Chapter 3
Developing Effective Global Pedagogies in Western Classrooms: A Need to Understand the Internationalization Process of Confucian Heritage Cultures (CHC) Students

Thanh Pham

Abstract To support international students better, Australian institutions have called for the internationalization of the curriculum. Internationalization is defined as the integration of international or inter-cultural dimensions into the teaching, research, and service functions of higher education institutions. However, the process of internationalizing curricula at Australian institutions has been found to achieve minimal success due to conflicting understandings and arguments about how international, especially CHC, students learn. This study aimed to systematically and critically review and discuss CHC learners' practices from various perspectives. The study reported common stereotypes about CHC learners as well as myths that are not often discussed in the Western literature about CHC learners. Insights discussed in the study would help Western educators and researchers achieve a deeper understanding of CHC learners, so that they can implement more effective pedagogies in teaching CHC learners.

Keywords Confucian heritage cultures · Asia · Pedagogies · Australia · Internationalization · Higher education

3.1   Introduction

Australia's international education activities have become an important sector contributing to the country's economy. International students account for more than 20% of tertiary education students—the highest proportion of international students in all OECD countries. The majority of these international students are from Asian

T. Pham (✉)
Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: thanh.t.pham@monash.edu

countries; thus, there has been great interest in examining the learning practices of Asian students at Australian universities. One of the methods that many Australian institutions are implementing to become closer to and to learn from Asia as well as to attract more Asian students is internationalizing their curriculum. Knight (1997) claims that this is also one of the ways that many institutions worldwide are implementing to respond to the impact of globalization. In essence, internationalizing curriculum is defined as a process of integrating international or inter-cultural dimensions into the teaching, research, and service functions of higher education institutions (Harman, 2002). This means that content does not arise from a single cultural base but engages with the global plurality in terms of sources of knowledge (Webb, 2005, p. 110). For this meaning, the success in internationalizing curriculum at Australian institutions very much depends on how academics understand international students so that they can integrate this knowledge into their syllabus and teaching. Unfortunately, there are still many misunderstandings about the learning practices of CHC students. Characteristic learning attributes and identities assigned to CHC learners are often described on an evaluative continuum. At one end are constructions that see CHC learners as being obedient to authority, passive, dependent, surface/rote learners prone to plagiarism, lacking in critical thinking, and adopting inadequate learning strategies (Hammond & Gao, 2002). At the other end of the continuum, many researchers believe that Chinese learners have positive attributes as valuing active and reflective thinking, open-mindedness, and a spirit of inquiry (e.g. Biggs, 1996a, 1996b; Cheng, 2000). These extreme perspectives have created a real puzzle that has placed Western academics in a situation where they do not know how to work with Asian students effectively and appropriately. Consequently, Western academics, to a large extent, still set and use their own rules and expectations which provide subjective criteria for evaluating what are appropriate learning behaviours and methods of instruction in Australia's learning environment (Volet, 1999). This is why Webb (2005) claims that in reality, it is rare to see any real examination of the appropriateness of conventional Western pedagogical approaches to contemporary, more globalized and culturally interdependent contexts for both domestic and international students. What most Western institutions are doing is merely provide 'add-ons' such as the inclusion of international examples to their syllabus. Unfortunately, researchers have warned that any reform that only solves problems at the superficial level would not have long-term effects (Elmore, 1996; Fullan, 2000). This is why Webb further proposes that internationalization must move beyond such superficial approaches.

   To clarify how CHC learners' learning should be understood correctly as well as to make some contribution to the process of internationalizing curriculum at Western institutions, this chapter aims to provide a review of research on CHC learners' learning practices and critically discuss how researchers from different discourses have argued over the relationship between culture and learning practices and how learning practices of CHC learners are transformed at Western institutions. It is hoped that these discussions will provide Western academics with better insights, so that they can then develop effective and appropriate pedagogical practices to work with CHC students. It is noted that this chapter focuses on discussing the learning of

students coming from CHC countries (e.g. Vietnam, China, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan) but not from all Asian countries. The authors acknowledge that Asia is a broad term that covers a range of nations among which many do not inherit or are influenced by Confucian cultures (e.g. Thailand, India). Therefore, when the relationship between Confucian culture and students' learning is investigated, it should be within CHC countries but not within all Asian countries. Regarding structure, this chapter consists of three main parts. Part I provides an overall view of how CHC learners' learning has been understood and characterized across times. The second part discusses theoretical perspectives that underpin different views on CHC learners' learning, and the final part discusses the implications for educational practice.

