



A systematized review of research into/on Asia literacy in schools

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of a paper published in *Asia literacy in a global world an Australian perspective*:

Cairns, Rebecca and Halse, Christine 2018, A systematized review of research into/on Asia literacy in schools. In Soong, H. and Cominos, N. (ed), *Asia literacy in a global world an Australian perspective*, Springer, Singapore, pp.9-23.

The final authenticated version is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1068-3_2

This is the accepted manuscript.

©2018, Springer Science+Business Media Singapore

Reprinted with permission.

Downloaded from DRO:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30116483>

A systematized review of research into/on Asia literacy in schools

Christine Halse¹ and Rebecca Cairns²

1 Education University of Hong Kong, chalse@eduhk.hk, +852 29487481

2 Deakin University, Geelong, Australia, r.cairns@deakin.edu.au

Abstract

This chapter presents a systematized review of the research literature on Asia literacy in schools over the last 25 years. It finds that much had been written but only around 10 percent of publications meet basic inclusion criteria to be classified as empirical or theoretical research. Overwhelmingly the published research literature is written by scholars in Australia about Asia literacy in Australian schools and schooling. There are seven substantive areas in this research. The largest proportion of publications relate to Asia literacy policy; the areas of least research are curriculum, pedagogy and student learning. In broad terms, research on Asia literacy in schools is local rather than national, and descriptive rather than theoretical. There is an absence of systematic, multi-method, larger-scale studies with comparative or control groups, studies amenable to generalizable findings, or studies that examine Asia literacy in relation to key theories in education, curriculum, psychology or other sub-disciplines. Across all substantive areas there remains a lack of clarity as well as on-going debate about the meaning of Asia literacy as a project and field of study and research in school education.

Introduction

This chapter attends to a practical concern. It presents a systematized review (see Gannon et al., 2010) aimed at identifying the key areas of empirical and theoretical research on Asia literacy in schools over the last 25 years. Studies were identified based on inclusion criteria, reviewed and coded into substantive areas or categories of focus. A total of 795 publications related to Asia literacy in schools were identified but only 70 publications met the inclusion criteria. These fell into seven main areas: teacher and principal capacities, developing an Asia literate teaching profession, school curriculum, pedagogy, policy, and student learning. The bulk of the research publications analyzed and critiqued policies; the areas of least research were curriculum, pedagogy and student learning.

While there were exceptions, the published research generally focuses on the local or state rather than national contexts, and is predominately descriptive rather than concerned with theory testing or generation. Other distinguishing features of this research literature is a general absence of systematic, multi-method, larger-scale empirical studies, or studies using comparative or control groups, or analyses that are amenable to theory testing, validation or generalizable findings. There is also an absence of studies on the relationship between Asia literacy and key theories in curriculum, sociology of education, social psychology, and educational psychology; for example, in relation to theories of declarative and procedural knowledge, attitude and value formation, intercultural relations, student motivation, learning and assessment, pedagogy, student learning processes and outcomes. Consistent across all the literature is an ambiguity, and in some areas

an unresolved debate, about the meaning and purpose of Asia literacy as a project and area of academic study and research.

Methods

All major databases were reviewed, including Scopus, Sociological Abstracts, ERIC, Google Scholar and relevant websites, such as those of the Asia Education Foundation and the Asia Education Society. Consistent with our focus, the search was limited to schools and schooling and the key words used were *Asia literacy*, *Asia capabilities*, *Asia knowledge*, *studies of Asia education*, *Asia priority*, *Asia curriculum*, and *Asia education*.

The search identified 795 journal articles, chapters, and books on Asia literacy in schools. These were located in a range of disciplines, including but not limited to philosophy, sociology, and policy, as well as education history, school curriculum, pedagogy and school organization.

Following the principles for systematized reviews (see Gannon et al., 2010), sequential process was undertaken to examine the abstract and text of each publication against the inclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria were: i) empirical reports of research related to school education over the last 25 years, including program evaluations, schooling policy, and teacher education and professional learning; ii) theoretical studies of, for example, the history or policy of Asia literacy in schools; iii) peer-reviewed; and iv) available in the public domain either on-line or through a commercial publisher. The bibliographies of all articles that meet the inclusion criteria were also searched for further relevant studies and checked in turn as described above.

Material that did not meet the inclusion criteria included unpublished theses, conference papers, and short reports of teaching practice because of their limited peer-review processes and/or circulation, and publications on Asian languages education because this is a specialized and distinct curriculum and policy in its own right.

From this process, a final pool of 70 books, research monographs, chapters, and journal articles was identified. Descriptive data about each publication were entered into an Excel spreadsheet, and publications were then coded using constant comparison methods (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Seven distinct, substantive categories emerged from the analysis. These are discussed in turn below.

