

Lessons from China: Understanding what Chinese students want

Dr Phiona Stanley
UNSW Australia

phiona.stanley@unsw.edu.au

<p>Please cite as: Stanley, P. (2013). Lessons from China: Understanding what Chinese students want. <i>English Australia Journal</i> 28/2: 38-52.</p>

Abstract

Students from the People's Republic of China are the single largest cohort of international students in Australia, and although attempts have been made to understand their needs and desires *in situ*, few scholars have considered the recently reformed and highly political Chinese education system itself as a source of understanding. This article addresses that gap, considering, as it does, two important issues in Chinese education: the positioning and performance expectations of 'Western' English-language teachers and the differentiation between product and process approaches in education more generally but in language education in particular. These matter to English-language course providers in Australia and beyond, as students' expectations may be informed by previously constructed, and often reified, notions of Western teachers' 'authenticity'. In addition, an understanding of the Chinese 'product' approach to education may help teachers and academic managers understand and manage Chinese students' needs and wants. Concrete suggestions and advice are also offered to those working in the classrooms and staffrooms of Australian and other international education providers.

Introduction

International students are ubiquitous in higher, further and other sectors of education in Australia as well as in other 'destination' countries, and the single largest source country of international students in Australia is China (Australian Education International, 2012). Many attempts have been made to study Chinese students' experiences of education in Australia but few scholars have discussed what is happening *in China*, and fewer still have considered what the implications of developments in Chinese education may be for international education providers in Australia and beyond. This paper addresses that gap.

This article is about *what Chinese students want*. This is obviously of enormous importance to international education providers hoping to engage with the Chinese market, but it is also vital for teachers working with Chinese students and trying to address their hopes and desires. Of course, these are not unitary; there is great heterogeneity among Chinese students. However, for a moment I suspend this kind of essentialist disbelief so as to discuss new educational research from English language teaching in China that I hope will provide

insights into how English Australia member institutions, among others, might adjust their practices, so as to engage better with Chinese students.

The research in question is that discussed in my recent book *A Critical Ethnography of 'Westerners' teaching English in China: Shanghaied in Shanghai* (Stanley, 2013). Building on four years of ethnographic research, an extensive literature review, and hundreds of hours of stakeholder interviews and observations in Chinese classrooms, the book presents a number of key findings about what Chinese students want, both in terms of education in and of itself but also education as a means to other ends. In this article, I draw out implications for teachers and directors of studies in English language teaching and international education *beyond* China. I ask: what can we learn from China to inform and improve what we do here?

The first discussion centres on the construct of 'Western' teachers in China against the notion of staged authenticity from tourism studies (MacCannell, 2008). The second section examines the distinction between process and product approaches in education and the resultant divide between *learning* as a primary motivation versus the market for *credentialling*. These discussions are then drawn together as a series of implications and concrete recommendations for education providers in Australia and elsewhere.

Staged authenticity: 'Shanghaied in Shanghai'

As a verb, to 'shanghai' means to trick or force someone to do something against their will. The term originates around the time of the California gold rush when huge numbers of sailors were required to crew clipper ships, then the main transport for world trade. Recruiting workers to join the ships *to* California was unproblematic: like the ships, the gold rush attracted poor, marginal itinerant labourers. But it was much more difficult to find crews for ships *out of* California, to East Asian ports including Shanghai. And so began 'shanghaiing': tricking or forcing crew to sail west across the Pacific. Some awoke, hungover, at sea while others were knocked on the head and bundled out through the 'shanghai tunnels' under US west-coast cities. These experiences aside, being shanghaied was not all negative: some men benefitted from months of enforced sobriety and physical labour aboard the ships. However, the word retains the meaning that united them: they were forced into something they had not chosen and that worked in interests other than their own (Alborn, 1992; Tamony, 1966).