3.2 Various Perspectives About CHC Students' Learning Approaches

3.2.1 CHC Learners and Rote/Surface Learning

CHC learners' approaches to learning started to attract the attention of researchers in the late 1980s and early 1990s. During this early period, most researchers, relying heavily on personal experiences and anecdotes, argued that CHC learners exhibit a lack of learner autonomy requiring step-by-step guidance and support; are uncritical consumers of information presented in the textbook or lectures; display reticence in class, and tutorials; prefer a reproductive approach to learning; and rely on a limited range of learning strategies, especially rote memorization (Ballard, 1996; Tsui, 1996). CHC students often receive knowledge from teachers as a truth rather than trying to think independently, challenge the teacher's knowledge, and draw their conclusions (Ruby & Ladd, 1999). To teach these learners, teaching is described as filling the 'empty-vessel' model, with the teacher as the 'full-vessel' pouring his/her knowledge into the 'empty-vessels', his/her students (Allen & Spada, 1982, p. 191). Such beliefs have been so prevalent and entrenched that even CHC students themselves have often internalized these descriptions and accept the image of themselves as lacking in initiative, being socially inept and boringly bookish (Ryan & Louie, 2006). These learning attributes contrast the image of teaching and learning practices at Western educational institutions where the ideal student is seen as inquiring, questioning, and self-reliant (Renshaw, 1999). This indicates that CHC learners must encounter many difficulties when studying in a Western environment.

However, it has been shown that international students achieve similar rates of academic success as domestic students in their higher education studies in Australia (DEST, 2004), and many CHC learners have been found to outperform their Western counterparts on international comparisons of student achievement. For instance, Jessen (2012) reported that mean scores for reading, mathematics, and science on PISA assessments of students from Shanghai, Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore

were consistently higher than those of students coming from Australia, the USA, UK, and Europe. An important note is that PISA assesses meta-cognitive content knowledge and problem-solving abilities. These skills are not conducive to rote learning (Jessen, 2012). Therefore, if CHC students only deploy a rote approach to learning in preparation for PISA assessment, they should achieve lower scores. This paradox has driven many researchers from a range of theoretical perspectives (e.g. Biggs, 1996a, 1996b; Cheng, 2000; Watkins & Biggs, 2001) to start reconstructing the stereotyped views on CHC learners, questioning if CHC students only learn by rote (as a mindless machine), they certainly cannot obtain so many impressive academic achievements both at Western institutions and on international tests. This doubtfulness initiated the birth of the second phase of research that aimed to seek evidence, demonstrating that CHC learners are not simply rote and surface learners.

3.2.2 CHC Learners and Deep Learning

The most well-known representative of this perspective is John Biggs (1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996a, 1996b) who mainly draws on Confucian heritage discourse arguing that it is not accurate when researchers use Confucian teachings as the underpinning theory to argue that CHC learners are rote and surface learners. This is because Confucius saw himself as a deep learner and encouraged deep teaching and learning (Biggs, 1996a, 1996b). The evidence Biggs utilized to protect his argument was that Confucius was keen on delighting his students in leading their better disciples to enlightenment through a process of questions and answers (Ryan & Louie, 2006). This is an interesting discovery that researchers in the literature have rarely mentioned and accepted. Based on this inference, later Watkins and Biggs wrote several papers aiming to dispel Western misconceptions. They collected empirical evidence to reveal that Chinese learners did value active and reflective thinking, open-mindedness, and a spirit of inquiry and engage in autonomous, problem-solving activities; Chinese societies did value an exploratory and reflective approach to learning; and Chinese teachers did not rely exclusively upon the transmission mode of delivery; engage in autonomous, problem-solving activities. They explained that Western researchers and educators did not see these positive aspects of 'Confucian heritage' education because the process of absorbing and digesting knowledge of CHC learners differs from that of their Western counterparts and Westerners were not aware of this differentiation.

Specifically, Biggs (1993) claims that the 'memorized learning' that Western researchers and educators often label Chinese learners should be called 'repetitive learning'. This practice is only used once the material has been understood to recall accurate information during exams. Repetition here actually helps students increase their attention to the details of the text and deepen their understanding. It is therefore suggested that CHC students do not simply rote learn unprocessed information, but attempt first to understand the new information in a systematic, step-by-step manner

and, once each part of the task is understood, memorize the 'deeply processed information' as repetition (Biggs, 1991, p. 21). Later, Watkins (1996) conducted a study in a Hong Kong school to investigate further explanations of CHC learners' learning process. He claimed that the learning process of CHC learners was divided into three clear-cut stages which the students seem to reach and pass through. First, students at primary and junior levels tended to achieve learning through total rote learning as a reproduction of everything. However, when students reached secondary school, under the pressure of workload they needed to be selective about what they had to memorize as their mind only allowed them to memorize important information in each subject. It was the process of selecting what to memorize that made the learner understand the materials. Thus, at this stage, the students achieved learning through reproduction with understanding. Finally, when reaching university, students continued using memorization as a means to understand, and their memorizing capacity was enhanced by understanding the material. It could, therefore, be argued that such students are well versed in the skills of memorization and rote learning as well as comprehension and understanding when they commence their tertiary education. They are very adaptable and can use a range of learning methods depending on the situation. This may enable CHC students to succeed academically more than local students in Western institutions.

