Theory, The Chinese Student, And Western Higher Education

Michèle J. Schmidt
Simon Fraser University

Kristina Berynets
Simon Fraser University

Emma Wu
Simon Fraser University

Charles Scott
Simon Fraser University

The internationalization of Western universities means that Chinese students often comprise a significant group of international learners. Instructors realize that knowledge about these students' learning backgrounds and cultural and social contexts enables them and their institutions to meet these students' learning needs. The authors discuss frameworks such as Leininger's transcultural theory, Bhabha's "Third Space" in postcolonial theory, and Callero's "Globalized self," all of which offer a hybridized perspective on identity formation with which to understand the international student, their place within an International M.Ed. Program at a Western university, and the learning and teaching that promotes success for the student, instructors, and the university.

INTRODUCTION

Globalization and internationalization of Western universities have resulted in large numbers of Chinese students enrolled as foreign learners (British Council, 2004). Indeed, statistics from OECD (2010) indicate that in 2008, 3.3 million international students studied outside of their home country.

When examining Chinese students' perceptions about Western education, a critical discourse of internationalization in higher education is missing, namely, the student voices that become vital sources of intercultural knowledge and understanding (Ryan, 2011). Extant literature around internationalization has in the past focused on student recruitment and developing international partnerships with little emphasis on the topic of internationalization of teaching and learning practices (Ryan 2011). A postcolonial transcultural lens can assist Western educators in developing and implementing curricula that legitimate both East and West contributions. In the forward of Chan and Rao's (2009) book, *Revisiting the Chinese Learner*, Biggs and Watkins (1996) share their observations of what they call "the paradox" of the Chinese student. While these students are typically stereotyped as rote and passive learners in their native

context, Biggs and Watkins (1996) discovered a paradox in their research, in that Chinese students excelled and often outperformed Western students. This puzzle has raised questions for which scholars are attempting to address how Chinese learners use memory and ways of understanding that are unfamiliar to Western educators (Chan & Rao 2009, pg. xiii).

Indeed, contemporary scholars (e.g., Chan & Rao, 2009; Grimshaw 2007) claim that the Chinese student depicted in the 1990s is not the Chinese learner of today. An individual cannot be known within a vacuum; we need to consider how sociocultural and historical influences impact these students. Scholars argue that stereotypical myths have clouded our perception of the *'real'* Chinese student (e.g., Flowerdew, 1998). Along with the notion that learning and teaching are situated, changing theories of learning and teaching also lead to a 'new' discourse. The traditional question of *"Who is the Chinese learner?"* is now more complex when we begin to address the notion of "context." The question then becomes: *"How do the contexts within which Chinese students learn influence their learning?"* (Chan and Rao 2009, xiii). Moreover, in this article, we examine whether these students can also influence their context.

In the case of one Western university, it became evident to the authors that we were at a critical crossroads if we wanted to implement an International M.Ed. program at our university. What was needed was a reflection of how Canadian universities are responding to changing international conditions and international student cohorts; of changing policies, structures and practices that strive to fit the purpose of educating international students; and, whether universities are equipped to face future challenges and opportunities at all, and what this might entail (Ryan, 2011).

While these conversations are primarily outside the scope of this paper, the authors' essential purpose here is to begin the discussion regarding viable and robust theories that offer a 'safe' space within which to unpack notions of internationalism. Such a space allows us, as researchers, to better understand international students and the cultures they inhabit and have inhabited (Duff, 2002; Morita, 2004; Park, 2007), as well as, to develop meaningful and relevant curriculum, along with responsive pedagogy and learning, particularly concerning academic writing in graduate programs. We suggest that the better we understand foreign students' sociocultural and academic situatedness along with the dynamic shaping of identity that occurs as students interact with Western sociocultural milieus, the better we can design curricula that can ultimately address international students' educational needs and foster the identity transformations that lead to successful outcomes in their graduate studies.

Scholars have pointed out that studying abroad can allow students to bridge culture and the sometimes artificial separations we create between academic, experiential and intercultural learning (Brewer & Cunningham, 2009). Later in this paper, we will examine transcultural perspectives that help explain the dynamic relationships these students have with sociocultural forces and thus offer suggestions for both curriculum and pedagogy. We specifically explore the concepts of the globalized self; the creation of a third space and identity hybridity; cultural and linguistic multicompetence; and dialogical perspectives on legitimated and meaningful participation and performance by these students within theories of postcolonial transculturalism.

Therefore, this paper moves beyond the problematization of international students to explore the opportunities that their presence can provide. Past research often employs a deficit approach and is deterministic and stereotypical (Jin and Cortazzi, 2006). Instead, we seek a balance between generalizations of Chinese students and a recognition of their individuality. Moreover, we recognize that their individuality lies not only in their Chinese origin but also in their lived experiences, which make each learner unique.