What does this have to do with Western English teachers in China? Like the 'sailors' who were not necessarily sailors, many such 'teachers' would not be considered teachers elsewhere. In many contexts in China, including universities but also language schools, Westerners can become 'teachers' through the simple expedient of buying a plane ticket: a degree of enthusiasm may be all that is required (Stanley, 2013, p. 26). However, this is not the sense in which they can be said to be similarly 'shanghaied': no-one forces them to go and teach in China, they can leave if they are not happy, and for many the prospects are much better there than their sometimes limited employment options in depressed Western economies. And yet they are nevertheless 'shanghaied in Shanghai': like the sailors, all are pushed into something they have not chosen and that works in

interests other than their own. This is because English teaching, by foreign teachers, in China may not be entirely what it seems.

In fact, the primary role of Western teachers does *not* seem to be mainly one of teaching English. Instead, a Chinese discourse of foreign 'Otherness' frames the 'authenticity' they are expected to perform. This binary Otherness discourse is examined by McDonald (2011), who writes:

A series of ... 'Great Walls of Discourse' has over the years been erected between 'the Chinese' ... and 'the Foreigners', who with the best will in the world will never succeed in bridging the awful gap of their inherent foreignness (p. 1).

The Chinese habit of dividing the world into two parts – commonly expressed as *guónèi* 'inside the country' and *guówài* 'outside the country' – is a persuasive one, and is supported by a whole discourse[.] (pp. 54-55) But this binary is more than an outline dividing 'Chineseness' from 'foreignness'. In China, the West is conceived as 'Other' and used as a foil against which to understand, and also to feel good about, the Chinese self (e.g. Conceison, 2004; Gorfinkel & Chubb, 2012; Li, 2008). This is partly simple nationalism and partly a tool with which the Chinese party-state gains legitimacy by appealing to putative unity, homogeneity, and patriotism. Running through it is the idea that individual Westerners are rather more 'fun' and less serious than the Chinese, that Westerners are bubbly and outgoing, more confident, more 'open'; gently entertaining. This creates an out-group (Chinese) notion of an imagined 'authenticity' that individual Westerners are supposed to portray.

This is similar to the 'authenticity' imagined and expected in some tourist contexts of 'primitive' people (Bruner, 2005). Tourists visiting Yagua villages in the Peruvian Amazon, for example, expect reassuringly brown people suitably attired in grass skirts, happily smiling for the camera and demonstrating blow-dart guns. And, for a price, many comply. However, tourists arriving early to such villages may witness the disconcerting sight of ostensibly 'authentic' primitives hastily changing out of t-shirts and tucking away any modern technologies. This is because the 'authenticity' performed for tourists is just that: a performance. As an out-group, the tourists imagine the authenticity of the group as unchanging and 'Other' and, as astute business people, the Yagua perform this 'authenticity' back to the tourists. Crang (1997, p. 148) describes this work, of playing expected roles, as 'the deep acting of emotional labour'. He analyses different types of tourism performances, including ever-smiling airline staff and compulsorily bubbly, chatty, and flirty bar staff in Mediterranean resorts, and concludes that 'these employees' selves become part of the product ... their personhood is commodified' (p. 153). However, it is more than just employees' *performances* that are commodified; their ascribed characteristics – ethnicity, gender, age, and looks, for example – are 'part of what is required from an employee' (p. 152).

In China, a discourse of Western Otherness operates similarly as an out-group notion of 'authenticity': a set of expectations that define what 'foreign teachers' are supposed to be like. And this is the sense in which Western teachers in China

are shanghaied: regardless of their 'real' selves, they are under pressure to live up to these expectations by being fun, bubbly, ever-smiling, and entertaining. This is how Western foreigners, particularly English teachers, may be imagined in China, and this is how foreign teachers are *marketed* to students, both in public and private sector contexts. While some more discerning students may be able to see through the 'fun foreigner' trope, and may demand, instead, useful language education, many students (as well as plenty of managers of foreign teachers) do not appear to problematize expected performances. Two students explain:

Foreigners are kind of very hot and very friendly ... hot is kind of, they're always laughing [and] even [though] they don't know you they will smile at you, you will feel, when you are with them, you won't feel cold. Your mind is always running.

