Teaching Abroad

International Education and the Cross-Cultural Classroom

Gordon E. Slethaug

香港大學出版社
Hong Kong University Press

Hong Kong University Press
14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong

Hardback ISBN 978-962-209-854-1
Paperback ISBN 978-962-209-855-8

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Secure On-line Ordering
http://www.hkupress.org

Printed and bound by Lammar Offset Printing Ltd., Hong Kong, China.

Hong Kong University Press is honoured that Xu Bing, whose art explores the complex themes of language across cultures, has written the Press's name in his Square Word Calligraphy. This signals our commitment to cross-cultural thinking and the distinctive nature of our English-language books published in China.

"At first glance, Square Word Calligraphy appears to be nothing more unusual than Chinese characters, but in fact it is a new way of rendering English words in the format of a square so they resemble Chinese characters. Chinese viewers expect to be able to read Square Word Calligraphy but cannot. Western viewers, however are surprised to find they can read it. Delight erupts when meaning is unexpectedly revealed."

— Britta Erickson, *The Art of Xu Bing*

Contents

Introduction

> We travel together, passengers on a little spaceship, dependent upon its vulnerable resources of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say the love we give our fragile craft.
>
> — Adlai Stevenson

About a decade ago the language historian Bill Bryson noted that, "the third edition of the *American Heritage Dictionary*, published in 1992, contained 10,000 words, about 5 per cent of the total, that had not existed twenty years before" (1998, 417), and he estimated that, as a result of technology and science since that time, the English language has grown "by up to 20,000 words a year" (1998, 417), far more than suggested by the 1992 dictionary.

Besides technology and science, the expanding English language has added words related to international developments in business, politics, and education. Words such as "globalization," "internationalization," "intercultural," "multicultural," "cross-cultural," "transcultural", and "transnational" have either come into existence recently, gained new currency, or acquired new meanings. The meanings of these words are in flux and sometimes hotly contested because the cultural milieu and international changes they represent are not coded in agreed-upon ways or distanced by time.

As part of this new international scene, multinational corporations, computer and telecommunication companies, and investment banks increasingly cover the globe even as hundreds of thousands of university academics, schoolteachers, and students go abroad. These international

workers, academics and teachers, and students are themselves intercultural and think in international and transnational rather than national terms and make a big difference socially and politically.

Robert Satloff has argued that, since September 11 "experts have debated how to win the battle for hearts and minds among the world's 300 million Arabs and 1.2 billion Muslims. Everyone seems to have the magic bullet" — but American education abroad, he thinks, is far better and less expensive than high profile and costly political alternatives:

> What makes American schools a strategic asset is the fact that non-Americans flock to them. Of the nearly 100,000 students enrolled in such schools around the world, more than 70% are not American, fairly evenly divided between local and third-country students. . . .
>
> Students at these schools learn how to ask questions, be curious, solve problems and accept differences. They study Thanksgiving, George Washington and Martin Luther King while finding a way to celebrate the various nationalities each brings to the classroom. Every student leaves with a facility in English and an appreciation for critical thinking and cultural diversity that represent American education at its best. (Satloff 2003, 9)

Satloff's depiction of students in international schools is one that most transnational educators would understand — they are sophisticated, mainly urban learners whose parents readily see the value of international education, want their children to be well versed in the subjects, and are fully engaged in educational processes. These children are already globalized, so that international schools are able to accomplish diplomatic goals effectively.

Although Satloff cannot give statistics about the total number of international schools because "no single organization keeps track of all international schools around the world" (Greenlees 2006), they grew from about 50 in 1964 to some 1,000 in 1995, with "50,000 teachers and half a million students distributed around the world, being 'equivalent in size to that of a nation with a population of 34 million, but with the significant difference that 90% of the students passing through the system go on to higher education' " (Hayden and Thompson 1995, 333).[1] This three-decade

1 Hayden and Thompson are here quoting M. Matthews' 1988 University of Oxford MSc Thesis, *The Ethos of International Schools*, and using those 1988 statistics, but they also use the same figure of 1,000 international schools for 1995.

period of growth to 1995 is a mere shadow of what has taken place at the primary and secondary level from that time because, according to estimates, there are currently about 3,000 schools globally, with at least 100 new international schools opening world-wide between 2005 and 2006 and enrollment in Asian international schools alone jumping 14% in the same year (Greenlees 2006). During these past two decades, the enrollment in all of these schools has increased exponentially, so that the total enrollment might well be two million.

There has been equally significant expansion at the university level as well. In 1995 Pamela George predicted that approximately 50,000 American academics would "participate in more than two hundred programs facilitating international exchanges" (1995, 1), and in 1998, William Gabrenya argued that "the movement of students across national boundaries for educational purposes has increased steadily since World War II, reaching well over 1 million persons per year by the 1990s" (1998, 57). The actual number during the rapidly globalizing '90s exceeded these predictions, and international student enrollment in higher education in the USA alone went from 34,232 in 1955 to 481,280 in 1998 (Spaulding et al. 2001, 195). Recently, the *New York Times* noted that 565,000 students from foreign countries were currently studying in American universities and 191,000 Americans were studying at international universities (Finder 2005). Add to these numbers the immigrant flow into the USA each year, and the number of foreign and naturalized-American students mingling with native-born students in American classrooms is staggering, not only in large urban areas like New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, or San Francisco, where substantial immigration has always been a fact of life, but in small towns and villages across North America. Added to this are those students who go to other countries such as the United Kingdom and Australia, with the UK receiving 195,000 non-EU students in 2004 and Australia receiving 303,324. Australia alone predicts that this international student body will rise to 810,000 by 2018, and the UK predicts 677,000 by 2015 (Ryan and Carroll 2005, 4).

In a related vein, in an article called "Let the Chinese Students Come," written in 2003, Yale University President Richard C. Levin celebrates the 25th anniversary of Deng Xiaoping's Open Door Policy that "permitted not only the inflow of capital, but also, for the first time since 1949, the flow of students and scholars in both directions." He notes that, "since 1978, tens of thousands of Americans have enrolled in educational institutions in China, and more than 580,000 Chinese have studied in U.S. colleges and universities" (*International Herald Tribune* 2003, 8). Indeed, China's

Ministry of Education statistics show that, in 2001, 61,869 undergraduate and graduate students from 169 countries studied in 363 Chinese universities (China Service Centre for Scholarly Exchange 2001) and, by 2004, that had grown to "110,844 overseas students" from 178 countries studying in mainland China, an increase of "42.63% over the previous year." The figures for 2005 are even more impressive with "more than 140,000 overseas students [studying] in China," and "119,000 Chinese [going] abroad for study" (*South China Morning Post* 2006). These assertions, reinforced by a host of studies about the impact of a growing and developing educational system in China, remind readers not only of the increasing movement of students between the USA and China, but hundreds of other countries as well.

This flow of educators and students across national borders has its rewards, but is not without problems and risks. To go outside one's own country is to discover a wealth of different cultural expressions, but it also means leaving certainties and securities behind — those physical and emotional comforts taken for granted within our home culture. To cross a national boundary and live in another country, quite possibly on a different continent, is to create a gap between new and old experiences and perceptions. This gap may shrink or expand in time, but it can never be eliminated, and those who set out to experience a new culture are forever likely to feel that they are simultaneously part of more than one culture but are never entirely at one with their culture of origin. In other words, educators who go abroad will live on the margins and inhabit the gap, even while experiencing the benefits of transnationalism.

