



**Implementing the Project Approach:
A Case Study of Hybrid Pedagogy in a Hong Kong
Kindergarten**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Research in Childhood Education</i>
Manuscript ID	UJRC-2015-0055.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	young children, Project approach, teaching methods, teaching

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Implementing the Project Approach:

A Case Study of Hybrid Pedagogy in a Hong Kong Kindergarten

Abstract

The Project Approach has been promoted in Hong Kong kindergartens since the 1990s. However, the dynamic processes and underlying mechanisms involved in the teachers' implementation of this pedagogical method there have not yet been fully investigated. This case study of a typical kindergarten in Hong Kong documented *how* and *why* eight teachers implemented the Project Approach the way they did. Methodological triangulation was established through videotaped classroom observations, audiotaped interviews with the teachers and school principal, and analysis of documents (e.g., artifacts, reports). The study revealed that instead of uncritically *adopting* the Project Approach, the teachers responsively *adapted* it into hybrid pedagogy between Chinese pedagogy and contemporary early childhood pedagogy. Such paradigm shift reflected the teachers': (a) cultural hybridity in pedagogical beliefs; and (b) practical considerations of contextual realities (e.g., time limitation and curriculum demands, parental expectations, professional and emotional comfortability). The findings suggest that considering cultural incompatibilities, when implementing pedagogies cross-culturally, a sensible, viable, and potentially sustainable solution is not a radical, direct transformation from a traditional pedagogy to an imported one, but an alternative, hybrid pedagogy that infuses unique characteristics of the two.

Keywords: Chinese pedagogy; contemporary early childhood pedagogy; education policy; globalization; Hong Kong kindergarten; localization; teaching; teaching methods; the Project Approach.

Introduction

The Project Approach was developed in the 1910s, as an integral part of the Progressive Education Movement (notably John Dewey's work advocating the idea of "learning by doing") that peaked in the 20th century in the United States (Kilpatrick, 1918). Falling under the umbrella of project-based learning, the Project Approach is a specific pedagogical strategy that enables the teacher to guide the children's learning and development through a project, which is defined as an in-depth study of a worthwhile concrete, real-life topic of their interest (Helm & Katz, 2010). According to Helm and Katz (2010), a project is structured in three phases: During Phase I ("Beginning the Project"), the children and their teacher identify, discuss, and select a feasible, investigable topic initiated by the teacher or emerged from child interest, and then the children (with or without the teacher's assistance) formulate a set of questions for investigation; During Phase II ("Developing the Project"), the children conduct the actual investigation including engaging in fieldwork, seeking answers to original questions, developing new questions, collecting relevant data and artifacts, and constructing representations of their learning (e.g., drawing, writing, building a model); Finally, during Phase III ("Concluding the Project"), the children conclude the project with a debriefing and culminating event or activities to showcase their products, during which they present what they have learned among themselves and with invited visitors.

The Project Approach is characterized as constructivist, child-centered, inquiry-driven, process-oriented, and small- or whole-group based, all of which capitalize on the children's innate intellectual dispositions, including their natural propensity to be curious about their surroundings and make sense of their experience (Helm & Katz, 2010; Katz & Chard, 2000). This pedagogical approach yields numerous educational benefits, including advancing children's

1
2
3 critical thinking skills, and enhancing their literacy, numeracy, and communication skills (Clark,
4
5 2006; Helm & Katz, 2010). Yet, the implementation of such approach poses significant
6
7 challenges to even teachers in the United States where it was originated. A major hurdle facing
8
9 many teachers, wishing to change their practices by adopting the Project Approach, lies in the
10
11 difficulty of shifting away from the traditional, transmission model of instruction (Clark, 2006).
12
13

14
15 Nonetheless, for its many benefits, the Project Approach has been enthusiastically
16
17 embraced by education reformers beyond the United States. For instance, since the 1990s,
18
19 Chinese societies, including Hong Kong, have been attempting to adopt the Project Approach
20
21 along with other Western-derived pedagogies, such as Montessori, Reggio Emilia, and
22
23 High/Scope. However, due to sociocultural incompatibilities between the Chinese and Western
24
25 contexts, the actual implementation of these pedagogical methods in Hong Kong kindergartens
26
27 has yielded little success (Cheng, 2006; Li, 2012). For example, in a survey study of the views
28
29 of teachers in 51 Hong Kong kindergartens about the implementation of project-based learning
30
31 coupled with videotaped classroom observations in 10 schools, Li (2012) found that the teachers
32
33 struggled to forsake familiar teaching styles in favor of a new pedagogical approach. While the
34
35 teachers welcomed pedagogical changes as they diligently planned and implemented projects,
36
37 they were unable to make the pedagogical shift toward child-centeredness, due to a lack of
38
39 training and a firm understanding about the processes of project implementation coupled with the
40
41 influence from deeply-held traditional beliefs about early education (Li, 2012). Yuen (2010) did
42
43 document a case of successful project execution in one Hong Kong kindergarten; however, she
44
45 was actually the consultant for the school on an improvement project that incorporated the
46
47 Project Approach to promote student learning. As such, this success case is not representative of
48
49 the general reality, as having a consultant is not a typical scenario in Hong Kong kindergartens.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

1
2
3
4 After one week of classroom observations in Hong Kong kindergartens, Lilian Katz
5
6 (personal communication with the second author, June 15, 2001) suggested that “the Project
7
8 Approach” as implemented there should be retitled, “the Hong Kong Style of the Project
9
10 Approach,” as it was best characterized as the Hong Kong rendition of what project work was
11
12 purported to be conducted (e.g., child-initiated, inquiry-based). Yet, the dynamic processes
13
14 involved in and the mechanisms underlying Hong Kong kindergarten teachers’ transformation of
15
16 the Project Approach into a localized version have not been fully investigated. To contribute
17
18 knowledge to the international literature on early childhood education, this study endeavored to
19
20 understand *how* and *why* Chinese teachers in one typical kindergarten in Hong Kong
21
22 implemented the Project Approach the way they did. Insights gained may potentially yield
23
24 important implications for pedagogy and policy relevant to early childhood education in the local
25
26 as well as global context.
27
28
29
30