In summary, this perspective aims to defend that when facing an academic task, Western and CHC learners have the same primary goal of trying to reach understanding, but CHC students use memorization, rehearsal, and repetition as a means to achieve this goal in a special way—a concept which Westerners find difficult to understand. Although the use of repetition and memorization strategies by Western learners has been found to indicate a surface approach to learning, the use of these same strategies by CHC learners does not necessarily indicate that they are adopting a surface approach (Chalmers & Volet, 1997; Renshaw & Volet, 1995). The process of learning applied by CHC students may not be common in Western education but it is not necessarily an incorrect approach, nor is it useless considering the advantages of discipline and foundation accrued. CHC learners are strategic, knowing how to use their abilities and skills correctly at the right times. This explains why they are well evidenced to outperform their Western counterparts in certain areas such as science and mathematics. Analyses of the cultural and educational processes of countries such as Singapore, Hong Kong, and Japan are being used to critique the practices in the West and to argue for reforms to teaching methods in Western countries (Renshaw, 1999; Stevenson & Stigler, 1996).

3.3   How to Understand CHC Students' Learning Accurately

The discussion above has shown that there exists a dilemma about CHC learners' learning. Any judgement made to argue one approach is more useful, valid, and accurate than the other does not sound sufficiently satisfactory and convincing because researchers on both ends have provided rich evidence to protect their views. To unpack this puzzle, it is proposed that researchers and educators must revert to examining the foundational theories underpinning these arguments and critically evaluate how effective and valid these theories are in today's globalization discourse. Besides, to understand the learning practices adopted by CHC students correctly, the criteria that are utilized to classify the types of learning must be investigated. If these criteria are not universally agreed, learning characteristics assigned to CHC learners' learning based on Western values and by Westerners become questionable and culturally inappropriate in the CHC context.

3.3.1   The Historical Perspective and CHC Learners' Learning

Ryan and Louie (2006) claim that to interpret contemporary Chinese education and its participants, too often researchers adopt a historical perspective and see cultural values as discrete, homogenous, and unchanging. Hofstede (1991) is probably the most popular protagonist representing this view. Hofstede bases much of his work on the characteristics which differentiate national cultures and presents geographical maps that present a world divided into cultural bubbles (Holliday, 1999). His cultural differentiation theory has influenced and shaped many other researchers' works which draw distinctions between 'Chinese' and 'Western cultures of learning' (Jin & Cortazzi, 1998, 2006), or between the 'Confucian' and the 'Socratic traditions' (Tweed & Lehman, 2002). Holliday (1999, 2005) claims that when researchers label a set of particular characteristics to describe people from a certain region(s), they deploy a 'large culture' approach that assumes that 'a culture' behaves like a single-minded person with a specific, exclusive personality (p. 5). Within this discourse, CHC learners are referred to as a homogeneous group embodying the values, identities, and behaviours of a shared culture which is 'Confucian culture'. Clark and Gieve (2006) highlight another characteristic of the historical discourse which views that cultures are determined by a historical heritage rather than emerging through history and thus dynamically evolving.

Researchers who have evaluated the two contrasting sets of attributes assigned to CHC learners discussed above fall into this trap. They believe that CHC learners' learning practices have their genesis in and are determined by cultural traditions left behind from the old times. They use teachings of historical sages as a theoretical foundation underpinning their evaluations and judgements. For instance, those

researchers who label CHC learners as passive and rote learners have often used the Confucian tradition that instructs teachers as knowledge masters and learners need to respect, obey and receive knowledge transformed from the teacher (Confucius, 1947) as evidence to protect their argument. In contrast, those researchers who see CHC learners as deep learners have proposed the idea that Confucius did emphasize deep learning and led his students through the dialectical process of questions and more questions (e.g. John Biggs as aforementioned) to provide evidence for their conclusion.

Since historical sages are often philosophers who represent a large community (e.g. Confucius is known as the representative of CHC countries; Socrates represents many Western nations), researchers supporting the historical perspective then tend to generalize that learning attributes shaped and influenced by teachings of these historical figures are similar among all participants who share the same national or ethnic cultures. If they find, for instance, Chinese students in Australia competitive, they then mask Chinese learners everywhere (both in China and in other CHC countries) as competitive learners. If they find Chinese culture values friendship, they will not hesitate to conclude that CHC learners worldwide appreciate friendship above competition, explaining why CHC people have such a saying as 'Friendship First, Competition Later'. Finally, as explained above, researchers underpinned by the historical perspective argue that student learning is determined by cultural values that are 'fixed' rather than emerging through history. They then assume that CHC learners carry fixed learning characteristics that do not change across times and in different situated contexts.