THEORETICAL TOOLS

The purpose of this study is to explore relevant, dynamic and vital theories with which to explore the academic and cultural understandings of Chinese students applying for graduate study at a Canadian university.

TABLE 1
THEORIES

Scholars	Theory	Description
Pavlenko & Lantolf (2000) Lave & Wenger (1991)	Identity, postcolonial, poststructural	Re-construction of self
Callero (2008); Cook (1992, 1999)	Globalized self	Multicultural, multilingual, internationally connected
Radcliffe (1999); McEwan (2001); Said (1978); Fanon (1984); Rizvi, Lingard & Lavia, 2006); Bhabha (1998); Spivak (2000); Freire (1974); Rajan (1993); Goetz (1997)	Postcolonialism	A lens with which to problematize and challenge Western assumptions surrounding meanings, values and practices of other cultures.
Bhabha (1996); Wang (2004); Xu (2011); Norton & Toohey (2011); Ryan (2011); Kramsch (1993)	Third space, third place, hybridity	A new area of meaning and representation; a liminal or in-between space where there is translation and negotiation or meaning and identity.
Leininger (2006); Mulholland (1995)	Transcultural Theory in Nursing	Culturally aligned (e.g., values, beliefs), nursing care that is tailored to individuals
Cuccioletta (2002); Strand (2010)	Cosmopolitan citizen	Transcultural way of knowing, transcultural communication
Papastephanou (2005)	Internationalization, Cosmopolitically sensitive education	How can academics take advantage of the internationalization of the student cohort in ways that benefit international students, home students, and staff?
Pieterse (2004); Archer (2007); Ryan (2005); Yang (2011); Gerris, Husband & Mackenzie (1996)	Culture	Internal complexity; networked nature; hybridity.
Gerris, Husband & MacKenzie (1996); Husband & Hoffman (2004); Johnson (2004); Lambert & Ogles (2004)	Transcultural communication	Cultural communicative competence, inter-cultural communication.

POSTCOLONIALISM AND POSTSTRUCTURALISM

Postcolonialism remains a contested term (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 1995). Rather than focusing on postcolonialism as the end of colonialism, scholars (e.g., Radcliffe, 1999) posit that postcolonialism offers a theoretical lens with which to problematize and challenge Western assumptions surrounding meanings, values, and practices of other cultures, and perhaps even the Western culture itself. By making voices of the marginalized, oppressed, and the dominated heard, the theory demands acknowledgment of a diversity of perspectives and priorities (McEwan, 2001). Postcolonial scholars are particularly indebted to Edward Said's (1978) conceptualization of postcolonialism in his book, *Orientalism*. Said's (1978) bifurcation of East and West, which is his 'othering' of the East, and the presentation of Westerners as rational (in opposition to Orientals' emotionality), is, however, critiqued by some postcolonial scholars (e.g., Fanon 1984). Fanon presents the caveat that we should not reduce colonialism to merely a relationship between colonizer and colonized; rather, colonialism needs to be problematized to examine the power imbalances between these two protagonists. Fanon (1984) adds that independence from colonialism does not necessarily result in, or mean, liberation since colonial subjects remain colonized psychologically. Postcolonialists, therefore, remain critical of Said's universalizing tendencies and limited view of differences, with little examination of class and gender differences that may influence gender discourses and organizational culture (Rizvi, Lingard, and Lavia, 2006).

Bhabha (1998), another influential postcolonial foundational scholar, stresses that the:

> social articulation of difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, ongoing negotiation and that the colonised subject's mode of resistance is itself constrained by the language of the dominant group (Rizvi, Lingard, and Lavia 2006, p. 254).

Spivak (2000) points out that the powerful have little or no capacity to listen and to hear, what he terms, the 'subaltern' – the class of people who are not empowered and do not possess any wealth. For the subaltern to have a voice would require engaging in what Freire (2006) refers to as *conscientization*.

Postcolonial advocates promote the potentialities of agency and postcolonial approaches that allow us as Westerners to be able to see, responsibly and respectfully, from another's point of view. Therefore, strategies must be found to create spaces that can make a difference (Goetz, 1997).

With his notion of mimicry, Bhabha (1994) adds another tension to the potentials arising from students' agency in this context. He explains mimicry as the "*ironic* compromise" between the colonizer and the colonized, where the former participates in this context for "narcissistic identification" and to "'appropriate' the Other" whereas the latter mimics the colonized due to a "desire to emerge as 'authentic'". In this dynamic relation of power, there is the authority and the "reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*" (p. 86). Through mimicry, the colonized do not only tend to mimic the colonizer but through representation, they may challenge and influence the identities of the colonizers thus de-essentializing them. Therefore, international students who represent these formerly colonized may influence both the represented culture and therefore, their learning context. Often international students represent the colonizer through language acquisition, culture, values, interests, all of which may influence both the represented culture and, therefore, their learning context. We may even say that it might be this tension and the "ambivalence" and almost chaos created by mimicry, that creates this opposition to change anything in order to cater to those who were called to represent, to never challenge, and to always not be quite the same, both in how they are perceived and in how much power they can exercise in this context.