(Xiaoli, Chinese university student, 2007)

I like foreign teacher to be fun, like actor, could told you about anything. ... I want to see he is very nice. Easy going, funny, can share the different ideas, don't have the distant ... humorous ... you feel flexible. ... He must be fun, yes, and vividly.

(Guo, Chinese university student, 2009)

As a result, guitar-playing, all-singing, all-dancing Westerners willing to perform the 'active' persona expected of them *as a category* find it easy to get and keep teaching jobs in China, whereas older, more subdued and insufficiently 'authentic' foreigners, even though perhaps better qualified as *teachers*, may struggle (Stanley, 2013, pp. 161-163). This is because one *de facto* purpose of hiring Western teachers of English is to represent and provide contact with 'the West' as imagined in China. As this may not match the teachers' own purposes, they are shanghaied into this role.

This results in a cycle of cause and effect: cheap, unskilled 'backpackers' are often hired as English teachers and many have little recourse but to entertain their students; this then reifies the imagined identity of 'fun foreigners'. Foreign teachers who attempt to teach 'seriously' subvert the social imaginary and may encounter student resistance and complaints for being insufficiently 'authentic'. As a result, much of the English language teaching by 'foreign teachers' in Chinese language schools, but also university oral English classes and elsewhere, comprises fun, aimless activities such as hangman, charades, and guessing games (Stanley, 2013, pp. 113-116). This is not to say that game-playing in language education is necessarily ineffective and that enjoyable activities cannot also be aims-driven, rather that game-playing *for its own sake*, or with the aim of padding out the lesson time and keeping the students entertained is perhaps not the most productive methodology (Stanley, 2013, p. 145).

Crucially, also, it may well result in disillusioned teachers, limited teacher 'development', and a reification of the cultural essentialism that 'foreigners are fun'. A Chinese university student and a British teacher explain some consequent issues:

The foreign teachers, they don't bring books to class and the students think the teacher ... doesn't have a lot of plans. They just pick a topic and

write on the board and say, 'this class we just talk a topic'. This is not a way Chinese teacher do a class, so this is not a good teacher. ... We think the foreign teacher is an idiot.

(Huang, Chinese university student, 2009)

[A friend] teaches little kids ... and he'll tell me about the lessons that he did ... and I thought 'oh, that sounds funny, I'll try that with my class'. And it was so childish, it was literally every time I showed them a card with the word in Chinese they had to throw a ball at the correct word in English. Childish, yeah? They loved it. And every lesson they just want to play stupid, pointless games like that. ... It makes me think less of the students. It also makes me think less of myself, because it makes me think 'what am I doing here?' ... But it passes the time and that's all I think about, is getting through those hours. What we're doing is pointless. ... It's a joke, English teaching is a joke.

(Karen, British teacher at a Chinese university, 2009)

As I have argued elsewhere, Huang's quote is borne of symbolic interactionism: a misreading of signs (Stanley, 2008). However, if a key purpose of language education is the development of intercultural competence, the stereotyping of cultural otherness and imaginings of cultural superiority are problematic. Karen's quote illustrates two further issues: her disillusionment with the TESOL profession and her own stereotyping and reduction of her students who 'loved' such 'childish', 'stupid' and 'pointless' activities. In addition, Karen's description of her lesson planning process and the resultant lesson content illustrate a further issue: the 'professional development' she experiences in this context is rather more limited than would be expected in a language school in Australia, for instance, and so she is reduced to borrowing kindergarten-type teaching tips from her friends as a way to 'pass the time' in class; this, she says, is her main teaching objective.