Analysis

The overwhelmingly majority of studies were conducted by scholars in Australia and based on theoretical or empirical analyses related to schools and schooling in Australia. There are a number of reasons for this pattern. The term and concept of Asia literacy originated in Australia. It was proposed in 1988 as a holistic label to describe contexts where people have an “understanding of Asian history, culture, geography and economies, are comfortable with Asians in the work environment and that knowledge of an Asian language is unexceptional” (FitzGerald 1997, p. 32). Further, since the 1970s, Australia’s geographical proximity to Asia has prompted policy makers to attend to the issue of Asia related curricula and policies in schools. Since this time, the character and extent of Asia related education in schools has been shaped by diverse definitions and understandings of Asia literacy

(see Halse, 2013a; Salter, 2013; Singh, 1996a, 1996b), historical changes in the logic for teaching about Asia in Australian Schools (Halse, 2015a), different levels of national and state support and funding (Henderson, 2007, 2008, 2015), and the different status given to languages and Studies of Asia and Asia literacy in state and national curriculum documents (Halse, 2015a, 2015c). Nevertheless, Australia's long history of Asia related school curriculum and policy puts it at the international forefront of Asia literacy schooling. By comparison, Canada and New Zealand focus on 'Asia knowledge' is a relatively recent phenomenon, and in the United States Asia literacy is subsumed within the broader, generalist field of 'global studies' (see Halse, 2015b).

Teacher and principal capacity

A key category of research concerns the Asia literacy capacities of teachers and principals because these populations are essential for implementing Asia literacy. The bulk of the research in this category comprise small-scale, school-level studies. For example, Ford (2010), a principal from regional NSW, shows that principals, particularly in regional areas, confront significant challenges in their schools, including "xenophobia, racism, resistance to change and allegiance to tradition" (p.43) but argues that their capacities for Asia literacy leadership can be stimulated by in-country experience and school visits in Asia, and by developing international relationships such as sister schools in Asia. Similarly, Trevaskis (2006) uses the life history of a single primary school teacher to illustrate how a teacher's pre-training experiences shape her/his identity, values, and ways of seeing the world. More recently, Salter's (2014b) case study of a regional secondary college in

Queensland showed how teachers struggle to view Asia through a critical lens, and are often constrained by a fear of “getting it wrong” (p. 206).

Such small-sample, case study designs can provide useful qualitative insights but they lack the empirical power for generalizable findings to advance knowledge and theory about teacher and principal Asia literacy capacities. This limitation and the significant gap in systematic, national research on teacher and principal capacity was noted in a national evaluation of the state of Studies and Languages of Asia in Australian schools (Erebus 2002). It was not until a decade later that this gap in knowledge was addressed, at least in part, by the publication of the *Asia Literacy and the Australian Teaching Workforce* (Halse et al., 2013; hereafter *Teaching Workforce Study*). This study was commissioned by the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), funded by the Commonwealth Department of Education, Employment and Workforce Relations, and managed by the Asia Education foundation (AEF). It was stimulated by a convergence of policy imperatives, most notably the development of the Australian Curriculum from 2011 to 2013, the Gillard Government’s White Paper on *Australia in the Asian Century* (Commonwealth of Australia, 2012) and the exclusion of Asia literacy from the national professional standards for teachers and principals.

The purpose of the study was to “inform future decision making for policy and practice” (Halse et al., 2013, p. 1) and thus it is an example of research *for* policy service (Blackmore and Lauder, 2011). The researchers developed a framework of teacher and principal capabilities based on a review of the literature and theory, advice from an Expert Group of eminent Asia literacy scholars, and focus groups with teachers. The resulting Teacher Asia Literacy Survey (TALS) and Principal Asia Literacy Survey (PALS)

surveys were administered on-line to 1300 teachers and 432 principals. Qualitative case studies of 12 teachers at different career stages were also conducted, and feedback on emergent findings solicited from a large group discussion with curriculum stakeholders at the AEF National Forum.

The study validated the surveys as robust, reliable tools, and identified six distinguishing characteristics of the Asia literate teacher:

- possesses expert knowledge of content, assessment strategies and pedagogy for teaching Asia related curriculum;
- demonstrates familiarity with a wide range of Asia related teaching resources;
- actively builds intercultural understanding;
- frequently, purposefully and seamlessly integrates Asia into the curriculum;
- uses ICT to connect their students with students in Asia; and
- leads Asia related learning within and beyond the school.

Four characteristics were identified as distinguishing the Asia literate principal:

- builds connections with local and international Asian communities;
- facilitates Asia related teaching and learning;
- demonstrates knowledge of the content and pedagogy required for high-quality teaching and learning about Asia; and
- provides inspirational leadership that supports staff to improve outcomes in the languages and studies of Asia.

The enablers for supporting Asia literacy in schools were similar for both teachers and principals with the most influential enabler being first-hand experience of Asia (Halse et al., 2013, p. 113), indicating the benefits of *both* specialist expertise and experience. Underlining this point, teachers of Asian languages had significantly higher levels of Asia literacy and confidence in teaching about Asia than their peers. In contrast to published critiques about the instrumentalism of Asia literacy schooling policy (see below), the study “found that the overwhelming majority of teachers and principals believe that the primary benefit of teaching and learning about Asia is to build students’ intercultural understanding to create ‘a more tolerant and successful Australia’” (Halse et al., 2013, p. 116).

Nevertheless, the study has several limitations. For example, a survey based on a different conceptual framework can produce different findings (cf Grainger and Christie, 2016); participants were largely, but not exclusively, recruited through AEF networks and therefore likely to already be committed to or engaged in Asia related teaching or leadership (Toe, 2015); and a key agenda for the study was to generate a theory of Asia related capabilities for teachers and principals, but this theory was not examined in relation to other theories, such as teachers’ and principals’ self-efficacy or self-concept in educational psychology, or teachers’ and principals’ attitudes and values regarding race relations.

