

“I Am Combined”: Chinese Teachers’ Cultural Identities and Pedagogical Learning

Johanna Ennser-Kananen
School of Education, Boston University, Boston, USA

Andie Fang Wang
Curriculum and Instruction, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

Abstract—In order to become effective instructors of cultural sensitivity, teachers need spaces to engage in cultural identity work while developing their teaching practice. This qualitative case study analyzed the integration of cultural identity work and pedagogical learning of bicultural teachers of Chinese during a two-week long professional development (PD) course in the US. Data consisted of classroom videos, observations, and student work and was theorized within an identity-as-pedagogy framework. Findings revealed a bidirectional and dynamic relationship between teachers’ cultural identity work and their pedagogical learning: Teachers did - although not consistently - appropriate pedagogical theories (e.g. on curriculum planning) by integrating them with their own cultural experiences and identities and vice versa. These appropriations were not always in line with the goals of the PD course but highlight a need to deliberately and systematically integrate teachers’ cultural identity work with their pedagogical learning.

Index Terms—identity as pedagogy, cultural identity, culture teaching, teachers of Chinese, professional development, language teacher identity

I. INTRODUCTION

It’s really, really hard for teachers to question themselves, like ‘Oh, I’ve been teaching in the wrong way’ - it’s just hard like ‘Am I wrong?’ But just question yourself. [...] This [*points at amoeba*] is like culture, always changing, along the time, changing [...] so at different time, I have different culture, I have different conflict, so you cannot really say ‘This is wrong’ or ‘That is right’, they’re just different, and so you have to keep questioning your teaching, yeah.

(Wenting, June 21, 2012)



Picture 1. Illustration of a “cultural amoeba” (Wenting, June 21, 2012)

With her teacher colleagues’ eyes following her closely, Wenting pointed at the poster before her, where a delicate amoeba was drawn in the center. This amoeba was her, she said, never static, always in motion, flowing between cultures but never settling for one. But the amoeba was more than that. It was what every language teacher should be, she added.

Just as Wenting’s metaphor of an amoeba represents her own identity as well as her model for all teachers, it reflects the important role identity work plays in the process of becoming a teacher. Similar to what Wenting expressed in her drawing, research with teachers has found strong connections between teachers’ identities and teacher learning (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Izadinia, 2013). Evidences showed that explicitly exploring teacher identity in teacher education sparked positive changes in cognitive knowledge, self-awareness, sense of agency, confidence, and relationships with students, parents, and colleagues (Izadinia, 2013). In a review of studies on language teacher identity, Martel and Wang (2015) recognized the power inherent in integrating a focus of identity in language teacher education. They called for an identity agenda in language teacher education that subscribes to “an identity approach” (p. 296) to curriculum design and teacher assessment, for example by engaging teachers in critical reflections on their identities (Miller, 2009).

In the area of culture teaching in language classes, Duff and Uchida (1997) highlighted that learning to teach culture means developing an identity as a culture teacher by critically looking at one’s own cultural and biographical roots. They suggested that “in examining such abstract constructs as culture and identity, collaborative inquiry and self-

reflection on the part of participant, including researchers and students, are very valuable” (p. 479). However, their call for such collaborative inquiry on culture teaching has been unanswered within the scholarship of teacher identity. As we will describe below, research has further revealed that language teachers’ cultural identities interacted with various aspects of their teaching (e.g. material selection, teaching approaches) in significant ways (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Fichtner & Chapman, 2011; Menard-Warwick, 2008). This important link between cultural identity and teaching practices points to the value of teachers doing cultural identity work within teacher education contexts.

Two implications of this prior work are that a) language teacher education needs to pay more attention to teachers’ cultural identities in order to be able to train and maintain effective practitioners and b) research is needed to better understand how teachers’ cultural identity work interacts with their pedagogical learning.

This article reports on a study from a professional development (PD) course for foreign language (FL) teachers of Chinese, where cultural identity was a central topic of the classroom discourse and language teachers negotiated and developed their cultural identities collaboratively. The article’s overall purpose is to show how language teachers’ cultural identity development takes place and could be supported in teacher education. It aims to dialogue with previous work on language teacher identities as outlined in the following section.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Although a number of studies from various contexts have described the development of language teachers’ identities (e.g., Kanno & Stuart, 2011; Kayi-Aydar, 2015; Pavlenko, 2003; Ruohotie-Lyhty, 2013; Simon-Maeda, 2004; Tsui, 2007; Xu, 2012; Xu 2013), most of this prior work has focused on the professional identity development of language teachers. The cultural dimension of language teacher identities has only appeared as a focus of investigation in a few empirical studies (Martel & Wang, 2015). We introduce these studies as they address a) teachers’ cultural identities and b) interconnections between cultural identities and teaching practices.

A. *Cultural Identities*

Studies following the first thread examined cultural identities through a variety of lenses. Fichtner and Chapman (2011), for example, investigated twelve German and Spanish language teachers’ affiliations with their home and target cultures and the way these affiliations shaped their practice. The majority of the teacher participants, both native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) of the target languages, claimed to have multiple cultural identities, yet identified with one of them more than with the others. Most of the teachers saw their national identities as primary and enacted these nationality-based identities relatively consistently. As the authors put it, even “meaningful engagements with experiences of other cultures may not necessarily lead to a profound restructuring of one’s own cultural identity” (p. 126). Whereas the teachers all recognized a place of cultural identity work in the classroom, they questioned their own legitimacy as an “authentic representation” of culture and expressed discomfort in being perceived as cultural experts of the target language. Many rejected performing or representing what they claimed to be their secondary identities, arguing that they embraced but did not embody their secondary cultures.