Chinese students report that they are used to more rote forms of pedagogy in Chinese universities; however, they learn quickly that Western post-secondary settings invariably de-legitimate rote learning. So, while these students might be seen as 'good' rote learners, it is less likely that they will be seen as good learners until we ensure they can mimic Western students--a task doomed to failure. Clark and Gieve (2008) point to the deficit models applied to Chinese learners based on significant misunderstandings of Confucian culture. As Dennick and Tavakol (2009) note, these students are used to a Confucian episteme of *acquisition* of knowledge and not a Socratic episteme of *inquiry* and *questioning*. Such a difference in epistemic approach, although significant, also, sadly, equates with poor learning and

models of learning deficiencies, which are often, consciously or unconsciously, applied to such students. Studying in Western universities presents epistemological challenges for them. Wong (2004) notes students' challenges with different learning styles, cultural barriers, and language difficulties. These challenges, however, are not the result of the students' learning capacities; rather, they reflect cultural and epistemological barriers present in current learning environments. Sato and Hodge (2009) note that marginalized doctoral students in Western universities eventually experience a "deeper appreciation of their cultures, values, and beliefs as Asian people" (p. 143). This suggests that students' abilities in integrating different epistemes and developing hybrid identities, can allow them to successfully bridge two or more cultures (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007; Wang, 2004).

Drawing on Habermas' work, post-structuralists, Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) argue that second language learning includes "a struggle of concrete, socially constituted and always situated beings to participate in the symbolically, mediated life-world of another culture"….leading to "(re-) construction of the self" (p. 155). Their work on identity, reflective of postcolonial and poststructuralist approaches, has shown that the "self" is made up of personal experiences and impressions that are dynamically processed by individuals; through language and other forms of contextualized sociocultural interaction, individuals "re-constitute" themselves (see also Lave & Wenger, 1991). Identity is thus dynamically established through participation in various sociocultural contexts and the rapid changes in globalization.

Concerning language learning, these students often continue to resist seeing themselves as bilingual, even when they have a considerable facility with English (Pavlenko, 2003). They continually struggle, primarily because they are seen as 'additional language learners,' and the message of deficiency is subtly but pervasively present.

Therefore, the Chinese student cannot be reduced to just that – "Chinese" – as they are not all positioned in only one sociocultural and historical context that can define them, but rather are constructing their identities through their unique experiences with their individual approach to it, which is ultimately what makes each learner unique, whether Chinese or not.

Norton and Toohey (2011) summarize a considerable body of research demonstrating that language learners are positioned by others and try to position themselves in developing identities that influence their learning. As they point out, "some identity positions may limit and constrain opportunities for learners to listen, speak, read, or write, other identity positions may offer enhanced sets of possibilities for social interaction and human agency" (p. 414). For such scholars, identity is theorized as "multiple, changing, and a site of struggle" (p. 414). The significance of the work of these scholars is that, as Duff (2002) argues, Chinese and other foreign students are at "considerable risk of alienation, isolation, and failure" due to the learning environments they encounter (p. 316). Ushioda's (2011) research, for example, shows that when teachers and others in the learning environment recognize and legitimate the cultural and intellectual capital of these students, they can seize power and, in so doing, enhance their learning.

The significance of Bhabha's (1994) work on mimicry is that we who feel we represent post-colonial approaches in education can still "speak in a tongue that is forked, not false" (p. 85). We promote, by word and deed, post-colonialism but all too frequently end up representing colonialism. Given the right opportunity, these students might not only use their intellectual and cultural capital to enhance their positioning in a certain context but *the context itself* along with all involved in the context. As argued by Bhabha, mimicry through a desire to learn from the powerful, the colonizer may grant the colonized their own position of power which may be enhanced by their sociocultural and historical background and recognition and legitimation of the same. Then it becomes a matter of whether their otherness is perceived through the colonial lens that defines them as different. The students, therefore, in the words of Bhabha, present "authorized versions of otherness" (p. 87), and yet to never quite able to reach the etalon. Alternatively, we could allow their cultural and intellectual capital to be viewed as distinct rather than the evidence of authorized otherness. In educational settings, it means that if we allow opportunities for these students to construct their identity in ways informed by their background and legitimize it, we could transcend the role of colonizer as we would not be perceiving them through the colonial lens that makes them a merely other, who tries to learn, but will never have the same authority. It is transcending these

roles of colonized and colonizer that is needed for dialogical learning between teacher-student and student-teacher (Freire, 2006).

