirely voluntarily.

- I understand I am free to withdraw from the study at any stage of the research process without penalty.

- I give permission for my contribution to this research to be presented at meetings, published in research publications, and made available online. However, in all distribution mediums, I understand that I will not be identified in any way.

- I understand that I can request a summary of findings once the research has been completed.

Name of research participant (printed): .................................................................

Signature of research participant: .................................................................

Date: .................................
Appendix B: Data-Generation Interview Frameworks

Given the nature of grounded theory methodology, the data-generation methods, and analytical processes used in this study, the interview and written questions formats were targeted to each participant. However, regardless of data-generation format, broad questioning approaches were the constants throughout the study period.

Round 2: Interview Questions

Phase One: Discussion on semester one results (i.e. First guiding question, examining participant’s perspectives on managing their studies)

1. Course/unit results
MQ: How did you go in terms of academic results?

List results in the units:
How did you feel?
Did the results meet or fail to meet your expectations?

2. Written assignment results
MQ: Tell me about any feedback you received in relation to your written assignments?

3. Lecturer discussions about semester results
MQ: Did you ever talk to your lecturers about the feedback and overall results?

Round 2: Written Responses to Research Questions

Phase One: Discussion on semester one results

Q1: Just wondering how you fared in your semester one results? Could you please provide details of your results; how you feel about them; and any feedback or discussion with lecturers that you had?

Your response (with as much detail as possible):

Q2: How useful did you find these discussions and what actions or steps are you planning as a result of this feedback?

Your response (with as much detail as possible):
Q3: Could you provide details of any discussions you had with other people about your uni results - family, friends, or fellow students?

Your response (with as much detail as possible):

Q4: Is there any other information you would like to add in relation to your semester one results?

Your response (with as much detail as possible):

**Round 3: Interview Questions**

**Opening conversation**

**Phase One: Discussion on semester two results** (i.e. First guiding question, examining participant’s perspectives on managing their semester two studies)

**Q1: Course and unit results**

MQ: How did you go in second semester?

**Q2: Feedback**

MQ: Could you tell me about any feedback you received in relation to your written assignments?

Exam feedback
Family, friends, fellow students.

**Q3: Taking personal responsibility for learning (Semester 2)**

**Accessing literacy support resources**

MQ: We discussed your inability to access ECU learning support the last time we met. Have you accessed any literacy support or resources (people, online, texts/guides) in semester two?

**STUDIOSITY**

Changes for next year
Uni-prep usefulness (further feedback) (5-6/10 ranking).

**Q4: Communicating more (relationship-building) with lecturers**

MQ: Since we last met, have you met up with OR talked to your lecturers about your literacy needs, written assignments, exams, or course results?

*If meetings/discussions took place, how useful did you find them?*
*If no discussions, why not? Changes for next year?*
*Discussions with other people?*
Round 3: Written Responses to Research Questions

Phase One: Semester two results

Q1: Could you please provide me with the results (and grades) of your second semester units?
Your response:

Q2: Could you please talk about any feedback or discussion you might had with your family, friends, lecturers, or course coordinators about your academic progress and results last semester?
Your response:

Q3: Could you tell me about how you felt on receiving your second semester results?
Your response:

Q4: In looking back over semester two, are there things you could have done differently to help improve your results?
Your response:

Q5: What are your 2019 study plans? How many units will you be studying? Please list the units.
Your response:

Q6: With your semester two experiences in mind, are there any changes (e.g. study approach, paid work commitments) you might make next year?
Your response:

Q7: Is there any other information you would like to add in relation to your 2018 academic year results?
Your response:
Appendix C: Memo-Writing Extract and Theoretical Development Memo Extract

Please note: As mentioned in Chapter 3, the following Resource Journal extract provides commentary on the upcoming Generation 1.5 learner study.

RESOURCE JOURNAL EXTRACT. Researcher’s reflections on the research process: Accountability, credibility, and theoretical development, 8 March 2018

I identified with the cognitive activities that underpin GT analysis, that is, the processes involved in thinking ‘differently’, while still being analytical, critical, and maintaining reflectivity within the approach. As the GT processes also relied on the researcher’s ‘creativity’ and intuition, while not creating a ‘fiction’, but maintaining an approach that develops an account or an understanding of the situation being experienced by the research participants. Importantly, in terms of developing a story line construct that functions as a narrative, this description evolves to represent and explain the substantive theory that is developed. This narrative may include the use of literary aphorisms or markers, metaphors, parables, and symbols. While the coding relies on the researcher’s personal, professional, and knowledge gained from published sources (i.e. technical literature) and non-technical, the Strauss and Corbin (1990) text discusses this reliance in terms of theoretical sensitivity, while other researchers may use the term ‘researcher positionality’.

Grounded theory data analysis: Generation 1.5 Research Project

MEMO TYPE: Theory development.

MEMO SEQUENCE: The fourteenth of twenty-seven theory development memos.

Purpose: Working towards substantive theory development. This memo provides a general impression of the first round of research contributions in relation to open and axial coding processes and possible working theories emerging from the data.

Possible core categories are nominated (e.g. Immigration systems; Learning systems; and Social-psychological systems).

Potential areas of theoretical development interest are also nominated (e.g. Coping resources, adaptive capacities, and management systems).

Thematic identification process

This process aims to align with the Strauss and Corbin (1990) grounded theory (GT) research methodology.

In determining the main theme, the first category listed is counted in terms of frequency, along with all subsequent sub-categories. For example, with Immigration or Acculturation possible designated main themes, subsequent categories (e.g. Adversity, Identity, and Coping strategies) are counted as related areas to the main category (in this case Immigration, with Immigration systems as the possible Core Category).

In situations where the identified theme (e.g. Acculturation or Immigration) appears as a listed category (but not the first-designated main category), this data will also be counted as main theme-related areas. However, it is important to note that in reviewing this material, inclusion under the main theme is made as deemed appropriate.

Collectively, all this identified data is allocated to the main theme (Immigration), with changes, as appropriate to the possible Core Category.
**Grounded theory data analysis: Generation 1.5 Research Project**

In addition, it is important to note that identified possible Core Categories may change as a result of the third research interview data analysis process.

The above approach is aligned, as far as practicable given the evolving research process, with the Strauss and Corbin (1990) GT research methodology.

**Please note**

Given participant Daniel has not responded to emails regarding the second research interview process, he is no longer part of the research project.

Participants Sarah and Rebecca decided to withdraw from the research project shortly before the second round of research interviews. However, both participants agreed to respond to written questions in lieu of having a face-to-face interview. While this approach has its limitations, it preferable to having the participants with draw entirely form the project.

Both Sarah and Rebecca completed the written research questions.

Shortly after Sarah submitted her written responses, she gave the impression (via email correspondence) that she may not be able to complete the third round of research questions. I remain hopeful that Sarah may re-consider and provide her final research contributions.

Given the change to the data collection methods, and the time delays in reaching an acceptable compromise in relation to data collection, this memo will differ from the approach taken in memo one in order to reflect the process changes.

Participants receiving written questions (i.e. Rebecca and Sarah) will be analysed separately (in advance of sending out the final research questions).

Interview participants (i.e. Louisa, Maria, and Randy) will be analysed separately (in order of interview scheduling).

This memo discusses the main categories, possible core categories, and potential theoretical development areas emerging from Louisa’s second research interview analysis.

**Please note:** TD_MEMO_1_First RD_main cats_themes_V6_1 August 2018 is included in this memo for ease-of-reference purposes.

**Related documents:** Participants’ open and axial summary memos; TD_MEMO_1_First RD_main cats_themes_V1_1 August 2018; TD_MEMO_2_Scarcity systems core category_V1_2 August 2018; TD_MEMO_3_Scarcity systems_tunneling_Gen 1.5 equivalent_V1_5 August 2018; TD_MEMO_4_Metaphors Gen 1.5 learners study by_tunneling_walls_V2_15 August 2018; TD_MEMO_5_Cognitive avoidance strategies_Core category_V2_15 August 2018; TD_MEMO_6_Scarcity-driven academic resilience strategies_V1_26 August 2018; TD_MEMO_7_Learning systems_core category_V1_4 September 2018; TD_MEMO_8_Avoiding cherry picking in my research_V1_6 September 2018; TD_MEMO_9_Dealing with open coding complexities_paradoxes_contradictions_paradoxes_V1_18 September 2018; TD_MEMO_10_Academic literacies_systems framework_V1_19 September 2018; TD_MEMO_11_Louisa_open coding observations_V1_23 September 2018; TD_MEMO_12_Louisa_Maria_Sarah_Academic management styles_coping mechanisms_implications_V1_12 October 2018; TD_MEMO_13_Guilt_shame_stigma connection_Sarah_Maria_V1_14 October 2018; TD_MEMO_14_Second RD_LOUISA_main cats_themes_V6_30 November 2018; TD_MEMO_15_Second RD_MARIA_main cats_themes_V1_16 December 2018;

**Raw data source details:** Consolidated listings of categories and subcategories from the open and axial coding processes.

**Memo 14 writing date:** 30 November 2018
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LOUISA: Working towards theory development

As a result of the second round of open and axial coding data analysis, Louisa’s **seven main categories**, related categories (and sub-categories), and possible core categories have been identified.