Whereas teachers drew a clear line between primary and secondary cultural identities in Fichtner and Chapman’s study, Menard-Warwick’s (2008) participants, two NNS English language teachers, described themselves within the frame of a hybrid identity of home and target cultures, with a blurred boundary between the two. Ruby, a Brazilian teacher of ESL in California, for instance, commented on herself being more American than Brazilian, while also identifying her communication style as Brazilian and prioritizing passing on Brazilian values to her daughters. Paloma, who was teaching EFL in Chile and had lived in the US for twenty years, felt that she belonged to both Chilean and American cultures and used metaphorical “umbilical cords” to describe her connections to both cultures. As the two teachers addressed cultural topics in the classroom, they further engaged in and modeled a process of constructing “intercultural identities”, which Menard-Warwick (2008) defined as “a negotiated investment in seeing the world through multiple cultural lenses” (p. 622).

The process of doing this complex cultural and social identity work was analyzed by Duff and Uchida (1997), who examined how four English as foreign language (EFL) teachers’ sociocultural identities interacted with their institutional and interpersonal environments in Japan. Viewing identities as “co-constructed, negotiated, and transformed on an ongoing basis by means of language” (p. 452), this ethnographic case study found that the teachers’ sociocultural identities developed along two dimensions: a biographical/professional one (e.g., past learning and teaching experiences) and a contextual one (e.g., the local classroom culture). Thus, on the one hand, the teachers’ sociocultural identities were heavily informed by their prior experiences; on the other hand, they continuously negotiated their identities in interaction with the local curriculum, the institutional expectations of them, and their teaching preferences.

As revealed by these studies, the cultural dimension of language teacher identity is often associated with teachers’ inter- or trans-cultural experiences, their understandings of what constitutes culture, and their positioning vis-à-vis multiple cultures. The teacher participants were in general bi- or multicultural and had significant cross-cultural experiences. Also, culture was frequently viewed as dynamic and complex and described as “split, hybrid, mixed” (Menard-Warwick, 2008, p. 635), “heavily textured” (Duff & Uchida, 1997, p. 476), and “subject to constant negotiation” (p. 460). Cultural identity was further conceptualized in relation to the constructs of affiliation, belonging,

and positioning. Fichtner and Chapman (2011) viewed “cultural affiliation” as constitutive of cultural identity and explored it as equivalent to cultural identity. In comparison, Menard-Warwick (2008) defined cultural identity as a “sense of belonging or not belonging to particular groups based on his or her history and participation in particular practices and systems of meaning” (p. 624). Likewise, Duff and Uchida (1997) linked cultural identity to constructs of positioning, belonging, and interculturality. Reflecting the difficulty of defining “culture”, terms such as “sociocultural identity”, “social identity”, and “cultural identity” refer to various aspects of cultural identity and the terms “role” and “identity” are used interchangeably.

In our study, we align our terms with the recently described distinction between “role” (shaped by external expectations) and “(role) identity” (shaped by internalized expectations). The distinction is crucial in understanding teacher identity construction processes because the constant negotiation between external and (selectively) internalized role expectations is often a space for teacher learning and source of teachers’ struggle (Martel, 2013). We understand cultural identity broadly to describe how our participants expressed cultural affiliation and belonging, but also include our participants’ cultural perspectives. We further acknowledge that as teacher educators, our role expectations for culture teaching were sometimes distinct from our participants’ (role) identities. Overall, there is still a need to explore what the concept of intercultural identity entails in different contexts, especially with regards to teacher learning.

B. Connections between Cultural Identity and Teaching Practice

Notably, the reviewed studies all provide evidence for connections between language teachers’ cultural identities and teaching practices, albeit at different levels. According to Menard-Warwick (2008), the two English language teachers’ transnational life experiences contributed to development of intercultural competence and a meta-awareness of the competence, which served as pedagogical resource in their teaching practice. Both teachers drew on their intercultural experiences as resources to address linguistic, ideological, and cultural issues in class. For example, Ruby referred to her long-term residence in the US to illustrate an intercultural attitude for her students and emphasized that one can be a life-long cultural learner in the target language. Through sharing transnational experiences and modeling intercultural identities, the two teachers were able to “open up identity options not previously imagined by their students” (p. 636).

Fichtner and Chapman (2011) explained that the relevance the teachers ascribed to their cultural identities in class developed on a continuum, subject to their “familiarity and level of comfort with the target culture(s)” (p. 131). For example, some teachers found it challenging to represent the target culture because of lacking practical experience to do so; others chose to teach only cultural topics or aspects they were acquainted with. This indicates that language teachers need and could be better prepared, mentally and practically, to teach culture.