The edited collection *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (Halse, 2015b) sought to address some of these limitations by extending the theoretical discussion of aspects of the *Teaching Workforce Study*. For example, Dyer (2015) elaborates on one of the case studies to examine the role of experiential personal and professional learning for developing a teacher’s

Asia literacy capacities and intercultural understanding. Drawing on empirical data, Cloonan (2015) examines the meaning and possibilities of Asia literacy as a cross-curricular area of study. She demonstrates that teaching about Asia is not central to most teachers' work and that most teachers do not feel confident teaching about Asia or Australia's engagement with Asia (p. 140). The reason, she proposes, is how Asia literacy is understood and can be operationalized as a cross-curricular area of study, particularly where schooling is organized according to discipline-based subjects. In contrast to these chapters, Kostogriz (2015) discusses the absence of philosophical debate in the Asia literacy literature and the problems resulting from this gap. He does this by illustrating the tensions between the "relational and situated nature of teaching" (p. 112), the increasing focus on managerialism, accountability and teacher standards in schools, and the ethics of tolerance and hospitality that is integral to the concept of Asia literacy.

Developing an Asia literate teaching profession

A key focus of the research related to developing an Asia literate teaching profession is the efficacy of in-country or study tour programs. The majority of publications in this area did not meet the inclusion criteria because they are predominately evaluations of programs, case study reports of policy in practice, or uncritical practitioner perspectives supported by the standard policy-based rationales for study tours to Asia.

Of the studies that *did* meet the inclusion criteria, a number were commissioned by the AEF as part of the evaluation of its own study tour programs. Halse's (1999) longitudinal, phenomenographic study, *Encountering cultures: the impact of study tours to Asia on Australian teachers and teaching*

practice, for example, used in-depth interviews with nine teachers in the AEF's Teacher In-country Fellowships to Asia (TIFCA) program. It found that teachers had multiple motives for participating in a study tour other than enriching their teaching practice, their learning was multidimensional, different from their expectations and challenged their preconceptions of Asia, and that there were substantial variations in the nature, depth and extent to which teachers implemented their learning when they returned to their classrooms/schools. Trevaskis' (2013) study with five teachers in South Australia of the personal and professional impact of participating in AEF study tours echoed these findings. The teachers reported positively on their study tour and its impact on their self-identity, confidence, motivation, cultural understanding, professional development and teaching philosophy. Post-tour implementation of teachers' learning, however, was constrained and Trevaskis argues this underlines the need for structured post-tour reflection and school and system support to maximize the investment in study tours (p. 232).

Other research on professional learning relates to professional learning (in-service) programs for practicing teachers. The majority of research in this area also relates to programs developed and funded by the AEF (Buchanan, 2002, 2006; McRae, 2001; Trevaskis, 2004). For example, Trevaskis (2004) analyzes the background data on 164 teachers participants in the delivery of the AEF's teacher professional learning program *Including Studies of Asia in Curriculum* in South Australia. He found that two thirds of teachers lacked any prior, formal Asia related study despite having visited or lived in Asia. This finding, Trevaskis proposes, added impetus to the introduction of a Graduate Certificate of Education (Studies of Asia) and the Master of Education (Studies of Asia) at his university.

A related focus in this category is Asia literacy education for pre-service teachers. There is only a small volume of research in this area (e.g. Buchanan, 2003; Grainger and Christie, 2016; Hill and Thomas, 1998, 2002). Much of the research comprises positive evaluations of the benefits of overseas teaching practicums in Asia for developing Asia literacy and is written by academics who had a leadership role in the practicum experience (e.g. Hill and Thomas, 2002; Orton, 1995). Research in this area, however, is being increasingly displaced by the expansion in Australian and overseas universities of global experience programs to develop undergraduate students' intercultural competence (see Chinnappan, McKenzie, and Fitzsimmons, 2013; Cruickshank and Westbrook, 2013; Santoro, 2014).

A key strength of the research on developing an Asia literate teaching profession has been the evaluation of professional learning programs for teachers and principals. However, the integrity and value of this category of research is constrained by the predominance of highly contextualized, small-sample studies, a tendency to impute findings from local, small-scale studies to all teachers and principals everywhere, the limited use of multiple methods or triangulation of data, the absence of studies with comparative or control groups, and the potential for conflicts of interest when researchers are researching programs that they developed or delivered, or when the research is contracted by the program funding body.

Curriculum for Schools

There is a small, dispersed body of research into curriculum theory and practice related to Asia literacy. This addresses specific subjects (e.g.

Henderson, 2004; Henderson, Allan, and Mallan, 2013; Henderson and Jetnikoff, 2013; Percival Wood, 2012) and the curriculum challenges of implementing the Asia cross-curriculum priority in the new Australian Curriculum (Cloonan, 2015; Peacock, Lingard and Sellar, 2015; Salter, 2014b; Salter and Maxwell, 2016; Weinmann, 2015).

A small body of research examines the theoretical issue involved in the *enactment* of Asia related curriculum in the national Australian curriculum. It includes studies of the tensions between the intended and symbolic curriculum versus the enacted and material curriculum (Peacock et al., 2015) and a critical policy analysis informed by critical race theory and interest convergence theory that shows how “constructed problems and faux solutions can have the effect of convincing teachers that racism, Asia illiteracy, parochialism and inequity are being addressed via curriculum initiatives” (Salter and Maxwell, 2016, p. 309).