However, this problem is not only one of intercultural misunderstandings and a glut of backpacker 'teachers' who can do little else but entertain their students. Even qualified, experienced Western teachers are pressured to perform 'foreignness' in Chinese TESOL. This is particularly true in the rather more intangible 'oral English', a stand-alone course ubiquitous in university contexts whose purpose is to 'activate' the English already taught 'in theory' over many years of schooling. One of the students I interviewed for the *Shanghai* study provided a telling metaphor of how he understands this process: English is 'downloaded' for years before being 'installed' though oral English (Stanley, 2013, p. 105). This provides an important insight to another issue: the Chinese educational paradigm and its *product* approach to learning. This is discussed next.

Product versus process approaches in education

Like so much else in China, the scale of the education system is vast: tens of millions of students attend schools and universities and English is compulsory from grade three of school through to tertiary education, where students in all disciplines need to pass English exams in order to graduate. In addition, countless millions of adults and children are engaged in extra-curricular English

language learning at a bewildering array of language teaching operations (Bjorning-Gyde & Doogan, 2004; L. Cheng, 2008; Ding, 2007; Feng, 2011; Hu, 2002, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2008; Ryan, 2010; Yan, 2012). As a result, we might expect most Chinese people to be highly proficient users of English. But we would be wrong. While many people function proficiently in English as part of their daily lives and work, many more struggle with what is known, in China, as 'deaf and dumb English' (Tsui, 2007). This means knowledge *about* English gained through many years of studying English *in Chinese* but a much more limited capacity to actually use the language to make, and make sense of, meaning (Y. Jin & Yang, 2006; Yu & Suen, 2005).

Why does this occur? As I have written elsewhere (Stanley, 2008), a very specific understanding of the *nature of language* appears to underpin language teaching in China. Like the Chinese language, English is counted quantifiably in curriculum documents: while pupils in different years of schooling are expected to have mastered different quantities of Chinese characters, the university English curriculum includes a 156-page list of all the English words and phrases a graduating student is expected to 'know' (Chinese Ministry of Education, 2007). However, the document does not clarify *what* students might be expected to 'know' about these lexical items in terms of language *in use*. Instead, language is seen as a series of discrete items that can be measured and counted, and, implicit in this, is a view of 'knowing' a language as knowledge of its discrete parts. This is different from the view of language underpinning communicative language teaching, for instance, of language as holistic, interrelated discourse in context. This is exacerbated by assessment backwash: the *gaokao* (university entrance exam) and College English Test (CET4; the graduating English examination) are both heavily structural and focused primarily on discrete-item testing (L. Cheng, 2008; Gu & Liu, 2005; G. Jin, 2008; Lingjie Jin, Singh, & Li, 2005; Wang, 2004).

So although the English curriculum in secondary and tertiary Chinese education is ostensibly organized around skills development, examination backwash creates different pressures. This explains the 'reading' lessons I observed while researching *Shanghai'd in Shanghai*: Chinese teachers presented paragraph-length segments of longer texts through commercially available PowerPoint presentations. Each text was explained word-by-word, with hyperlinks leading from each lexical chunk to a slide showing Chinese and English definitions, example sentences, and in some cases other meanings of the word. Each paragraph took half an hour to 'read' in this way (Stanley, 2013, p. 105). This is quite different from macro-skills teaching which aims to develop reading sub-skills such as scanning and skimming and which aims at holistic comprehension and developing students' tolerance of ambiguities such as unknown but communicatively non-salient vocabulary. The treatment of listening skills is often similarly atomistic and micro-analytical. And so although 'skills' appear on Chinese timetables, the nature of what goes on in class may be very different.

As a result, while students may have a good explicit knowledge *about* grammar and can often translate the propositional meanings of many lexical items, there is often very little awareness of, for example, connotational meaning, register, context appropriateness, collocation, and dependent verb forms, and often very

little communicative competence in using memorized language items. Grammar may be seen as a right/wrong binary rather than a choice-based resource from which to make meaning, and primacy may be given to sentence-level 'correctness' (as valued in the *College English Test* and *gaokao*). In-class macro-skills development (that is, the teaching of listening, speaking, reading, and writing) may serve primarily as a vehicle for presenting lexical and grammatical items (Chen, 2008; L. Cheng, 2008; X. Cheng, 2002; China Daily, 2006, 25 May; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Hannum, An, & Cherng, 2011; Lixian Jin & Cortazzi, 2006; Wette & Barkhuizen, 2009; Yan, 2012; Yu & Suen, 2005).