Interestingly, the teachers in Fichtner & Chapman’s (2011) study were found to rely largely on their personal experiences and immediate context in teaching culture, rather than drawing on their teacher education experiences to inform their practice. This finding points to a need for an “open dialogue” (Fichtner & Chapman, 2011, p. 135) about cultural identity in teacher education that invites emergent and in-service teachers to articulate and reflect on their cultural history and positioning (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Fichtner & Chapman, 2011; Menard-Warwick, 2008). As Duff and Uchida (1997) put it,

If culture is such a dynamic negotiation site and not just a body of knowledge and, indeed, if all educational contexts are themselves cultural sites, just as all teaching/linguistic actions are also cultural actions, there is much in teachers’ everyday pedagogical (and other) routines and identities to be deconstructed and understood (p. 476).

Like Fichtner and Chapman (2011), we argue that such deconstruction and understanding needs to be given space within teacher education and PD programs. However, a review of literature found no study that explored connections between culture identity and practice in the professional development context. The lack of relevant research led us to believe that there is a gap in research that needs to be filled in.

This study, therefore, investigated teachers’ cultural identity discourse in a professional development setting, where such open talk around cultural identity was in place. Our work was guided by the following research questions:

How do teachers of Chinese use “cultural identity as pedagogy”?

- a. How did teachers in the PD course identify culturally?
- b. What characterized the relationship between the teachers’ cultural identities and the pedagogical content of the course?

To answer these questions, we used and adapted Brian Morgan’s “identity as pedagogy” framework as outlined below.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: IDENTITY AS PEDAGOGY

Theorizing his experience of teaching English to Chinese (mostly Cantonese) adult speakers in Toronto, Brian Morgan (2004) adopted concept of “image-text”, which Simon (1995) used to describe the particular identities students construct of their teachers that are shaped by the context of higher education (e.g. the difference in status between professors and students or the students’ desire to acquire knowledge) as well as by students’ interpretation of aspects of a teacher’s personal life (e.g. their religion). Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, and Johnson (2005) elaborate on the concept of image text as

composite portrait, based on interpretations of immediate and observable phenomena – teacher-student interactions, formalized instruction, evaluations, and so on – but shaped as well by indirect and often imperceptible factors – the attitudes a student might have toward a teacher based on the latter’s race or gender, or conversely, a teacher’s low expectations for a group of students based on the socioeconomic status of the neighborhood where the school is located. (Varghese et al., 2005, p. 32)

Such image-texts comprise multiple and sometimes contradictory voices, are in constant flux, and do not exist outside of their processes of being constructed. Because being confronted with image-texts promotes self-awareness, such confrontations open possibilities for compliance and resistance. Simon’s concept underlines the importance of teacher-student discourses as spaces of identity construction. As Varghese et al. (2005) put it, “[t]he interpersonal relations generated between teachers and students are not simply a *context* for language learning. At times, they are *texts* themselves, indivisible from the meanings produced through schooling” (p. 34).

Morgan’s study describes how he foregrounded various aspects of the image-text students constructed of him (e.g. his involvement in household chores and childcare) in order to shift the discourses around gender roles and race in his class. In other words, he used his identity as pedagogy. Similarly, in our research study, we describe how emerging and practicing teachers engage in identity work in a classroom. Through analyzing their discourse in a PD context that focuses on culture and language teaching, we examine how teachers use aspects of their bicultural and bilingual identities to inform their pedagogical learning.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Design and Context

This study is designed as qualitative, partially participant-observer case study with the case being the bounded unit of a two-week-long professional development (PD) course. As Yin (2009) argues, “the case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” (p. 4), which was crucial to our investigation of cultural identity work and pedagogical learning. We approached the “real-life event” of the PD classroom with the intention to describe how its participants created and developed their cultural identities and pedagogical learning. With these aims, the study is situated within an interpretive/inductive research paradigm. Further, as Andie Wang acted as an outside observer and Johanna Ennser-Kananen as participant observer (i.e., she was as course instructor as well as observer), the study brings together participant and outside observations of the case.

The need for this study was first communicated to us by the instructional team of a two-week-long summer institute, which was entitled *Culture as Core in the Second Language Classroom* and geared toward pre- and in-service teachers of Chinese. This team consisted of a university professor (Heidi), a PhD student (Xue), an experienced Chinese teacher (Yaolan), (all pseudonyms) and Johanna. The course was funded through the STARTALK initiative for less commonly taught languages. Some important objectives of the class as stated on the syllabus were to “[r]eflect upon own cultural understandings, experiences, beliefs, and boundaries”, “[a]nalyze, critique, and apply theories and research about culture and culture learning, and “[e]xamine curricular models for integrating language and culture”. The instructional team had taught the class twice before and found that past participants struggled to accept or process the paradigm shift the course content entailed. In particular, the following ideas seemed to challenge many participants:

- critical reflections on Chinese cultural practices and perspectives (especially regarding minority rights)
- definitions of culture beyond “high culture” or “big-C-culture” (arts, history, literature, etc.)
- definitions of culture beyond the “food-festivals-fashion” approach
- including multiple and diverse perspectives, for example from everyday cultures, pop cultures and youth cultures
- bringing together culture teaching and language proficiency in student-centered lesson planning

Key resources for the course included Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, a theory that describes the development of intercultural sensitivity in six stages from the most ethnocentric one, Denial, to the most ethnorelative one, Integration, as well as the Standards for foreign language learning (“5 Cs”) (NSFLEP, 1999)

Course requirements included writing reflections on readings and creating lesson plans. The most important summative assessment was a “culture quilt piece”, a creatively designed poster, which the participants worked on throughout the two weeks. On their quilt piece, they were asked to respond to the following questions: What is culture?, Who are you as culture being?, and Who are you as language/culture teacher? Although we did not have explicit goals for their identity development, we were hoping to stimulate discussion about complex and multiple identities in order to challenge cultural stereotypes and clichés.