Part of "inhabiting the gap" is giving up comforting cultural perceptions and understandings. For instance, although "America" in this book specifically refers to the USA and "North America" to Canada, Mexico, and the USA together, I have become uneasy with these definitions. Most Americans take the term "American" for granted as referring to inhabitants of the USA, but some from the USA and other countries think the term should not be used in that sense. Still, rhetorically it works better than always referring to "citizens of the United States." Similarly, there are times when I use "Asian" and feel discomfort about the cultural complexity and diversity subsumed under that term. In general, I will use that term only to refer to an area and not to something like a so-called Asian value system, which would be impossible to define or defend. For the purposes of this book, then, America is a country and Americans the inhabitants of that country, Asia is a continent, and East Asia a part of that continent — but I am always on the alert about the shifting sands of meaning and attitude regarding these usages.

Those who inhabit international spaces learn how to question local assumptions and issues and ways of expressing them, but it is important to feel part of those neighborhood relations, educational processes, and everyday work in the operation of society. Those going abroad will experience on a personal level the distinctions inherent in the terms "globalization," "internationalization," and "transnationalism." Globalization is the most rhetorically loaded of the three terms and usually refers to the rapid international transfer of goods, commodities, culture, and political ideologies. Those who celebrate globalization see multilateral trade leading to growing economic and political equality across the planet. Those who reject it believe that the benefits of globalization accrue mainly to the United States and other developed and developing countries and that underdeveloped countries suffer as a result (Alexander 2004, 1). Those who disapprove of globalization find it a form of exploitation, extreme capitalism, and economic colonization and therefore dislike the term applied to non-economic and non-governmental sectors.

Because "internationalization" suggests reciprocity rather than cultural and economic hegemony, it is a relatively neutral term and well adapted to broad cultural and educational issues. Educators increasingly use this term but also like "transnationalism," suggesting a reciprocal, almost arbitrary and unintentional (as opposed to schematically controlled) flow of knowledge and cultures across national boundaries. Terms closely related to transnationalism are "transculturalism" and "transculturation." Francoise Lionnet says that transculturation means "constant interaction, transmutation between two or more cultural components with the unconscious goal of creating a third cultural identity" (15–16). Although these terms mute the mediation of nationalist discourses that transnationalism suggests, they suggest a cross-national discourse, which, as with "internationalization," lacks many of the negative indicators that "globalization" bears.

When educators describe internationalization in education, they often do so in terms of the need for equality of race, ethnicity, and gender, and for the separation of church and state in the classroom, but without significant consideration of the more comprehensive educational challenges of an intercultural classroom. For example, France's struggle to integrate its Muslim population into classrooms, while protecting secular values, provides a rough sort of lesson. The issue occupying the French and German press in 2003–04 was the Muslim wearing of headscarves in their countries, and the consequent French government report recommending a ban on headscarves worn by Muslim girls, yarmulkes by Jewish boys, and

large crosses by Christians, as a means of protecting secularism in the classroom and workplace. The press was occupied with the issue of headscarves, but said little else about implications for the education system, except that there could be a threat of more private religious schools in the wake of this ban in the public schools (Sciolino 2003, 1).

Surely in these international contexts, there should be greater concern about teaching style, student responses, and classroom relations, which are even more important for education than religious symbols, and this is the area that has been least recognized and researched. Of all the areas of globalization and internationalization, the classroom may well be the least discussed. Everyone knows, and has an opinion about, the interface of politics and business as reflected in national trade policies and the World Trade Organization (WTO); and most also understand the migration of students from all parts of the world as they pursue their academic interests. However, surprisingly little has been said about the international classroom — whether that classroom is in Morocco, China, Bolivia, South Africa, Denmark, Canada, or the USA. It is this paucity of discussion about the intercultural classroom that provides the impetus for this study, and I hope that my observations can be thought-provoking to all teachers and incorporated into conversations about classrooms at every academic level, although my own experience on three continents is with the university classroom. I have taught American studies — culture, literature, and history — at universities in the USA, Canada, China (both Hong Kong and mainland), and Denmark; have given papers, lectured, and discussed educational perspectives in a dozen different countries (including several places in China, Poland, South Korea, and Vietnam); and have grounded my observations in what students in other countries often call the "American style" that favors student participation over teacher control. Along with others in various international settings, I have increasingly crossed national and cultural boundaries — a phenomenon for teachers and students alike.

In their book about international education, Janette Ryan and Jude Carroll define international students as those "who have chosen to travel to another country for tertiary study" (2005, 3), and, in her book about Fulbright professors going abroad to teach, Pamela George defines cross-cultural contexts as "those in which academics from the United States teach in countries, cultures or in languages which are not their native ones" (1995, 3). These excellent sources focus on students and contexts, but I am interested in the teachers or pedagogues who go abroad to teach because they engage cross-cultural dynamics in ways that those who stay

at home do not, even if they teach culturally diverse and international students.

Those cross-cultural educators who go abroad must adjust to new cultures while trying to preserve and promote some of their own, and do so in a way that is not "culturally imperialistic" (McLean and Ransom 2005, 45), but those remaining at home can expect students (in whatever mix of international and local/home students) to adjust to their own country's beat. Teachers who stay at home and deal with international students can assume the so-called "deficit approach," that "implies that any 'problem' is the student's, that it is the role of academics and language support staff to 'correct' the problem and that it is the student's responsibility to 'adjust'" (McLean and Ransom 2005, 45). Those who remain at home may not have to interrogate familiar pedagogical formulations: "the academic culture inherent in their discipline seems obvious and expectations are rarely made explicit . . . [for] we have learned how to behave in tutorials and lectures, expectations of the postgraduate-supervisor relationships, out-of-class etiquette, and attitudes to cheating and intellectual property" (McLean and Ransom 2005, 47).

As outsiders to a culture and in teaching ethnically and nationally diverse groups of students, cross-cultural teachers have to rethink culture, pedagogy, and identity, and reconsider their social and pedagogical assumptions in critical ways or risk failure. It is quite typical that teachers' evaluations plummet when they first go abroad because they have not thought sufficiently about the new classroom and adjusted their habits and standards. My assertion in this book that "cross-cultural" refers to teachers who go abroad is not meant to suggest a preference for the foreign over the domestic, or even to assume that it is not possible to have a cross-cultural experience at home, but only that in teaching abroad to students of other nationalities — whether monocultural or multicultural — teachers must self-consciously engage their pedagogical assumptions and strategies and develop new ones to cope with the particular new international context. According to Kam Louie, this can give them a deep understanding of the learning process: "teachers who gather cultural knowledge at the same time as they are imparting it are aware of the processes of learning about another culture, and that awareness deepens their rapport with the students" (2005, 17). However rewarding, this encounter with the cross-cultural classroom is often difficult; as one teacher noted in designing courses, "my major difficulty has been in designing a unit for our overseas programme. The students in that specific locality have had very different preparation from our local students but the unit must fit within the standard degree

framework" (Toohey 1999, 4). As educators and students move around the world, they constantly must be aware of the fit of the local and the international and invent ways to deal with that.