A quantifiable understanding of the nature of language may be only part of the reason for this atomistic approach to language teaching, however. A product approach is also better suited to the explicit, transmission-style teaching that characterizes 'Confucian-heritage' cultures of learning (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). 'Correct', unambiguous answers, in turn, allow teachers to 'save face'. In addition, as mentioned above, China's education system is vast, and part of its social purpose is to sort and filter a huge population. This points to a logical need for a testing system that can quantify and compare students. A product-approach is also better suited to this need as discrete-item testing appears to be more objective and quantifiable than the testing of the holistic skills of language *use*.

These factors combine to produce an educational environment in which:

[L]earning involves mastering a body of knowledge ... Both teachers and learners are concerned with the end product of learning – that is, they expect that the learner will, at an appropriate time, be able to reproduce the knowledge. ... [D]eductive presentation tends to be favoured over inductive, and the teaching and use of learning strategies such as prediction and contextualisation are in general neglected. A further result is that, in language teaching, the use of the mother tongue tends to be stressed.

(Brick, 2004, pp. 149-150)

This is a *product approach* to learning, in which learning products are transmitted by teachers and acquired by learners. It can be contrasted with a *process approach* in which skills are developed. Wette and Barkhuizen (2009) found that tertiary teachers struggled to reconcile these objectives and Yan (2012), researching high school teachers' responses to recent curriculum reforms, found that despite teachers' enthusiasm about the communicative curriculum there was a serious implementation gap. So while there is a strong rhetoric of 'communicative' teaching in China, and while communicative teaching materials are in use, teachers still face significant challenges in implementing a process approach to teaching. These include students' resistance and implicit theories of language, teachers' own pedagogical preparation and apprenticeships of observation, and backwash from predominantly structural examinations. As a result, Chinese TESOL remains product oriented and may be conducted largely in Chinese (Gu & Liu, 2005; Hu, 2002, 2005b; Lingjie Jin et al., 2005; Yan, 2012).

Within this paradigm, oral English is something of an anomaly. A skills-development island in a sea of product-oriented teaching, oral English may appear intangible as its product —the development of speaking and listening

macro skills— may be difficult to perceive or quantify. This makes the task of oral English teachers all the more difficult, not least as oral English is often the exclusive preserve of minimally TESOL qualified foreign teachers and as many foreign teachers are hired to teach nothing but oral English.

This is a perfect storm: oral English may be perceived to be intangible and of limited utility in delivering concrete learning 'products' while foreign teachers may be expected to be nothing but entertainers anyway. These perceptions seem to mutually reinforce one another. A Canadian teacher explains the problem:

[The students] look at the book and see '*maybe you could* plus verb', and they think 'I know those words, that's not new, I already know that', and even though there's no possible way that person would ever use that in a conversation they'll dismiss it and go, 'boring', [and put their] head down on the desk. And then you ask them, like, 'what would you say: you just killed a friend and you don't know what to do with the body?' And they'll be like, 'uhhh, I say go to police'. ... So they're not using it at all. You've just taught it, you've just reviewed it ... and you know that person's just completely tuned out ... they don't get it, like, you're supposed to be practising it.

(Ryan, Canadian teacher at a Chinese university, 2009)

At issue here is the attempt to conduct process teaching within a product-dominated environment. In addition, Ryan's description of students putting their heads 'down on the desk' warrants further investigation, and I explore this next.