The group of 25 participants was diverse in age and teaching experience. While some had been teaching for almost a decade, others were planning to start their careers in the following academic year. All except one white male self-identified as ethnically Chinese. As for the self-identified ethnically Chinese participants, they came from a wide range of regions in China and all spoke Mandarin Chinese. Although our participants likely knew or had been exposed to regional dialects of China, we adopted their own ethnic identification as Chinese for this study and did not explore intra-cultural differences unless they emerged in the data. All of them were working or preparing to work as teachers of Chinese in K-12 schools. They registered for this optional summer course in the hope of finding tools that would allow them to integrate meaningful culture content with target language instruction in their classrooms.

The instructors hoped to receive information from this study that would inform their teaching. Against this backdrop, we designed this case study with the goals to understand a) which cultural identities teachers enact in our PD classroom and b) how the teachers build (or do not build) connections between their learning and their cultural identity.

B. Data Collection

In order to obtain trustworthy data (Lincoln & Guba, 1986), we triangulated our data collection by drawing on four sources:

First, we video recorded every lesson of the course, often with two or three cameras to capture multiple perspectives. Course participants sometimes took the cameras to film their work and offered impromptu reflections on the course content. Some of our richest data came from final presentations of their culture quilt pieces.

Second, classroom observations were either conducted by one of the instructors or an outside observer (Andie Wang). Observation notes were taken and shared between the researchers.

Third, Heidi, Xue, and Johanna kept journals about their experiences in class and reflections on them.

Fourth, we collected readings, worksheets, and student work (reflections on readings, formative assessment quizzes, etc.) and took pictures of posters, notes, and writings on the board.

C. Data Analysis

After organizing and transcribing about a third of our classroom videos, we engaged in a process of open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) of all our data (video transcripts, observation notes, journals, classroom documents), during which we started to see recurring topics. In this process, we mainly relied on video transcripts and observation notes to identify themes and referred to the journals and student work for the sake of triangulation to confirm or amend potential themes). Based on them, we selected further data for transcriptions and applied codes more inductively. Finally, we merged the most dominant codes into three themes, which we called “critical cultural awareness”, “identity as pedagogy”, and “cultural identity”. We defined them and assigned them subcategories as shown in the table below:

TABLE 1.
DATA ANALYSIS - THEMES AND CODES

| theme | definition | subcategories/codes |
|---|--|---|
| critical cultural awareness or lack thereof | participants did (not) talk about culture in ways that align with the course goals, i.e. in a critical, non-stereotyping way | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (not) integrating products, practices and perspectives ● (not) complicating topics by addressing multiple perspectives ● (not) moving away from a big-C-culture approach to everyday or popular culture ● (not) reinforcing or deconstructing cultural stereotypes |
| identity as pedagogy | participants used aspects of their identity to illustrate pedagogical beliefs or concepts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● making connections between self and use of cultural products/materials ● making connections between self and authenticity ● making connections between self and pedagogical concepts ● making connections between personal experiences and teaching culture |
| cultural identities | participants talked about their cultural identity (development) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● addressing hybridity or flexibility of bicultural/multicultural life ● claiming being monocultural ● expressing feelings of belonging ● positioning as insider and/or outsider |

When interpreting our data, we shared and discussed our most important findings with an outside expert (Martha Bigelow) for intercoder reliability (Krippendorff, 2004), which helped strengthen or revise our interpretations.

V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Our analyses led us to the following findings:

A. There Was a Wide Range of Teachers’ Positionings vis-à-vis Multicultural Identities.

Our teacher participants’ enacted cultural identities were linked to their affiliations with or positioning vis-à-vis home and host cultures. In particular, our findings indicated a mixed picture of how they identified in terms of Chinese and US American cultures. One teacher participant, Meng, explained, “For me, 10 years here, I don’t consider myself as an American, but I don’t consider myself as a pure Chinese any more” (Meng’s presentation, June 29, 2012). Her dilemma was influenced by the way others, both Chinese and US Americans, perceived her culturally. She said, “The

way I talk and the way I dress, I don't think (Chinese) people will think I'm Chinese... they (US Americans) still think I'm a Chinese based on the way, how I look" (Meng's presentation, June 29, 2012). In contrast, some participants accepted two or more cultures as co-existing within themselves. Yet they insisted on one part of their identities, usually the Chinese one, being stable and inflexible, which echoed Fichtner and Chapman's (2011) finding that the teachers' nationality-based identities tended to be the dominant ones and remain stable. Liping, for example, represented her identity on her poster as two body halves in one human being. She commented, "Some things will never change and I will automatically defend them ... because I want to be a little safe" (Liping's presentation, June 29, 2012). This suggests that she considered changes of her identity as a potential threat and associated them with a feeling of being unsafe. Another common statement teachers made was the expression of pain when losing part of their cultural identities, even when they were "not ready to give up" (Min's presentation, June 29, 2012). Min, for example, regretted failing to retain Chinese values in parenting her daughter, who she described as being "Americanized" and who "rejects anything Chinese" (Min's presentation, June 29, 2012).