Only two large-scale national studies of Asia literacy curricula have been conducted. The first is the *Review of Studies of Asia in Australian Schools* (Erebus, 2002) commissioned by the Australian government prior to the cessation of funding for the National Asian Languages and Studies of Asia Strategy (NALSAS). This study mapped the extent and focus of Asia related curriculum across all states and school sectors. It found that NALSAS funding has produced some “high quality curriculum materials” and “significantly enhanced” the position of Asia related curriculum schools. Nevertheless, “about one-quarter of schools do not teach about Asia at all, and at least the same number do so in only superficial ways” (p. vi). The second study mapped the Asia related content in English, History, Geography, Interna-

tional Studies and Art curricula across Australia in the final year of secondary school (Wilkinson and Milgate, 2009). Commissioned by the AEF, the study concludes that European content dominates curricula, and that all Asia related content has either an Australian or Western focus, or addresses only a limited number of Asian countries (Wilkinson and Milgate, 2009). The study provides a useful overview but also demonstrates the desirability of supporting claims about teachers' curriculum decision-making, such as "teachers are not likely to select material with which they themselves are unfamiliar or may have never studied" (Wilkinson and Milgate, 2009, p. iii), with triangulated data.

Pedagogy

In broad terms, research on Asia literacy pedagogies divides into two areas: 'teaching practices' and 'critical literacy'. Several studies in the former area cite 'best practice' as distinguished by interdisciplinarity, local and international connections, role play, innovative and connective use of Information Communication Technologies (ICT), activities exploring cultural identity, interculturality and popular culture, and project- or inquiry-based learning (e.g. Baumgart and Halse, 1999; Buchanan, 2005; Erebus, 2002; Halse et al., 2013). Few of these studies, however, assess the impact and effectiveness of these pedagogies on student learning outcomes. An exception is Reading et al. (2013) which builds on ICT research in Asian language classrooms (see Oakely, 2011) to examine the use of video conferencing for cultural exchange. The study was conducted as part of an evaluation of the Australian-Korea ConneXion (AKC) video conferencing program. Data comprised student pre- and post-experience surveys, video conferencing

quality coding, teacher interviews, and parent interviews. The analysis revealed that students had the confidence to speak but problems interacting effectively. The finding led researchers to develop detailed advice for teachers and clearer steps for lesson planning to increase the effectiveness of video-conferencing pedagogies for cultural exchange.

Other studies use critical literacy methods to demonstrate how particular pedagogies can engender unintended attitudes and values, and to propose alternate pedagogies for teaching Asia related content. Three studies demonstrate the diversity of research publications in this area. First, a critical discourse analysis was used to analyze data from an action research project (Garbutcheon-Singh, Elliott, and Chirgwin, 1998). The analysis elucidated Grade 5 students' fears and desires about Asia and Asian people, and demonstrate the importance for teachers to consistently develop students' critical literacy skills *and* to check their *own* tacit complicity in perpetuating Orientalist values. Second, Bullen and Lunt (2015) present a detailed critique of the language and imagery of the oft-used picture book in schools, *The Little Refugee* (Do, 2012). Their analysis highlights that stereotypes and problematic conceptions of Asia and people from Asia can be hidden in children's books, even those written by immigrants from Asia. Extending existing research on pedagogy, the authors offer alternate strategies for implementing a critical approach to teaching about Asia in schools. Finally, critical of the content, textbooks and transmission methods often used to teach about Asia, Koh (2015) demonstrates an alternate, 'deparochial' pedagogy whereby young people develop collaborative projects using DIY media production, convergence, and popular culture.

Nozaki (1996, 2007, 2009) is one of the few scholars in this category of research who draws on empirical data from within *and* beyond Australia. Building on Said's (1978) critique of Orientalism, Nozaki has contributed to the reconfiguration of a critical Asia literacy based on post-colonial and counterhegemonic approaches that connects to post-colonial education research on Othering more broadly. She has done this, for example, using discourse analysis of student writing samples (2007) and text books (2009) to study Japan and to examine constructions of Japan in American contexts.

Policy

The largest category of all publications (44 percent) is in the area of the history and development of Asia literacy policy (see Erebus, 2002; Halse, 2013a, 2015c; Henderson, 2003, 2007, 2008; 2015; Kamada, 1994; Muller, 1996; Pang, 2005; Salter, 2013, 2014a, 2015). Scholars structure their analyses by the historical foundations of Asia literacy education (e.g. Walker, 2010, 2013, 2015), chronologically (e.g. Halse, 2015a, 2015c), and by policy emphases (Henderson, 2003). Some common arguments occur across these analyses. First, that there has been a shift in the policy logic for the study of languages and studies of Asia from a philosophical and humanistic rationale to a utilitarian, economic rationale designed to serve the national interest (Halse, 2015a; Henderson, 2003; Salter, 2013; Singh, 1996a; 1996b) in response to the perceived economic competition as a result of the accelerated growth of the Asian economies in the 1980s and 1990s (Henderson, 2003, 2008; Pang, 2005). Second, that changes in Asia literacy schooling policy align with the changes in the purpose and political economy of schooling (Halse, 2015a), and the impact of globalization, federalism, teacher professional standards and impact of the knowledge economy on

twenty-first century learning (Henderson, 2015). Pulling together these policy threads, Henderson (2015) shows that Australia's policies for Asia literacy in schools is consistent with education policy changes in other Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries, including using the school curricula to increase students' Asia related knowledge to build workforce capabilities and national prosperity in the future.