3.4   Alternative Discourses and CHC Learners' Learning

Arguments and conclusions underpinned by the historical perspective have been challenged by interpretations based on critical sociology, with theoretical contributions from cultural studies and post-structuralist discourse theory (Kubota, 2001, 2002, 2004; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Norton & Toohey, 2004; Pennycook, 1998; Spack, 1997). Researchers supporting these critical discourses argue for the idea that there are no distinctions between cultures because cultures have 'blurred boundaries', to 'flow, change, intermingle, cut across and through one another' (Holliday, Hyde, & Kullman, 2004, p. 4). There should not be any particular attribute (s) labelled to any individual or community because cultural flows have, at different degrees, influenced every single person in all societies. Individuals are now belonging to 'a complex multiplicity of cultures both within and across societies and their identities are moderated by the membership of the various cultures' (p. 5). These researchers, therefore, claim that cultural heritages cannot be the only determinant of teaching and learning preferences and experiences. More accurately, one's learning patterns and paths are more likely to result from and built on both personal factors, i.e., their educational and family backgrounds and goals and motivation for learning as well as external factors with which they come into contact, i.e., their instructors

and friends both inside and outside the school and social activities they are involved in. This view is becoming increasingly popular and widely accepted because there is now a large corpus of research evidencing that CHC learners have changed their learning strategies, skills, and habits in a new learning environment where they faced new requirements of academic programs and came into contact with people with different cultural backgrounds.

Key studies reporting such findings include a study conducted by Volet and Renshaw in 1996 who found that the requirements of academic programs at Australian institutions influenced their Chinese student sample to change their learning practices. The students did become more independent and have stronger responsibility for their study at the end of the course as a result of program requirements. Later, Gieve and Clark (2005) announced similar findings showing that Chinese students learned and adopted new learning habits and skills, i.e., how to prepare assignments, how to operate in learning groups, and how to work on their own, as a response to their programs at British institutions. In another study, Volet and Kee (1993) reported that Asian students tend to be more reserved than Australian counterparts when it comes to participation in group discussions. The authors, however, noted that this characteristic was not the true nature of Asian students but as a result of the educational contexts in Asian countries that did not strongly encourage students to participate in class discussions (e.g. this activity was only organized in some disciplines, never assessed and not strongly encouraged by teachers). This argument became highly valid when later in a study that examined the actual tutorial participation levels of Australian and Singaporean students at an Australian university conducted by Renshaw and Volet (1995), the authors found an interesting point that the overall levels of participation of the two groups were not significantly different, but they were within the group of local students. Based on these findings, Volet (1999) concluded that new studying requirements can influence CHC students to change their learning practices dramatically in compliance with rules and norms in the new system.

Having argued that not essential cultural heritages but social factors have a strong impact on students' learning, post-structuralist researchers also question the concept of 'large' culture widely adopted by those who follow the historical perspective. This is because CHC learners are well surrounded by students who vary in family backgrounds, goals of learning, and degrees of commitment to study as well as are educated in various socio-cultural contexts where their instructors and fellow friends may give them different degrees of support and instruction. Therefore, each CHC leaner in different contexts or different CHC learners in the same context may be situated to deploy various forms of learning depending on other individuals' appreciation and acceptance in their contexts. Ryan and Louie (2006), for instance, provided an example to argue against the universal generalization made by Lee (1996) who claims that 'Asian students are not only diligent, but they also have high achievement motivation. Invariably they have high regard for education' (p. 3). Based on their teaching experience, Ryan and Louie explained that they have seen many Asian students do indeed have high regard for education but many others do not. Tang and Biggs (1996) also advised researchers to be cautious when concluding

or generalizing that the test-oriented culture of CHC educational institutions has trained all CHC learners to become 'experts' in identifying assessment demands. It is true that after years of repeated practice of test-taking throughout their schooling, CHC learners have become skilful with exams. However, these identification skills varied among students from Hong Kong and Singapore, among students studying different disciplines and among students who are trained by different teachers.

In summary, all of the aforementioned arguments have warned that the powerful role of the learning context and question the adequacy of the construct of CHC learners as a homogeneous group. Whatever the approaches to learning adopted by CHC learners, rote or deep, surface or critical, they are more likely to be the result of influences that various factors in their educational contexts make on them than of cultural heritage left behind by their historical sages and ancestors. For instance, Pierson (1996) pointed out that Chinese Hong Kong students become passive rote learners who want to be told what to do, show little initiative, and accordingly have difficulty dealing with autonomy because they study with teachers who decide what is correct and little room is given for the students to exercise personal initiative in the context of the traditional Chinese learning culture. Furthermore, Clark and Gieve (2006) warn that researchers and educators should not make any generalization about CHC learners because such generalizations hide as much as they reveal and, in reducing individuals to inadequately understood group characteristics, approach racial stereotyping. The extent to which CHC learners are shared across locations (e.g. countries, regions, districts), social status (e.g. family background, financial situation), and especially schooling (e.g. teachers, friends, requirements of academic programs) cannot be taken for granted.