THE GLOBALIZED SELF

Callero (2008) refers to a "globalized self—multicultural, multilingual, and internationally connected" (p. 1972). It is an identity "created from a global mélange of diverse cultural resources where the values of creativity, exploration, freedom, hospitality, community, and expanding wealth are embodied" (p. 1973). This process of identity change is characterized by the development of new and unique voices, positions, and roles. International students possess what Vivian Cook (1992, 1999; Cook & Wei, 2016) calls multicompetence. Multicompetencies include competencies of knowledge, cognition, culture, linguistics, and meta-linguistics, which straddle cultures. When individuals mingle with those of other cultures, they increasingly do not feel the need to judge themselves as competent by the same criteria as those of the other cultures might use. Further, Cook and Wei point out that multicompetence refers to the cognitive capacities of a language user at any level of achievement. Also, they point out that multicompetence is not a solely cognitive function; it recognizes sociocultural perspectives and dynamics as well as the situated reality of the student in developing a globalized identity.

Such globalized identities are made possible through the valuing and development of creativity, exploration, freedom, hospitality, and community (Chittooran, 2015; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Ushioda, 2011). Individuals who have opportunities to live and work in other nations and cultures see these experiences as transformative. These become opportunities to bridge and engage with alternate worldviews and practices. Through these experiences, the self is expanded and enhanced. There can be elements of resistance to, and defiance of, established cultural norms, and the willingness to forge new possibilities. With these relatively privileged students, we are looking at what Callero calls those who are "globalization from below" (pp. 1982ff), wherein those new to a culture may engage creatively and in a self-organized fashion or through the agency of family or significant others who have wealth and power. This process is what Callero (1982) calls the development of a political self as the individuals are exercising power and autonomy. They are not being globalized through oppression (Foucault, 1995; Freire, 2006).

THE THIRD SPACE AND HYBRIDITY

Meintel (2000) noted in her work with immigrant youth living in Montréal, that they adopted complex, shifting, "plural" identities. The concept of "hybrid" identities is based on a combination of elements from two or more sociocultural backgrounds--a definition that was developed by Hall (1996) and by Bhabha (1996). The globalized self emerges out of what Bhabha referred to as a hybrid identity. It represents an identification with the other and with otherness, along with a sense of ambivalence about the self and its permanence and a willingness to enter into that space of uncertainty. Hybridity is a third space that sets up new structures of authority and new political initiatives. Engaging in the third space gives rise to "something new and unrecognizable, a new area of meaning and representation" (Rutherford, 1990, p. 211). Hybridity represents a liminal or in-between space, where there are translation and negotiation of meaning and identity--a third space (Bhabha, 1996). The hybrid identity emerges out of the engagement of the colonized and colonizer where the new identity challenges notions of essentialism, of static and fixed properties in the self.

For Hongyu Wang (2004), the third space leads to an encounter between the self and stranger. She describes this third space as "A journey out, a journey within…. The encounter between the self and the stranger. The meeting of each other's potential. A journey beyond, a journey inward. A journey home at a simultaneous moment of in and out, the moment of eyes meeting" (p. 7). It is "a space beyond the in-between, a space embodying both love and freedom but also transcending both, for a possible creative transformation of selfhood" (p. 10). It is formed by a creative willingness to enter into foreign territory (both physical and cultural) and by being open to the "otherness of the other" (p. 10). The third space is

where there is a movement of the self across the differences of culture into creative and dynamic interactions and connections. This leads to having a space of meeting and mutual transformation, where two or more people representing differing cultures and histories interact and transform through a "multiplicity of the self" (p. 15), developing new intersubjective possibilities. The third space is dynamic, "unfolding an inventive, shifting, and winding path between the self and the stranger on a journey beyond the current forms of life" (p. 15).

The significance of Wang's work is that the third space represents a legitimated space. The student claims it and those interacting with the student fully support that space, recognizing its fundamental Otherness. As well, the third space serves as an 'invitation' by its creator to those who are willing to engage: "it intends only to inform and inspire those who desire to move with the third space" (p. 181).

Xu (2011) modified the concept of a hybrid into one of "expanding identities," capturing the notion that these pluralistic, globalized identities have the capacity to hold multiple, dynamic frames of reference: they can add and blend elements from more than one culture, and they can hold perspectives that might seem conflicting or paradoxical. In the context of a more globalized world, where different cultures are intersecting, these individuals will have a deeper and often unique understanding of the various cultures, and thus be able to work more efficiently across cultures without feeling marginalized or deficient. Although the perspectives are somewhat unique, depending on local circumstances, they are also shared through globalization. Although these students face the aforementioned epistemological challenges, they are at the same time immersed in, and products of, the rapidly changing forces of globalization that instill in them the desires and abilities to engage in creative and non-normative heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981; Callero, 2008; Lyotard, 1984). Their abilities to "mix it up" can often serve them well if instructors and administrators provide the curricular and pedagogical approaches that capitalize on the students' creative license.