The majority of the policy literature since the 1990s has drawn on post-colonial theory to examine the discursive, contested and problematic construction of Asia and Asia literacy policy. The consistent argument across this literature is that Australia's relations with Asia and the logic for Asia literacy in schools is underpinned by Orientalism and instrumental, economic self-interest (e.g. Hamston, 1996; Lo Bianco, 1996; Nozaki and Inokuchi 1996; Rizvi, 1993, 1996; Singh, 1995, 1996b; Singh and Miller, 1995; Williamson-Fien, 1994a, 1994b, 1996). The same perspective persists in more recent analyses and commentaries (e.g. D'Cruz and Steele, 2003; Halse, 2015c; Martin et al., 2015; Nozaki, 2007, 2009; Pan, 2013, 2015; Rizvi, 2013, 2015; Salter 2015, Takayama, 2016).

Students' attitudes, values and learning

There is a significant absence of research on students' Asia literacy and only one study, the *Australian Students' Knowledge and Understanding of Asia* (Griffin, Woods, Dulhunty, and Coates, 2002) met the inclusion criteria, although further detail about the findings were published in two subsequent journal articles (Griffin, Woods, and Dulhunty, 2004, 2006). This study is one of the few examples of systematic instrument development based on established procedures and theories. With a national sample of

more than 7000 students from Year 5 and Year 8, as well as 200 teachers, the study found that: knowledge levels were higher in secondary than primary school, girls expressed more positive attitudes about Asia related matters than boys, that positive attitudes to Asia were not as a result of exposure to Asia related curriculum, and that students' attitudes and knowledge were higher at schools where Asia literacy was a whole-school priority (Griffin et al., 2002). Consistent with other studies (Baumgart and Halse, 1999; Erebus, 2002; Halse et al., 2015), Griffin et al. (2002) concluded that resources, teacher commitment and school commitment made a difference to students' knowledge and attitudes.

Conclusion

This review identifies a large volume of publications on Asia literacy in schools but the majority of research did not meet the inclusion criteria as empirical or theoretical research. The excluded work included some commissioned studies (e.g. AEF, 2006; DETYA, 2001; Oakely, 2011; Owen, Ling, Andrew, and Ling, 2006; Sugghett, 2011), practitioner commentary such as the AEF's *What Works* series (see AEF, 2016), contributions to other publications (Hassim, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c; Kirby, 2004; Kirby and Suggett, 2012), and reports by education departments on specific programs (e.g. DEECD, 2012).

In broad terms, the review found that the overwhelming proportion of published research on Asia literacy in schools has been conducted by scholars in Australia in relation to policy and practices in Australia. Much of this research focuses *on* policy rather than *for* policy, and research *of* practice rather than *for* practice. Quantitatively, the largest volume of research is on

policy (44 percent) and the second largest area is professional learning (15 percent). The areas of least research are curriculum (12 percent), pedagogy (12 percent) and students' attitudes, values and learning (1%). In part, these patterns reflect the disciplinary expertise and research interests of the academic workforce. It also reflects that much Asia literacy research has emerged from local, commissioned program evaluations funded and/or managed by state and Commonwealth governments and by bodies such as the AEF. Potentially, such research is vulnerable to being local rather than state or national, small rather than larger scale, and constrained in its methods and analysis by restrictions and requirements imposed by the commissioning body. The consequence can be descriptive findings designed to show that the objectives of a program have been met and on-going funding is warranted, rather than the production of critical, analytical or generalizable findings. In contrast, critical researchers undertaking historical or policy analyses confront other challenges such as a vulnerability to privileging particular paradigms and theories, even in the absence of empirical evidence.

So where ought future researchers focus their energies? Our review highlights that substantive gaps lie in the areas of curriculum theorizing (rather than mapping), pedagogy, and students' attitudes, values, and learning. It highlights the need for multi-method, larger-scale, comparative and control studies that lend themselves to more generalizable findings and theory development, and for studies that examine the relationship between Asia literacy and key theories in curriculum, sociology, psychology and the learning sciences, such as theories of declarative and procedural knowledge, attitude and value formation, intercultural relations, pedagogy, and student motivation, learning and assessment.

A major challenge for the future, we propose, is the continuing ambiguity and often contested meaning of Asia literacy as a project and field of study and research. Critical theorists have highlighted the problems of defining Asia literacy (e.g. Rizvi, 2015; Singh, 1996a). Further, recent studies show that radically different findings can emerge, for example, when Asia literacy is defined according to modalities of practice (see Halse et al., 2015) compared with more rigid definitions such as “language proficiency achieved through formal tertiary study in an undergraduate degree equivalent to eight tertiary courses/subjects/units” (Grainger and Christie, 2016, p. 230). Greater agreement about the meaning of Asia literacy remains the definitive challenge for both education researchers and the implementation of Asia literacy in schools.