31 32 **The Influence of Globalization on Localization of Early Childhood Pedagogy** 33

34 A synthesis of current global knowledge base concerning early childhood education
35
36 reveals that Western theories of child development are assumed to be universally valid, and thus
37
38 are becoming pervasively cemented as the foundation on which teacher preparation courses are
39
40 built (Cleghorn & Prochner, 2010; Nsamenang, 2007). Correspondingly, specific Western
41
42 theory-driven, child-centered pedagogies including the Project Approach and others, such as
43
44 Montessori and Reggio Emilia, are introduced in early childhood teacher education programs in
45
46 non-Western cultural contexts, including Hong Kong (Li, Rao, & Tse, 2011, 2012). However, a
47
48 paradigm shift from a traditional to globalized pedagogy is not a seamless transformation as the
49
50 incongruence of cultural values between Western and Eastern societies has challenged the
51
52 universal applicability of Western pedagogies to teaching and learning situations in other
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cultures (Li et al., 2012; Tobin, 2007). Given the differences between traditional Chinese
4 pedagogy and contemporary early childhood pedagogy, Hong Kong teachers face enormous
5 challenges in implementing child-centered pedagogical approaches (Li et al., 2012).
6
7
8
9

10 **Differences between Chinese Pedagogy and Contemporary Early Childhood Pedagogy**

11
12 By *Chinese pedagogy*, we mean a specific instructional model to teaching and learning
13 that is profoundly influenced by traditional Chinese cultural values and extensively practiced in
14 classrooms in Chinese societies, including Hong Kong (Li, Rao, & Tse, 2012). However, as
15 there is no distinctively identifiable Western pedagogy, by *contemporary early childhood*
16 *pedagogy*, we mean instructional approaches originally developed and widely adopted in early
17 childhood classrooms in Western countries, albeit actual practices may vary. In contrast to
18 Chinese pedagogy, contemporary early childhood pedagogy embodies characteristics including
19 being constructivist-oriented, child-centered, play-based, and inquiry-driven. Due to their starkly
20 unique cultural roots and characteristics, the “Chinese-ness” and “Western-ness” of pedagogy
21 have been conceptualized as distinct in terms of philosophy (didacticism vs. constructivism),
22 epistemological beliefs (knowledge transmission vs. knowledge construction), theory
23 (behaviorist vs. constructivist), and practice (teacher-directedness vs. child-centeredness).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Specifically, Chinese pedagogy is associated with the philosophical view of teaching as
42 didactic/instructive in nature, involving imparting “correct” academic and moral knowledge from
43 the teacher to the learners (Biggs, 1996; Chan & Elliott, 2004; Rao, Ng, & Pearson, 2009). This
44 perspective aligns with the epistemological belief concerning the traditional transmission model
45 of knowledge acquisition, ascribing the teacher (the expert) as the transmitter of knowledge to
46 the learners (the novice) (Chan & Elliott, 2004; Lee, Zhang, Song, & Huang, 2013). Similarly,
47 Chinese pedagogy reflects the behaviorist theory, viewing the child as essentially a passive
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 recipient of environmental stimuli, and his/her mind as a tabula rasa (blank slate) to be filled
4 with knowledge (perspectives that are representative of the work of Skinner and Locke,
5 respectively) (Rao et al, 2009; Trawick-Smith, 2006). Furthermore, influenced by enduring
6 Chinese cultural beliefs that the early years are a critical time for moral and behavioral
7 development, the teachers conceive teaching as involving teacher authority and child training for
8 positive outcomes, such as discipline, propriety, behavioral control, conformity, and academic
9 achievement, which are highly valued in the collectivist-oriented Chinese culture (Rao, McHale,
10 & Pearson, 2003; Rao et al., 2009). Reflecting these philosophical, epistemological, and
11 theoretical perspectives, Chinese pedagogy is characteristically teacher-directed. Whereas,
12 sharing seemingly contrastive views, contemporary early childhood pedagogy is child-centered,
13 rooted in constructivist perspectives, notably Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory. From a
14 sociocultural stance, a key constructivist, instructional strategy for buttressing the children's
15 potential learning and development is *scaffolding*, a concept that is referred to as tailored
16 guidance that an adult/teacher or a more competent peer provides to the child, and gradually
17 diminishes such guidance as the child becomes more independent and competent at achieving a
18 target learning task (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Of particular relevance to teaching practice in early childhood education, classroom
42 observations have documented that the dominant mode of instruction in Chinese preschool
43 classrooms is the traditional Chinese pedagogy cast as teacher-directed, whole-class instructed,
44 content-based, academically-focused, and product-oriented (Li et al., 2012). These
45 characteristics are also prevalent in a thematic approach to teaching and learning in Hong Kong
46 and other countries. However, what makes these characteristics central features of Chinese
47 pedagogy lies in its cultural impetus. Concomitant with Chinese pedagogy, there is an emphasis
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on inculcating in children Confucian-inspired, collectivist-oriented Chinese culturally valued
4 behaviors (e.g., conformity, discipline, academic competence) (Rao et al., 2009). In contrast,
5
6 aimed at fostering in children individualist values (e.g., individuality, autonomy, critical
7
8 thinking) favored in Western countries, contemporary early childhood pedagogical approaches,
9
10 including the Project Approach, demonstratively embody constructivist, individualist-oriented
11
12 characteristics (e.g., child-centered, inquiry-focused, play-based) (Li et al., 2012; Rao et al.,
13
14 2009).