The diversity in teachers' positioning vis-à-vis multiple cultures reinforces that construction of cultural identities is ultimately an individual process that is heavily shaped by individual factors, such as time spent in the target culture and parenting responsibilities (Varghese et al., 2005). As Menard-Warwick (2008) put it, intercultural identity is "a negotiated investment in seeing the world through multiple cultural lenses" (p. 622). Following this definition, our teacher participants negotiated and constructed their cultural identities in this PD course, especially when cultural identities became a focus of discussion and aspects of identities were explicitly explored and examined. The importance of doing this cultural identity work was echoed by Yun in her statement, "every immigrant has a story" and her call to learn to listen to these vastly different stories (Yun's presentation, June 29, 2012).

Regarding the relationship between our participants' cultural identity work and their pedagogical learning, we found disconnects as well as misconnects, as we show in the following sections.

B. Disconnects and Misconnects between Pedagogical Learning and Cultural Identities

We found a pattern of disconnects and misconnects between course content and concepts and our participants' creation of cultural identities, in other words, instances in which participants either did not make a connection between their cultural identities and their pedagogical course concepts (disconnects), or the connections they made did not align with our goals for the class (misconnects). Disconnects and misconnects surfaced in four different ways:

Performance. We noticed that course participants frequently "performed" course concepts, especially during presentations. We use the word "perform" here to describe discourse that is disconnected from the main topic or purpose of communication and instead serves other purposes, such as identity and relationship building. According to Goffman (1959), performances are directed at an audience, which, in our case, consisted of the teachers' peers as well as the course instructors. Wenting, for instance, referred to a large number of pedagogical concepts and terms in her presentation: the 5 Cs of the Standards for Foreign Language Learning, Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), the triangle of culture learning (products, practices and perspectives), authenticity, and the idea of "complicating culture". However, her comments about the concepts remained very general and did not show evidence of deep understanding. In fact, her interpretation of the DMIS suggested that she had a positive image of "Denial", the most ethnocentric stage during which "people of other cultures, insofar as they are perceived at all, seem less human, lacking the 'real' feelings and thoughts of one's own kind" (Bennett, Bennett, & Allen, 2003, p. 23). Also other comments ("I just really liked this"; "Johanna presented this"; "is like that") did not explain why she used these terms on her poster and how she appropriated them for her work and thinking. Finally, when she talked about her teaching practice, she said,

I'm not sure I'm gonna change it because it's it has been great, but do you think the 5 years old kid will really tell you 'I don't know I want this [unintel.]'? No, they probably won't question, so how do you really stand out their perspective?. (Wenting's presentation, June 29, 2012)

As Wenting prefaced her reference to the triangle of culture learning (products, practices, and perspectives), her reflection contained uncertainty ("I'm not sure") about teaching culture perspective and confidence in her current way of teaching ("because it's it has been great"), which implied that she had not addressed the perspective aspect of culture learning in class. She expressed serious doubts about the possibility of teaching cultural perspectives to five-year-old children in her class ("No, they probably won't question"). What is important to know is that ways of addressing cultural perspectives, especially with younger students and students with lower proficiency levels, had been discussed and addressed in our course. However, Wenting still denied this possibility and showed reluctance to even attempt such teaching in her context. It might have been worth further probing why she did not consider teaching perspective to her students as a real possibility. In all, her mentioning of the triangle of culture learning did not necessarily show deep understanding of the concept or a willingness to connect it with her teaching practice. It is reasonable to conclude that Wenting's list of course concepts was disconnected from a larger string of discourse about making changes to one's pedagogy as a teacher.

Misinterpretation. The word that was most frequently misinterpreted was "authentic". This was surprising to us, considering that authenticity was emphasized throughout the program. However, the course participants had their own understandings of it as the following two examples show:

I like this question ‘Am I authentic?’ I say yes am I as Chinese. I am authentic as Chinese person because I live there for 30 years. I speak Chinese, I have a Chinese face, like this, and I love Chinese culture. I enjoy Chinese food. I eat Chinese food daily. I lived there for almost 30 years, and uhm I’m authentic as Chinese person. (Wu’s presentation, June 29, 2012)

When I started my teaching career, I just like a Chinese carp, very authentic, very authentic. Everything came from Chinese, pure Chinese. [...] My Mandarin Chinese pretty standard because China’s TV host, radio host, most of them from my hometown. So if you could take my Chinese everyone could understand your Chinese in China. Is so authentic. (Yang’s presentation, June 29, 2012)

These examples do not simply differ from our definition of authenticity, they are evidence of an understanding of authenticity that is in stark contrast to the goals of our class: Wu and Yang, among many others, used “authentic” to define “appropriate” and “real” Chinese culture, which seems to be associated with the prestige and power of dominant social groups. By evoking such traditional understandings of Chinese identity and culture, they implicitly, and probably without intention, reinforced an existing yet commonly unchallenged hierarchy within diverse Chinese-speaking communities, with traditional ways of being Chinese on the top and non-mainstream ways on the bottom. This is the opposite of our course goal of encouraging teachers to include minoritized and hybrid cultural identities in their Chinese instruction.