Quantifiable testing has ancient antecedents in China, beginning with the imperial civil service examination dating from the Song dynasty, in which state officials were selected, through merit-based examination, from among the ordinary populace (Elman, 2000; Yu & Suen, 2005). This role of education as social filtering explains the exam fever that occurs every June in China, as millions of school leavers compete for tertiary entrance. The examination —the sole determinant of access to institutions such as Tsinghua or Peking University— is the *gaokao*, the national entrance examination. The largest high-stakes examination in the world, about nine million people take the *gaokao* every year (Zhang, Zhao, & Lei, 2012). Of course, like the imperial examinations, the playing field is not entirely level: then, as now, those with access to better education and with enough household income to support tutors and a full-time student relieved of other responsibilities have a much better chance of success (Hannum et al., 2011). But it is, on the face of it, a merit-based system, and high school students in China are under enormous pressure to do well in the *gaokao* as their entire family's fate can depend on it (Hannum et al., 2011).

This contrasts with university life in China. The hard work having been done at high school, university is as much rite of passage and an opportunity to make all-important connections —*guanxi*— with classmates as it is an exercise in learning. This may explain the limited skills portfolio of some graduates, a common complaint among multinational firms seeking to hire in China (e.g. Farrell & Grant, 2005). This affects teaching:

If you talk to the students here, their response will be 'our classes are conducted in a very boring way, we're not really learning anything'. [In a

class I observed,] there were 80 students and I was the only person taking notes and listening to the teacher. Everyone else was reading newspapers, listening to MP3 [players], chatting on the phone. The teachers don't care.

(Leo, Chinese-Canadian teacher, 2007)

The Chinese [university] teachers do not care if students read magazines, discuss the weekend; they do it all the time. University is the time to relax, only the degree matters. It's just: 'which university?' 'Do you have *guanxi*?' 'Are you a [Communist] Party member?' It matters for promotion, for jobs.

(Xiaoli, university student, 2007)

The result of this situation is a higher education market in which learning may take second place to credentialling: the point is the degree rather than the graduate attributes gained as a result of acquiring it. Just as important for employment and social mobility is the perceived status of the institution and the quality of the connections garnered through it. This is a product approach to education on a larger scale, in which the degree itself is the point rather than the learning that it embodies.

Conclusions: Lessons from China

What can we, in English Australia, learn from this exploration of Chinese education and the role of foreign teachers there? There are a number of 'take away' messages, and I divide them into implications for teachers and directors of studies. In doing so, I acknowledge that some of what I have described above uniquely applies to Chinese education and students *within China*. The demographics of students *outside of China*, as well as their likely varied levels and types of interculturality and motivation, may mean that some of my findings from China do not apply elsewhere. However, while bearing in mind this likely diversity as well as the enormous heterogeneity of Chinese students more generally, it is true that all Chinese students who study overseas have been shaped by their previous study experiences, and that the majority of these, for most, will have been in China. And so an understanding of the educational situation in China is invaluable for educators in Australia and elsewhere who are trying to make sense of, and better support, Chinese students who study overseas.

For teachers, there are a number of points. Firstly, make sure your lesson aims are clear to your students. For inexperienced teachers, this suggests a supporting role for directors of studies: ensure that teachers are aware of their own lesson aims and ensure that these are made explicit. One way of achieving this might be to include a blocked-off corner of classroom whiteboards into which teachers write their aims for each lesson. These aims should be as specific and measurable as possible and should fit the overall objectives of the course. In addition, I would suggest that lesson aims not be exclusively focused on holistic skills development and that it is worth including more tangible, product-like learning outcomes. For instance, instead of a lesson that aims to 'develop oral fluency', teachers might aim to 'develop learners' oral fluency through a job interview role play' and, as a sub aim in the same lesson, 'to revise and provide controlled and freer practice of functional exponents for expressing opinions in a

formal context'. This is a methodological sleight of hand that allows for students to perceive a more product-like purpose to the lesson while justifying plenty of holistic skills development along the way.