References

- AEF. (2006). *Views of Members of the Executive of the Australian Council of State School Organisations (ACSSO) and Australian Parents Council (APC) on Studies of Asia in Australian Schools*. Retrieved from: http://www.asiaeducation.edu.au/docs/default-source/Research-reports/viewsofmembers_file.pdf?sfvrsn=2
- AEF. (2016). What Works Series. Asia Education Foundation. Retrieved from: <http://www.asiaeducation.edu.au/research-and-policy/what-works-series>

- Australian Government. (2012). *Australia in the Asian Century White Paper*. Retrieved from Canberra: http://www.murdoch.edu.au/ALTC/Fellowship/_document/Resources/australia-in-the-asian-century-white-paper.pdf
- Baumgart, N., and Halse, C. (1999). *Asia Education Foundation: national evaluation of the second triennium*: Asia Education Foundation.
- Blackmore, J., and Lauder, H. (2011). Researching Policy. In C. Lewin and B. Somekh (Eds.), *Theory and Methods in Social Research* (pp.190-197). London: SAGE.
- Buchanan, J. (2002). The emergence of Asia: Development of studies of Asia in one Australian school. *Issues in International Research*, 12, 1-18.
- Buchanan, J. (2003). Are we there yet? Pre-service teachers' constructs of Asia and their preparedness to teach about Asia. *Education and Society*, 21(1), 53-57.
- Buchanan, J. (2005). Towards a future for the study of Asia in Australia. Asia on a shoestring? *Social Educator*, 5(1), 39-49.
- Buchanan, J. (2006). Itadakimasu: Who's getting the most out of Asia Education in Australia? *Pacific-Asian Education Journal*, 18(1), 7-21.
- Bullen, E., and Lunt, T. (2015). Asia and the autobiographical picture book. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia literate schooling in the Asian century* (pp.151-165). New York: Routledge.
- Chinnappan, M., McKenzie, B., and Fitzsimmons, P. (2013). Pre-service teachers' attitudes towards overseas professional experience: Implications for professional practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 38(12).

- Cloonan, A. (2015). The feasibility of implementing cross-curricular studies of Asia. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (pp.133-150). New York: Routledge.
- Commonwelath of Australia (2012). *Australia in the Asian Century White Paper*. Retrieved from Canberra:
http://www.murdoch.edu.au/ALTC-Fellowship/_document/Resources/australia-in-the-asian-century-white-paper.pdf
- Cruickshank, K., and Westbrook, R. (2013). Local and global conflicting perspectives? The place of overseas practicum in preservice teacher education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(1), 55-68.
- D'Cruz, J. V., and Steele, W. (2003). *Australia's ambivalence towards Asia: politics, neo/post-colonialism, and fact/fiction*. Clayton: Monash Asia Institute.
- DEECD. (2012). *Leading 21st Century Schools Victoria: Engage with Asia*. Retrieved from Melbourne:
<https://studiesofasia.wikispaces.com/L21CSV#Reports>
- DETYA. (2001). *Scan of Studies of Asia Activities in Pre-Service Primary and Secondary Teacher Education*. Retrieved from Canberra:
<http://www.asiaeducation.edu.au/docs/default-source/Research-reports/nalsaspreservice.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
- Do, A. (2011). *The Little Refugee*. St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.
- Dyer, J. (2015). Asia literacy as experiential learning. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (pp.90-102). New York: Routledge.
- Erebus. (2002). *Review of Studies of Asia in Australian Schools*. Retrieved from <http://www1.curriculum.edu.au/nalsas/pdf/reviews.pdf>

- FitzGerald, S. (1997). *Is Australia an Asian country? : Can Australia survive in an East Asian future?* St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.
- Ford, V. (2010). Internationalism of curriculum: Implications for principals wanting to introduce change in order to move their school towards Asia Literacy for all students. *Australian Educational Leader*, 32(3), 41.
- Ganann, R., D. Ciliska, and H. Thomas. (2010). Expediting Systematic Reviews: Methods and Implications of Rapid Reviews. *Implementation Science* 5: 56–65.
- Garbutcheon-Singh, M. J., Elliott, K., and Chirgwin, S. (1998). Crime ... raggy clothes ... factory workers ... and rice: 'they're all the same ... aren't they?: deconstructing media stereotypes of 'Asians'. *Education Australia*, (38) 10-13.
- Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Grainger, P., and Christie, M. (2016). Measuring pre-service teachers' Asia literacy and their preparedness to teach Asia. *Teaching Education*, 27(3), 229-247.
- ~~Gray, J. (1999). An episode in the development of educational research. In J. Rudduck and D. McIntyre (Eds), *Challenges for Educational Research*. London: Sage.~~
- Griffin, P., Woods, K., and Dulhunty, M. (2004). Australian students' knowledge and understanding of Asia: a national study. *Australian Journal of Education*, (3), 253-267.
- Griffin, P., Woods, K., and Dulhunty, M. (2006). Australian Students' Attitudes to Learning about Asia. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 5(1), 83-103.

- Griffin, P., Woods, K., Dulhunty, M., and Coates, H. (2002). *Australian Students' Knowledge and Understanding of Asia*. Retrieved from Canberra:
<http://www1.curriculum.edu.au/nalsas/pdf/knowledge.pdf>
- Halse, C. (1999). *Encountering cultures: the impact of study tours to Asia on Australian teachers and teaching practice*. Asia Education Foundation.
- Halse, C. (2010). A process of (un)becoming: Life history and teacher professional development. In A. M Bathmaker and P. Harnett (Eds.), *Exploring Learning, Identity and Power through Life History and Narrative Research*. (pp. 25-38). London: Routledge.
- Halse, C. (2013a). Asia Literacy and Schooling. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 33(3), 71-73.
- Halse, C. (2013b). Presidential Address: Culture and the future of education research *Australian Education Researcher*, 40(2), 130-153.
- Halse, C. (2015a). Asia literacy and the purposes of schooling in Australia. In C. Pan and D. Walker (Eds.), *Australia and China in the 21st Century: Challenges and Ideas in Cross-cultural Engagement* (pp. 270-288). Beijing: Chinese University Press.
- Halse, C. (2015b). *Asia literate schooling in the Asian century*. New York: Routledge.
- Halse, C. (2015c). What makes Asia literacy a 'wicked policy problem'? In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (pp. 13-28). New York: Routledge.
- Halse, C., Cloonan, A., Dyer, J., Kostogriz, A., Toe, D., and Weinmann, M. (2013). *Asia Literacy and the Australian Teaching Workforce*. Retrieved from <http://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default->