Misuse. A third type of disconnect between pedagogical learning and participants’ identities occurred when course participants understood the literal meaning of an idea or concept but used it in ways that we had not intended and thereby, again, created meaning that ran counter to the main ideas of our class. For example, one participant, Mei, argued that with minimization being the most common stage, it was legitimate for her to remain in it (“I’m fine.” - Mei’s presentation, June 29, 2012). She further explained she was “totally Chinese” when coming to the U.S. and that she wanted to “stay in Chinese culture” because it was her “root” and that she was interested in exploring other cultures only “a little bit”. In her presentation, Mei showed that she had a good understanding of the DMIS as she was able to apply the stages of the model to her narrated life experience. Interestingly, she did not use this knowledge to push herself to the next stage, but to find justification to remain in the status quo of her intercultural development. While her use of Bennett’s model and terminology showed understanding, it appeared to serve the purpose of justifying an absence of development. This exemplifies how course participants connected pedagogical learning with their own identities in unintended and potentially problematic ways.

No connection. A fourth and final disconnect between pedagogical learning and participants’ cultural identities was the absence of course ideas and concepts in situations that would have lent themselves to using them. One example is Yan’s narrative of the international festival that her daughter’s school puts on every year. She described how her daughter participated in the following narrative:

She made a big poster. I did not expect that. She wrote her Chinese name. She introduced her favorite food, noodle, and then she used calligraphy and also she wrote the zodiac animal. She wrote a lamb, that’s her, and for her dad, he is a lamb too. Yeah, I am very proud of her, but yeah, she is American. Only her face is Asian.

(Yan’s presentation, June 29, 2012)

Such moments made us instructors wonder why the concepts and ideas from our course did not transfer to participants’ stories like the above. Our very explicit critique of a traditional approach to cultural festivals as they are commonly put on in schools laid out how presentations of different cultures in these contexts tend to essentialize cultures and their representatives by focusing merely on idealistic and traditional ways of “the four Fs: food, festivals, famous people, and folklore”. Although the examples we gave in our critique were very close to Yan’s story, she described the school’s festival uncritically. This is even more surprising as her story follows her description of her daughter as “American with a Chinese face”, in which she emphasized her daughter’s orientation towards US American culture. A critical view on the school’s cultural activities based on the concepts from our class might have empowered Yan to distance herself from a restrictive and imposed view of Chinese and American identities and claim acknowledgment of her daughter’s multiple identities. Yan’s story is evidence for the absence of course concepts in participants’ identity narratives, and thus for the disconnect between their cultural identities and their pedagogical learning.

Overall, the disconnects and misconnects we described are evidence of a discrepancy between the expectations we had for our teacher participants and their selective internalization of them. Put differently, misconnects and disconnects originated in the gap between “roles” and “(role) identities” (Martel, 2013).

C. Teachers Made Two-way Connections between Cultural Identities and Pedagogical Learning

Apart from misconnects and disconnects, we found strong evidences for two-way connections between the teacher participants’ cultural identities and their pedagogical learning. On one hand, they drew on personal cultural experiences and their understandings of these experiences in learning to teach culture in this two-week PD course; on the other, their learning in this course shaped the way they interpreted their experiences, which constitute their cultural identities.

Using cultural identity to learn pedagogy. First, the teachers in our study used their personal experiences, often cross-cultural ones, and their understandings of these experiences to make sense of pedagogical content and concepts, similar to previous studies (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Menard-Warwick, 2008). Sometimes, this reference to personal experiences and understandings was prompted by the instructors; at other times, the teacher participants chose to

connect with their experiences and understandings while processing new concepts introduced in this PD course. One such reference occurred in a session when the teacher participants were asked to find examples of essential questions. This was part of a review from the previous day when essential questions were introduced as a tool for lesson planning (see Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Many teacher participants shared personal stories and from these stories generated questions that aligned with newly learned pedagogical content. We found teachers' integration of stories and essential questions powerful as they illustrated their sense-making of a pedagogical concept with stories that were deeply meaningful for them and critical to their identities and life course. One question, for instance, came from a teacher participant, Liping, as she reflected on religion. She said:

Should a person have a religion? Because my family, my background, my mother and my grandma, they, Buddha, they believe in Buddha. So now my husband's family, my husband, they believe [in] Christian. But I don't have any. [laughs] So I, sometimes I think I should [act] like my mother and my grandma believe in Buddha, or should I [act] like my husband, my husband's family? So I'm just don't know what to do. Or just nothing. (Liping's presentation, June 21, 2012)

In many cases like the one above, the reference to experience was cultural as well as personal. Liping's question on religion did not necessarily develop as a result of her cross-cultural experiences. Yet, her reference to Buddhism and Christianity can be seen as an act of cultural identity work. She was torn between religious choices and came up with a fundamental anthropological question: Should a person have a religion? Liping's personal experience of being part of a bi-religious family brought to the fore her attitude towards religion, which was rooted in her growing up in China and augmented by her marrying and living with her US American husband in the US. This positioning vis-à-vis religion, or a sense of belonging or not belonging to a group, constituted her cultural identity in this moment.