15
16
17
18
19
20 Furthermore, it has been reported that Chinese teachers' theories of teaching and learning
21
22 play a pivotal role in their instructional practices (e.g., Chan & Elliott, 2004; Lee et al., 2013).
23
24 Specifically, Chinese teachers who endorse traditional, behaviorist, knowledge-transmissionist
25
26 views tend to engage in practices that are didactic, teacher-directed, academically-driven, and
27
28 content-focused, whereas teachers who espouse contemporary, constructivist perspectives are
29
30 likely to practice student-centered and learning-oriented strategies (Chai & Khine, 2008; Lee et
31
32 al., 2013; Li et al., 2012). Yet, there are teachers who hold a merged traditional and
33
34 contemporary theory, and correspondingly engage in both teacher-directed and child-centered
35
36 practices (Chan, 2008, 2009; Ng & Rao, 2005, 2008). Premised on the idea that the teachers'
37
38 classroom practices are inextricably ingrained in, and mediated by, their pedagogical beliefs (Lee
39
40 et al., 2013), one aspect of this investigation entailed identifying what pedagogical theories were
41
42 developed by Hong Kong kindergarten teachers and how these theories affected the way in
43
44 which they implemented the Project Approach.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Challenges in Implementing Contemporary Early Childhood Pedagogy in Hong Kong**

51
52
53 Influenced by the global discourse on early childhood education, Hong Kong has been
54
55 constantly reforming its pre-primary education system with an effort to promote constructivism
56
57

1
2
3 and child-centeredness in the curriculum and resultant pedagogy. All of these curricular and
4
5 pedagogical changes are reflected in the *Guide to the Pre-primary Curriculum*, which was first
6
7 issued by Hong Kong Curriculum Development Institute in 1996 and later revised by Hong
8
9 Kong Curriculum Development Council in 2006. Furthering these efforts, a new edition is about
10
11 to be released in 2016, that incorporates all the new curricular and pedagogical changes occurred
12
13 during the decade 2006-2016. However, a number of sociocultural and contextual realities have
14
15 rendered efforts to implement constructivist-based pedagogical ideals formidable. These
16
17 realities can be subsumed under three major areas: (1) the incongruence between top-down early
18
19 childhood education reform and cultural emphasis on academic success, and relatedly the close
20
21 alignment in curriculum and resultant pedagogy between pre-primary and primary education; (2)
22
23 the dissonance between traditional ethno-theories and contemporary conceptions of early
24
25 learning and development; and (3) contextual factors impeding pedagogical shifts.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 First, the top-down education reform in Hong Kong has been promoting constructivist,
33
34 child-centered ideologies as guiding principles for making curriculum and pedagogical
35
36 modifications at the pre-primary level. Yet, situated within the prevailing examination-oriented
37
38 education system and cultural emphasis on academic success that thrive on didactic pedagogy,
39
40 the realization of such education reform ideals is like riding against the wind. Furthermore,
41
42 given this pervasive educational climate, both parents and teachers tend to regard the close
43
44 alignment in learning experience between the pre-primary and primary levels of education as
45
46 vital to the children's academic success (Chan & Chan, 2003; Li et al., 2011). This belief is
47
48 further fueled by the implicit "push-down effect" of the primary school curriculum on
49
50 pedagogical practices at the pre-primary level, leading early childhood teachers to adopt formal,
51
52 didactic strategies as necessary to prepare children for the highly-structured and performance-
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 oriented education at the primary level (Chan & Chan, 2003; Li et al., 2011).
4

5
6 Second, variations in cultural emphases have led to differences in ideology and practice
7
8 between Chinese pedagogy and contemporary early childhood pedagogy. The main distinction
9
10 between the two lies in the degree of child freedom and teacher control in deciding the children's
11
12 learning, with the Chinese pedagogy being teacher-directed and contemporary early childhood
13
14 pedagogy child-centered (Tzuo, 2007). As contemporary early childhood pedagogical
15
16 approaches including the Project Approach exact Western values, they thus are culturally
17
18 compatible with the Western context (Li et al., 2012). However, these Western pedagogies are
19
20 generally considered challenging and even inappropriate to implement in the Hong Kong context
21
22 that espouses contrasting cultural ideas about early education (Li et al., 2012).
23
24
25

26
27 In addition to sociocultural incompatibilities, another set of undercurrents seemingly
28
29 militating against Chinese teachers from adopting Western pedagogies involves contextual
30
31 factors, such as their states of professional competence and emotional security derived from their
32
33 own personal and professional experience. Research evidence has suggested that Chinese
34
35 kindergarten teachers do not feel that they have sufficient professional knowledge to implement
36
37 imported pedagogies competently (Li & Rao, 2005), neither do they feel confident enough to
38
39 make the pedagogical shift toward child-centered, project-based instruction (Li et al., 2012).
40
41
42

43
44 The afore-discussed major impediments converge to suggest that Hong Kong has not yet
45
46 rendered an educational environment conducive for the implementation of contemporary early
47
48 childhood pedagogy advocated fervently by its current pre-primary education reform.
49

50
51 Unfortunately, the sociocultural tradition and contextual constraints exhibited in Hong Kong
52
53 seemingly run antithetical to the very ideals that its education reformers are promoting, making
54
55 them too lofty, if not impossible, for early childhood educators to reach. It begs the question:
56
57

1
2
3 *how can teachers reconcile the complex dynamic between education reform, and pedagogical*
4 *conceptions and practices so ingrained in and constrained by sociocultural as well as contextual*
5 *realities?* Early childhood scholars (e.g., Li et al., 2012; Ng & Rao, 2008) have recommended
6 that, instead of instinctively following global trends and developmental theories to directly *adopt*
7 imported pedagogies, it is culturally more appropriate to *adapt* them in ways that befit the local
8 context. Previous research has demonstrated that some forms of pedagogical adaption are at
9 work in Hong Kong schools, such as in what Chan (2009) termed “transformed pedagogy”
10 integrating Chinese and Western pedagogy, and in what Ng and Rao (2008) described as a
11 “fusion” of “constructivist and instructivist pedagogies.” This study further explored whether
12 Chinese teachers in a Hong Kong kindergarten would adapt rather than adopt the Project
13 Approach, and if so, *how* and *why*. By investigating the implementation of the Project Approach
14 as an example of progressive pedagogical approaches vigorously advocated by education
15 reformers in Hong Kong, we hope to shed light on the complex dynamics involved in how
16 teachers may reconcile the tensions between globalization (Westernized pedagogical trends) and
17 localization (sociocultural influences).