All of this evidence has conceptualized that when CHC learners move into a new situated context, they are heavily influenced by both cultural dimensions, i.e., the sets of beliefs, value systems, assumptions, and social expectations that prevail and are shared by participants in that context as well as physical contact, namely the support of and relationship with instructors and friends. Therefore, fixed attributes labelled to Chinese learners are highly questionable. Clark and Gieve (2006) have pointed out a range of such approaches that provide opportunities to address many aspects that the historical perspective has ignored or undervalued but have now been recognized and widely accepted as influential factors determining one's learning practices. These new perspectives are post-structuralist, critical pedagogy, anthropological, and cultural studies discourses. These discourses are now beginning to be recognized to be well suited to small culture ways of thinking (Breen, 2001; Norton & Toohey, 2004), emphasise the concepts of identity (Norton, 1997; Toohey, 2000), agency (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001), investment (Norton-Pierce, 1995), accommodation, resistance and non-participation (McKay & Wong, 1996; Nichols, 2003; Norton, 2001), colonial and post-colonial discourse (Pennycook, 1998; Phillipson, 1992), voice and empowerment (Canagarajah, 1999; Giroux, 1992; Spack, 1997), critical multiculturalism (Kubota, 1999), and peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

3.5   How 'Active' and 'Passive' Learning Is Defined

There has not been, so far, any universal agreement on criteria utilized to define 'deep/critical' and 'surface/rote' learning. Jin and Cortazzi (1995) point out that these terms are often interpreted differently, depending on the expectations of the 'culture of learning' into which one has been socialized. Recently the idea using Vygotskian notions of language as the tool for thought has become very popular, especially in the Western world. In Western classrooms talk or verbal participation is seen as the pathway to a critical questioning approach (Ryan & Louie, 2006), and learner-centred pedagogies are defined to aim to encourage students to 'learn by participating, through talking and active involvement' (Jin & Cortazzi, 1995, p. 6). This explains why Western academics have an implicit and explicit preference for these activities and expect that their students including both local and international to actively engage in these practices. If students are not verbally participatory, they are very likely to be seen as problematic. Consequently, it is now common to see many Western institutions compulsorily requiring students to actively participate in class discussions, tutorials, and online forums by allocating a portion of their marks to these activities (although the amusing side of this policy is that it does not always require the quality and appropriateness of such 'active participation' to be taken into account).

This view of 'effective' learning contrasts with the 'more cognitive-centred, learning–listening approach' that is favoured by Chinese educators (Jin & Cortazzi, 1998, p. 744). Within this tradition, being 'active' suggests 'cognitive involvement, lesson preparation, reflection and review, thinking, memorisation and self-study' (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996, p. 71). Therefore, Littlewood (2000) claims that Chinese classrooms may indeed appear relatively static in comparison to those of the anglophone West, but just because the students operate in a receptive mode, this does not imply that they are any less engaged. Conversely, just because students in anglophone Western classrooms are seen to be verbally participatory, this does not necessarily guarantee that learning is taking place. For instance, in their study, Volet and Kee (1993) reported that CHC students found it astonishing and culturally inappropriate when Australian students interrupted someone who was talking to make a point or ask very simple questions when they should just keep quiet and find out from friends later.

As such, it appears that each specific learning context has its own explicit and tacit rules to define what should be called 'deep' learning and what should be called 'rote' learning. Teachers need to take cautious steps before making judgements on what accounts for 'good learning'. Holliday (2005) has sent a message warning teachers that "one should not automatically assume that 'good lessons' are those in which students are 'lively' and 'orally 'active'" (p. 81).

3.6   Conclusion

The discussions provided in this chapter aim to draw the attention of educators and researchers to the following points. First, there has been rich evidence demonstrating that both a 'deficit' and 'surplus' view of Confucian education is inadequate to evaluate CHC learners' learning accurately. Therefore, instead of taking either one of the extreme perspectives, teachers need to be sensitive to the diversity and complexity of approaches to study among students across cultures and within a culture. When teachers operate in classrooms on stereotypes and generalizations, they may adopt ineffective teaching approaches leading to negative impacts on their students. Furthermore, Ryan (2000, 2005) claims that when teachers do not have critical views but simply accept stereotypes and generalization, they would face difficulties and confusion when responding to the increasing globalization and internationalization of the curriculum and their pedagogy. These cautions need to be taken among students within a culture as well.