The second implication for teachers goes beyond the level of single, stand-alone lessons: make students' macro skills development progress clear to them over time. This might include re-using listening and reading texts with new tasks to demonstrate how receptive skills have developed, and having students make YouTube videos, and wikis or blogs, to chart the development of productive skills (speaking and writing, respectively). For the technologically reluctant (or under-equipped) this may mean using students' own technology and the knowledge they bring. For example, students' own digital cameras might be used to create English-language short films or series of captioned photographs, either individually or in small groups, in or out of class. These need not be linguistically or technologically complex: there is a series of user-generated videos and narrated slide shows on YouTube, for instance, called 'my trip in a minute' about tourism destinations including parts of Australia. Students could generate similar projects that, over time, would allow them to perceive linguistic (as well as technological and creative) progress.

The third implication for teachers relates to the notion of imagined authenticity and the stereotypes about 'fun' Westerners. My suggestion here is that exactly this type of stereotype might, itself, be explored though incorporating the teaching of culture (with a small 'c') into language teaching. This would likely require teacher development, and Holliday, Hyde, and Kullman's (2004) book *Intercultural communication: An advanced resource book* would be an excellent starting place for teachers' guided intercultural explorations both in staffrooms and in classrooms. As well as the fact of developing students' (and teachers') intercultural competence for its own sake and the sake of improving communication skills, teaching 'culture' has the added advantage that it may appear to be more tangible, quantifiable, and product-like to Chinese students.

From a director of studies point of view, there are also three implications. The first relates to teacher support, as described above. The second implication relates to how students' complaints might be handled: if students are concerned about their own progress and/or the seeming intangibility of macro skills development, directors of studies may, following this article, be better able to address their concerns and to frame them in ways that make sense to Chinese students.

The third implication for directors of studies relates to teacher recruitment. My research among Western teachers in China was originally sparked, in part, by a throwaway remark by a Cambridge DELTA-trainer friend who said: 'those who have only taught in China are hell to get through the diploma'. This is because, as discussed, Westerners may be pressured to develop *as entertainers* rather than *as teachers*. While this does not imply that China-experienced Western teachers should be avoided altogether (there are plenty of perfectly good Western teachers working in China), such teacher job applications require careful scrutiny.

This article has examined some implications of recent TESOL research from China for English language providers and, indeed, other international education providers, in Australia and in other destination countries. My findings are that *what Chinese students want* may be rather different than has previously been assumed, and that their wants are borne of a complex mixture of constructions of 'the West' and a culture of learning that values product over process. Insights are offered into the nature and origins of these desires and solutions have been suggested at the level of classroom and staffroom.

References

- Alborn, D. M. (1992). Crimping and Shanghaing on the Columbia River. *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, 93(3), 262-291.
- Australian Education International. (2012). *Monthly Summary of International Student Enrolment Data – Australia – YTD October 2012* Retrieved 1 December 2012, from https://aei.gov.au/research/International-Student-Data/Documents/Monthly%20summaries%20of%20international%20student%20enrolment%20data%202012/10_October_2012_MonthlySummary.pdf
- Bjorning-Gyde, M., & Doogan, F. (2004, 24-28 May). *TEFL practice and reform in China: Learning, adapting, succeeding, creating*. Paper presented at the The 2nd International Conference of IATEFL China, Tonghua, China.
- Brick, J. (2004). *China: A handbook in intercultural communication*. Sydney: NCELTR.
- Bruner, E. (2005). *Culture on tour: Ethnographies of travel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chen, J. (2008). Education not delivering 'results'. *China Daily*. Retrieved from http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2008-03/25/content_6561947.htm
- Cheng, L. (2008). The key to success: English language testing in China. *Language Testing*, 25(1), 15-37.
- Cheng, X. (2002). Chinese EFL students' cultures of learning. In C. Lee & W. Littlewood (Eds.), *Culture, communication and language pedagogy* (pp. 103-116). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Baptist University Press.
- China Daily. (2006, 25 May). Tsinghua professor calls for abolition of CET, *China Daily*, p. 17.
- Chinese Ministry of Education. (2007). *College English curriculum requirements*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education and Research Press.
- Conceison, C. (2004). *Significant other: Staging the American in China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crang, P. (1997). Performing the tourist product. In C. Rojek & J. Urry (Eds.), *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory* (pp. 137-154). London: Routledge.
- Ding, Q. (2007). English summer, *China Daily*. Retrieved from http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bw/2007-07/09/content_5421591.htm