The understanding of "cross-cultural" — and even transcultural — is different from "multicultural," which can be restricted to intercultural and often ethno-racial mingling within a particular country like the USA (Hollinger 1995, 13). Students in an American school may be African American, Asian American, European American, Hispanic, and Native American, representing different cultures and racial groups within the USA, without any of them, including the teachers, being international. This multicultural group probably shares and takes for granted characteristics of the national and local culture, which an international cross-cultural situation would not. "Transcultural" suggests the exchange of cultural components within or outside the boundaries of a single country, but "cross-cultural" implicitly has an international dimension (Charles Wei-hsun Fu 1990, 135; Ryan and Carroll 2005, 6) even when used with reference to seminars involving foreign professionals wanting to "assimilate as quickly as possible by enrolling in cultural training courses to learn the attitudes, accents, and auras of Americans" (Zia 2000, 210). Because of privately run, cross-cultural training seminars that prepare Americans for life abroad or for foreigners wanting to assimilate quickly into the USA, people fear that "cross-cultural" has come to refer only to American experiences and argue that the term and situations it governs should include the experiences of any expatriate encountering other national cultures. According to Gretchen Lang, one of the complaints of business cross-cultural training seminars is that the organizers forget about the perceptions and problems of nationalities other than Americans, even though they invite them to attend: "Martina Nelson, a German national whose family moved from Spain to the Philippines in 2000, said her one-day training seminar in Manila failed because the trainer geared her talk exclusively toward Americans. 'It was all oriented toward what an American expat would want to know,' she recalled. 'There was no one there who could understand what a European would want'" (2004, 13). In short, many want cross-cultural education to be universalist, incorporating the experiences of anyone who needs to understand how best to relate to other nationals, whatever the setting.

Pamela George uses the term "cross-cultural" to talk about teachers or pedagogues who are outside their native countries, are teaching students of a different nationality, and, therefore, are put in the position of rethinking their cultural imperatives and of negotiating core principles of education.

It is this understanding that I will follow in this book, and my comments are directed at those who intend to go abroad to teach. These foreign-bound teachers are my target audience, and it is my assumption and experience that they are interested in the historical and cultural conditions of a country and in need of practical advice about teaching abroad.

Teaching abroad offers rich opportunities for cultural understanding and communication for teachers and students alike because those who leave their home country and enter another need to be especially careful that they are not exploitative and arrogant toward those cultures, or guilty of thoughtlessly imposing their own home culture on others. Each culture has its own ideology, advantages, and limitations, and those who enter a new culture need to be aware of and sensitive to it, and able to critique it and their own culture as well, and to negotiate with it. Although social analysts often criticize cultural imperialism in politics and business, it can be equally present within the educational context. The first lesson to be learned by those who choose to leave their home country and live abroad is that they are outsiders and guests of their new domicile. Putting themselves outside their home country also places them on the cusp of their home value systems and the ones they enter, so that internationalization is at once a form of cultural engagement, both enlargement and marginalization. Those who work internationally are simultaneously insiders and outsiders in their home and guest countries.

Although a cross-cultural perspective can be applied to business, government, and non-government organizations, as well as school systems, I would like to focus my comments on the interdisciplinary classroom that lends itself to area studies (such as American studies, Canadian studies, Chinese studies, Scandinavian studies, etc.). Such academic domains as Media Studies and Communications can easily benefit from the same interdisciplinary perspectives, but for the sake of consistency, I will focus on area studies. As Heinz Ickstadt notes, international American studies was among the first to emphasize interdisciplinary teaching at the university level: "the founding of American studies institutes in Germany (Berlin, Frankfurt, Munich), Great Britain (Nottingham, Keele), Poland (Warsaw) and, most recently, Denmark (Odense) resulted from the wish to bring different disciplines (in most cases literature and history) together under one roof" (1996, 11).

In the process of discussing the cross-cultural classroom, I want readers to consider the role of the teacher, the relationship between the teacher and students, and the value of the local culture in relation to the international environment. By doing so, I hope to meet a critical need for pedagogical

perspectives that involve not just the intercultural and multi-national classroom, consisting of students from many countries, but the increasingly complex international cross-cultural classroom that thinks about and promotes everyone's involvement in a way that draws out their best qualities, consciously incorporates and respects their cultures, and looks carefully at classroom practices that might be perceived to advance or undermine those values. In this regard, it is important to remember that, in the cross-cultural classroom, everyone is an outsider because when teachers and students are from various countries, there is no inside space that can be taken for granted. As such, teachers and students alike need to be educated into a self-conscious awareness of local conditions and be reminded of particular cultural dispositions and pedagogical preferences. It is also critical to remember that the cross-cultural classroom is about respect for each culture and a willingness to learn at every step. These, I think, must be the most important values for education in the twenty-first century.

A first step in thinking about the cross-cultural classroom is to reflect on familiar assumptions about education. As Philip Jackson (1990, 8–9) has remarked, it is easy to take the activities of classrooms for granted because they are generally consistent spaces across any given nation:

> The labels: "seatwork," "group discussion," "teacher demonstration," and "question-and-answer period" (which would include work "at the board"), are sufficient to categorize most of the things that happen when class is in session. . . . [These] major activities are performed according to rather well-defined [national] rules which the students are expected to understand and obey — for example, no loud talking during seatwork, do not interrupt someone else during discussion, keep your eyes on your own paper during tests, raise your hand if you have a question. Even in the early grades these rules are so well understood by the students (if not completely internalized) that the teacher has only to give very abbreviated signals ("Voices, class." "Hands, please.") when violations are perceived.

Such conventions are understood as second nature by the public in a given country, but need to be rethought in crossing different cultures.

National culture, then, looms large as a consideration, and I will be referring to that often, but local conditions also play a large part. For example, as a professor, I taught at the University of Waterloo, one of the most highly respected educational institutions in Canada, especially well known for its computer, engineering, and mathematics programs and its

cooperative education, work-study features. Students there are smart, hardworking, practical, and able to engage in effective classroom discussions, but some colleagues argued that the institutional emphasis on technology resulted in a greater pressure for lecturing than characterized other institutions dominated by the arts. This was not my experience, but it serves as a reminder that all learning is contextually embedded, and local conditions affect pedagogy and the style of education, even when national curricula and pedagogical considerations appear to dominate.

First of all, then, this book intends to think out cross-cultural issues and problems to help educators teaching abroad avoid pitfalls and make the right decisions for a creative learning environment. To go away from one's own local environment and study or teach in a different culture is to experience a new way of apprehending life or undergo a paradigm shift, as Thomas Kuhn (1996) would call it. I wish to make the reader aware that one of the most important paradigm shifts is the internationalizing of education and the considerable degree to which we live in a global economy with teachers and students moving around the world all the time and experiencing these paradigmatic changes.

Second, I want to help the reader consider cultural identity or what Hollinger calls chosen "affiliations" (1995, 7) at personal, social, and national levels in order to create the most stimulating and effective classroom experiences for teachers and students alike. Because teachers and students can be exhilarated by mixing cultures or frustrated because that international classroom is resistant to the tried-and-true ideas and techniques that worked so well at home, self-assessment can help create better pedagogical goals and directions. In this book, I do not intend to address the subject matter of a classroom, though many of my comments are oriented towards humanities, area studies, and interdisciplinary work.

Finally, I propose to blur customary writing genres as a way to rethink intercultural communication and bridge writing cultures and classrooms. I will begin this study with the history and culture of the Chinese higher education system, and common assumptions about classrooms in the East and West. The final chapter is grounded in postethnicity theories of identity. Between these scholarly chapters, I will personalize the study, presenting my own experiences as well as scholarly comments by others who write about international education to raise issues, provide insights, and offer practical advice about effective tools and techniques for teaching in the cross-cultural classroom. Teaching at any level is deeply personal as well as scholarly, and it is my intention to combine the two — to cross writing and cultural boundaries in discussing the international cross-cultural classroom.