TRANSCULTURALISM

The transcultural theory remains one of the oldest, most holistic and comprehensive means to generate knowledge of diverse and similar cultures worldwide (Leininger, 2006). Rooted in nursing theory, the theory's strength lies in serving as a lens to discover more knowledge when caring for or teaching diverse populations. When applied to international higher education, the theory's potential lies in providing Western educators with new insights about teaching and learning and doing so by providing a new mode of communication and pastoral care within a safe transcultural space.

Papastephanou (2005) reminds us of important questions that need to be asked: "How can academics take advantage of the internationalization of the student cohort in ways that benefit international students, faculty, and staff? How can international students be used as a resource for the internationalization of teaching and learning and so reify universities' internationalization rhetoric and the achievement of the 'cosmopolitan' ideal through "a cosmopolitically sensitive education"? (p. 533). Ryan (2011) leaves us with another critical question to ponder: "How can universities and academics open not just their 'doors' but also their 'minds' to the benefits of diverse academic traditions and perspectives?" (p.635).

A move towards transcultural approaches to understanding international students' perceptions of Western education recognizes that cultures are fluid and change through interactions with one another. The formation of new cultures through combining elements of different cultures often leads to a third space or third culture (Norton and Toohey, 2011; Ryan, 2011, p. 635). Murray (2010) defines transculturalism as "the result of contact between two or more different cultures," which results in "a new, composite culture in which some existing cultural features are combined, while some are lost, and new features are generated" (Ryan, 2011, p. 635).

Cuccioletta (2002) argues that we can no longer view society as a monolithic world. Instead, transculturalism recognizes the possibility of transcending an individual to becoming a 'cosmopolitan citizen.' Rizvi (2011) states that 'cosmopolitan learning' enables instructors and students to communicate within a safe cultural space, that legitimates different perspectives of knowing. Strand (2010) notes that new forms of cosmopolitanism are disruptive: they surprise and bewilder, bringing together logical

opposites, and disturbing rational or pre-existing modes of thinking; they can violate existing cognitive frameworks and cultural norms. Students representing or living in these forms of cosmopolitanism will require curricular and pedagogical approaches, which align and work with such disruptions. Nevertheless, a sense of urgency is implicit in moving towards a transcultural way of knowing since the processes of globalization continue to reshape the social and political terrain within which universities find themselves linking people and interactions across borders and nation states (Rizvi 2011). Cuccioletta (2002) prophesized that transculturalism will redefine the nation-state.

Scholars (e.g., Mulholland, 1995) often criticize transcultural theory for serving as a panacea for best practice. Despite this, the intent is to offer an epistemological and ontological framework providing a space for the social, economic and political dynamics within the teacher-student relationship (Mulholland, 1995). Mulholland (1995) critiques the misuse of transculturalism in nursing, with the theory being viewed as "vague, idealistic, inconsistent and inadequate in the sense that [it] offer[s] little in the way of a meaningful analysis of power" (p. 442). Mulholland adds that "its capacity for enabling nurses to examine critically the socio-economic and political dynamics of nurse-client relations and develop strategies for addressing racism…., is seriously undermined" (442).

In response, we would argue that the transcultural constructs of the globalized self, the third space, and the notion of hybridity are less vague, idealist, and inconsistent than Mulholland (1995) claims. There is now considerable literature reflecting these postcolonial perspectives—we have only cited a part of that literature—and transcultural theory does offer specifics about curriculum and pedagogy. Another critical element of transculturalism that we hope to explore is that of a culture of care. As we already know from Nel Noddings' (2013) work on the ethic of care, this will be a vital dimension to consider. In doing so, it recognizes a fundamental shift in power in that international students manifest power in their abilities to bridge and transcend cultures and epistemologies. How that power is acknowledged and engaged by Western educators remains to be seen.

Further to these limitations of transcultural theory, culture as a construct remains ubiquitous and vague with multiple meanings and conceptions. In fact, Pieterse (2004) believes some traditional aspects of culture are outdated, more specifically, he claims that notions of homogeneity, ethnic consensus, and intercultural delimitations are passé. He cautions scholars to look beyond these dated conceptions in our changing global and postmodern world. The notion that culture reflects one exclusive domain rather than a collective is shortsighted. He proposes three key features of culture that support transculturality. These include internal complexity; networked nature; and hybridity (Pieterse 2004). It must be noted, however, that these are characteristics that now more accurately describe culture, and we would agree that concepts such as homogeneity and ethnic consensus are passé. We have already considered hybridity in this paper, and we will now explore the more profound complexity and networked nature of transcultural ways of being and acting.