[source/default-document-library/asia_literacy_the_australian_teaching_workforce](#)

- Hamston, J. (1996). Studies of Asia in the Primary School. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 16(3), 59-63.
- Hassim, E. (2013a). Building intercultural understanding through the teaching of Asia perspectives: What Works. *Primary and Middle Years Educator*, 11(2), 16.
- Hassim, E. (2013b). *An 'intercultural understanding' view of the Asia priority : implications for the Australian curriculum*. East Melbourne: Victoria Centre for Strategic Education.
- Hassim, E. (2013c). Intercultural understanding through Asia perspectives in English. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years*, 21(3), 7-16.
- Henderson, D. (2003). Meeting the National Interest through Asia Literacy: An Overview of the Major Stages and Debates. *Asian Studies Review*, 27(1), 23-53.
- Henderson, D. (2004). Reconceptualising our cultural maps: Teaching for Cross-Cultural Understanding through the Studies of Asia. *The Social Educator*, 22(2), 5-11.
- Henderson, D. (2007). A Strategy Cut-short: The NALSAS Strategy for Asian languages in Australia *e-FLT Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 4(S-1), 4-22, 5-11.
- Henderson, D. (2008). Politics and Policy-Making for Asia Literacy: The Rudd Report and a National Strategy in Australian Education. *Asian Studies Review*, 32(2), 171-195.
- Henderson, D. (2015). Globalisation and the National Curriculum Reform in Australia: the push for Asia Literacy. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Second International Handbook on Globalisation, Education and Policy Research* (pp.633-647). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Henderson, D., Allan, C., and Mallan, K. (2013). Towards Asia literacy: the Australian curriculum and Asian-Australian children's literature. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 33(1), 42-51.
- Henderson, D., and Jetnikoff, A. (2013). Exploring Representations of Asian Identities in Films for the Australian Curriculum. *English in Australia*, 48(2) 33-44.
- Hill, B., and Thomas, N. (1998). Asian studies in Australian schools: the preparation of teacher education students. *Unicorn*, 24(1), 55-64.
- Hill, B., and Thomas, N. (2002). Preparing Australian Teachers to Teach Asian Studies: the importance of in-country experience. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(3), 291-298.
- Hoyle, E. (1982). The professionalization of teachers: A paradox. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 30(2), 161–171.
- Kamada, M. (1994). Asian studies in Australia: Approaches to Asia through education. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 48(1), 1-23.
- Kirby, K. (2004). *Internationalising the school curriculum: What is essential for Australia?* Jolimont: Incorporated Association of Registered Teachers of Victoria.
- Kirby, K., and Suggett, D. (2012). *Australia in the Asian century: implications for Australian schooling*. East Melbourne: Centre for Strategic Education.
- Koh, A. (2015). Deparochialising education and the Asian priority: a curriculum re(imagination). In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (pp.169-189). New York: Routledge.

- Kostogriz, A. (2015). Professional standards and ethics in teaching Asia literacy. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian century* (pp.104-116). New York: Routledge.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1996). Asia-literacy, Australian Studies and a Plural Nation: Articulating Perspective on Social Education of Young Australians. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 16(3), 55-58.
- Martin, F., Healy, C., Iwabuchi, K., Khoo, O., Maree, C., Yi, K., and Yue, A. (2015). Australia's "Asian Century": Time, Space and Public Culture. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 13(6).
- McRae, D. (2001). *Change is a journey, not a blueprint: teacher stories of change - the studies of Asia in Australian schools*. Melbourne: Asia Education Foundation.
- Muller, W. (1996). Asian studies in Australian school curriculum: and ongoing challenge. *Unicorn*, 22(4), 49-59.
- Nozaki, Y. (2007). Critical Asia literacy: Othering, orientalism, and other counter-hegemonic challenges. In J. Soler and R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Reading Across International Boundaries: History, Policy, and Politics International* (pp.155-169). Charlotte: Information Age Publications.
- Nozaki, Y. (2009). Critical teaching about Asia: Orientalism, postcolonial perspectives and cross-cultural education. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 30(2), 141-155.
- Nozaki, Y., and Inokuchi, H. (1996). On Critical Asian Literacy. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 16(3), 72-76.
- Oakely, C. (2011). *The Impact of Web 2.0 Technologies in Asian LOTE Classrooms: National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program ICT Professional Development Project — 2010 Evaluation Report*. Melbourne: Asia Education Foundation.