   Second, teachers need to be aware that learning is not a predetermined concept but evolves in situated contexts. This point of view would accord with Accommodation Theory, which focuses on how aspects of social context, rather than cultural heritage, affect individual behaviours. Therefore, to develop and deploy effective teaching and pedagogical practices, Renshaw (1999) claims that teachers need to consider the interplay of a wide range of actors including pedagogical factors (assessment tasks, curriculum content, and teaching practices), the students' level of initial background knowledge, their level of interest and enthusiasm of the subject, and their appraisal of the relevance of the subject to their long-term goals. However, Volet (1999) notes that it is unsatisfactory to adapt the host educational context to suit individual [cultural] differences. This is because it not only would be practically unrealistic to cater to all styles of learning but also because it would involve using individual learning styles as the criteria for deciding on appropriate methods of instruction. The only valid approach is to teach in a way that maximizes effective learning by all students, local and international alike. The question now is how to develop such teaching methods. Boekaerts (1997) and Salomon and Perkins (1998) have helped answer this question by claiming that regardless of their cultural-educational backgrounds, all students need to be provided with opportunities to learn how to cognitively, motivationally, and emotionally self-scaffold their learning for independent as well as interdependent modes of participation. Regarding theoretical perspectives and instructions that researchers and educators should utilize to achieve these goals, Volet (1999) points out that the principles of learning applied in Communities of Learners settings (Brown, 1994; Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1994), self-regulated learning programs (Boekaerts, 1997), and process-oriented instruction (De Corte, 1996; De Jong, 1995; Vermunt, 1994; Volet, 1995) provide a sound basis for designing powerful learning environments in an international, multicultural perspective. In summary, as expressed in Kostogriz's words (2005)*, educators now need to 'work out the shifts from how best to *teach*, to how best to *learn*. Without this shift, current approaches to pedagogy will probably

perpetuate the hegemony of one system of cultural practice over another, and lose opportunities for the development of new knowledge through the critical falsifying of the known' (p. 3).

Third, international education should not be seen as a problem but an opportunity to enrich the understanding of both Western academics and CHC learners. For Western academics, CHC learners are outsiders or 'others' who come and bring a 'surplus of vision' (Bakhtin, 1990). Therefore, international students have given local academics 'proximity' to act as anthropologists to learn about their cultural practices (Ryan & Louie, 2006), so that they could understand how the normative assumptions underpinning their teaching practices can be problematic for international students or indeed for other groups of local students as well (Ryan, 2000). For CHC learners, the topic that has attracted lots of educational debate is whether these students should and could keep their identity while studying in the Western learning context. Gieve and Clark (2005) claim that from the monolithic perspective, Chinese students are seen to lose their identity (i.e., a loss of linguistic identity, a loss of the 'inner voice', and a loss of their first language) when coming into contact with Western attitudes and practices. A conceptualization of identity which accepted fluid and multiple identities, however, would allow for students taking on the attitudes and practices of different social and cultural groups simultaneously, contingently, instrumentally, and flexibly. They might still feel themselves to be very much Chinese and not acknowledge any contradiction between 'being Chinese' and following 'Western' learning practices.

Fourth, as discussed elsewhere in this chapter, the concepts of 'active' and 'passive' are built on criteria that are based on different Western and CHC cultural values. Therefore, Western academics should be more considerate and inclusive when setting up assessment criteria. What decides 'good learners' should be based on the quality of their work, i.e., the quality of assignments, the quality of what they say, the quality of what they voice on online forums, but not on the quantitative of their actions, i.e., the number of their questions in the class, the number of their posts on online forums. Unfortunately, assessment criteria at Western institutions now seem very quantitative-oriented. Therefore, CHC learners are disadvantaged because the language barrier significantly hinders them from participating in discussions verbally. Therefore, they are perceived as a 'reduced other' who contrast with the 'enlightened self' of the native English-speaking Westerner (Holliday, 2005, p. 82). Such deficit understanding and evaluation have certainly made a negative impact on the mentality and motivation of CHC students at Australian institutions.

Fifth, discussions provided in this chapter also send a message that researchers need to be critical when evaluating research findings. Any research on CHC students' learning conducted in a country beyond CHC countries may result in questionable findings. This is because obstacles such as the pressure of studying in a second language, being surrounded by unfamiliar friends, coping with personal life pressures, and so on may hinder CHC learners from expressing their true personalities. CHC learners may perform less actively than local students due to the language barrier but not by expressing opinions. Consequently, results obtained from such research should not be utilized to generalize CHC learners in their home countries.

Finally, the chapter draws the attention of researchers and educators to the issue of utilizing appropriate research methodologies if they wish to investigate how to maximize students' learning. As discussed throughout this chapter, learning should be seen as a factor in a complexity in which it has a close connection with and is influenced by many other dynamic factors. Therefore, an effective research methodology would be the one that creates opportunities for all of these factors to emerge and to be adjusted to support each other so that the best learning outcomes can be brought about. For this purpose, design-based research and activity theory appear to be effective methods because they give researchers the opportunities to question the effectiveness of those teaching and learning practices that have been seen as 'norms' and 'standard' practices and adjust to make them culturally appropriate in a different situated context. These methodologies also create opportunities for hidden factors and marginalized voices to be seen and heard. It is these 'ignored' factors and voices that may then turn out to be influential elements, making significant contributions to constructing effective teaching and learning.