INTERNAL COMPLEXITY AND NETWORKED NATURE

Transcultural theory proposes a new approach to teaching and learning that involves using the perspectives, knowledge, and attitudes of international students as a resource for learning about their needs when developing higher education programs. For well over a decade, the extant literature on international students, especially Chinese students, has often illustrated negative attitudes toward international students and a 'deficit' approach towards their capabilities. International students are described as passive, rote learners, lacking in critical thinking and independent learning skills, and prone to plagiarism (Archer, 2007). Indeed, much of the current literature on teaching and learning for international students and on internationalization generally fails to connect with academics and is often disconnected from the 'real world' dilemmas and challenges facing those dealing with the increasing numbers of international student and the consequences of this change to their work (Ryan, 2005). Furthermore, Yang (2011) advocates for a critical examination of the long-term effects of merely grafting Western practices onto a Chinese base. And while many Chinese universities are emulating Western practices, they are, by and large, doing so uncritically.

Critical elements of the networked nature of transcultural theory serve as the foundation for transcultural communication and rely on cultural communicative competence and inter-cultural communication. Cultural communicative competence requires practitioners to learn and understand the cultural values, behavioral patterns, and rules for interaction in particular cultures (e.g., ethnic-cultural background, religion, migration history, social, economic position, popular culture, etiquette). They then must be able to draw upon this knowledge to inform one's understanding of an international student. Thus, cultural communicative competence has a knowledge-base and is existentially acquired in practice (Husband & Hoffman, 2004). Moreover, this competence recognizes intercultural change and is itself adaptive and hybridizing in nature.

Intercultural communication can address ambiguities in cross-cultural interactions. This kind of communication is grounded in open, empathic discussion of the foreign student's identity and needs. Unlike cultural communicative competence, where practitioners derive confidence from already possessing knowledge about particular cultures, here practitioners derive confidence from knowing that they can quickly learn what is required to interact appropriately in new cross-cultural encounters (Husband & Hoffman 2004). Transcultural communication introduces a hybrid by combining cultural communication and intercultural communication.

When working with culturally diverse students, characteristics such as caring, empathy, understanding, and respect are the main contributors to change, and these human traits rely on excellent communication skills. Therefore, practitioners who lack transcultural communication skills may be less able to achieve positive outcomes with students from diverse backgrounds.

CURRICULAR AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Given the right academic and cultural support systems, these students prove to be very adaptable in shifting academically to inquiry and critical analysis, as well as expanding their globalized identities as a result of their globalized, hybridized selves. What can make this possible are transcultural communications within communities of practice where students' participation as outsiders is legitimated (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Also, providing adequate and responsive academic and cultural support can help these students adapt successfully to expand their identities to be able to work in multiple worlds. Xu (2011) noted that she and her classmates appreciated the dialogical ethos in the classroom created for international students where their voices were respected. We can create classrooms that are responsive to individual and collective diversity (Norton & Toohey, 2011). As Norton & Toohey write:

> If language educators recognize that diverse classroom practices offer learners a
> range of positions from which to speak, listen, read, or write, it is important for
> educators to explore with students which identity positions offer the greatest
> opportunity for social engagement and interaction (p. 429).

Kramsch's (1993) "third place" in the classroom represents a place that is open to new and varied experiences, encouraging the formation of hybrid identities across cultural and dynamically shifting borderlands. This is a space where these students can co-construct, negotiate, and transform to build a place where they feel they are valued and comfortable, even though the process itself is dynamic, unstable, and uncertain at times. Also valuable are "multimodal pedagogies," expanded modes of expression to include visual, musical, gestural and performative scopes. These "position human bodies in semiotic activities to engage them in relations of culture, history, and power" (Stein, 2008, p. 98). Wu (2011) notes that artistic practices help students situate their learning academically, in personal experience, life history, and in present and future becoming within the community of practice. Not only do they move into the community of practice in the target culture, but also, we suggest, they can also serve to expand its sphere of reference by serving as cultural models who represent these hybrid, developing, adaptable, and globalized identities.

As we have pointed out, however, colonialist attitudes and practices can still be present, even when we intend to represent the best of inclusion, respect for diversity, the formation or at least possibilities of the creation of third spaces, hybrid identities, and transculturalism. We often still de-legitimate these

Chinese students by applying deficit models to their knowledge and learning capacities. We still, even in the spirit of post-colonialism, expect the students to mimic us, only seeing them as representing a 'partial presence.' Hongyu Wang (2004) concludes her thesis boldly:

Co-journeying into a world or many worlds different from what we have, returning to our own world to rebuild homes, we and our children are forever on the road in a third space to create new realms of life with tears, laughter, screams, love, pain, and prayers. Are we ready--side-by-side--connected yet apart--to go? (pp. 182-183)