Chapter 1, "Internationalizing Education: The Example of China," reflects upon the recent intensification of global educational initiatives. University education has become a huge enterprise in the West during the twentieth century, and many countries in the world, including China, owe at least some of their university system to its influence. As the example of China indicates, the development of universities has not always been easy and has been linked to political winds. Recently, however, this country and others like it have been working hard to ensure that they keep pace with the rapidly changing world of science, technology, communications, and economics, both in sending their youth and professors abroad, as well as bringing experts to China for short or long terms. This receptivity to global changes has also affected certain other areas such as law and American studies, and has made English language study one of the most important subjects in the contemporary curriculum.

This goal of internationalization has extended to the creation of new programs and the restructuring of courses of study, faculties and colleges, and entire universities. The national government of China has also indicated that it wants to incorporate certain aspects of Western pedagogy and has backed that up with additional resources to its top universities, making many of its classrooms more interactive and giving individual students a greater opportunity to participate. Still, not all universities have benefited and, even in those that have, such traditional areas as literature and history have not shared equally in this development of programs, addition of human capital, economic support, or shifts in pedagogy — which suggests that such change and growth may be more heavily weighted toward the research universities and toward technology and economics rather than arts and social studies. The emphasis on change in education and the dialogue with Western forms of pedagogy may not extend equally, then, to all sectors of the university or to the country as a whole.

In Chapter 2, "The Individual, the Group, and Pedagogy," I look at the differences that an awareness of individuals and groups can make in the classroom. Many accept Geert Hofstede's dichotomy between collectivism and individualism, suggesting that, if North Americans go to Thailand to teach, for example, they must take into account the values associated with this collectivist social structure which is so radically different from the North American individualist structure. As I will note, I have difficulties with this bifurcation and prefer to think of a loose distinction between *communitarian* and *individualist* values. Nevertheless, the perceived difference between the individual in the USA and the group in China does account for certain strengths and weaknesses in each system.

Chapter 3 examines "The Classroom Environment: Physical, Emotional, and Intellectual Spaces," which builds on group and individualist perspectives. The space where learning takes place is important because inadequate and poorly planned space clearly hampers the educational process, but more important for the cross-cultural classroom is the need to think of students' cultural dispositions in relation to the space. The use of space is never completely neutral because of local and national cultural expectations and constraints, and teachers need to locate preferences and become sensitive to resistances in order to create an effective classroom. If the cross-cultural classroom only involves going between Germany and Denmark, for instance, or between South Korea and Japan, then taking into account similar preferences may be good enough. However, if a teacher goes from the West to the East, the USA to China, or an individualist to communitarian society, very different cultural expectations can come into play, perhaps necessitating different uses of physical space. How best to organize the activities of the cross-cultural classroom within a given space is thus a particularly important issue, for some cultures give priority to lectures while others prefer unstructured, student-oriented spaces.

Space, however, is not only physical and cultural; there is also a mental dimension, and students clearly need to feel that their learning does not suffer from inadequate teaching, a poor learning environment, and oppressive attitudes. They need to be assured that theirs is a level playing field, where they can learn about themselves and their cultural heritage and where they can be assured of equal treatment, regardless of race, class, gender, religion, or age.

In Chapter 4, I delve into "The Teacher-Oriented Classroom," the dominant pedagogical strategy of most cultures. Some teachers and students like to emphasize the give and take of lively student exchange, but, in most places in the world, teachers ground education with lectures as the best way to transmit information, create knowledge, and establish a basis for discussion. It is important in the cross-cultural classroom to understand this reality and see how creative lecturing can foster a positive learning environment. A single teacher in the classroom may seem the easiest and most efficient way of educating students, but team teaching can provide dynamic education, and this is especially the case where various disciplines are incorporated in a course of study — in short, where interdisciplinary learning takes place. Team teaching may not be applicable to all classroom environments, but it is especially appropriate for various kinds of area studies — American studies, Canadian studies, Chinese studies, etc. —

provided that the teachers really do work together as a team rather than give quick walk-through presentations without collegial interaction.

Team teaching, as such, may play an important part in "The Student-Oriented Classroom," discussed in Chapter 5, helping students to discover how to relate respectfully and enthusiastically with a variety of students and faculty in an interactive environment. Most North American educators take it for granted that a discussion-oriented classroom is an excellent mode of learning, but that is not a universal assumption. Students in Asian countries and Scandinavia, for example, are taught to work as groups, but often do not like to "stand forward" individually in the classroom, whereas American students may tend to jump into a discussion and dominate it. Even in the USA, however, such student-oriented discussion can have problems. In a recent account of the wireless keypad in the American classroom, Katie Hafner (2004) argues that "although some sceptics dismiss the [wireless keypads] as novelties more suited to a TV game show than a lecture hall, educators who use them say their classrooms come alive as never before. Shy students have no choice but to participate, the instructors say, and the know-it-alls lose their monopoly on the classroom dialogue." Implied in Hafner's comment is a view that a student-oriented classroom can lack balance because quiet students do not talk and loquacious students talk all the time. In a cross-cultural classroom, this tendency can be amplified, and as many non-Americans think that the classroom is stacked against them, teachers must be particularly sensitive to the class dynamics and create strategies to include everyone. The strategies include exercises in problem solving, group work, and presentations (both group and individual) and might also involve student responsibility for classroom activities and assessments. By incorporating team-building techniques into the classroom, with teachers and students alike responsible for creating, participating, and assessing their effectiveness, students may feel part of the classroom environment in ways they never have before. Recognizing, however, that learning extends well beyond the classroom space is extremely important, and electronic technology (e-mails, blackboards, and teleconferencing) can supplement the traditional space in amazing ways. So, too, can field trips to other countries.

Whether in a teacher- or student-oriented classroom, cross-cultural education can benefit from film, the subject of Chapter 6, "Film in the Cross-Cultural Classroom." Although "reading and 'riting and 'rithmatic" have traditionally been seen as the basis of knowledge, these are never completely transparent subjects, so media aids make language, numbers, and science available to the imagination and understanding in particular

ways. All forms of media — music, documentaries, films, and computer applications — can enhance learning in the cross-cultural classroom, but teachers also have to be cautious about cultural predispositions and sensitivities. Students in countries without a history of film criticism often think that films exist only for entertainment and not for social critique and, consequently, may not take film viewing as serious study. Also, certain films cannot be shown in particular countries without offending local tastes or may be barred by national censors. Thus, while the cross-cultural classroom provides an excellent opportunity to enhance learning, the teacher needs to be cautious in ascertaining the appropriateness of all the materials. I am a particular fan of film adaptations as a special kind of cross-cultural tool to raise issues about gender, ethnicity, regions, and identity, but even here the teacher must think carefully and consult widely about appropriate forms.

The cross-cultural classroom is never complete without "Assignments and Assessments," the subject of Chapter 7. Everyone assumes that students require assignments and assessments, but these are subject to cultural expectations and preferences. Some cultures are strongly oriented to large reading assignments and some to small ones; and some like final examinations, whereas others prefer ongoing or continuous assessment over the duration of the course. Teachers must work hard to understand and evaluate particular cultural demands, so that students never have the feeling that the expectations of their culture are being ignored even while they become receptive to new methods, matter, and ideology. For that reason, teachers may have to use a variety of methods of assessment. They also have to be aware of attitudes to cheating and plagiarism as well as official school policies — and lack of them — and penalties for committing them, whether the guilty parties are teachers or students. Plagiarism can be one of the most difficult and disconcerting assessment problems that teachers abroad may have to face. Another aspect of assessment is that of the classroom itself, and teachers and students alike should be involved. This is not as common internationally as Americans, for example, may assume. As it is important to everyone that learning be a positive experience, part of the closing activities of the year might include an assessment of the goals, accomplishments, and attitudes in the classroom.