References

Allen, W., & Spada, N. (1982). A materials writing project in China. *Language Learning and Communication, 1*(2), 187–196.

Bakhtin, M. (1990). *Art and answerability*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Ballard, B. (1996). Through language to learning: Preparing overseas students for study in Western universities. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 20–35). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biggs, J. B. (1989). Approaches to the enhancement of tertiary teaching. *Higher Education Research and Development, 8*(1), 7–25.

Biggs, J. B. (1990). Effects of language medium of instruction on approaches to learning. *Educational Research Journal (Hong Kong), 5*, 18–28.

Biggs, J. B. (1991). Approaches to learning in secondary and tertiary students in Hong Kong: Some comparative studies. *Educational Research Journal, 6*, 27–39.

Biggs, J. B. (1992). Why and how do Hong Kong students learn? Using the learning and study process questionnaires. *Education Paper 14*. Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong.

Biggs, J. B. (1993). What do inventories of students' learning processes really measure? A theoretical review and clarification. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 63*(1), 3–19.

Biggs, J. B. (1994). What are effective schools? Lessons from east and west. *Australian Educational Researcher, 21*(1), 19–39.

Biggs, J. B. (1996a). Western misconceptions of the Confucian-heritage learning culture. In D. A. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological, and contextual influences* (pp. 45–67). Hong Kong: CERC and ACER.

Biggs, J. (1996b). Western misperceptions of the Confucian heritage learning culture. In D. Watson & J. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 45–67). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre and Melbourne, The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd..

Boekaerts, M. (1997). Self-regulated learning: A new concept embraced by researchers, policy makers, educator, teachers and students. *Learning and Instruction, 7*(161), 186.

Breen, M. (2001). *Learner contributions to language learning*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Brown, A. L. (1994). The advancement of learning. *Educational Researcher, 23*(8), 4–12.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chalmers, D., & Volet, S. E. (1997). South-east Asian students learning in Australia. *Higher Education Research & Development, 16*(1), 87–98.

Cheng, X. (2000). Asian students' reticence revisited. *System, 28*, 435–446.

Clark, R., & Gieve, S. N. (2006). On the discursive construction of 'the Chinese learner'. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 19*(1), 54–73.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1994). From visual word problems to learning communities: Changing conceptions of cognitive research. In K. McGilly (Ed.), *Classroom lessons: Integrating cognitive theory and classroom practice* (pp. 157–200). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press/Bradford.

Confucius. (1947). The wisdom of Confucius. In S. Commins & R. N. Linscott (Eds.), *Man and man: The social philosophers* (pp. 323–258). New York: Random House.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169–206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Corte, E. (1996). Instructional psychology: Overview. In E. De Corte & F. E. Weinert (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of developmental and instructional psychology* (pp. 33–43). Oxford: UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.

De Jong, F. P. C. M. (1995). Process-oriented instruction: Some considerations. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 10*, 317–324.

Department of Education, Science and Training (2004). *International higher education students: How do they differ from other education students?* Strategic Analysis and Evaluation Group Research Note No. 2. Retrieved February 20, 2019, from http://www.dest.gov.au/research/publications/research_notes/2.htm

Elmore, R. (1996). Getting to scale with good educational practice. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 1–26.

Fullan, M. (2000). The three stories of education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(8), 581–584.

Gieve, S., & Clark, R. (2005). The Chinese approach to learning: Cultural trait or situated response? The case of a self-directed learning programme. *System, 33*(2005), 261–276.

Giroux, H. (1992). Resisting difference: Cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (pp. 199–212). New York: Routledge.

Hammond, S., & Gao, H. (2002). Pan Gu's paradigm: Chinese education's return to holistic communication in learning. In X. Lu, W. Jia, & R. Heisey (Eds.), *Chinese communication studies: Contexts and comparisons* (pp. 227–244). Westport, CT: Ablex.

Harman, G. (2002). *Internationalization of the higher education sector: Draft annotated bibliography and report on literature review*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organisations: Software of the mind*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Holliday, A. R. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(2), 237–264.

Holliday, A. R. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A., Hyde, M., & Kullman, J. (2004). *Inter-cultural communication: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Jessen, B. (2012). Catching up: Learning from the best school systems in East Asia. Grattan institute report. Retrieved March 20, 2019, from http://grattan.edu.au/publications/reports/post/catching-up-learning-from-the-best-school-systems-in-east-asia/

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (1995). A cultural synergy model for academic language use. In P. Bruthiaux, T. Boswood, & B. Du-Babcock (Eds.), *Explorations in English for professional communication* (pp. 20–35). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (1998). Dimensions of dialogue: Large classes in China. *International Journal of Educational Research, 29*, 739–761.