Another, perhaps more elaborate, example was offered by Feili, who had an essential question to ask: How big a dream one can have and how far one can go? The question was essentially evidenced, if not answered, by her own life before and after coming to the United States. She said,

In Chinese, we always teach us ... don't have too much dream, because you know that bring you up in the sky, you are floating, you don't have a root, that's all Chinese cultures teach me ... and that time we saw the commercial. I was in Hong Kong. ... And they have this commercial about the Toyota, the car. The picture is like there is the house, you know, the family, husband and wife, have two kids, and they were washing their car really happy, ..., that's the ideal life. You know, I thought, it's like I want that life. But that time in China I know it's impossible because in China we can only have one child. But ten years later, fifteen years later, you know, I met someone on the internet who was in the US, (laugh) who was in the United States. that's interesting, you know, how I, I am here, you know, I have my ideal life, we own Toyota. We both have Toyota and the house. We have two kids. You know, [interrupted by the audience's comments].... it's like this is the life I always wanted to be. ... I've always been dreaming." (Feili's presentation, June 29, 2012)

Feili's evolvment of the question describes her journey from a young girl dreaming about a middle-class American family life in a commercial she saw accidentally to a now wife, mother of two, and house/car owner in the United States. Based on her experience, Feili questioned the Chinese value of being grounded and not dreaming big. She then supported this questioning with her success story of having big dreams and making them come true.

These examples of developing essential questions out of cross-cultural experiences were evidence that the teacher participants were to some extent developing "critical cultural awareness through the juxtaposition of opposing values" (Menard-Warwick, 2008, p. 631). More importantly in this context, this awareness served their learning to teach culture by incorporating their personal understandings of the course content into the PD course.

Pedagogy shaping cultural identities. Second, pedagogical content and concepts also shaped our teacher participants' cultural identity building processes, which were largely reflected on the way participants used pedagogical concepts to frame their cultural experiences and identity work. One example is Fan, who used course concepts in telling her cross-cultural experiences and cultural identity in her presentation of her cultural quilt piece on the last day of the course:

Actually I used uhm big ideas and then essential question essential question to make this poster the last several days I have a lot of ideas a lot but not be organized so I used this to organize my thinking uhm the first one big idea is 'Who is Fan?' or 'Who am I?' that is my big idea. And then continue that is my essential question overarching is 'What is my culture being? American? Chinese?'. And then I have different essential question for about the topic and to answer to reflect myself 'Who is Fan?', like that. (Fan's presentation, June 29, 2012)

Here Fan connected her skills of developing essential questions with the cultural quilt project in which she was supposed to reflect on her cultural beings. In the following part, she elaborated on how this connection had helped her understand herself.

I need to jump out jump out from my own thinking. And then through the teaching about the reading and the teaching about the DMIS right? [...] Actually because I have ever been in a lot of country I always think I'm very open mind very you know and then you know I can accept adapt and integrate other culture but actually through this course I just understand actually, not at all. Actually I still Denial Defense and most of the time I still just stay here [points at Minimization] uhm Minimization. Yeah, so this help me to understand myself. (Fan's presentation, June 29, 2012)

Using the DMIS framework she had learned from the PD course, Fan readjusted her identity with reference to the DMIS' stages of intercultural competence. It is fair to say that learning about DMIS framework brought to her attention

those she was unaware of or had misconstrued. She was thus able to articulate changes from a seemingly simplified self-perception of being open-minded to a more critical understanding of herself and her intercultural competence. According to Fan, this critical self-understanding could be attained by opening her heart and not being afraid to ask this question of “who I am?”, as the quote below shows:

And the other [point] is complicate myself [...] that help me to understand myself more deeply you know like deeper anyway. And just don't be afraid to ask why because sometimes because I'm scared to ask this question because I'm scared I don't have answer for myself right now. So I just think It's OK I just open my heart maybe I can have this question I can reflect myself and then through everyday life daily life I can try to find an answer for myself one day. So if I use in my class, just don't be afraid to ask why. [...] We have this struggle because we wonder if we can give students an answer but that's a Chinese culture for teacher. First I think we need to have the correct answer for students but actually no. We just to have this question actually we can that's a very good chance we can have good interaction and then we can understand each other and then, yeah, so then is open-end, you know, open discussion. (Fan's presentation, June 29, 2012)

As Fan said, learning in the PD course opened up a space for her to “complicate herself”, where it was acceptable not to have an answer about her identity. Such a space was the “open dialogue” that Fichtner and Chapman (2011) suggested, inviting teachers to articulate and reflect on their cultural identities. Because this self-reflection was done in a group presentation, it was also “collaborative inquiry”, as Duff and Uchida's (1997) called it, on the teachers' part. As Fan's quotes showed, this space for collaborative inquiry and self-reflection contributed to her knowing that cultural identity is a dynamic concept and involves constant reflection on one's own. Overall, these episodes illustrated Fan's incorporation of course concepts into reflections on her identity and cultural sensitivity development.

Interestingly, this reflection also made Fan reconsider what she expects of teachers. Rather than having one correct answer ready, she now embraced the idea of having open discussion with students. This indicates a back-and-forth relationship between pedagogical learning and cultural identities. Whereas it was commonly found in literature that language teachers utilized their cultural experiences and understandings in teaching (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Menards-Warwick, 2008), such bi-directionality was not explicitly reported. Rather, previous studies focused on how teachers' cultural identities served language teaching rather than the other way around.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

As our findings show, the relationship between cultural identities and pedagogical learning is bidirectional. Thus, not only do cultural identities shape the process of becoming a teacher, pedagogical learning also interacts with how teachers identify and position themselves. This interaction seems to be more dynamic than the one-directional development from identity work to pedagogy that previous literature has suggested (Morgan, 2004). In other words, the classroom discourse in our PD course was characterized by constant shifts between identity work and pedagogical learning. Thus, rather than merely transferring identity-related topics into a PD classroom, we suggest cycling back and forth between identity and pedagogy foci to ensure a deep integration of both areas. Not only could such an integration strengthen both areas, it might also enhance the quality of teacher education programs and PD courses. As Martel (2013) has observed, the “washout effect”, i.e., the gradual deviation of first-year teachers from their teacher education program's contents after program completion, poses severe challenges to teacher education programs. Integrating pedagogical learning and cultural identities in a bidirectional/cyclical and dynamic way could help reduce this washout effect.