The possibilities and demands of the cross-cultural international classroom impact upon personal, social, and national identities, so in the concluding chapter, "Descent, Consent, and Cross-Cultural Affiliations," I will discuss the unique and rewarding aspects of affiliated identities, those which, as David Hollinger stresses, are capable of change and multiplicity.

Students and teachers alike in international classrooms must be aware of the values inherent in cross-cultural education and the positive changes to individual identities, but they must also be aware of personal and professional risks.

In short, teachers abroad need to consider the program in total — the cross-cultural classroom environment, the students, the kinds of learning that take place, an annual review of the entire process, and resultant issues of identity. The cross-cultural classroom is one of the most interesting developments of globalization and internationalization, but it is also one that requires awareness and sensitivity. By thinking about these aspects all the time, teachers and students alike can benefit more fully from the educational process.

8

Conclusion: Descent, Consent, and Cross-Cultural Affiliations

Globalization, internationalization, and transnationalism have accelerated in the last two decades, and, as noted throughout this study, the cross-cultural classroom has shared strongly in this phenomenon, enhancing simple enjoyment, facilitating teaching and learning, and aiding in the construction of identity. Opportunities for cross-cultural teaching exist in every country but are particularly well illustrated in China's rapidly changing educational culture. Chinese education has a long and venerable history, but as existing programs have been transformed and new ones opened, curriculum requirements of faculties and colleges have changed, and universities have taken on a new character. Change at the structural level has driven the effort to re-examine and refresh the quality of teaching and learning as well.

Given this emphasis on pedagogy and learning in the international classroom, teachers need to be aware how culture is configured locally and internationally. Without understanding the priorities and values of the differing cultures present in the modern cross-cultural classroom, teachers and students alike can make unwise decisions. As previously discussed, one primary consideration in strengthening the cross-cultural classroom is attentiveness to the relationship of the individual to the group. This is a complicated matter and bears strongly upon aspirations and restrictions, hierarchical arrangements, politeness, and styles and degrees of participation in the classroom. Whether the teachers and students come from communitarian or individualist societies, and whether they are able to understand differing perspectives on the group versus individual dynamics impacts strongly upon the classroom atmosphere and, ultimately, everyone's identity. Adjusting to the demands of teaching abroad, learning

how to respect the students, and receiving respect from them in turn, however, goes beyond the relationship of the individual to the group and beyond multiculturalism: it is dependent upon what Werner Sollers in *Beyond Ethnicity* defines as descent and consent in culture — that is, cultural codes, beliefs, rites and rituals that are inherited through blood or ideology (descent) in interaction with those that are chosen, contracted, or self-realized (consent). As Sollers (1986, 39) remarks in defining his terms against conventional assessments of ethnicity and multiculturalism:

> I propose that for the purposes of investigating group formation, inversion, boundary construction and social distancing, myths of origins and fusions, cultural markers and empty symbols, we may be better served, in the long run, by the vocabulary of kinship and cultural codes than by the cultural baggage that the word "ethnicity" contains. My concern has therefore shifted from ethnicity to the cultural construction of the codes of consent and descent . . .

Although Sollers makes his observations about American culture within the context of ethnicity theory, his view that the relationship between inherited and chosen traditions creates personal and social identities is decidedly relevant for the international cross-cultural classroom as well.

Within the rhetoric of nation-building from the settlement of America, Sollers points out that consent and adjustment to local values are valued over descent and adherence to old-world cultures and mores; however, in assessing the contemporary scene, David Hollinger in *Postethnic America* does not value the new world over the old but argues that his "postethnic perspective favors voluntary over involuntary affiliations, balances an appreciation for communities of descent with a determination to make room for new communities, and promotes solidarities of wide scope that incorporate people with different ethnic and racial backgrounds. A postethnic perspective resists the grounding of knowledge and moral values in blood and history, but works within the last generation's recognition that many of the ideas and values once taken to be universal are specific to certain cultures" (1995, 3). He further argues that postethnic affiliation is valuable in debating "issues in education and politics" (ibid.). He favors voluntary *cosmopolitan* postethnic affiliation (as opposed to a *pluralist* one based on ethnocentrism and fixed ethno-racial groupings) that "promotes multiple identities, emphasizes the dynamic and changing character of many groups, and is responsive to the potential for creating new cultural combinations" (ibid., 3–4). By "affiliation," Hollinger refers to acts of individual will and volition in forging identities, and by "cosmopolitan" he

means "recognition, acceptance, and eager exploration of diversity" (1995, 84) as an important part of that volition. I do not think that the term "identity" is as bound to stasis as Hollinger claims, but I also take his point that a term is needed to reflect the desired diversity, multiplicity, and dynamic process of change in identity formation. I will, then, link affiliation to identity and refer to "affiliated identities" to represent these evolving identities.

Cross-Cultural Affiliated Identities

More than a century ago, W. E. B. DuBois (1897, 195–96) saw that living as a black person in the USA required a "double-consciousness":

> [T]he Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world — a world which yields him no self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.

For DuBois, a black or Negro consciousness was expressed through family and the immediate racial community, but another — an American consciousness — was required for interactions in the larger economic, social, and political sphere. Later, Malcolm X and others in the black community objected to this idea of a double-consciousness, arguing that blacks were racially different from the whites and had to be singular in their commitment and allegiance to their own race and community. In Malcolm X's mind, an identity or consciousness could not be bifurcated between private and public or black and white spheres.

While Malcolm X's position appeals to those like Richard Rodriquez who believe in the importance of a single undifferentiated identity — either the complete rejection of, or, alternatively, complete assimilation into, the mainstream culture — DuBois' pluralism continues to resonate with many "hyphenated" Americans (e.g. Asian-Americans) who find that rejection of their racial and ethnic descent would be destructive of their family identity and social heritage. For them, complete consent and "achieved identity"

as opposed to "ascribed identity" (Sollers 1986, 37) is neither desirable nor possible. Instead, many who value cultural pluralism argue that it is necessary to conjoin descent and consent in what the Hawaiians call a Hapa mentality, the marriage of opposites. These double identities may be used for different purposes, giving rise to what Amy Iwasaki Mass refers to as "situational identity," in which, as Paul R. Spickard reflects, the Asian identity is a private, subdominant identity, and the American identity the public and dominant one (2000, 257–60). These are uneasy alliances. There are those like Joy Nakamura who, rather than juggling oppositions or pairing dominant and subdominant identities, opt for a third that "mixes the languages, values, and symbol systems of their two parental cultures" (Spickard 2000, 262). Each of these positions confirms ethnic harmony, and each is also situational, cultural, and experiential, but only the latter comes close to affirming Hollinger's identities based on choice.