The Goal of this Study

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Against the backdrop of the sociocultural and contextual dynamics within which educational practices have traditionally been operative in Hong Kong, this study endeavored to address two interwoven research questions: (1) *How do Hong Kong kindergarten teachers implement the Project Approach?* and (2) *Why do these teachers implement the Project Approach the way they do?* To this end, we conducted a qualitative, in-depth case study of the processes involved and the mechanisms underlying the way in which the teachers implemented project work in one typical Hong Kong kindergarten.

Method

Procedure for Selecting the Kindergarten and Participants

The main criterion for selecting the kindergarten as our case study was that it needed to be a typical Chinese kindergarten in Hong Kong by exhibiting two common characteristics: (1) is non-profit-making, and accepts fee subsidy issued to eligible families in the form of vouchers from the government under the Pre-primary Education Voucher Scheme; and (2) implements Cantonese Chinese as the main medium of instruction. Cantonese Chinese is the language spoken by 89.5% of the population in Hong Kong (2011 Population Census Office). On the basis of the kindergarten profiles provided by the Education Bureau (<http://www.chsc.hk/kindergarten/>) and in consultation with Hong Kong educators, a pool of kindergartens deemed meeting the criterion of typicality was identified, from which one kindergarten was ultimately selected for participation.

Background Information about the School, Participants, and Project Implementation

In Hong Kong, all kindergartens are privately operated (Education Bureau, 2015). In this study, the participating kindergarten was run by a religious organization and located in a bustling district on the Hong Kong Island, enrolling 260 children in 13 classes with 23 teachers. School documents on socio-demographics of families indicated that, the children came from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, with most (60%) from middle-class families, 30% from middle- to lower-class families, and least (10%) from lower-class families. Approximately half of the children attended half day and the rest full day in one of the three grade levels: Nursery (K1) for children ages 3-4, lower kindergarten (K2) for children ages 4-5, and upper kindergarten (K3) for children ages 5-6. One third of the teachers possessed a college degree in Early Childhood Education, and two third of them held a Certificate in Early Childhood Education. Furthermore,

1
2
3 half of the teachers have had at least 10 years of teaching experience.
4

5
6 As deemed developmentally appropriate for the children in K2 and K3, this kindergarten
7
8 has been implementing the Project Approach but only in these two grades: in all of the four K2
9
10 classes (two half-day and two full-day) for the first time, and all of the four K3 classes (two half-
11
12 day and two full-day) for five years. Thus, while K2 teachers were new to the Project Approach,
13
14 K3 teachers were not. For the purpose of consistency, we focused solely on all full-day classes
15
16 conducting projects, leading to only four classes (two K2s and two K3s) for this investigation.
17
18 According to the school curriculum, once every academic semester, K2 and K3 classes would
19
20 conduct projects within a predetermined thematic unit. At the time of this research, both K2 and
21
22 K3 classes were conducting projects that aligned with the curriculum unit on “food,” which was
23
24 considered concrete and practical enough for projects to derive from.
25
26
27
28

29
30 Each participating class comprised two female team teachers and 20 children (with
31
32 approximately an equal distribution of genders). Those few children, whose parents did not
33
34 consent to their participation, were subsequently excluded from all videotaped observations.
35
36 Although the team teachers worked in tandem, the main teacher with the most teaching
37
38 experience led the Project Approach. All Hong Kong natives aged between 23-38 years
39
40 (averaging 31 years), the teachers had been teaching at this kindergarten for a range of one to 13
41
42 years (averaging four years). Among the participating teachers, only one possessed a college
43
44 degree, but all held a Hong Kong Certificate in Early Childhood Education needed to teach at
45
46 this kindergarten.
47
48
49

50 51 **Data Collection**

52
53 To establish “methodological triangulation” using multiple sources of data (Denzin,
54
55 2009), we obtained data from three sources: (1) videotaped classroom observations, (2)
56
57

1
2
3 audiotaped interviews with the teachers and school principal, and (3) analysis of collected
4 documents. Increasingly, educational researchers (e.g., Li, 2013; Li et al., 2011, 2012) have
5 employed videotaped classroom observations and often complemented or supplemented with
6 subsequent audiotaped interviews with teachers as effective data collection strategies in such a
7 way that, videotaped classroom observations help to capture specific instructional interactions
8 and behaviors in the classroom as well as the dynamics of the sociocultural context in which they
9 occur, and audiotaped interviews with the teachers help to elucidate their meaning making of
10 their teaching practices. For instance, Li et al. (2012) employed these two methods of data
11 collection to compare pedagogical practices in three Chinese societies (Hong Kong, Singapore,
12 and China), revealing rich findings embedded in the videotaped classroom observations and
13 audiotaped interviews with teachers that could not have otherwise been captured.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 *Videotaped observations*

30
31 To capture practice in action, two trained observers (the first and third authors)
32 videotaped how the teachers implemented the entire Project Approach during the designated four
33 weeks. Prior to formal videotaping, a familiarization, introduction visit was done in each
34 classroom to establish a comfort level among the teachers, children, and the two trained
35 observers. Except for a few days under special circumstances (e.g., events at the school during
36 which typical project work was suspended), daily observations were videotaped in each
37 classroom by one observer in the morning for half an hour to two hours (depending on the
38 duration of project-related activities that day). Videotaped observations totaled approximately
39 48 hours in the four classrooms.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Audiotaped interviews