At this stage in the research process, it important to note that Scarcity systems is considered a core category, impacting to varying degrees on all the identified main categories. Accordingly, in keeping with this analysis and story line development, overview scarcity systems information is also provided in this memo (see Theoretical Memo 2 for more detailed information).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN CATEGORIES AND RELATED CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>COMBINED TOTAL</th>
<th>POSSIBLE CORE CATEGORIES, POTENTIAL THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING-RELATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective learning (cats)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective learning (sub-cats)</td>
<td>196 (217)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural learning (cats)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural learning (sub-cats)</td>
<td>22 (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive learning (cats)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive learning (sub-cats)</td>
<td>1202 (1228)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning support (cats)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning support (sub-cats)</td>
<td>52 (58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main related areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (cats)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (sub-cats)</td>
<td>76 (90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity (cats)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity (sub-cats)</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods (i.e. students’ responses to teaching methods) (cats)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods (sub-cats)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University experiences (cats)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University experiences (sub-cats)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC LITERACY AND MANAGEMENT APPROACH-RELATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Academic management systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic literacy (cats)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic literacy (sub-cats)</td>
<td>278 (309)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic management styles (cats)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic management styles (sub-cats)</td>
<td>389 (420)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main related areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance (cats)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance (sub-cats)</td>
<td>28 (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Sub-category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>7 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adversity</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>41 (43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>20 (23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coping strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coping strategies</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>60 (64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enculturation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enculturation</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family factors</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>13 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>189 (199)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>77 (90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>16 (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scarcity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scarcity</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>267 (290)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vulnerability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vulnerability</strong></td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
<td>6 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCARCITY-INFLUENCED COGNITION AND DECISION-MAKING: CONTEXT-DRIVEN SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL RESOURCES, ADAPTIVE CAPACITIES, AND MEANING-MAKING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity</td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abundance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abundance</td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main related areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjustments</td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adversity</td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affective learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affective learning</td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Behavioural</td>
<td>sub-cats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scarcity-influenced social-psychological coping systems; Scarcity-influenced coping resource systems; Coping resistance resources, transactional capacities, and across-systems management.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive learning (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive learning (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping strategies (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping strategies (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>95 (102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family factors (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family factors (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalisation (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalisation (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>77 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>102 (111)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IDENTITY-RELATED** 1226 Identity systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>956 (991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main related areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abundance (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family factors (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family factors (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>163 (180)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation 1.5 learner profile (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation 1.5 learner profile (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalisation (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalisation (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMMIGRATION SYSTEMS-RELATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration (cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration (sub-cats)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1147 (1147)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigration (sub-cats)</th>
<th>95 (176)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration-systems related areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acculturation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acculturation (sub-cats)</td>
<td>102 (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjustments (cats)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjustments (sub-cats)</td>
<td>53 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adversity (cats)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adversity (sub-cats)</td>
<td>108 (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coping strategies (cats)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coping strategies (sub-cats)</td>
<td>95 (102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discrimination (cats)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discrimination (sub-cats)</td>
<td>17 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enculturation (cats)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enculturation (sub-cats)</td>
<td>39 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family factors (cats)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family factors (sub-cats)</td>
<td>91 (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identity (cats)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identity (sub-cats)</td>
<td>263 (274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marginalisation (cats)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marginalisation (sub-cats)</td>
<td>6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vulnerability (cats)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vulnerability (sub-cats)</td>
<td>70 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resilience (cats)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resilience (sub-cats)</td>
<td>62 (69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUALITATIVE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH-RELATED

| GT research methodology (cats) | 8 |
| GT research methodology (sub-cats) | 81 (89) |
| Positionality (cats) | 3 |
| Positionality (sub-cats) | 55 (58) |
| Reciprocity (cats) | 6 |
| Reciprocity (sub-cats) | 55 (61) |

**DISCUSSION**
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Ranking after the first research interview:

Louisa (39)
- Academic literacy systems (847)
- Learning support systems (746)
- Acculturation systems (540)
- Identity systems (487)
- Immigration systems (347)

This ranking order was expected.

Ranking after the second research interview:

1. Learning systems (1634)
2. Academic management systems (1527)
3. Coping resistance resources, transactional capacities, and across-systems management (1308)
4. Identity systems (1226)
5. Immigration systems (1147)
6. Qualitative educational research (208).

This ranking order was expected, and its connection with pre-second research interview data findings is apparent. The most significant difference in the rankings is that an area of transactional capacities, and across-systems management emerged from the data analysis process. In addition, ‘Qualitative educational research’ was ranked last. This was expected as this data, in this stage of the research project, arose from discussions with Louisa only. Collectively, it seems clear that the first five identified areas are inter-related, overlapping to varying degrees, serving to inform and influence the other crucial areas. These areas are similar in the data overview rankings.

Observations and reflections

Given the analytical findings, it seems that Louisa’s academic management is multi-dimensional, with alignments to a range of areas and theoretical constructs. This seems to be reflected in the ranking for the top four areas. In turn, the fourth highest ranked area (i.e. ‘Identity systems’) seems appropriate given she has experienced multiple immigration moves.

Among the discoveries emerging from the data was the disconnect between universities welcoming undergraduate students (i.e. typically non-traditional students from a range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds (e.g. Generation 1.5 learners)), while failing to provide academic literacy support that is targeted to specific cohorts of students for whom English is their second language. It is important to note that all research participants’ data identified this literacy support disconnect, citing the Monday to
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Friday, business hours approach to literacy services as being out-of-alignment with their real-world, across-domain demands responsibilities.

In addition, the three research participants who participated in university-provided uni-prep course were critical of its ability to deliver the literacy support measures that they required. Surprisingly, these participants described the course as easy, disorganised, and unconnected to real-study requirements, along with limited one-on-one time with tutors to discuss their individual literacy concerns. From these discussions, it also seemed clear that there was little time devoted to writing processes instruction and multiple opportunities to put these into practice. As university grades are typically written assignment-grade driven, findings in relation to uni-prep courses is clear and counter-intuitive to universities roles in supporting their undergraduate students as they transition to studying, learning, and achieving in tertiary education environments.

The crucial, clear take home messages:

Tertiary access without literacy support is squandering opportunities for Generation 1.5 learners to maximise their academic potential.

Tertiary access with literacy support is counter-intuitive in terms of achieving academic success.

As Dweck et al. (2014) point out, it is “rigorous, supportive learning environments” (p. 32) that help students develop academic tenacity, that ability that assists students in developing a sense of belonging, a commitment to achieving academic success, and working towards maximising their true academic potential. The authors point out that these psychological factors, often referred to as motivational or non-cognitive factors, can matter even more than cognitive factors in relation to students' academic performances. These factors include: students’ beliefs about themselves, their feelings about education, or their self-regulatory or self-control habits. Collectively, educationalists, psychologists, and economists recognise the importance of non-cognitive factors in academic achievement. This view aligns with the Brindley (1989) needs analysis orientations (i.e. one covering psycho-humanistic considerations for students whose second language is English. In addition, Dweck et al. advise that an individual’s experiences (both in and out-of-learning situations can influence psychological development (consider Louisa’s adverse childhood experiences in her home country and in the UK).

Counter-intuitively, given universities actively recruit potential students (with diverse learning, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds), the philosophy seems to be that once enrolled in studies, providing relevant, high quality, targeted, individual-specific literacy support is not a crucial consideration. While literacy support is provided it fails to meet the needs of generation 1.5 students. From my research journey point-of-view, the literacy support that is available is inadequate in terms of content, approach, and scheduled Monday-to-Friday delivery.

Consider the following:

- Marketisation of tertiary study; marketing rhetoric (accessibility, inclusion, and ‘real-world’ relevance (versus elitism) of marketing programs.
- Mediaisation of HE; broadening and encouraging tertiary participation.
- Increasing competition between universities; adopting students-as-a consumer approaches; students seeing HE as consumers, uni-shopping, uni-hopping to get the ‘right’ university ‘fit’ and the ‘right’ product; having a consumer-orientated view/value of their tertiary education and outcomes.
- Ironically having more Generation 1.5 students (via aggressive marketing) results in a disconnect in assisting these students with the literacy support they need.
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Literacy and learning support issues include:

- Scheduling clashes (attending sessions versus lectures decision-making).
- Monday to Friday support only (no evening or week-end support).
- Not targeting Generation 1.5 university students adequately.
- Not being proactive in helping to identify at-risk students early in their crucial first year transitional period at university.

Possible academic management theories

Generation 1.5 learners, ‘wanting it all, right-here, right-now’—buying into the great Australian aspirational cultural dream—regardless of their academic literacy preparedness to transition (with varying levels of L2 abilities and high school experiences) to successfully managing their undergraduate university studies. Research indicates that these learners are typically inadequately prepared for academic studies. In addition, learners may over-estimate their L2 abilities, under-estimate the demands associated with their personal situations, with the result that scarcity-influenced literacy decision-making, internal and external situational contexts, and associated across-domain demands adds further levels of anxiety, stress, and complexity in relation to their management styles.