Many now accept the view that culture and identity differ, and that neither is fixed. As Jan English-Lueck notes, "culture and identity are different concepts, but they overlap, making it difficult to carefully define the distinctions between them. Identity is one piece of culture. Identity refers less to what we do — our behavior — than to who we believe ourselves to be. Identity is reflexive, reflecting several dimensions; it is how we categorize ourselves to ourselves. Identity is theatre; it is how we present ourselves to others. Finally, one aspect of identity is passive; it is how others classify us" (2002, 117). Hollinger's idea of conjoining descent and consent confirms English-Lueck's observation that identities are neither essentialist nor stable, but, rather, diverse, malleable, and dependent on cultural context. Hollinger, however, separates identity from affiliation on the basis that "*identity* implies fixity and givenness" (1995, 7), while *affiliation* performs personal choice and participates in the social dynamics of that action. By this definition, affiliation can be subdivided into the personal (personal views, personality, individual reactions and responses); the familial (ways of relating to parents, siblings, and partners and preferences for domestic arrangements); the community or communal (where to live and what feels comfortable in public); and the national (not only things that make Americans, Canadians, or Chinese but attitudes towards those that affect social relationships).

Affiliation is created through the fusion of home and society or descent and consent, and schools and universities are the crucible in which the private, the public, and the national are mixed strategically. This blending is useful in thinking out teaching in a foreign classroom because the classroom reflects the way the culture positions identity and learning.

Learning consists of many things, but, in the cross-cultural classroom, it is referenced by politics of descent and consent in an unstable relationship between teacher and students. At certain moments the teacher might well be avowing descent and the students consent, whereas in other ones this might be reversed.

Intelligence, learning, and the educational context of the cross-cultural classroom are thus intricately intertwined in the construction of cross-cultural affiliated identities. Robert Sternberg (1985) maintains that intelligence consists of three elements — the componential, the contextual, and the experiential. Componential intelligence, he argues, concerns the process of thinking, planning, and realizing thoughts and executing plans. Contextual intelligence concerns the ability to apprehend and adapt to the basic needs and requirements of the context. Finally, experiential intelligence allows the individual to make use of experiences, build upon them in creative ways, and incorporate them into actions. These are all practical forms of intelligence as opposed to theoretical constructs, and relate directly to the *development* and *performance* of affiliation in the classroom as opposed to the *understanding* of it.

Because the classroom shapes identity, it is important to build a strong foundation. The classroom is critical as the site where many first become aware of who they are, how their affiliations are constituted, and how these affiliations are performed, but the cross-cultural classroom is even more central because it requires a bifurcated vision, an awareness of and adaptation to the new "layered" environment and "flexible, evolving and differentiated" multiple identities (Kim, 2001, 38, 66). Students who learn in this layered cross-cultural classroom need to feel socially, culturally, and linguistically connected, part of local kinship networks, and able to maintain their "own culture, traditions and values, starting from family values" and extending to national characteristics (Deshpande 2004), but they also should be able to embrace others coming from outside and generate interest and enhance their knowledge base and skills set. In other words, the cross-cultural classroom performs ethnicity, as Sollers might say, as the teacher and students bring their inherited ideas and attitudes into the social realm and yet adapt to different kinds of people, situations, and contexts. Teachers must feel connected to the classroom, even if their students vary considerably in cultural background and understanding from their own. They need to feel that their personal and public affinities are maintained even as they change, adapt, and accommodate to new forms. This ability to change and adapt should serve students and teachers well in future situations.

That situational identity is marked nationally as American, Canadian, Chinese or something else. Even though the nation state is a contested notion, it is fair to say that culture, educational training, and identity assume a national character, if not always a national curriculum, and pedagogy, too, tends to be marked nationally, although usually with a range of choices. Students who are part of these systems thus find that their individual and social affiliated identities are defined at least in part by these preferences. That means that students in China will see and value their educational experiences differently than do students in the USA. This is not a matter of being better or worse, superior or inferior, but rather of being appropriate to the culture. Students who have been exposed to other educational systems and pedagogical alternatives may, then, feel that their identity in the cross-cultural classroom is affected and altered by this new classroom situation.

Students and teachers alike may find this change exhilarating as they affirm a multiple national affiliation, but they may also find it problematic because they are simultaneously insiders and outsiders, of their own country and another, of a foundational ideology and an adopted one, of one governing pedagogy and another, creating a new kind of learning opportunity and shifting identity. This might seem obvious for teachers and students who mix the cultures of East and West and their differing social patterns and pedagogies, but it is an important characteristic and applies to any transnational situation and sometimes to a thoroughly domestic one. Each person is first located in a particular culture, probably a middle-class American culture for any teacher who has gone abroad from the USA and the local or host culture for students who enroll in the course/school/university, but must change as a result of these new encounters. Stable identities will be transformed to new and flexible affiliated identities by an encounter with, and regard for, new practices and beliefs.

Taken together, descent and consent create the ingredients for a new cultural awareness, and, given the right attention and nurturing, new organizational dynamics and personal affiliated identities. Both teacher and students must partly suspend belief in (or deconstruct) their own culture and traditional training in order to embrace this new classroom dynamic. Although the experience of adaptation will have difficult moments, the nurturing of a cross-cultural affiliation should succeed relatively well when, as Ruben and Kealey (1979) observe, individual competence is perceived as productive and affirming.

As mentioned in previous chapters, in helping to shape this dynamic cross-cultural classroom, create the best opportunity for an interaction of

stability and change, and mould flexible affiliations, teachers and students have to be willing to learn, experiment, share, and show respect for the opinions of others. The academic, cultural, and social dimensions to education need to be recognized and modified in each case. In Geert Hofstede's language, students and teachers alike must be willing to have their mental software modified to cope with this new environment. They both need intellectual space to develop a classroom dynamic appropriate to this particular group in this particular place. All must be willing to share in what they know intuitively from their own culture and what they learn from others in the cross-cultural classroom.

Students and teachers in this new cross-cultural classroom who learn to manage stability and change readily develop the characteristics of leadership. As Debashis Chatterjee notices, "leaders shape reality. They do so by combining change and stability. This involves the synthesis of two innate human competencies: creation and construction. Whereas creation is a living and changing process, construction is a structure of stability that controls this process. Creation is multidimensional and dynamic; construction is sequential, progressing step by step" (2002, 222). In the cross-cultural classroom, these leaders will be both teachers and students. Certainly, one of the values attributed to the classroom is the cultivation of leadership, and involvement in the cross-cultural classroom on its own creates strategies for incorporating stability and change, creativity and construction.

Affiliated Identity and Cultural Markers in the Classroom

There are many factors that serve as ingredients for successful affiliated identities and cross-cultural classrooms, but the most important is the respect between teacher and student and between students themselves. Unless the teacher adapts to the culture in important ways and also respects the basic identity of the students, including their collective rights and individual opinions, and unless the students respect the teacher's knowledge, attitude, and identity, basic learning is jeopardized and educational opportunities sacrificed.

Although this may seem superficial, the image of the teacher and of her/his professional identity in a given cultural context is fundamentally important. This is as basic as our clothing. Americans students have fairly casual relationships with their instructors, and teachers in American classrooms often dress in a correspondingly relaxed way. While a generation

ago, the teacher-student relationship was more formal and a dress or suit required of teachers, now jeans and other kinds of casual apparel are common for women and men. Casual relationships and dress are also common in many countries in Europe, especially in Great Britain and Scandinavia, where societies as a whole value that.

Other countries may expect something different. Lecturers typically dress up in China, where they are given high regard and expected to dress correspondingly. Men and women alike wear high-quality casual clothing, and women often wear dresses, but, in many places, anything that fits too tightly is inappropriate, and, in parts of India, the Middle East, and Northern Africa, Western-style dresses — even with skirts well below the knees — are often considered inappropriate, and the women will be stared at by everyone and refused entry to some public places.