All eight teachers were interviewed individually by the first author after project work had concluded. The lead teachers were interviewed for 45-60 minutes, and their partner teachers for 30-40 minutes. Employing the “interview guide approach” (Patton, 1990), we developed a semi-structured interview protocol, drawing on insights from classroom observations and documents, to encourage the teachers to reflect on four main areas: (1) professional training, knowledge, and experience with the Project Approach; (2) pedagogical beliefs and associated source(s); (3) pedagogical practices; and (4) project process and outcomes. To gain a contextual understanding of the kindergarten, the first author also interviewed the school principal for an hour to learn about the school’s operation, including its mission, educational philosophy, curriculum development, and impetus for project work. All interviews were conducted and audiotaped in the participants’ native language of Cantonese Chinese. They were then transcribed in Chinese.

Documents

Documents, such as fieldnotes and artifacts (e.g., project documentations, lesson plans, school and curriculum records, project reports, student work) were collected as supplementary data.

Data Analysis

We analyzed the qualitative data using open coding and axial coding strategies (Strauss & Corbin, 2015). The interview transcripts were analyzed using open coding, which led to the formation of core categories and concepts as well as subcategories. Next, axial coding was conducted to discover potential relationships among categories and concepts. Each interview transcript was also examined for material pertaining to the research questions, and once that paragraph or segment had been identified, a “microanalysis” entailing a detailed examination of

1
2
3 the data “line-by-line” was subsequently conducted (Strauss & Corbin, 2015). Salient themes
4
5 were categorized from the analysis of interview data, and in addition, general patterns were
6
7 identified from the analysis of observation data. An analysis of documents was also conducted
8
9 to help clarify, complement, and even supplement analyses from both the interview and
10
11 observation data.
12
13

14 Findings

15 How the Project Approach was Implemented

16
17 All eight participating teachers, regardless of their educational background or teaching
18
19 experience, implemented the Project Approach similarly as supported by the school principal and
20
21 aligned with the pre-primary education reform in Hong Kong. As shown in Table 1, while
22
23 adhering to some aspects of the Project Approach (Helm & Katz, 2010), the teachers’ practices
24
25 revealed distinct features that made project work for the children both a teacher-directed and
26
27 child-centered learning experience. Following the school curriculum on the “food” unit, the
28
29 teachers started off by providing direct instruction on related concepts, including food pyramid
30
31 and nutrition, through which they also taught the children to conform to societal expectations of
32
33 collective values (e.g., protecting the environment¹ by ways, such as reducing food waste and
34
35 utilizing reusable rather than disposable materials). To cultivate healthy eating habits, the
36
37 children were taught and asked to memorize and recite poems, for instance, about the importance
38
39 of a balanced diet.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The teachers gradually proceeded to implement what Helm and Katz (2010) described as
49
50 the three phases of project work, from discussing and negotiating with the children to select a
51
52

53
54
55 ¹ Hong Kong has been vigorously advocating for environmental protection. Visible signs of “environmental
56
57 protection” in both Chinese and English can be found throughout Hong Kong to raise such awareness to the public.
58
59 Actions taken include banning the provision of free plastic shopping bags by retail outlets, notably supermarkets.
60

1
2
3 topic of their interest for investigation in Phase I, engaging the children in conducting the project
4
5 in Phase II, and to finally concluding the project in Phase III with a culminating “show and tell”
6
7 event about their learning. However, while progressing through these processes, the teachers did
8
9 not completely adhere to the child-centered aspect of what Clark (2006) described as key to
10
11 successful project work, including engaging the children in developing their own questions for
12
13 inquiry, proposing their own hypotheses, and finding ways to test them. Yet, classroom
14
15 observations and teacher interviews revealed that the teachers did shift their roles from
16
17 knowledge transmitters to guides, tutors, and facilitators, as they orchestrated the project
18
19 processes to consist of both teacher-directed and child-centered learning explorations. Within
20
21 this teaching-learning dynamic, a unique instructional pattern was consistently observed in all of
22
23 the classrooms involving a four-step scaffolding process: (1) teacher instruction/facilitation, (2)
24
25 teacher demonstration/modeling, (3) child demonstration, and (4) group participation.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 For instance, in one K3 class conducting their project on Dim Sum² restaurant, the four-
33
34 step scaffolding process of instruction was observed. The classroom teacher began by
35
36 facilitating a lively discussion with the whole group about Dim Sum. First, the teacher accessed
37
38 the children’s prior knowledge and experience with different types of Dim Sum by asking
39
40 various levels of questions (low-order as well as follow-up, high-order questions) such as: What
41
42 types of Dim Sum have you eaten? What do they look like? What do you think they were made
43
44 of? How were they being prepared and cooked? Why? She subsequently webbed the children’s
45
46 answers to gauge what they already knew and what they would still need to learn from the
47
48 investigation. Second, following the class discussion, the teacher demonstrated how to make a
49
50 pretend *siu mai* (pork dumplings, which is one of the most typical types of Dim Sum) with craft
51
52

53
54
55
56 ² Ubiquitous in Hong Kong, Dim Sum is a style of traditional, beloved Cantonese food, typically cooked as bite-
57 sized portions and served in small steamer baskets or on small plates.