Wanting it all regardless—in association with scarcity-influenced cognition and decision-making—essentially working with available coping resistance resources, dealing with diversity in terms of cognitive transactional capacities, and managing across-systems responses, attitudes, and approaches to stressful situations (i.e. managing their academic studies). In Louisa’s situation her approach seems to have evolved over the academic year (i.e. winging it; being selectively proactive in tackling assignments; faking it till you make it; becoming more accustomed to using these approaches and essentially ‘hanging-in there’, developing academic tenacity), while not necessarily actively working on improving their L2 skills and abilities in order to better manage her academic studies, and thereby reducing the stress and anxiety associated with studying. As with all the participants, while time scarcity is acknowledged as a major issue, it seems to be ‘forgotten’ or seen as ‘normal’ because the overall management approach is focused on ‘wanting it all, right here, right now’—regardless of across-domain and life balance constraints and conflicts.

Wanting it all regardless—in association with Dornyé’s L2 motivational L2 self systems. Some considerations:

1. Aspirational, ideal L2 self construct that is mediated by across-domain factors.
2. Identity re-construction is fluid, fragmented, evolving and highly context-sensitive.
3. Generation 1.5 culturally-situated cognition within the ideal L2 self construct (cultural mindset cognition and decision-making).
4. The ideal L2 self construct is about having a vision for themselves as competent L2 users, with ideals selves being motivated to reduce the gap between this vision and their current L2 competency realities.
5. Being an ideal L2 self means having a distinct self-regulatory system. Louisa’s systems is not fully functional in terms of becoming an independent learner she acknowledged this post-second research interview).
6. Ideal L2 selves function as ‘self guides’ that are used in the person’s social domains (family, personal, academic, work).
7. The ideal L2 self guide is negotiated, re-constructed within systems (e.g. person’s agency; culture; social) through interaction in domains (work, family, academic), in institutional settings; local setting; and also globally in terms of identifying with English language speakers more broadly.
8. Situated Learning Theory, ideal L2 selves may be struggling to fit in, be recognised by communities (e.g. academic discourse community).
9. This theory aligns with aspirational cognition (i.e. aspirational Australian cultural dreaming (wanting it all, buying into the great Australian dream), with ideal L2 selves having a vision for their future.
10. Dornyei’s L2 motivational self system provides a useful framework for interpreting Generation 1.5 data findings.
11. Dornyei’s L2 motivational self systems aligns with Generation 1.5 participants ‘wanting it all’ academic management approach (academic-specific, but also applicable to other areas of their lives).
12. As mentioned previously, wanting it all and Dornyei’s ideal L2 selves construct fits with aspirational Australian cultural dreaming.

**Wanting it all regardless**—in association with Mezirow’s (1997) Transformative Learning Theory.

Some considerations:

Transformation Learning Theory: “the process of effecting change in a frame of reference. Adults have acquired a coherent body of experiences—associations, concepts, values, feelings, conditioned responses—frames of reference that define their life world. Frames of reference are the structures of assumptions through which we understand our experiences. They selectively shape and delimit expectations, perceptions, cognition, and feelings. They set out our “line of action”. Once set, we automatically move from one specific activity (mental or behavioural) to another…A frame of reference encompasses cognitive, conative, and emotional components, and is composed of two dimensions: habits of mind and a point of view. Habits of mind are broad, abstract, orienting, habitual ways of thinking, feeling, and acting influenced by assumptions that constitute a set of codes. These codes may be cultural, social, educational, economic, political, or psychological. Habits of mind become articulated in a specific point of view—the constellation of belief, value judgement, attitude, and feeling that shapes a particular interpretation” (Mezirow, 1997, pp. 5-6).

Individuals have a strong tendency to “reject ideas that fail to fit our preconceptions, labelling those ideas as unworthy of consideration—aberrations, nonsense, irrelevant, weird, or mistaken” (Mezirow, 1997, p. 5).

On the learning process: “When circumstances permit, transformative learners move towards a frame of reference that is more inclusive, discriminating, self-reflective, and integrative of experience” (Mezirow, 1997, p. 5).

Transformative learning develops autonomous thinking.

Autonomous thinking...thinking as an autonomous and responsible agent is essential for full citizenship in democracy and for moral decision making in situations of rapid change.

Critical thinking helps develop transformative learning.

Critical thinking involves meaning-making processes, how people make sense of their experiences, and how they interpret these experiences. This involves two dimensions (i.e. meaning schemes (i.e. sets of related, habitual expectations, with implicit rules for interpretation); and meaning perspectives (i.e. higher-order schemata)).

Critical reflection: “refers to challenging the validity of presuppositions in prior learning” (Mezirow, 1997, p. 4) (Mezirow's *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*) (n.d).
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Mezirow (2000) states that: "individuals can, through adult learning, reformulate "reified structures of meaning by reconstructing dominant narratives (p. 19) (Millman & McNamara, 2018, p. 38).

Accordingly, Mezirow (2000) discusses the self-construct as important “when defining identity and the impact learning can have on the ways in which individuals begin to change their notions of self. Bourdieu refers to the restructuring of self as a response to exposure to the different ‘fields’ inhabited or that may be encountered” (Millman & McNamara, 2018, p. 38).

Mezirow, in highlighting the importance of critical thinking and critical reflection, identifies a paradigmatic shift in cognition, cognition that can occur “when reflective practices result in changes to the meaning perspectives individuals hold. Once recognised and critically evaluated, such perceptions of self can then be challenged, negotiated and reimagined if the individual so desires” (Millman & McNamara, 2018, pp. 38-39). In turn, Bourdieu advises that identity reconstruction “is possible” (Millman & McNamara, 2018, p. 39).

Consider Bourdieu’s (1967) Social Capital Theory, which aligns with Mezirow’s Transformational Learning Theory and his consideration that identity re-construction is possible given the impact of learning on individuals notion of self. This seems relevant to Generation 1.5 learners as they manage their university studies.

It seems to be all about getting that ‘piece of paper’, that degree that is the springboard to greater across-domain life opportunities and possibilities (i.e. becoming the ideal L2 self).

In essence, scarcity-influenced undergraduate university studies (e.g. time; foundational L2 skills; time management; becoming self-regulated; becoming a truly independent learner able to meet the literacy demands of the academic discourse community; able to make informed decisions), while acknowledged, do not receive considered attention from any of the participants.

Academic management systems: Overall theoretical considerations

All participants

- Their stories, their differences as providing a way to appreciate, understand, and reflect on their unique perspectives and experiences.
- Noting the commonalities and the diversity in their narratives.
- Their stories, their way, with their meanings.
- Narratives they live by, re-constructing their L2 selves (ought to or ideal, and variations in-between (in keeping with these students being ‘in-betweeners’, caught between two cultures in re-building their lives in Australia.

Academic management style

Wanting it all regardless – right here, right now.

Living the Australian dream (i.e. going to uni, getting a good job, buying a house, starting a family, traveling, having the ‘dream’ lifestyle).

- Originally the Australian dream was considered as typifying white, middle class cultural aspirations (middle class cultural dreaming), closely associated with Australian ‘lucky country’ thinking (Donald Horne, 1964).
- Participants with immigrant backgrounds buying in to living the Australian dream cultural aspirations.
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- The stereotypical Australian dreaming does not seem to re-conceptualised, re-framed, or re-defined in terms of relevance and achievability in today’s increasingly globalised societies.
- The Australian dream does not appear to be re-conceptualised in terms of different ways to measure happiness, life satisfaction, health, and well-being – seemingly out-of-alignment with 21st century realities but still aspired to regardless of associated implications.

Aspirational Australian ethos; Aspirational Australian academic dreaming.

Consider the theoretical construct of salutogenesis and Antonovsky’s term ‘generalised resistance resources’ as an individual’s resources and abilities to cope effectively with stressful situations. Managing stressors is seen as vital to individuals being able to develop their personal sense of coherence framework for making sense of the world around them (i.e. using available resources to deal effectively with their life experiences, helping to shape outcomes and achieve balance and stability in their lives.

These generalised resistance resources include: material, financial; knowledge, intelligence; ego identity; coping strategies; social support; commitment and cohesion with one’s cultural group, community; cultural stability; religion; philosophical underpinnings; genetic and internal resistance resources; and the individual’s state-of-mind (Idan, Erikson, & Al-Yagon, 2017, p. 57).

Stress: “the significant life event or change that demands response, adjustment, or adaptation” (Walinga, [n.d.]).

Stress: “…a product of a transaction between a person (including multiple systems: cognitive, physiological, affective, psychological, neurological) and his or her complex environment” (Lazarus and Folkman-adapted; (Walinga, [n.d.])).

Selective adaptive coping, using available resistance resources, appraising the situation, decision-making in terms of the individual’s across-systems management responses to dealing with stressful situations (i.e. cognitive; physiological; affective; psychological; neurological). If managing stress is viewed as a transactional process, these systems must be considered in terms of the complexities of the individual's environment.

Selective adaptive cognitive coping systems.
Scarcity-influenced cognition and decision-making.
Academic learning disconnections.