Further, our findings point to the importance of individual differences for both cultural identity building and pedagogical learning. The broad spectrum of stages of cultural development that our participants represented sparked many discussion or moved them along, but also challenged us as instructors with an ambitious agenda. Differentiating our instruction according to cultural development would have been critical, yet our differentiation was mostly based on language, teaching context, and teaching experience. What remains open is what theoretical basis could be used for such differentiation. Commonly, the DMIS (Bennett, 1993) has been promoted to categorize learners according to their development intercultural competence and design instruction based on their developmental stages (Bennett, Bennett, & Allen, 2003). However, this model cannot capture the complexities of our participants' cultural experiences and ever-changing nature of their identity construction processes. In contrast, PD courses for language educators that are created around cultural identity building could carve out space and time for participants to do this complex work and thus be more successful in the long run.

Based on these findings, we suggest that further research is needed that analyzes the classroom data within an identity-as-pedagogy framework. Such work could shed light on the intersection of teacher identities and student learning or teacher identity and student identities, both of which would fill a great dearth in the research about how teacher identities impact student learning and wellbeing.

REFERENCES

- [1] Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 29.2, 175-189.

- [2] Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (revised). In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the Intercultural Experience* (pp. 21–71). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
- [3] Bennett, J. M.; Bennett, M. J. & Allen, W. (2003). Developing intercultural competence in the language classroom. In D. L. Lange & R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 13-45.
- [4] Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31.3, 451–486.
- [5] Fichtner, F., & Chapman, K. (2011). The cultural identities of foreign language teachers. *L2 Journal*, 3.1, 116–140.
- [6] Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Carden City: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- [7] Izadinia, M. (2013). A review of research on student teachers' professional identity. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39.4, 694-713.
- [8] Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). Learning to become a second language teacher: Identities-in-practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(2), 236-252.
- [9] Kayi-Aydar, H. (2015). Multiple identities, negotiations, and agency across time and space: A narrative inquiry of a foreign language teacher candidate. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 12.2, 137-160.
- [10] Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage Publications Ltd. London.
- [11] Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. In D. Williams (Ed.), *Naturalistic evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 73-84.
- [12] Martel, J. (2013). Learning to teach a foreign language: A student teacher's role identity negotiation. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- [13] Martel, J. & Wang, A. (2015). Language Teacher Identity. In M. H. Bigelow & J. Ennsner-Kananen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of educational linguistics*. New York: Routledge, 289-300.
- [14] Menard-Warwick, J. (2008). The cultural and intercultural identities of transnational English teachers: Two case studies from the Americas. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42.4, 617–640.
- [15] Miller, J. (2009). Teacher identity. In *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 172-181.
- [16] Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-internal conceptualisation in bilingual and second language education. *Bilingual education and bilingualism*, 7.2&3, 172-188.
- [17] National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (NSFLEP). (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.
- [18] Pavlenko, A. (2003). "I never knew I was a bilingual": Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2.4, 251-268.
- [19] Ruohotie-Lyhty, M. (2013). Struggling for a professional identity: Two newly qualified language teachers' identity narratives during the first years at work. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, February, 120-129.
- [20] Simon, R. I. (1995). Face to face with alterity: Postmodern Jewish identity and the eros of pedagogy. In J. Gallop (Ed.), *Pedagogy: The question of impersonation*. Bloomington, IA: University of Indiana Press, 90-105.
- [21] Simon-Maeda, A. (2004). The complex construction of professional identities: Female EFL educators in Japan speak out. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38.3, 405-436.
- [22] Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- [23] Tsui, A. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41.4, 657-680.
- [24] Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity Education*, 4(1), 21-44.
- [25] Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by Design* (2nd ed). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- [26] Xu, H. (2012). Imagined community falling apart: A case study on the transformation of professional identities of novice ESOL teachers in China. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46.3, 568-578.
- [27] Xu, H. (2013). From the imagined to the practiced: A case study on novice EFL teachers' professional identity change in China. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 31, April, 79-86.
- [28] Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Johanna Ennsner-Kananen is a clinical assistant professor of language education at Boston University. Her research is situated in teacher education and language learning and focuses on issues of language and power. For example, her work seeks to answer questions such as: How do language learners become legitimate users of their linguistic resources? Ennsner-Kananen is the co-editor of the *Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics* and has published, among other places, in the *Modern Language Journal*, the *International Journal of Language Studies*, and the *Education and Language Research Journal*.

Andie Fang Wang is a Ph.D. candidate in Second Languages Education at the University of Minnesota and currently a visiting instructor at the Department of Asian Languages and Literature at Macalester College, St. Paul, MN. She has both experiences of teaching English as a Foreign Language in China and teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language in the U.S., at university levels. Her research interests include Chinese as a second language acquisition, culture teaching in Chinese language classrooms, and cross-cultural language teacher identity development.