1
2
3 supplies, while explaining the procedure step-by-step. Third, the teacher invited a more capable
4
5 child volunteer to make a pretend *siu mai* to not only demonstrate her understanding, but “teach”
6
7 and scaffold her peers, especially those who needed help, in grasping the steps. Finally, during
8
9 small-group activities, grouped by interest, children were assigned to collaboratively make *siu*
10
11 *mai* and other types of Dim Sum for their restaurant, modeled after their teacher and peer
12
13 volunteer. The teacher circulated around the classroom to assess the children’s learning and
14
15 progress, providing assistance as needed. Similar to all other learning experiences that are both
16
17 teacher-directed and child-centered, this session demonstrated high levels of student engagement,
18
19 discipline, and conformity: The children participated actively by listening quietly, watching
20
21 intently, and raising their hands to offer ideas. The children were also acquiring meaningful
22
23 vocabulary to analyze and understand the process of making a Dim Sum, thereby promoting their
24
25 development of autonomous, critical thinking skills.
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Why the Chinese Teachers Implemented the Project Approach the Way They Did**

32
33
34 This study revealed the confluence of five major factors on the way in which the teachers
35
36 implemented the Project Approach: (1) “time pressure” and curriculum demands, (2) parental
37
38 expectations for academic achievement, (3) professional competence, (4) emotional tensions, and
39
40 (5) pedagogical beliefs.
41
42

43 ***“Time pressure” and curriculum demands***

44
45
46 The teachers spoke candidly about “time pressure” and curriculum demands as a reason
47
48 underlying the way in which they implemented the Project Approach. For one, given the fixed
49
50 timeframe of four weeks for project work and a large amount of material to cover in the specified
51
52 curriculum, the teachers believed that they just could not simply structure the learning experience
53
54 entirely as child-led. For another, recognizing that just like how they needed time and space to
55
56
57

1
2
3 make pedagogical adjustments, the teachers perceived that the children also needed support to
4
5 adapt their learning strategies and classroom interactions to project work. This awareness has
6
7 subsequently compelled the teachers to attend to a number of practical considerations, including
8
9 not “jumping right into the project from the outset” and instead “taking it slow” and “providing
10
11 ample guidance.” Time limitation was also a source of challenge, necessitating the teachers to
12
13 make pedagogical adaptations (e.g., negotiating with the children in selecting a doable project,
14
15 skipping field trips, restricting their exploration).
16
17
18

19 20 *Parental expectations for academic achievement and knowledge acquisition*

21
22 This study revealed that parental expectations for academically-oriented learning
23
24 constituted another salient factor affecting the school’s choice of curriculum and the teachers’
25
26 approach to project work. For instance, as reflected by one K3 teacher, their decision to adapt
27
28 rather than adopt the Project Approach was driven by their perception of the parents’
29
30 expectations for their children’s academic success and “acquisition of a large quantity of
31
32 knowledge.” Furthermore, the teachers also realized that using the Project Approach in the
33
34 child-centered way solely would engender a discontinuity in pedagogical practice and associated
35
36 educational experience for the children, from the pre-primary to the primary level, which was
37
38 dominated by the traditional, didactic teaching method and examination-based assessments.
39
40
41
42

43 *Professional knowledge*

44
45 The teachers indicated that they had only formally learned about the Project Approach
46
47 and other progressive, Western pedagogies along with contemporary conceptions about early
48
49 education through courses in their respective teacher education programs. They recognized that
50
51 while their pedagogical knowledge and skills with the Project Approach had advanced with time
52
53 and experience, they were still in the learning stage and would need to improve with support of
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 professional development. Nonetheless, they believed that by having the freedom to balance the
4 Project Approach with Chinese pedagogy, they were able to engage in a transitional phase from
5 teacher-directedness to child-centeredness in practice. It also provided them with the
6 opportunity to venture outside of their comfort zone and experiment with a different mode of
7 teaching yet with appropriate adaptations, especially as they did not feel fully equipped with the
8 requisite knowledge and skills to competently implement the Project Approach the way it was
9 purported.

10 11 12 ***Emotional comfortability***

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Teacher interviews revealed that while embracing the values of project work for promoting student learning, the teachers approached it with trepidation and caution. Particularly, two teachers invoked the emic concept of *fongsau* (which literally means letting go of one's hands) to describe the dialectic tension between surrendering teacher control and granting student autonomy. As reasoned by one K2 teacher:

Actually it is about *fongsau* to let the children take on an active role to an appropriate extent because there are many children who have good self-control, and all you need to do is let go a little to see good results...Actually, letting go [in terms of teacher control] more is better. If you don't let go, how can they learn independently?

Yet, this same teacher was also adamant about the need to pull the children back if they digressed from the project direction, thus advocating for the importance of "providing the children with an appropriate [but not excessive] amount of freedom," while retaining a certain level of teacher control. These sentiments also similarly resonated with other teachers.

51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 ***Hybridization of pedagogical beliefs***

This study also demonstrated that the way in which the teachers implemented the Project Approach aptly reflected a paradigm shift toward a convergence of Chinese ethno-theories and

1
2
3 Western-based contemporary conceptions of early education. For instance, the teachers
4
5 internalized the Chinese cultural emphasis on early teaching and learning as involving training
6
7 children for moral development including discipline, conformity, and behavioral control. An
8
9 example referenced often by the teachers was about how being quiet and listening attentively
10
11 were considered key to both their knowledge acquisition from the teacher as well as their
12
13 development of moral virtues. Interviews further revealed that the teachers subscribed to the
14
15 view that a balance of teacher-directedness and child-centeredness would be optimal for
16
17 promoting learning and development in meeting the demands of both the local and global
18
19 context.
20
21
22
23