- Aggressive university marketing.
- Failing to provide targeted literacy support to L2 students.
- Access without literacy support does not promote educational opportunities and realising their true academic potential.
- Access without literacy support does not assist students in developing academic tenacity.
- At risk students require supportive learning environments that maximise non-cognitive capacities (e.g. motivation (achievement motivation), academic grit, determination, and tenacity; a growth mindset; self-regulation; identity; values affirmations). Academic tenacity helps students develop a sense of belonging in the learning situations.

As psychological constructs are described as being tools that are used to facilitate and understand human behaviour, I would describe Louisa’s management approach as ‘wanting it all’, in close associated with previous management descriptions (i.e. winging it; faking it till you make it; hanging-in
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This is part of the participant’s ideal L2 self construct, of being successful in her academic studies. However, when this university student ideal L2 self clashes with the reality of being inadequately prepared (CALP-wise) to achieve academic literacy success, the ‘idealised university student self must deal with the consequences and the situation facing the ‘real’ self.

In developing the theory of self, Horney advised that it is crucial the individual is cognisant of the differences between one’s ideal self and the real self, freeing up the individual to realise their potential, achieve their goals, and work towards self-actualisation. Importantly, Horney views the ‘real self’ as not being a fixed entity but comprising intrinsic potentialities that include temperament, talents, capacities, and predispositions that require a favourable environment in which to grow and develop. This real-self is not a product of learning. In addition, research (Rogers) discusses the perceived self (i.e. how the person sees self and how others see them), the real self (i.e. how the person really is), and the ideal self (i.e. how the person would like to be).

Importantly, in relation to Generation 1.5 learners, Paris (1999) advises that while self-actualisation takes different forms in different cultures, positive conditions in childhood are essential in working towards self-actualisation. As Louisa has experienced adverse childhood experience, this provides significant consideration as the project continues. For L2 learning and motivation researchers such as Dornyei, the construct of self in linked to identity. In addition, the author developed his L2 Motivational Self System in response to its importance in language-learning. This model attempts to determine the gap between the ‘actual’ self and their projected goal states (i.e. their motivational capacity).

In Louisa’s situation, this approach seems linked to a degree of cognitive avoidance. I might also describe this approach as ‘idealised-self cognition’ that results and influences the learner’s subsequent and systematic psychological responses (i.e. affective, behavioural, cognitive, identity developmental, and motivational) in relation to managing her studies.

Should subsequent third research interview data analysis suggest that this theory is accurate, developing a potentially unifying framework that captures the range of external (e.g. impacts of globalisation on Western countries and their citizenry) and internal influences informing this type of cognition (e.g. cultural, identity development, learning, linguistic, economic, personal, physical, political, workplace, and social environments) would be extremely useful.

Background information

The participant’s world view and personal philosophy towards tertiary education is framed in terms of ‘having a go’, being motivated in terms of ‘everything to gain, nothing to lose’ and ‘faking it till you make it’ mentality. Given Louisa’s age, perhaps there is a sense of urgency in completing her studies just as soon as possible (rather than doing one or two units per semester in order to allow the necessary time to improve her CALP and writing skills. While valuing the educational opportunities in Australia (i.e. endless possibilities), enjoying and valuing education, the participant does acknowledge her abilities to meet academic literacy demands (in terms of CALP scarcity) are inadequate. Louisa is unable to attend university-provided literacy support (she works full-time, and studies full-time), her main academic support person is her husband. Paradoxically, while acknowledging it is her personal responsibility for learning, and that she needs to improve her literacy skills, she does not actually take active steps to improve them (i.e. become a more independent learner, consult writing guides).

Despite these CALP-informed scarcity challenges, Louisa’s achievement motivation seems strong. This view is informed by the participant having experienced acculturation shock three times (i.e. in London; on returning to her home country; and when emigrating to Australian under a marital visa program); by dealing with adverse childhood experiences in her home country; and by developing resilience to deal with a wide range of situational contexts (i.e. educational; linguistic; and socio-
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cultural). Collectively, multi-factorial experiences impact on the participant’s positive (although perhaps overly optimistic) approach to managing her academic studies given her academic literacy scarcities.

As Louisa has a degree in her first language (Spanish), with Cummins’ theories in mind, in theory she has the linguistic foundations in place, to be able to complete a degree in her second language (English) with further instruction and practice. However, Louisa lacks the foundational L2 academic skill sets, particularly in writing which, research indicates, takes approximately 10 years of consistent practice to improve. Underlying her CALP scarcity is the fact that she does not have a grounding in effective study skills or have a solid understanding of independent learning processes. Self-efficacy scarcity also appears to be relevant construct.

In turn, these considerations invite discussion in relation to cognitive, psychological, and behavioural resources, adaptive capacities, and how context-driven influence shape outcomes and consequences, as well as the construct of moving from selective attention to sustained attention, in terms of academic studies management models.

Other research-related observations

In relation to academic literacy skills scarcity, along with time scarcity considerations, the following observations are made:

Handwritten notes are typically more time consuming and it is not as easy to re-read, make changes, and check any spelling mistakes that Word identifies; (ii) that providing reflection in relation to the SWOT assignment, preparing an electronic document would essentially become the first draft (or first version) of her assignment; (iii) making a start with an electronic document makes version control and archiving documents easier and securely (if Louisa is aware of the document and knowledge management systems); (iv) working directly in an electronic document enables the student to save content as she progresses (e.g. emailing the document to her student email address (and private one if this is applicable), providing an additional back-up strategy should the computer crash or some other technological disaster take place); and (vi) consider whether Louisa’s ‘note taking’ approach to learning one that lingers on from her university experiences in Colombia?

As Louisa appears to be quite tech-savy, I wonder if she has considered moving out of her comfort zone in terms of seeking ECU-provided literacy support in relation to improving her learning approaches. In the second research interview, in what seemed to be a light-bulb moment in terms of her lack of willingness to take steps to improve her academic literacy skills, she acknowledged this failing.

The analysis from the interview tends to indicate that she relies mainly on her husband and on her ECU lecturers for literacy pointers (as well as sometimes asking her 15-year-old daughter). Clearly, this approach seems inadequate as none of the parties has experience in teaching English as a second language.

- Louisa needs to take more active responsibility for her learning – becoming more metacognitively aware of her knowledge and approach to her own learning – and stating steps to address limitations.
- Louisa also needs instruction, and practice in identifying the most appropriate strategies in use in different learning contexts. She needs to be able use metacognitive awareness and practices to more effectively plan, monitor, and evaluate her thinking about managing her academic writing assignments.
In talking about the metacognitive processes, Louisa needs to be made aware of the types of knowledge, the four knowledge dimensions that include: factual; conceptual; procedural; and metacognitive (i.e. moving from concrete knowledge to abstract knowledge). Louisa also needs to be aware of the range of cognitive process thinking skills (i.e. being able to remember; understand; apply; analyse; evaluate; and create) that represent a continuum of increasing cognitive complexity – moving from lower-order thinking skills, to higher-order thinking skills.

These observations align with the concept coding from the second research interview, along with Louisa’s email feedback (provided 20 August 2018) on the interview process (copied below):

*Thank you Elizabeth! That was a great session. Talking to you makes me realise a lot about myself that usually I wouldn’t notice, so I take away from these sessions probably more than you realise and I’m very thankful for that :). Your suggestions are very valuable and I will start looking more actively into material that can help me to improve my grammar, writing composition and reading skills.*
Appendix D: Resource Journal Extracts

Researcher commentary: Early thoughts on the grounded theory research processes, 5 March 2018

As Corbin (1986) points out, grounded theory does not take place in a vacuum. With this and other considerations in mind, this research journal provides another way in which to interact with the data, as well as interaction with self. Accordingly, this journal records my observations, reflections, and thoughts from the first round of interviews (held during March-April 2018), through to the third and final round of interviews, storyline development and explaining the developing substantive theory. While a great deal of material has been written about the grounded theory research methodology, little has been written from the novice researcher’s position using a journal format that essentially becomes a document study data source.

Researcher’s commentary, 28 March 2018 interview with participant assigned the code name of ‘Sarah’. This writing records the researcher’s observations, reflections, and thoughts after interviewing the research participant. Interview rating in terms of ‘thick’ descriptive data: nine-out-of-ten. It was clear from the interview discussion that a central theme in relation to managing her undergraduate university studies relates to her refugee background (i.e. “a boat person, a queue jumper’ who fled with her family from the Hazara region of Afghanistan). The family went to Pakistan, then to Indonesia, and made the boat trip to Australia via the Christmas Island detention Centre (then to Woomera in South Australia, then to Sydney, and finally to Perth).

Important observations: Social pressures and identity development

In a highly globalized world, where more than 200 million people are living as international migrants (OECD, 2013), continuously confronting and negotiating the demands of at least two different cultures, there is a growing need to understand how cultural transition affects the identity of immigrants and explore the factors that can potentially contribute to the development of a positive and coherent immigrant identity. (Szabo & Ward, 2015, p. 13).