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2006). Changing practices in Chinese cultures of learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 19*(1), 5–20.

Knight, J. (1997). Internationalization of higher education: A conceptual framework. In J. Knight & H. deWit (Eds.), *Internationalization of higher education in Asia Pacific countries* (pp. 5–19). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(1), 9–35.

Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of US classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 9–38.

Kubota, R. (2002). The author responds: (un)ravelling racism in a nice field like TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(1), 84–92.

Kubota, R. (2004). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 30–52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Problematizing cultural stereotypes in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 709–719.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). (S)econd (l)anguage (a)ctivity theory: Understanding second language learners as people. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning* (pp. 141–158). Harlow: Longman.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning. Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, W. O. (1996). The cultural context for Chinese learners: Conceptions of learning in the Confucian tradition. In D. Watkins & J. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 25–41). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre and Melbourne.

Littlewood, W. (2000). Do Asian students really want to listen and obey? *ELT Journal, 5*(1), 31–36.

McKay, S., & Wong, S. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(3), 577–608.

Nichols, S. (2003). They just won't critique anything: The 'problem' of international students in the Western academy. In J. E. Satterthwaite, E. Atkinson, & K. Gale (Eds.), *Discourse, power and resistance* (pp. 135–148). Stoke on Trent: Trentham.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 409–429.

Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. In M. P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning* (pp. 159–171). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norton-Pierce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 9–31.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pierson, H. D. (1996). Learner culture and learner autonomy in the Hong Kong Chinese context. In R. Pemberton, E. S. L. Li, W. W. F. Or, & H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 49–58). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Renshaw, P. (1999). Learning and culture: Representations of the Chinese learner at Australian universities. In L. Jie (Ed.), *Education of Chinese: The global prospect of national cultural tradition* (pp. 48–71). Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University Press.

Renshaw, P. D., & Volet, S. E. (1995). South east Asian students at Australian universities: A reappraisal of their tutorial participation and approaches to study. *Australian Educational Researcher, 22*(2), 85–106.

Ruby, R., & Ladd, P. (1999). Learning styles and adjustment issues of international students. *Journal of Education for Business, 7*(6), 363–379.

Ryan, J. (2000). *A guide to teaching international students*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Ryan, J. (2005). Improving teaching and learning practices for international students: Implications for curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all* (pp. 92–100). London: Routledge Falmer.

Ryan, J., & Louie, K. (2006). False dichotomy? 'Western' and 'Confucian' concepts of scholarship and learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 39*(4), 404–417.

Salomon, G., & Perkins, D. (1998). Individual and social aspects of learning. In P. D. Pearson & A. Iran-Nejad (Eds.), *Review of research in education* (pp. 1–24). Washington: AERA.

Spack, R. (1997). The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(4), 765–774.

Stevenson, H., & Stigler, J. (1996). *The learning gap: Why our schools are failing and what we learn from Japanese and Chinese education*. New York: Summit Books.

Tang, C., & Biggs, J. B. (1996). How Hong Kong students cope with assessment. In D. Watkins & J. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 159–182). Hong Kong: CERC: The University of Hong Kong/ACER.

Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English in schools: Identity, social relations, and classroom practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Tsui, A. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145–167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tweed, R. G., & Lehman, D. (2002). Learning considered within a cultural context: Confucian and Socratic approaches. *American Psychologist, 57*(2), 89–99.

Vermunt, J. D. H. M. (1994). Design principles of process-oriented instruction. In F. P. C. M. de Jong & B. H. A. M. Van Hout-Wolters (Eds.), *Process-oriented instruction and learning from text* (pp. 15–26). Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Volet, S. E. (1995). Process-oriented instruction: A discussion. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 10*, 449–459.

Volet, S. E. (1999). Learning across cultures: Appropriateness of knowledge transfer. *International Journal of Educational Research, 31*(7), 625–643.

Volet, S. E., & Kee, J. P. P. (1993). *Studying in Singapore and studying in Australia: A student perspective*. Occasional paper no 1: Murdoch University Teaching Excellence Committee, Murdoch.

Volet, S. E., & Renshaw, P. D. (1996). Chinese students at an Australian university: Adaptability and continuity. In D. Watkins & J. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 205–220). Hong Kong: CERC: The University of Hong Kong/ACER.

Watkins, D. (1996). Hong Kong secondary school learners: A developmental perspective. In D. Watkins & J. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological, and contextual influences*. Hong Kong: Centre for Comparative Research in Education/Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Watkins, D. A., & Biggs, J. B. (2001). The paradox of the Chinese learner and beyond. In D. A. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 3–26). Hong Kong: CERC.

Webb, G. (2005). Internationalisation of the curriculum: An institutional approach. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all* (pp. 109–118). London: Routledge Falmer.