Not only apparel but also voice and actions must be approached with caution in working in another part of the world. The loudness of Americans in conversation, their tendency to sit on the desk when lecturing or put their feet on furniture, their playful jostling in public places — these are cultural traits and personal characteristics that can strain cross-cultural relationships where soft-spoken speech and personal restraint are valued. The image of the teacher, as well as those in other occupations, is context- sensitive, and Westerners need to be cautious about professional dress and personal conduct for, as outsiders, they are under scrutiny outside and inside. One of my colleagues said that most local Hong Kong people thought expatriates were crazy anyway, so being careful of dress and conduct was not essential, but this easy attitude might get people into trouble in many cities where a host population might not so easily discount or forgive actions not in keeping with their cultures.

In the cross-cultural matters of dress, custom, religion, and politics, it is always best for foreign professionals to be careful, if not reserved, in and out of the classroom in order to be accepted. It is always important to recognize that teachers, as foreigners, are guests in the country, and regardless of private opinions, are not in the position to change a country's culture. Americans who dislike smoking and complain openly about public smoking in France will not keep any of the French from smoking but will convey a sense of intolerance. Or, within the classroom, if there is a pervasive pattern of students coming late, the instructor's shouting at the students to be on time will not change the culture but can alienate students. Of course, instructors should talk with their classes about matters of tardiness, but if they are working against deeply engrained cultural habits, it is unlikely to have much effect. Teachers are in the position to modify

the subject matter and pedagogy, but not deeply held practices or views of behavior. Continuing to fight unwinnable battles will leave everyone angry and frustrated.

An important battle that teachers in Asia often face is with the students talking in class. This phenomenon can also be observed at movie theatres, conferences, and other public events. In many cases, students do talk because it has become a pattern in class, whether or not they are vitally interested in the lecture. Having sat in these audiences, I have, however, observed that students in the cross-cultural classroom often have difficulty in understanding all the terms or concepts and try to ask their friends for clarification before the lecturer moves too far along. This can create a noisy buzz in the classroom that is very unnerving for presenters and can seem rude. For the most part, students do not see it as rude, and it continues whether the speaker is high profile and interesting or not. Having enough handouts with the keywords should eliminate some of the need for buzz, but the teacher will have to develop his/her own technique to keep the students quiet.

Key to keeping students interested is having an interesting style, but, even more importantly, keeping abreast of new developments in the field and so having something to say. That requirement is equally important for basic knowledge and classroom pedagogy. Only with the required knowledge can teachers be sufficiently confident of their material to cultivate appropriate means of presentation. Although it is not my purpose to dwell on basic knowledge and academic credentials here, a "wing and a prayer" style is clearly bad pedagogy and inadequate preparation for the classroom. Because internationalized parents and students often value excellent education highly and because international teachers and students are exposed in a kind of fish-bowl, cross-cultural teachers need to be even better prepared than when in their own country and very careful in thinking through potential difficulties in understanding the material.

When going abroad, it is crucial for teachers to study the culture carefully in order to find their right place within it. When teachers and students go abroad, there will be a period of adjustment to the new social conditions outside the classroom as well as the expectations of the classroom. Various people, particularly those in intercultural communications and intercultural psychology, have talked about the culture shock that teachers and students can expect (Gabrenya 1998, 57), and some people approach new cultures neutrally, but others have strong and immediate reactions — either loving or hating them. Even those who immediately love the culture will usually experience some disillusionment

after about six weeks and then gradually move to an acceptance of the positive aspects and difficulties.

This process of adaptation also applies to the classroom itself. Gao and Gudykunst find that the main difficulties in foreign students' adaptation center on the degree of cultural distance from their home cultures, insufficient knowledge of the new culture, and a poor social network. These characteristics are not limited to students, but other key factors for teachers include personal and professional expectations, age, status and change of status, previous cross-cultural experience, personality traits, social skills, living arrangements, and knowledge of the job itself.

One of the most important goals in the classroom is the understanding, accepting, and enhancing of the identity of the students and the culture in which the school or university is located — whether personal, regional, national, or ethnic. John Stephens asserts that an important value of American studies programs in the USA is "to gain self-knowledge, to understand ourselves" (1996, 6), and I would add that one reason to teach and study in the cross-cultural classroom is to accept our own identities and those of others. This is a fundamental starting point and goal for education. In major American centers of immigration like New York City or Los Angeles, it is not unusual to have a dozen different nationalities in the same classroom, so individual and collective affiliated identities can be a complicated matter, and this can be doubly so in the foreign cross-cultural classroom. A consideration of student affiliated identity begins with the students' and/or teacher's national and ethnic background and the degree to which they are deculturated from their mother culture, and enculturated or absorbed into the host or receptor culture (Kim 2001, 53). An unresolved national debate continues in the USA about whether it is best for immigrants to *assimilate* into the "melting pot," surrendering their native identity and blending into the American social landscape, or whether it is best for them to *acculturate* and embrace the "salad bowl" or "quilt" ideal, retaining important features of their national and cultural background and becoming only as "American" as they wish (Hollinger 1995, 65; Sollers, 1986, 66–101). But the USA is by no means the only country where this is an issue.

It is always helpful for instructors who are teaching abroad to bear in mind the national and ethnic backgrounds of their students and routinely ask them to reflect on their own national background. This has the advantage of alerting the teacher to differences in attitudes and making issues more relevant and interesting for the students. Without including the local context in their teaching, teachers sometimes make false assumptions about what class material the students are absorbing because

they lack the ability to see international connections. Pamela George notes that many Fulbright professors going abroad find that only by comparing their course materials about the USA to local conditions can students understand it (1995, 75–77). International law, for instance, may only be comprehensible within the context of the students' understanding of their own national laws. International positions on the environment make better sense when compared to local views. International youth culture makes sense only when students reflect on the youth culture of their local environment. By reflecting on the global in relation to the local, students perceive cross-cultural values with regard to their own particular cultural practices and through that process become aware of their own values. This process should make both teachers and students alike more understanding and accepting of each other's positions, and it should also give them pride in their "home" culture.

In an international cross-cultural context, some of the students might not have a strong sense of their home culture but rather see themselves as "third culture kids" (Pollock and Van Reken 2001) or nationals of one country transplanted to another and, therefore, not completely of one culture or another, but sharing elements of both. Those who live outside what Julie Kidd and Linda Lankenau call their own "passport culture" inevitably discover that they cannot be wholly comfortable in either their adopted or home cultures (no date). Discovering that they are third-culture people complicates their lives but also liberates them to feel that they have a unique identity not completely congruent with any given culture. Third-culture students can be among the most enjoyable to teach because they can readily identify with various cultural contexts and positions and are quite adaptable.

This is abundantly clear in Hong Kong, which has seen a change in sovereignty in the last 10 years. In Hong Kong, citizens at large have often experienced a conflict about the primacy of the once-dominant British culture and the newly emerging dependency on the culture, politics, and economics of mainland China. There, students "see themselves as 'in between' in tangible ways," (Ford and Slethaug 1999, 152), reinforcing Ackbar Abbas's cautions that, in Hong Kong, national and personal identities "are not stable, they migrate, metastasize" (1997, 2). While being "in between" in immediately-post-handover 1997 Hong Kong bore the complications of the British, Chinese, and Hong Kong identity, a decade later Hong Kong people are no less conflicted, although mainly about Hong Kong and Chinese identities. As C. K. Lau of the *South China Morning Post* reported in 2005, "54.8 percent felt more Hongkongese than Chinese, while

31.9 percent more Chinese than Hongkongese. Another 11.2 percent said they regarded themselves as both Hongkongese and Chinese . . .” These figures all suggest multiple affiliated identities.