Researcher commentary, 19 July 2018: Discussing Rogers’ and Maslow’s Self-Actualisation Construct in terms of participants’ happiness orientations and positive psychology

Petersen, Park, and Seligman (2005) discuss happiness orientations and their associations with life satisfaction in relation to research participants’ perceptions (via an online questionnaire). Broadly speaking, experiencing happiness sits within Maslow’s levels three to five in the pyramid of human needs that encompasses love, family, affection, belonging, and relationships.

Researcher commentary, 21 July 2018: Confucianism and the concept of Asian values

Investigating these concepts was prompted by the fact that research participants Randy is South Korean-born, while Daniel is Malaysian-born. It the course of both first-round interview, it seemed clear that Asian cultural considerations were crucial. Widely considered one of the most influential people in the study of sociology, along with Karl Marx and Emile Durkheim, German sociologist Max Weber (1864–920) challenged prominent thinkers in the field at the time. Many of Weber’s arguments are still controversial today. It was Weber’s belief that sociology should be ‘value free’ in the development approach.
Another key Weberian belief is that religion is the central force in social change, rather than economics. In relation to Asian values, Weber's writing prompted other sociological studies on non-Western societies where aspects of Chinese and Indian political culture featured prominently. Since 1980s research suggested that the educational achievement of Asia students is relatively high, relating this achievement primarily to presumed Asian values that include “respect for learning and a willingness to exert effort to master school work” (p. 4). In addition, while Asian values may influence learning and education, the role of Confucian learning has been identified.

**Researcher commentary, 4 August 2018: The Scarcity systems core category, working towards a possible working theory for Generation 1.5 learners managing their undergraduate university studies**


The Harvard economist Sendhil Mullainathan and the Princeton psychologist Eldar Shafir, in discussing the scarcity construct argue that living with too little, for example, time and imposes huge psychic costs that reduce our cognitive capacity or ‘mental bandwidth’. In turn, these impositions influence and distort our decision-making processes in ways that have major impacts on their lives, leading people to make even ‘poorer’ or adverse life decisions and choices. Collectively, this scarcity response makes an already bad situation much worse. The authors use the term ‘tunneling’ in order to describe people’s responses to scarcity of resources (e.g. time or money), dealing with layer upon layer of missing resources, and being simply overwhelmed by the degree and level of scarcity. Recalls Goffman’s frame analysis and laminating processes that adds further complexity to the situation.

**Researcher commentary, 7 September 2018: Investigating the Dunning-Kruger cognitive bias effect in connection with the construct of learning systems as a possible key component in developing substantive theory**

“People are able to make many quick and efficient decisions each day by, often nonconsciously, relying on cognitive schemas or short cuts. These short cuts allow people to come up with judgments that are “good enough” and, frequently, correct. That said, they also leave people prone to predictable cognitive biases”. (Ehrlinger (2016). Decision-making and cognitive biases). In keeping with gaining a better understanding of the learning systems construct, and as a result of the second round of research interviews (i.e. Randy), the Dunning-Kruger Effect may be useful. Coined in 1999 by then-Cornell psychologists David Dunning and Justin Kruger, the Dunning-Kruger Effect is a cognitive bias whereby people who are incompetent at something are unable to recognise their own incompetence. Importantly, not only do they fail to recognise their incompetence, they are also likely to feel confident that they are competent.


Taking on a systems approach; stress, coping and emotions as inter-connected and inter-related systems in terms of substantive theory development; transactions are relationships in a systems approach. Explore ‘transactions’, feel confident that it is the term used in L2-focused models and theories. I would like to have a better understanding any other important connections (in terms of stress, coping, and emotions (stress versus emotions considerations)). Two main theoretical constructs of the stress and coping transactional theory (i.e. appraisal and coping).
Overview/introduction in relation to the Generation 1.5 research: Developing a conceptual framework design, 13 October 2018

Two systems: Academic management systems AND coping systems.

Researcher commentary, 20 February 2019: On being ‘immersed’ in the Generation 1.5 data and making ‘discoveries’

As my research journey rolls on, I look forward to that happy day when I start to ‘write up’ my Generation 1.5 learner findings. In listening to my participants’ immigration and acculturation experiences, much of their home country stories have involved dealing with adverse childhood experiences. For these participants, immigration seems to have been a lifeline, an escape route to a life that offered greater opportunities. For all the participants, accessing tertiary education in Perth, as Australian citizens, has been life-changing. As I learn and ‘discover’ more about their highly individual situational contexts, about the diversity of influences which in turn serve as educational drivers for these participants. Along the way, I have also made discoveries about myself. Sometimes challenging but always rewarding, these research experiences help to reinforce the view that life is for living, that life is not a dress rehearsal. For my research participants, life is about having aspirational educational goals, exploring opportunities, dealing with challenges, making decisions and commitments, and managing the consequences—both positive and negative. I look forward to writing that thesis chapter that explores participant and researcher positionality, along with the lessons learned along the way.

Researcher commentary, 27 February 2019: Wanting it all regardless

In relation to this possible conceptual framework for my working theory of wanting it all regardless, Goffman’s (1974) frame analysis (FA) seems an appropriate addition to this discussion. Goffman introduces conceptual, performative features within FA that recognise power relations and role-based footings (alignments, positionalities, intersectionalities, crossing, passing journeys/social interactions; FA as including: the broader primary frame (an overall definition, description of the situation faced by participants – wanting it all regardless in terms of managing their 2018 academic studies); narrower frames within the broader ones (multiple journeys); laminated frames that can be superimposed on one another creating multiple layers of interpretation (aligning of multiple journeys, identities, roles, responsibilities, with the destination being a SA-related and completing tertiary studies); bracketing frames that highlight specific stages or phases; keying as signalling transition from one frame to another, meaning-making processes in terms of the primary frame (wanting it all regardless journey); keying also involves footings as orientations or positions (and subsequent actions) in relation to specific areas that may or may not result in changes of alignment (positionality) – consider highway journey metaphor (i.e. taking exits, pulling over into the emergency stopping lane, deciding to take new routes); misframing and settling frame disputes (i.e. micro-social, across-domain conflicts, challenges, strains, overloads, overspills); frame disputes can indicate power relations, asymmetry, and inequality (e.g. procedural justice issues in terms of assessment and appeals processes; breakdown in marital relationships); frame disputes involve lifeworld frames, voices, narratives, experiences which may conflict with institutional ones (e.g. uni staff; educational frame versus Generation 1.5 students lifeworld frames); lifeworld voices as social narratives, lifeworld matters; regrounding (consider regrounded student profile; a self-representative, re-integrative, restorative construct/processes), final aspect of FA that takes place after misframing or frame disputes, acknowledging tensions that have arisen and making attempts to restore balance, re-integration, re-install a sense of belonging, equilibrium to the situation, impression management, adapting socially-constructed ‘realities’, rectifying academic mis-steps and faltering in the wanting it all regardless, AMS, SA, future selves journeys (to ‘normalise’ the situation); attempting these processes through reflexive linguistic tools and
gestures, re-defining the situation, re-framing the situation, wanting to strategically re-align themselves with the culturally-preferred norms and values within the situation.

**Researcher commentary, 14 August 2019: Further reflection on the coding and data analysis processes**

Coding the third round of research interview and written responses (in lieu of interviews), and subsequent data analysis has occupied my time for most of 2019. In keeping with my radically revised Strauss and Corbin (1990) GT approach and a strong focus on using literary markers throughout the coding (see posting for 2 August 2019), these processes involved being totally immersed in the data, questioning the data, and allowing findings to emerge from the data. I can honestly say that following this approach has been successful in gathering unique profiles of my research participants, profiles that helped develop story lines and a working theory that has strengthened and been validated by research data.

**Researcher commentary, 2 August 2019: Arts-informed literature that augments the Strauss and Corbin (1990) grounded theory methodology**

After reading Patricia Leavy’s novel *[Spark]* (2019) that explores the research process, critical thinking, problem-solving, and transdisciplinary, further reading indicated that the author is a proponent of arts-based research. Leavy describes arts-based research as one that includes many different practices or methods (just like quantitative and qualitative research), adding that this approach can be used during research conception, data collection, data analysis, interpretation, presenting findings, research dissemination ([Literary sociology: An interview with Dr Patricia Leavy about *Spark*, 2019](https://example.com)).

The characters in Leavy’s novel are all on a journey of self-discovery, navigating the research process which in many ways aligns with identity and life stage development processes. From a reading of *Spark*, an alignment with GT’s rigorous procedural framework, along with my method of data collection and analysis, offers exciting possibilities in terms of enriching, value-adding, and enhancing my research findings, thesis discussion, and recommendations.