24 Discussion

25 The Implementation of the Project Approach

26
27 Situated within the broader context of pre-primary education reform advocating for
28
29 Western-derived constructivist, child-centered pedagogies, this study illuminated the processes
30
31 and underlying mechanisms associated with the teachers' implementation of the Project
32
33 Approach in situ. It is worth noting that, if judged by the strict standards of the Project Approach
34
35 (Helm & Katz, 2010), the ways in which it was conducted at this participating kindergarten
36
37 would not have been considered authentic. However, our study was not about implementation
38
39 fidelity. Instead, it endeavored to uncover authentically *how* and *why* the Chinese teachers
40
41 conducted project work the way they did.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 First, this study revealed that the unique underlying dynamics of the processes involved
49
50 in the teachers' implementation of the Project Approach seemed to characteristically represent a
51
52 negotiation of values between the Chinese and Western cultures, and of educational practices
53
54 between Chinese pedagogy and contemporary early childhood pedagogy, leading to their
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 adoption of hybrid pedagogy. This study revealed that the instructional processes were both
4
5 teacher-orchestrated and child-centered as evident in the application of a four-step scaffolding
6
7 strategy during which the teachers shifted their roles from instructor to ultimately facilitator in
8
9 supporting the children's learning, demonstrating a progression toward embracing the
10
11 constructivist framework of contemporary early childhood pedagogy. Although previous
12
13 research has long identified the varied nature, types, and processes of scaffolding during adult-
14
15 child interactions focusing particularly on how the adult helps the child acquire the knowledge
16
17 and skills needed to ultimately be able to perform a target task competently and independently
18
19 (e.g., Bruner & Sherwood, 1975; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976), our investigation further
20
21 revealed a unique pattern of four sequential, interrelated steps of a scaffolding process that the
22
23 teachers adopted during the Project Approach involving: (1) teacher instruction/facilitation, (2)
24
25 teacher demonstration/modeling, (3) child demonstration, and (4) group participation. This
26
27 scaffolding process is an example of possible fluidity in the teachers' adaptation in shifting their
28
29 role from knowledge transmitter to facilitator, reflecting their tenable transition toward
30
31 embracing a constructivist approach to teaching.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 This finding supports Biggs and Watkins' (2001) general conclusion about the nature of
40
41 teaching and learning in the Chinese classroom as being *both* "teacher-centered" *and* "student-
42
43 centered." It is also consistent with Chan's (2009) discovery of expert teachers as being *both*
44
45 "didactic" *and* "constructivist" in a "transformed pedagogy," and with Ng and Rao's (2008)
46
47 observation of Hong Kong teachers' "fusion" of "constructivist and instructivist pedagogies" in
48
49 early mathematics instruction. Thus, in the context of Hong Kong, pedagogical hybridization as
50
51 practiced by the teachers in this study may be interpreted as culturally appropriate and socially
52
53 situated. It also supports Katz's (personal communication with the second author, June 15,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2001) observation that the way in which Hong Kong kindergarten teachers implemented the
4 Project Approach may be more aptly described as the “Hong Kong style” of project work. In
5
6 this study, the Hong Kong style may be interpreted more specifically as the way in which the
7
8 teachers uniformly localized the child-centered Project Approach in assimilation with the
9
10 teacher-directed Chinese pedagogy into hybrid pedagogy, an adaptation that was conducted with
11
12 practical considerations of cultural beliefs about early education and contextual constraints (e.g.,
13
14 predetermined curriculum, predetermined timeframe for project).
15
16
17
18

19
20 Furthermore, the idea of hybrid pedagogy is also consistent with the observation that,
21
22 direct *adoption* of Western-derived pedagogies in the non-Western context of Hong Kong is
23
24 largely futile (Cheng, 2006; Rao et al., 2009), whereas pedagogical *adaptation* or *localization* is
25
26 more culturally sensible and productive (Li et al., 2012). Our research findings demonstrated
27
28 that the way in which the teachers implemented the Project Approach was in the form of
29
30 *adaptation* rather than *adoption*. More specifically, in the process of adaption, the teachers
31
32 engaged in a pedagogical negotiation ultimately favoring *pedagogical assimilation* over
33
34 *pedagogical accommodation* to reflect their appraisal of implementing the Project Approach in a
35
36 purely child-led manner as not being realistic in Hong Kong, given its prevailing sociocultural
37
38 and contextual constraints. That is, instead of superseding their customary practice of Chinese
39
40 pedagogy with the Project Approach by accommodating to the way in which this contemporary
41
42 early childhood pedagogy was purported to be implemented (child-centered), the teachers
43
44 assimilated their professional knowledge of progressive pedagogies (learned through their
45
46 respective teacher education programs as well as education reform promulgations) into their pre-
47
48 existing schema of the traditional Chinese way of teaching (teacher-directed). This interpretation
49
50 suggests that the teachers’ approach to the Project Approach may well reflect “good teaching,”
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which 'is about making the best use of contextual information and dynamics and aligning
4 pedagogy and innovation with cultural contexts and conditions' (Chan, 2008, p. 249). In the
5 context of "good teaching," the teachers carefully designed, structured, crafted, and orchestrated
6 project learning activities in ways that infused unique characteristics of both teacher-directed
7 Chinese pedagogy and child-centered contemporary early childhood pedagogy.
8
9

10 **Mechanisms Undergirding the Implementation of the Project Approach**

11
12 This study reveals that the mechanisms underpinning the teachers' adaptation of the
13 Project Approach in the form of hybrid pedagogy were contextually and philosophically driven.
14 First, corroborating with the finding of previous research that there are sociocultural and
15 contextual factors hampering the successful implementation of imported Western pedagogies in
16 Chinese contexts (e.g., Cheng, 2006; Tang & Maxwell, 2007), this study revealed several such
17 challenges as perceived by the teachers, including "time pressure" and curriculum demands,
18 parental expectations for academic achievement, professional competence, and emotional
19 tensions. Similar obstacles have also been reported by research in the United States (e.g., Clark,
20 2006; Mitchelle, Foulger, Wetzell, & Rathkey, 2009). However, what characterizes the
21 contextual challenges facing the teachers in this study as unique of the Hong Kong's educational
22 situation is the fact that for these teachers, such challenges were confounded by a qualitatively
23 different set of cultural beliefs about early education and a long-held tradition of practicing
24 Chinese pedagogy.
25
26