Are we, in fact, ready to go? We would suggest there is more work to be done in allowing both our students and ourselves to embark on such co-journeys. Those of us who work with such students need to be able to pack our bags with what might be new epistemic gear, remembering that we are journeying to lands new and unknown, not the lands we are used to. We might even ask our students for suggestions of what to pack. We will need to let them guide us as much as we might guide them.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, within a climate of globalization, it is exceptionally incumbent upon universities to pro-actively move beyond mere interactions between cultures while one culture (that is, the host university), remains positioned as more powerful and dominant than the other. Instead, a new paradigm is needed that encapsulates a new epistemology from mutual dialogue and respect amongst the academic cultures and knowledge traditions that ultimately result in new learning, knowledge, and practices (Ryan, 2010). Furthermore, universities must move beyond rhetoric about internationalization by listening to the visiting culture. Universities must be not only 'institutions of learning' but also 'learning institutions' (Ryan, 2010). In doing so, the combined theories we have discussed in this paper provide tools with which to create culturally inclusive teaching and learning environments at the level of the classroom, in curriculum design and pedagogical approaches, through to epistemological plurality of the knowledge base. Also, sociocultural theories remind us that learning is individually and socially constructed, socially supported and culturally situated and mediated. The work of theorists such as Lave and Wenger (1999) highlight the importance of the social and cultural milieu of teaching and learning contexts and the 'communities of practice' that exist in teaching and learning environments through the co-construction of knowledge by teachers and learners (Freire, 2006).

Despite the rhetoric of internationalization at the university policy level, faculties continue to report the same kinds of difficulties and 'pedagogical uncertainties' when teaching international students that were reported over a decade ago (Singh, 2009). International students often relay negative and even hostile attitudes and comments by faculty (Rizvi, 2010). We continue to identify such students as 'Chinese' or 'international,' failing to consider fully the resulting implications from not being able to see these and all students as simply that: students, each of whom is unique and represents a different journey. Many professors continue to see international students as problematic and are unwilling (or are unconvinced of the need) to change and adapt to new conditions and imperatives, seeing their role as just educating students 'in our ways' or 'our values,' unaware of the lens through which they are looking. There remains much work to be done to ensure that the rhetoric of internationalization engages academics and is translated into positive experiences for staff and students, both local and international, in ways that facilitate the two-way flow of knowledge and understanding. (Ryan, 2011, p. 638).

REFERENCES

Archer, L. (2007). Diversity, equality and higher education: A critical reflection on the abuses of equity discourse within widening participation. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(5–6), 635–653.
Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (1995). *The Postcolonial Studies Reader.* London: Routledge.
Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Holquist, M. (Ed.) Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. (1996). Cultures in between. In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 53–60). London, Sage Publications.

Bhabha, H. (1998). Culture's in between. In D. Bennett (Ed.), *Multicultural states: Rethinking difference and identity* (pp. 29–36). London and New York: Routledge.

Biggs, J. & Watkins, D. (1996). The Chinese learner in retrospect. In D.Watkins & J. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese Learner*, pp. 45–68. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.

Brewer, E. & Cunningham, K. (2009). *Integrating Study Abroad Into the Curriculum: Theory and Practice Across the Disciplines*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Callero, P. (2008). The globalization of self: Role and identity transformation from above and below. *Sociology Compass, 2*(6), 1972–1988.

Chan, C. & Rao, N. (2009). The paradoxes revisited: The Chinese learner in changing educational contexts. In C. Chan & N. Rao (Eds.), *Re-visiting the Chinese learner: Changing contexts, changing education* (pp. 315-349). Hong Kong/Dordrecht, NL: The Comparative Education Research Centre,University of Hong Kong/Springer.

Chittooran, M. M. (2015). Reading and writing for critical reflective thinking. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2015*(143), 79-95.

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

Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning, 42,* 557–591.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 185–209.

Cook, V., & Wei, L. (Eds.). (2016). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). Chapter one: A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. In *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cuccioletta, D. (2002). Multiculturalism or transculturalism: Towards a cosmopolitan citizenship. *London Journal of Canadian Studies, 17,* 1–11.

Dennick, R. & Tavakol, M. (2009). Are Asian international medical students just rote learners? *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 15*(3), 369–377.

Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 289-322.

Fanon, F. (1984). *Black Skin, White Mask*. London: Pluto Press.

Flowerdew, L. (1998). A cultural perspective on group work. *ELT Journal, 53*(4), 323-329.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Freire, P. (1974). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum

Freire, P. (2006). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Goetz, A.M. (1997). *Getting Institutions Right for Women in Development.* London: Zed Books.

Grimshaw, T. (2007). Problematizing the construct of 'the Chinese learner': Insights from ethnographic research. *Educational Studies, 33*(3), 299–311.

Hall, S. (1996). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, P. Held, D. Hubert, & K. Thompson (Eds.), *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies* (pp. 595–633). Oxford: Blackwell.

Husband, C. & Hoffman, E. (2004). Transcultural health care practice: Transcultural communication and health care practice. In C. Husband & B. Torry (Eds.). *Transcultural Health Care Practice: An educational resource for nurses and health care professionals.*

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2011). Changing practices in Chinese cultures. *Language, Culture & Curriculum, 19*(1), 5–20.