- Elman, B. A. (2000). *A cultural history of civil examinations in late imperial China*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Farrell, D., & Grant, A. (2005). McKinsey Global Institute: Addressing China's looming talent shortage. Retrieved from <http://www.mckinsey.com/mgi/publications/emergingglobalbormarket/>
- Feng, A. (Ed.). (2011). *English language education across greater China*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gorfinkel, L., & Chubb, A. (2012, 2-3 March 2012). *Foreigners performing the Chinese nation: Between cosmopolitanism and a superior Chinese culture*. Paper presented at the Television, Power and Ideology in Postsocialist China Conference, 2-3 March 2012, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Gu, W., & Liu, J. (2005). Test analysis of college students' communicative competence in English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2). Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_05_gw&lj.php
- Hannum, E., An, X., & Cherng, H. Y. S. (2011). Examinations and educational opportunity in China: Mobility and bottlenecks for the rural poor. *Oxford Review of Education*, 37(2), 267-305.
- Holliday, A., Hyde, M., & Kullman, J. (2004). *Intercultural communication: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 93-105.
- Hu, G. (2005a). Contextual influences on instructional practices: A Chinese case for an ecological approach to ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(4), 635-660.
- Hu, G. (2005b). English language education in China: Policies, progress, and problems. *Language Policy*, 4, 5-24.
- Hu, G. (2005c). Professional development of secondary EFL teachers: Lessons from China. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=11816>
- Hu, G. (2008). The misleading academic discourse on Chinese-English bilingual education in China. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 195-231.
- Jin, G. (2008). Application of communicative approach in college English teaching. *Asian Social Science*, 4(4), 81-85.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2006). Changing practices in Chinese cultures of learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(1), 5-20.
- Jin, L., Singh, M., & Li, L. (2005, 27 Nov - 1 Dec). *Communicative language teaching in China: Misconceptions, applications and perceptions*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Parramatta, NSW.
- Jin, Y., & Yang, H. (2006). The English proficiency of college and university students in China: As reflected in the CET. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(1), 21-36.
- Li, H. (2008). Branding Chinese products: Between nationalism and transnationalism. *International Journal of Communication*, 2, 1125-1163.
- MacCannell, D. (2008). Why it never really was about authenticity. *Society*, 45(4), 334-337.

- McDonald, E. (2011). *Learning Chinese, turning Chinese: Challenges to becoming sinophone in a globalised world*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Ryan, J. (Ed.). (2010). *China's Higher Education Reform and Internationalisation*. London: Routledge.
- Stanley, P. (2008). 'The foreign teacher is an idiot': Symbolic interactionism, and assumptions about language and language teaching in China. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 4(1), 67-89.
- Stanley, P. (2013). *A critical ethnography of 'Westerners' teaching English in China: Shanghaied in Shanghai*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Tamony, P. (1966). Western words: Shanghai. *Western Folklore*, 25(1), 41-45.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative enquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(4), 657-680.
- Wang, S. (2004). A need for reform of college English testing in China. *American, British and Canadian Studies*, 5. Retrieved from <http://abcjournal.ulbsibiu.ro/Shihua Wang.html>
- Wette, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2009). Teaching the book and educating the person: Challenges for university English language teachers in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 29(2), 195-212.
- Yan, C. (2012). 'We can only change in a small way': A study of secondary English teachers' implementation of curriculum reform in China. *Journal of Educational Change*. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/f1062689w6377142/>
- Yu, L., & Suen, H. K. (2005). Historical and contemporary exam-driven education fever in China. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy Vol.2 No.1 2005* 17-33, 2(1), 17-33.
- Zhang, G., Zhao, Y., & Lei, J. (2012). Between a rock and a hard place: Higher education reform and innovation in China. *On the Horizon*, 20(4), 263 - 273.