In addition, for me, the novel had close associations with my working theory (i.e. wanting it all regardless within a self-actualisation (SA) framework; not taking anything (life) for granted; “today is always better than someday” (*Spark*, 2019, p. 88); my participant’s academic study journeys, with their SA journeys; “Someday is always in the distance. Someday is dangerous. Be careful of someday” (*Spark*, 2019, p. 86). Using *Spark’s* journey metaphor, in conjunction with this study’s analytical and theoretical development landscapes, this journey includes:

**Exploration on multiple levels:** Intraperonals (maximising and balancing self-interests); interpersonal (balancing one’s interests with the interests of ‘others’); extrapersonal (achieving balance and order in relation to the situational contexts in which the individual lives, such as contributing to the community, one’s city, one’s country) over the short and longer term as a way in which to adapt to various environments, help shape existing environments, and choose new environments (Sternberg, 1998, 2003; quoted in Koltko-Rivera, 2006, p. 310). These levels are also referred to as micro, meso, and macro in related research. Sternberg discusses his Balance Theory of Wisdom in terms of these levels of self and other interests, a construct that involves self-transcendence (associated with the SA journey (eudemonia (Aristotle; a good life; wisdom, virtue, identities, self-control; future selves; framework for wanting well-lived life; worldview); logotherapy; Maslow; Koltko-Rivera; Frankl’s logotherapy; man’s search for meaning and purpose in life; healing through discovering meaning in lifeworld experiences; his belief that SA is possible only as “a side-effect of self-transcendence”.

395
Sternberg considered wisdom as being the highest form of human development. The multiple journey being undertaken by the Generation 1.5 research participants invite reflection and consideration in terms of arts-informed research approached (data collection, analysis, coding literary references). Considerations (see section below on literary alignments).

Commitment; Making adjustments; Creativity, adding value to the journey, and valuing the commitments, adjustments, and so on; Positivity; Maintaining a future-focus; SA journey influences; Being prepared (as a researcher); Embracing the journey challenges and responsibilities; Being grounded in the data, letting the data inform data analysis; questioning the data; challenging the data; Investigating and attempting (as far as possible) to capture the realities of the research journey that deals with multiple realities.

Arts-informed in relation to liminality, positionality, intersectionality, crossing and passing journeys. Maintaining a strong self-belief (believing in what is possible; being open to all possibilities; not forcing the data). Avoiding ‘dinosaur thinking’; being open to working with data that informs future analytical directions, research findings, research recommendations. Working creatively with technical (theoretical-based literature) and non-technical literature (literary works), in keeping with the GT approach and its focus on creativity.

Non-technical literature including literary forms (poetry, paintings, song lyrics (Louisa). Research methodology about maintaining balance, about reader engagement, about representing my thesis creatively with an arts-informed approach, presenting information ‘in a novel form or format’ (Rolling, 2010, p. 105). This approach requires a greater creative commitment from the researcher. Making connections (technical and non-technical literature); making my thesis a pleasure to read; using arts-informed literary writing style; “I want to write things that I’d really want to read…I want what I write to be entertaining. That’s my primary wish. I want my writing to be a pleasure to read” (p. 150); “wanting to give my writing life” (Adam Phillips).

On-going awareness of the ‘spark’ that is necessary in life’s journeys. Diego’s (Spark) words that liken stars “look like little sparks lighting up the sky” (p. 137); that “some of the teeniest sparks of creativity this week contain the greatest insights. And like the spark inside of you, inside us all. Entire worlds of possibility and wonder” (p. 137). The aim of all researchers is to provide great insights into their research topics. Spark’s aim, to re-ignite that spark within us all. Understanding that lifeworld experiences matter: interpreting, investigating making-meaning processes, re-presenting the data in ways that remain as faithful as possible to the data.

Re-storying, mesh it with the ‘Spark’ approach – readable, engaging; make the text an art-form as Adam Phillips does). Research as knowledge-building; multifaceted knowledge-building; value-adding through creative writing; Being arts-informed while remaining focused on the central research question. It seems clear to me that the arts-informed approach has merit and that a variation of the GT analytical coding approaches was validated.

Examples of coding:

FUTURE SELVES (SA JOURNEY-FOCUSED; "NO BIRD SOARS TOO HIGH, IF HE SOARS WITH HIS OWN WINGS"; WILLIAM BLAKE; THE MARRIAGE OF HEAVEN AND HELL)

IDENTITY-RECONSTRUCTION (LOGOTHERAPY; PSYCHOTHERAPY; HEALING THROUGH DISCOVERING MEANING IN LIVED EXPERIENCES; FRANKL: MAN’S SEARCH FOR MEANING TEXT; “OUR GREATEST FREEDOM IS THE FREEDOM TO
Researcher commentary, 12 August 2020: Closing the curtain on the Generation 1.5 learner study

The past months have flown by as the all-important writing-it-all-up thesis stage kicked in with a vengeance. I under-estimated the difficulties and dilemmas involved in this final research process. To name a few…to project-manage and direct my Generation 1.5 learner study; to reign in all I had discovered and present my findings to an informed audience; to strive to achieve the balance between producing an engaging and innovative thesis while maintaining an authoritative, first-time researcher stance; and to survive the challenges along the way. This direction continues to be challenging. As the curtain is being lowered on my three-year study production, it is a time of mixed emotions and feelings. I recall Patricia Leavy’s novel Spark, her characters, and their journeys of self-discovery. While my production journey has not yet finished, there will be many related journeys yet to come. As Liev counsels, “Be careful of someday”. I consider myself fortunate to have met my research participants and privileged to have been able to tell their stories.
Appendix E: Resource Journal Extract: Selective Coding, Story Line, and Theoretical Development Commentary

Researcher commentary, Friday 12 October 2018: Story line and theoretical development considerations, with reference to participant Maria and Sarah in terms of academic management and subsequent coping mechanisms

Having started the concept coding on Sarah and Maria's second round research literature, it seems to me that there are some alignments in terms of identity, developing a sense of belonging, and using coping mechanisms to manage their university studies. In relation to Sarah, investigate same, stigma, failure (in terms of coping mechanisms: faith, own-family-local community-collective expectations).

In relation to Maria, investigate her age, age when she married in terms of the possible implications of her recurrent drowning in snakes dream script - this dream may have past, current, and on-going future significance. Maria wants to 'have it all' - perhaps making up for the past (when she was dealing with multiple levels of adversity (Question: Maria's father holding her down/holding her back) - attempting to 'block out' the past events by having an "I want it all" and "I want it now" approach to living her life to the full. Consider cognitive avoidance, and coping mechanisms (i.e. cognitive and emotional) - which seems to fit with Bourdieu's concepts of filed, capital, and habitus (multiples types of capital - resulting in symbolic importance (i.e. the dream) see the Morrice (2013) journal; article dealing with refugees in HE (UK perspectives).

However, Maria's recurrent dream doesn't seem to be letting her move on - father still having an impact while Maria wants to prove her father wrong - wanting to prove herself, establish her role, identity, status, worth and values in her 'new' life (i.e. her ideal, possible, future, ought-to L2 self) in Australia. In relation to ages, as Maria spent 16 years in her home country, how long she has now spent in her adopted country. Might be interesting - is it 'half-and-half; equal amount of years?

In relation to Maria's academic expectations - always high - having a go, everything to gain, nothing to lose philosophy, and given her extreme time constraints, passing is fine (she also acknowledges her L2 academic literacy limitations (and no time to improve them)). In some respects, this perspective now aligns with Sarah (S1 high expectations), but after having to withdraw from her studies (? unknown reasons really - choosing not to disclose) - just passing is fine (can't bear to let her parents down - Hazara proverb - struggle and the beauty in the struggle) - S2 expectations are much lower. Aiming lower will help to lessen her L2 literacy/social pressures) influenced-anxiety, less pressure, less stress, demonstrating a more pragmatic approach to managing her studies (while on 'paper' she is the participant who should achieve well - having all her education in Australia - but this may not be the case. Unfortunately, I wonder whether either participant will ever achieve their true academic potential.

Consider the 'status' and 'identity/belonging implications associated with being a university student (when you have an immigrant/refugee background/inadequate L2 literacy resources/not a native English language speaker)- seeking to attain the privileges, prestige, and position attached to having the linguistic capital and knowledge capital associated with being a university student. In relation to both Sarah and Maria, investigating the affective domain impacts and coping methods seem important. However, as a novice GT researcher, it is important to acknowledge that it is important not to over-generalise and universalise about the L2 academic needs/support needs of Generation 1.5 research participants. However, while there is diversity, there may also be commonalities (especially in the
affective domain dimensions set against the backdrop of global impacts, forced and forced migration/refugee flows/subsequent acculturation and enculturation experiences. Essentially, all six research participants had no say in leaving their home countries - their parents made that life-changing decision - typically in order to provide a better life for their children.

However, while it seems the affective domain is a useful area of research consideration, exploring the cognitive domain works naturally follows. In terms of the Transactional Theory of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987), may be relevant (in association with Bourdieu's concepts (especially habitus). This theory is considered in respect of participants pre-immigration/refugee experiences; their immigration/refugee experiences; and their post-immigration/refugee experiences. Morrice (2013) discusses this theory in her journal article Refugees in higher education: boundaries of belonging and recognition, stigma and exclusion. Lazarus and Folkman also further investigate their theory in their 1987 article. Essentially, when dealing with stressful situations, the authors suggest that individuals use coping activities to either remove stress or minimise negative effects - with two stages in this process.