Blending Creative Opposites: The Best of All Possible Worlds?

This sense of multiple-consciousness, respect for diverse cultures and nations, and blend of creative opposites carried to leadership levels is reminiscent of what Larry Wang describes of Westerners who come to Hong Kong and China for work:

> It’s no secret that Greater China is flourishing. Its surging economy is creating tremendous, long-awaited chances for multinationals bold and smart enough to meet the demands of rapidly developing markets. . . . To grow and succeed, these multinationals are in dire need of qualified staff. They’re hungry for professionals with a foot in both the East and the West. They want people who possess the best of both worlds in terms of culture, language, education, and professional training, and who can effectively implement western corporate business strategies within local markets. (1998, ix)

Wang’s admiration for an innovative East and West mixture of “culture, language, education, and professional training” gets precisely at the cross-cultural classroom that sets out to marry the differing institutional, pedagogical, personal, and national identities. It is, of course, fitting that he sees this as the best strategy for multinational companies that are increasingly global and visible.

Many see an opportunity for Chinese Americans who come to China with the skills of the new world combined with their partial Chinese identity. As Jun Wang writes, returning Chinese “are discovering better career opportunities at home. ‘They are promoted much faster back in China,’ says Steve Orlins, chairman of the private, non-profit making National Committee on United States-China Relations” (2005). They are not imperilled by a glass ceiling. As Larry Wang (1998, 8) also notes:

> In many ways, Greater China is evolving into a mix of the best of two worlds, the East and the West, which reflects the exact make up and abilities that many Chinese Americans possess. Increasingly, business in the region encompasses a broad spectrum of scenarios, from the entirely Asian to the entirely western and everything in between. Chinese

> Americans are finding themselves among those capable of adapting to the range of situations that are encountered.
>
> The implication is clear. Bilingual and bicultural Chinese Americans are finding themselves with a distinct competitive advantage. It's not about having either Asian abilities or western professional training alone, but the combination of both that's at a premium.

The mixture of affiliated identities can work to the advantage of those who have been raised with multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, and cross-cultural perspectives and can easily be seen as a metaphor for the generative constructing and blending of different affiliated identities in the cross-cultural classroom. Embracing the formation of affiliated identities in the classroom can have long-term beneficial effects for companies requiring creative, resourceful and independent thinkers willing to solve problems, communicate well, and cooperate with others.

Teaching and learning in the cross-cultural classroom thus involve a process of "selves-discovery," for ideally they present everyone with multiple possibilities, and each can adapt differently. As Salman Rushdie remarked about his own adaptation to new cultures and nations and the literature that grew out of such border-crossings: "Our identity is at once plural and partial. Sometimes we fall between two stools. But however ambiguous and shifting this ground may be, it is not an infertile territory for a writer to occupy. If literature is in part the business of finding new angles at which to enter reality, then once again our distance, our long geographical perspective, may provide us with such angles" (1992, 15). These angles of vision are the result of the processes of learning discussed in this book.

In concluding, it is important to note that, as with so many things, there can be problems. As Young Yun Kim comments, "all individual experiences of cross-cultural adaptation, long-term or short-term, are both problematic and growth producing . . . Cross-cultural adaptation is thus a double-edged process, one that is simultaneously enriching and troublesome. Despite, or rather because of, the difficulties crossing cultures entails, people do and must change some of their old ways so as to carry out their daily activities and achieve improved quality of life in the new environment" (2001, 21). This must also be the case with the identity of the cross-cultural classroom and those who inhabit it — there will be stresses and gains as well as losses, and it is the teacher's role to be perceptive enough to be aware of these disturbances and negotiate them.

One of my former students from Hong Kong recently reminded me of

the gains of the cross-cultural classroom. She remarked that other classes had not required students to "voice out" on a regular basis, whereas that was part of the American studies classroom. Finding her voice and being able to speak her mind was thus a profound discovery made possible by the cross-cultural classroom. Indeed, the verb "voice out" describes this particular phenomenon well for it clearly differs from just learning to speak up or speak out: voice out incorporates a notion of the affiliated identity discovered in this classroom. This experience resonates with others in Southeast Asia, as noted by a Thai mother who sent her children to an international school, "'we didn't learn how to express our ideas,' she recalled of her days in Thailand's national school system. 'We learned from our teachers that we're not supposed to stand in front of the public and say anything'" (Gatsiounis 2006, 10). She wanted her children to be given the opportunity to voice out in an international school.

There can be real advantages to this environment, but it is important not to disregard the stresses and losses. The stresses and losses experienced in institutional and personal identities are often related to the process of acculturation and becoming comfortable with a new environment and habit of being, and also to deculturation as well. Transforming oneself psychologically and socially and acquiring new affiliated identities requires giving up or unlearning something that previously had value. This can be difficult. A few decades ago, for example, the American government did not allow Americans moving to Canada to take out Canadian citizenship unless they gave up their US citizenship, whereas the British could hold dual nationalities in Canada. The British usually felt little loss in taking out that new Canadian passport and identity, but as Americans sometimes did, the rate of taking out Canadian citizenship was much lower for Americans. Fear of deculturation and cultural loss thus can be daunting. By contrast, highly qualified Asian Indians have come to the USA in ever-increasing numbers since the Indian and US governments have allowed them to hold dual citizenship.

Even when deculturation is successful in the short term, it may still be disconcerting over the long run. Communications experts often talk about stress that can accompany deculturation and transformation to identity. In that vein of thought, some of the short-term advantages of the cross-cultural classroom might be disadvantageous in the long-term. One of the students exposed to American-style teaching in Hong Kong may serve as an example here. "Shari" was taught in the Chinese way in her public school education and was not encouraged to speak in the classroom unless specifically asked. After taking courses with American instructors who

favored class reports, discussions, and on-going assessment, she overcame her reticence and became comfortable speaking to her fellow students and teachers in the classroom. After graduation, she worried about this new identity because she found that her habits had been so modified that she did not exactly fit into the Asian patriarchal family and workplace. The hierarchical workplace required certain forms of submission to authority, and what initially had been liberating began to seem a liability because she could not be entirely happy in that particular constrained environment. On the whole, she still thought of her new-found abilities as positive, but there is a lesson here: education moulds and shapes, but, if values in the classroom differ substantially from those in society at large, students and their parents may come to believe that they have not been well served. In one such case, a Thai mother was happy that her son learned to think for himself in an international school, but less pleased that "he doesn't listen to us as much as he should" and that he is less "humble" than he should be (Gatsiounis 2006, 11). Teachers need to be aware of what they want to accomplish, what they have accomplished, and the cultural ambiguity they have created for all of this impacts on the students' sense of their cultural identity.

In conclusion, then, the cross-cultural classroom concerns the things that make teachers and students human and humane and that mark personal, social, and national affiliated identities in particular ways, whether in the cultures of East or West. These include: the creation of a classroom that can develop a lifelong interest in learning and important skill sets; the ability to construct dreams and try to achieve them; the desirability of transcending the restrictions of a single culture and mode of education; the ability to relate and work with others, regardless of ideology, race, ethnicity, class, family, gender, religion, and age; and the power to change, assess, adapt, and create.

Index