- Orton, J. (1995). Becoming 'Asia-literate': From rhetoric to reality. *Asian Studies Review*, 19(2), 73-84.
- Owen, J., Ling, I., Andrew, P., and Ling, M. (2006). *The Future of Studies of Asia and Australia in Australian Schools: An Evaluative Investigation*. Retrieved from Canberra: http://www.asiaeducation.edu.au/verve/_resources/futurestudies_file.pdf
- Pan, C. (2013). Knowing Asia and re-imagining the Australian self. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 33(3), 77-79.
- Pan, C. (2015). Australia's self-identity and three modes of imagining Asia: a critical perspective on 'Asia literacy'. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (pp.197-210). New York: Routledge.
- Pang, D. (2005). Educating for Location? The Policy Context of "Becoming Asia-Literate" in Five Western Countries/Regions in the 1990s. *Comparative Education*, 41(2), 171-198.
- Peacock, D., Lingard, B., and Sellar, S. (2015). Texturing space-times in the Australian curriculum: Cross-curriculum priorities. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 45(4), 367-388.
- Percival Wood, S. (2012). Teaching History in the 'Asian Century'. In D. Walker and A. Sobocinska (Eds.), *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century* (pp. 322-344). Crawley: University of Western Australia Publishing.
- Reading, C., Auh, M.-S., Pegg, J., and Cybula, P. (2013). Exploring cultural horizons: Connecting Australian students with Asian students via video-conferencing. *Australian and International Journal of Rural Education*, 23(3), 32-45.

- Rizvi, F. (1993). Asia and the Search for an Australian Identity. *Social Alternatives*, 12(1), 23.
- Rizvi, F. (1996). Racism, reorientation and the cultural politics of Asia-Australia relations. In E. Vasta and S. Castles (Eds.), *The teeth are smiling : the persistence of racism in multicultural Australia* (pp.173-188). St. Leonards: Allen and Unwin.
- Rizvi, F. (2013). Asia literacy and beyond. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 33(3), 80 - 82.
- Rizvi, F. (2015). Learning Asia: in search of a new narrative. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (pp.56-69). New York: Routledge.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Random House.
- Salter, P. (2013). The Problem in Policy: Representations of Asia Literacy in Australian Education for the Asian Century. *Asian Studies Review*, 37(1), 3-23.
- Salter, P. (2014a). Knowing Asia: creative policy translation in an Australian school setting. *Journal of Education Policy*, 29(2), 145-164.
- Salter, P. (2014b). Teachers' Cultural Maps: Asia as a 'Tricky Sort of Subject Matter'. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(2), 204-227.
- Salter, P. (2015). A reconceptualisation of 'knowing Asia' in Australian education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36(6), 781-794.
- Salter, P., and Maxwell, J. (2016). The inherent vulnerability of the Australian Curriculum's cross-curriculum priorities. *Critical Studies in Education*, 57(3), 296-312.
- Santoro, N. (2014). 'If I'm going to teach about the world, I need to know the world': developing Australian pre-service teachers'

- intercultural competence through international trips. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 17(3), 429-444.
- Singh, M. G. (1995). Edward Said's critique of orientalism and Australia's 'Asia literacy' curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 27(6), 599-620.
- Singh, M. G. (1996a). Australia – Asia Relations in Education. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 16(3), 53-55.
- Singh, M. G. (1996b). Studying Asia for the National Economic Interest: an analysis of the Australian Government's strategy for schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 17(2), 153.
- Singh, M. G., and Miller, H. (1995). Mimicry as a tactic for engaging cultural policy: Australian studies of Asia. *Southern Review*, 28(3), 303-314.
- Stenhouse, L. (1980). The Study of Samples and the Study of Cases. *British Educational Research Journal*, 6(1), 1-6.
- Sugghett, D. (2011). *Australia-Asia Education Partnerships*. Retrieved from http://www.ptrconsulting.com.au/sites/default/files/Australia-Asia_Education_Partnerships.pdf
- Takayama, K. (2016). Deploying the post-colonial predicaments of re-searching on/with 'Asia' in education: a standpoint from a rich peripheral country. *Discourse*, 37(1), 70-88.
- Toe, D. (2015). Assessing Asian Literacy in Australian Teachers. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian century* (pp.73-88). New York: Routledge.
- Trevaskis, D. (2004). The Including Studies of Asia in Curriculum professional development program: Who's doing it and why? *International Education Journal*, 4(4), 114-128.

- Trevaskis, D. (2006). Going all the way: A life history account focusing on a teacher's engagement with studies of Asia. *International Education Journal*, 7(1), 1-16.
- Trevaskis, D. (2013). Asia In-Country Experience: Impact on Teachers. In S. Alagumalai, S. Burley, and J. P. Keeves (Eds.), *Excellence in scholarship: transcending transdisciplinarity in teacher education* (pp.215-234). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Walker, D. (2010). The 'flow of Asia' — vocabularies of engagement: a cultural history. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 45(1), 45-58.
- Walker, D. (2013). *Experiencing Turbulence*. New Dehli: Readworthy Publications.
- Walker, D. (2015). The time has come: histories of Asia literacy. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (pp.29-33). New York: Routledge.
- Weinmann, M. (2015). Asia engagement beyond boundaries: Towards a re-theorisation of Asia community and curriculum. In C. Halse (Ed.), *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century* (pp.182-196). New York: Routledge.
- Wilkinson, J., and Milgate, G. (2009). *Studies of Asia in Year 12*. Retrieved from Melbourne: http://asialink.unimelb.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/439658/studiesofasia_year12_ACER_report.pdf
- Williamson-Fien, J. (1994a). Facing the tiger: the problematics of Asian Studies Education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 15(1), 75 - 87.
- Williamson-Fien, J. (1994b). The study of Asian societies in schools: questioning the assumptions. *History Teacher*, 31(4), 12-19.

Williamson-Fien, J. (1996). Studies of Asia: 'Trafficking in Otherness' or
Articulating a "Geography of the Possible". *Curriculum
Perspectives*, 16(3), 67-71.