The first stage involves cognitive appraisal, the second coping mechanisms. The first appraisal stage comprises determining meaning/threat level (i.e. benign, positive, irrelevant, and stressful) - typically in terms of motivational relevance; while the second appraisal stage involves determining what actions need to be taken (in light of the appraisal, being either harmful, threatening, or challenging). These two processes work in unison, recalling the scarcity construct; systems thinking; cognitive ease versus cognitive strain. The results of these processes, in turn, inform what actions are to follow (i.e. is the event/situation deemed to be both stressful and exceeding the individual's abilities/resources for coping). Coping (defined as involving thoughts and behaviours that are used to manage situational demands (with the choice of coping mechanisms) (Baranak et al., 2018, p. 117).

Lazarus and Folkman (1987) discuss coping methods as being:

- Problem-focused (i.e. involving direct attempts to manage the stressors).
- Emotion-focused (i.e. involving managing the emotions resulting from dealing with the stressors).

Once again, it is important not to over-generalise because the effectiveness of using these coping mechanisms depends on the appropriate use of strategies/mechanism that result from the individual's appraisal of the event and its inherent situational characteristics (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, 1987).

In thinking about the Lazarus and Folkman theory of coping, I am also reminded of the salutogenesis construct and how it may impact in terms of the collective considerations: Dornyei's process model of L2 motivation; Dornyei's L2 motivational self systems; the Willingness to Communicate construct; systems thinking; the scarcity construct; Dweck's mindset theories (i.e. fixed and growth); the concepts of academic resilience, tenacity, and the 'grit' factor; and the Dunning-Kruger Effect (i.e. being ignorant of one's own ignorance) - all of which - and I'm sure many more in the technical literature - help to inform cognitive avoidance mechanisms.

These mechanisms are considered adaptive characteristics of stressors/stressful situations (with two implicit approaches (i.e. problem-focused, and emotion-focused). Once again, as a researcher, I can only work with what participants self-report as stressors. However, in relation to my GT coding, each word, phrase, sentence, and perhaps sentences are crucial in the data analysis process - each component being capable of generating one or more concepts of themes that 'emerge' naturally from the process, ultimately being interpreted and considered in term of higher-level categories, sub-categories, and core categories.
At this stage in the research process, it seems likely that investigating situational stressors and subsequent coping mechanisms used may be crucial in gaining a better understanding of how Generation 1.5 learners manage their academic studies over a one-year period. Areas inviting consideration include the following: stigma (need a comprehensive definition; refugee/immigration experiences (three levels); faith/clothing; having an non-Australian sounding name; impact of the lack of cultural awareness of others- and coping mechanism (affective, behavioural, cognitive).

**Story line and theoretical development considerations**

This study investigates how Generation 1.5 learners manage their undergraduate university studies over a one-year period. This qualitative study uses the Strauss and Corbin (1990) Grounded Theory (GT) research methodology to examine and identify participants’ academic management systems in relation to their learning systems. Accordingly, this approach considers and investigates identified academic management stressors (i.e. the various situational stressors and their characteristics) in relation to the coping systems (or mechanisms) they employ to either (i) avoid; (ii) minimise; or (iii) eliminate this event (or situation) and the negative consequences of these stressors.

In keeping with the Transactional Theory of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, 1987), research findings suggest that both diversity and commonalities in terms of how the research participants manage their academic studies. Data suggests that these participants use Generation 1.5 learner-specific coping mechanisms informed by their unique situational stressors (and their characteristics). Accordingly, these stressor include their (i) family; (ii) family; (iii) L2 proficiencies (i.e. CALP levels); (iv) learning approaches; (v) acculturative; (vi) enculturative; (viii) immigration (pre-immigration, immigrating; and post-immigration); (ix) refugee (pre-refugee, being forced to become a refugee, and post-refugee); (x) worldview; and (xi) work-family-study-life balance systems.

In response to these academic management stressors, findings emerging from the analytical process indicate diversity and commonalities (i.e. variations on establish data finding themes) in relation to how Generation 1.5 learners cope with these stressors. While profile for this discrete cohort of students is well-establish in mainly North American-based research (i.e. having well-developed BICS but under-developed crucial CALP levels), less is known about how these students manage and successfully transition to tertiary learning environments. In gaining new research insights it is necessary to consider these learners within the context of on-going global tensions, wars, persecution, refugee and asylum seekers flows; and immigration patterns and personal impacts and influences.

When high school students undertake university studies, implicit in this transition process is the understanding that the typical student is cognisant of being independent learners, independent learners with well-established English language proficiencies who can meet the reading and writing demands of the academic discourse community. However, many Generation 1.5 learners may be inadequately prepared to meet academic study demands.

Accordingly, the results of this study suggest participants use a variety of coping mechanisms. These coping mechanisms use both a problem-focused approach and an emotion-focused approach (with their inherent personal influences). These adaptive coping mechanisms can be either positive or negative, as well as an amalgam of both (i.e. being pragmatic, but at the expense of possibly never achieving their true academic potential):

Management styles - **Maria** (i.e. wanting to have it all; having a go; nothing to lose, everything to gain; taking personal responsibility for learning (sometimes this is cognitive avoidance), despite knowledge that they lack the L2 academic literacy skills necessary – all participants to varying extents). These styles are often accompanied by a willingness to
settle for just ‘passing’ and being pragmatic given their constraints (e.g. time) and L2 Willingness to Communicate failings. Maria’s recurrent ‘drowning in snakes’ dram may also be relevant to her academic management approach. Time constraints mean that she would never be able to access ECU learning support centre sessions.

Management styles – Sarah - that are faith-based and the Hazara proverb that explains that is beauty in the struggle. Sarah has consequently lowered her academic study expectations (previously ‘high’, now just wanting to ‘pass’). Sarah previously considered that it is her ‘personal responsibility for learning – back up Islamic teachings that advocate learning (i.e. seeking knowledge from the cradle to the grave). Until very recently (i.e. responding to the second-round interview-like questions), she acknowledged that a future management change would be admitting and seeking literacy support when she needs it. This is quite an advance in metacognitive practice. Uncertain if Sarah will access the ECU learning support centre (i.e. it is not what participants say, it is what they actually do (the actions/steps taken) in terms of investing in their learning. Her refugee experiences may also be informing her academic management style – perhaps experiencing stigma and shame – at letting herself down, and in turn her family because she has acknowledged that she cannot bear to let their struggles and sacrifices (for a better life and education for her) go in vail.

Tremendous pressure to do well academically. Explore stigma – a mark of disgrace, a stain, a blemish, and an impact on her identity – her ideal L2 self-identity.

Stigma (Pietrus, 2013; Canadian Mental Health Commission): a complex social process involving many parts, all of which work together to marginalise and dis-enfranchise people with a mental illness and their family members (p. 2).

Stigma: primarily a problem of behaviour resulting in the unfair and inequitable treatment/consequences for the people being submitted to these behaviours.

Stigma (three types; self-stigma; public stigma; and structural stigma (p. 2)).

Self-stigma: accepting/agreeing with negative cultural stereotypes (and feelings of being ashamed, blameworthy, and avoiding situations that might elicit stigmatising responses. This results in stigma avoidance/stigma avoidance strategies.

Public stigma: prejudicial attitudes, behaviours by members of the public. A process of making cultural attributions that are typically based on deeply-held prejudices that are resistant to change. These cultural attributions attribution theory) help to fuel public stigma. Consider the media’s (mass media and social media) portrayals of refugees and stigma.

Structural stigma: Prejudicial behaviours and attitudes at the institutional level, involving policies, laws; programs, regulations that result in/create situations in which people are denied their basic human rights. This may occur when policy agendas do not give a high priority to addressing and eradicating stigma in various domains (e.g. refugees, asylum seekers, immigration programs and flows). Collectively, dealing with stigma is a challenging, pervasive, and complex area that requires government-level responses (see Pietrus (2013); Canadian mental Health Commission, 2013, p. 2).

Management styles – Randy – laissez faire approach – very relaxed – happy enough to get that ‘piece of paper, just pass to obtain his degree. However, he has withdrawn from ECU studies, planning to study online at a Canberra-based university from December 2018. Randy is happy to continue contributing to the study. Would access ECU learning support is sessions were scheduled in the evenings.

Management styles – Louisa – working with the Colombian saying “faking it until you make it, and approach that aligns with Maria’s ‘having a go’, ‘hanging in there’, and ‘having nothing
to lose, everything to gain’ styles. However, Louisa had an epiphany of sorts when teaching disadvantaged people in her home country – sees becoming a teacher as an important way to make a difference in people’s lives and help them achieve their dreams. This attitude/approach also aligns with the lyrics from a Spanish song (i.e. that it does not matter where you were born, where you live, or where you die – what matters is the ‘battle’ (where ever you currently live) and making a difference. Louisa also interprets this as being engaged in your local community, making a difference to improve that community (showing the love), being a good citizen, and probably also being a good global citizen.

Considerations

Janesick and social justice theories; Dornyei’s decision-making – choice motivation (as per L2 process motivational models and L2 motivational self systems; Louisa made the choice to leave her home country to marry in Australia (while the two previous upheavals to London (and then back to her home country) were family decisions – not hers.