Johnson, M. (2004). *A philosophy of second language acquisition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching.* Oxford University Press.

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

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1999). Learning and pedagogy in communities of practice. In J. Leach & B. Moon (Eds.), Learners and pedagogy (pp. 21–25). London: Paul Chapman.

Leininger, M. (1995). *Transcultural nursing: Concepts, theories, research and practices.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Lyotard, J.F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge.* Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

McEwan, C. (2001). Building a postcolonial archive? Gender, collective memory and citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies 29,* 739–57.

McLaren, P. & Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York: Peter Lang.

Meintel, D. (2000). Plural identities among youth of immigrant background in Montreal. *Horizontes Antropologicos, 6*(14), 13–37.

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *Tesol Quarterly, 38*(4), 573-603.

Mulholland, J. (195). Nursing, humanism and transcultural theory: The 'bracketing-out' of reality. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 22,* 442-449.

Murray, D. (2010). *Female North African–French students in France: Narratives of educational experiences* (Doctoral thesis, University of Nevada). Retrieved May 23, 2012 from http://digitalcommons.library.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/344.

Norton, B., and Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching, 44*(4), 412–446.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2010). *Education at a glance 2010.* OECD Indicators. Retrieved May 23, 2012 from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/45/45941837.pdf

Papastephanou, M. (2005). Globalisation, globalism and cosmopolitanism as an educational ideal. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 37*(4), 533–551.

Park, J. E. (2007). Co-construction of nonnative speaker identity in cross-cultural interaction. *Applied Linguistics, 28*(3), 339-360.

Pavlenko, A. (2003). "I never knew I was a bilingual": Re-imagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 2*(4), 251–268.

Pavlenko, A. & J. Lantolf (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re) construction of selves. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 155–177). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Pavlenko, A., & Norton, B. (2007). Imagined communities, identity, and English language learning.*International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 669-680). New York, NY: Springer.

Pieterse, J.N. (2004). *Globalization or Empire?* New York, NY: Routledge.

Radcliffe, S. (1999). Re-thinking development. In P. Cloke, P. Crang & M. Goodwin (Eds.) *Introducing human geographies* (pp. 200–10). London: Arnold.

Rizvi, F. (2010). International students and doctoral studies in transnational spaces. In M. Walker & P. Thomson (Eds.), *The Routledge doctoral supervisor's companion: Supporting effective research in education and the social sciences* (pp. 158–170). London: Routledge.

Rizvi, F. (2011). Teaching global interconnectivity. Retrieved May 23, 2012, from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Rizvi__Teaching_Global_Interconnectivity_v.1.Pdf

Rizvi, F., B. Lingard, & J. Lavia (2006). Postcolonialism and education: Negotiating a contested terrain. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 14,* 249–62.

Rutherford, J. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 207–221). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

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.

Ryan, J. (2011). Teaching and learning for international students: Towards a transcultural approach. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17*(6), 631–648.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Press.

Sato, T. & Hodge, S. (2009). Asian international doctoral students' experiences at two American universities. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*(3), 136–148.

Singh, M. (2009). Using Chinese knowledge in internationalising research education: Jacques Rancière, an ignorant supervisor and doctoral students from China. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 7*(2), 185–201.

Spivak, G.C. (2000). Can the subaltern speak? In D. Brydon (Ed.), *Postcolonialism: Critical concepts*, (pp. 1427–1477). London: Routledge.

Stein, P. (2008*). Multimodal pedagogies in diverse classrooms: Representation, rights and resources*. London: Routledge.

Strand, T. (2010). The cosmopolitan turn: Recasting 'dialogue' and 'difference.' *Paideusis: International Journal of Philosophy of Education, 19*(1), 49–58.

Ushioda, E. (2011). Language learning motivation, self and identity: Current theoretical perspectives. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 24*(3), 199-210.

Wang, H. (2004). *The call from the stranger on a journey home: Curriculum in a third space*. New York: Peter Lang.

Whitehead, A. (1967). The aims of education. In *The aims of education and other essays* (pp. 1-14). New York: The Free Press.

Wong, J. (2004). Are the learning styles of Asian international students culturally or contextually based? *International Education Journal, 4*(4), 154–166.

Wu, Y. (2011). *Opening up a new entry point for ESL students through infusing arts into the curriculum*. Unpublished M.Ed. comprehensive exam paper, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, November 2011.

Xu, Y. (2011). *Expanding identities of Asian international students in a western university*. Unpublished M.Ed. comprehensive exam paper, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, November 2011.

Yang, R. (2011). Self and the other in the Confucian cultural context: Implications of China's higher education development for comparative studies. *International Review of Education, 57*, 337-355.