Consider how Louisa felt when she left to immigrate to Perth, Western Australia under a marital visa. THREE major upheavals in Louisa’s life that involved immigration; three upheavals in terms of education; three upheavals in terms of dealing with family systems; three upheavals in terms of self-worth, identity formation, and identity re-construction (especially L2 ideal self) and worldview development. Basically, three upheavals in every domain/system possible (e.g. cognitive, behavioural, affective, attitudinal, emotional, motivational; family; linguistic; learning; social; political; cultural; economics; educational; socio-economics. READ the text chapter on Colombia for background information.

Consider checking with Louisa (i.e. pre-immigration; during immigration; and post-immigration) in relation to all three upheavals. Ideally, this question should be put to all participants. Louisa is ‘hanging in there’ to achieve her goal of becoming a teacher. She admits her failings, acknowledges her time constraints (working full-time, family, study, life balance) feels guilty at times being away from her family, but she feels that it is ‘her time now to achieve her goals’ (she delayed studies, putting family matters first before), now she is motivated to achieve her goals. Family appear to be supportive. Management approach seems to be: motivated, goal-focused, and pragmatic in terms of working with her time constraints, and doing her best in terms of managing her L2 academic literacy failings. She would access ECU learning support if their scheduling included weekend or evening sessions. However, she is an advocate for lifelong learning and one day wants to study for a PhD.

Management styles – Rebecca – seems to be ‘hanging in there’, attempting to develop academic tenacity and grit. At the time of writing, it appears that she is developing metacognitive practice. She seems to be prepared to just pass (given her inadequate CALP, and having spent just six months in a Perth high school learning English as her second language. Uncertain if Rebecca will access the ECU learning support centre (i.e. it is not what participants say, it is what they actually do (their actions/steps taken) in terms of investing in their learning.

Management styles – Daniel – as he is not returning my emails about making second round research contributions by way of responding to interview-like questions, it seems he withdrawn from the study. I will try just one more email to confirm.

Management styles that acknowledge their lack of time, academic language skills and support necessary to achieve; seemingly unwilling to change their learning approaches or management styles.
Management styles that tend to incorporate academic resilience; academic tenacity; and academic grit.

These management styles can also demonstrate types of coping strategies/mechanisms (i.e. removing stressors; minimising negative impacts of these stressors; or addressing the stressors in order to resolve them directly and overtly. Either adaptive or maladaptive coping mechanisms.

The above stressors and cognitive approaches can also be discussed in relation to Bourdieu’s conceptual framework of field, capital, and habitus (see journal article by Morrice (2013) that investigates refugees in higher education (using Bourdieu’s conceptual framework), in terms of belonging and recognition, stigma and exclusion; see journal article by Baranik et al., 2018) that investigates the stigma of being a refugee (situational stressors and coping mechanisms employed to deal with these stressors).

Investigate study outcomes (i.e. management styles; coping mechanisms; outcomes – positive, negative, mixed) in terms of stressors (i.e. personal, family, work, interpersonal) in relation to Bourdieu's conceptual framework.

Capital stressor areas: religions; cultural; linguistic; economic; knowledge (i.e. life skills experiences versus academic knowledge; learning; social and in turn symbolic).


**GT research considerations**

Using GT techniques and procedures, the researcher is able to develop substantive theory that meets the demands of Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) elements of ‘good’ science. These elements include: significance; theory-observation compatibility; precision; and rigor, along with enabling the researcher to use their creativity. This creativity allows the researcher to ask questions of the data, and in doing so, to become ‘immersed’ or ‘grounded in the data’ and identity and interpret findings. This approach enables comparisons, reflections, and investigations that help develop new insights into the research area being investigated. This approach also encourages the researcher to maintain theoretical sensitivity (i.e. researcher positionality) that encourages the researcher to be ‘grounded’ in both the data and in relevant technical literature consulted during the study journey. Collectively, theoretical sensitivity maintains a healthy dose of scepticism in generating provisional findings that are ‘backed-up’ by theoretical sampling – an on-going process until no ‘new’ findings emerge from the data collection and analytical processes.

**Consult the following texts**

- *Death of democracy* / Benjamin Carter Hett.
- Book chapter on Colombia.

**Revised story line, theoretical developmental approach, 13 October 2018 (based on the Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, 1987)**

Taking on a systems approach.
Stress, coping and emotions as inter-connected and inter-related systems in terms of substantive theory development.
Transactions are relationships in a systems approach. Explore ‘transactions’, feel confident that it is the term used in L2-focused models and theories. I would like to have a better
understand any other important connections (in terms of stress, coping, and emotions (stress versus emotions considerations).
Two main theoretical constructs of the stress and coping transactional theory (i.e. appraisal and coping).

**Overview/introduction in relation to the Generation 1.5 research: Developing a conceptual framework design, 13 October 2018**

Two systems: Generation 1.5 academic management systems AND their coping systems. Emotions as a system.

Three important variables: **antecedents** (causal); **mediating** (mediation); and **outcomes**. These two systems (i.e. Generation 1.5 academic management systems AND their coping systems), work in conjunction with investigating the empirical relationships (the transactions), among **antecedents** (personal (i.e. values; commitments; goals; self-esteem; mastery; sense of control; interpersonal trust; existential beliefs; general beliefs; worldview; belief systems)) and **environmental** (i.e. demands; constraints; (time, L2 abilities); resources (e.g. social support/networks, ambiguity, imminence (convenience, proximity), constraints (i.e. time, L2 abilities); temporal aspects; priorities)); **mediating** (a process that involves **two appraisal processes** (i.e. primary appraisal (stakes) and secondary appraisal (i.e. the coping options available (includes the use of social support)), and **two coping forms** (i.e. problem-focused and emotion-focused); and **outcome variables** that are involved in the stress process.

This approach considers that the **variables** in these systems are “recursive; at different points in the flow of events an antecedent can be an outcome, and vice versa” (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987, p. 142).

These **outcomes** can be adaptive and can be short-term/immediate effects (‘short-run’ such as emotions during/after an encounter/event; include affect, physiological changes, quality of encounter outcomes) or long-term effects (‘long-run adaptational’, such as subjective well-being; psychological well-being; morale; social functioning; social health/illness; social functioning; somatic health) (pp. 143-144).
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PARTICIPANTS’ CODING CHANGES OVER THE 2018 RESEARCH PROJECT
Developing the major GT categories

Table 1: An overview of participants’ main categories and frequency ranking after the first round of data-generation and analysis: Research interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randy</th>
<th>Sarah</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Louisa</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Rebecca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic literacy systems (275)</td>
<td>Identity systems (495)</td>
<td>Academic literacy systems (1010)</td>
<td>Academic literacy systems (847)</td>
<td>Academic literacy systems (357)</td>
<td>Academic literacy systems (462)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity systems (145)</td>
<td>Academic literacy systems (448)</td>
<td>Identity systems (894)</td>
<td>Learning support systems (746)</td>
<td>Learning support systems (264)</td>
<td>Learning support systems (448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning support systems (136)</td>
<td>Acculturation systems (436)</td>
<td>Acculturation systems (780)</td>
<td>Acculturation systems (540)</td>
<td>Identity systems (196)</td>
<td>Acculturation systems (386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration systems (135)</td>
<td>Learning support systems (267)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (735)</td>
<td>Identity systems (487)</td>
<td>Acculturation systems (132)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (361)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation systems (124)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (123)</td>
<td>Learning support systems (540)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (347)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (59)</td>
<td>Identity systems (335)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: An overview of participants’ main categories and frequency ranking after the second round of data-generation and analysis: Research interviews and contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randy</th>
<th>Sarah</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Louisa</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Rebecca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic management systems (1727)</td>
<td>Identity systems (5336)</td>
<td>Academic management systems (5490)</td>
<td>Academic management systems (1527)</td>
<td>Academic management systems (317)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity systems (1516)</td>
<td>Academic management systems (791)</td>
<td>Identity systems (6765)</td>
<td>Learning systems (1634)</td>
<td>Learning systems (354)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning systems (853)</td>
<td>Coping management systems (490)</td>
<td>Coping management systems (6119)</td>
<td>Coping management systems (1308)</td>
<td>Coping management systems (849)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration systems (281)</td>
<td>Learning systems (346)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (4573)</td>
<td>Identity systems (1226)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (800)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping management systems (1046)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (1431)</td>
<td>Learning systems (5571)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (1147)</td>
<td>Identity systems (1369)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: An overview of participants’ main categories and frequency ranking after the third round of data-generation and analysis: Research interviews and contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Louisa</th>
<th>Rebecca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic management systems (3424)</td>
<td>Academic management systems (5001)</td>
<td>Academic management systems (6111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity systems (20138) TOP RANKING</td>
<td>Learning support systems (2585)</td>
<td>Learning systems (3009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping management systems (2046)</td>
<td>Coping management systems (3156)</td>
<td>Coping management systems (8473)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration systems (2343)</td>
<td>Identity systems (12637) TOP RANKING</td>
<td>Immigration systems (10366)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning systems (2563)</td>
<td>Immigration systems (2099)</td>
<td>Identity systems (40032) TOP RANKING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In turn, these identified GT major categories became the:

- Academic systems
- Coping systems
- Identity systems
- Immigration systems
- Learning systems.