27
28 Second, corroborating with the findings of previous research (e.g., Ng & Rao, 2005,
29 2008), this study revealed that the teachers' engagement in pedagogical assimilation may have
30 reflected a paradigm shift in educational beliefs toward adopting an amalgam of two seemingly
31 contrasting belief systems about early education, with one being the Chinese cultural set of
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ideologies (acquired through socialization experiences) and the other Western and globally
4 promoted conceptions (learned through teacher training courses and education reform
5 promulgations). The possible convergence of these two pedagogical belief systems may
6 encourage the teachers to harmonize their understanding of the differences between collectivist-
7 oriented, Chinese cultural values (e.g., discipline, conformity, academic success), and
8 individualist-oriented, Western cultural values (e.g., autonomy, critical thinking). It may be that,
9 in mediating the dialectical tensions between two contrasting set of ideologies that galvanized
10 the different pedagogies, the teachers might have catalytically created a happy medium between
11 the two, possibly driven by the strong emphasis on “harmony” as supported by the culture of the
12 school and that of the larger society. The finding may also be interpreted from the Chinese
13 philosophical notion of the “Doctrine of the Mean” (Chan & Rao, 2009; Li, 2005). It has been
14 observed that Chinese people are more inclined to find a middle ground when resolving
15 divergent approaches and lifestyles to maintain harmony, a Chinese cultural virtue that is
16 reflective of Confucian philosophy (Lee, 1996, Li, 2005).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 It is also possible that hybrid pedagogy serves as an example of how teachers may
37 transcend philosophical and pedagogical dichotomies (i.e., didacticism vs. constructivism,
38 knowledge transmission vs. knowledge construction, behaviorist vs. constructivist, teacher-
39 directedness vs. child-centeredness) that have largely polarized Chinese pedagogy and
40 contemporary early childhood pedagogy. This finding supports the assertion that dichotomies
41 are too simplistic and not useful in capturing the full extent and complexity of pedagogical
42 practices (Biggs, 1996). Furthermore, hybrid pedagogy may also be interpreted as a negotiated
43 approach in which the teachers process and make sense of imported ideologies and pedagogies.
44 The “negotiated approach” to adapting the Project Approach as befitting the sociocultural and
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contextual dynamics was also evident in other studies conducted in Hong Kong (Li, 2012) and
4
5 even in the United States (Mitchell et al., 2009). In the context of understanding how and why
6
7 the Chinese teachers in one typical kindergarten in Hong Kong implemented the Project
8
9 Approach, this study has provided a case for considering hybridization as a possibly operable
10
11 educational solution to contextual tensions emerged from cross-cultural pedagogic pollination.
12
13

14 15 **Educational Implications**

16
17 As the Project Approach and other progressive pedagogies are being implemented in
18
19 many kindergartens throughout Hong Kong, the findings of this investigation on one typical
20
21 kindergarten there provide important educational implications for how these Western-derived
22
23 pedagogies may be enacted in a non-Western context. For instance, teachers in other
24
25 kindergartens may also adapt the Project Approach in a similar manner as did those in our study.
26
27 Furthermore, although this was just one case study of a typical Hong Kong kindergarten, it may
28
29 be considered as an example of what could transpire when teachers in Hong Kong and other
30
31 parts of the world facing similar circumstances attempted to implement an imported pedagogy.
32
33
34
35

36
37 The pre-primary education reform in Hong Kong seems well-meaning and anchored in a
38
39 globally promoted Western stance concerning how children best learn and develop, and thus
40
41 should be taught. Yet, it has triggered particular challenges to frontline teachers who are directly
42
43 shouldered with the responsibility of translating Westernized reform ideals into action. While it
44
45 appears simple and straightforward to transplant a pedagogical model from one culture to
46
47 another as part of an education reform, it is a whole heap more complicated or even
48
49 insurmountable for the model to survive and thrive in a diametrically divergent sociocultural
50
51 environment with a radically different educational tradition. Within the recent pre-primary
52
53 education reform in Hong Kong, there lies seemingly a conspicuous disjunction between
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 idealism (contemporary early childhood pedagogy) and realism (incompatible sociocultural and
4 contextual dynamics). It begs the question, *Can this disjunction be reconciled?* Considering the
5
6 findings of this study and others (e.g., Cheng, 2006; Li et al., 2012; Ng & Rao, 2005, 2008), we
7
8 believe that for the moment, what seems culturally sensible, viable, and potentially sustainable is
9
10 not a radical, direct transformation from a traditional pedagogy to an imported pedagogy (be it
11
12 the Project Approach or other approaches), but an alternative, hybrid pedagogy that infuses
13
14 unique characteristics of the two. Similarly, when promoting pedagogical changes, educational
15
16 policymakers should consider sociocultural and contextual influences as those reported in this
17
18 study. Taken together, this case study suggests that even an internationally embraced pedagogy,
19
20 like the Project Approach, could be adapted to best fit local needs. Such a transformation
21
22 epitomizes what may be called “global pedagogy, localized practice.”
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Limitations of the Study**

30
31 A methodological strength of this study was that it gathered data from multiple sources
32
33 (interviews, classroom observations, and documents), yielding consistent, complementary
34
35 findings. Nevertheless, this study has methodological limitations. Notably, the small sample
36
37 size from one Hong Kong kindergarten precludes generalizations of findings to dissimilar
38
39 populations. Studying a larger and more diverse sample may provide additional insights and/or
40
41 further validate our findings. Future research might include quantitative measures of the
42
43 teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and practices to complement and supplement qualitative findings.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 2011 Population Census Office. Population aged 5 and over by usual language, 2001, 2006 and 2011. Census and Statistics Department. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. Retrieved from <http://www.census2011.gov.hk/en/main-table/A107.html>
- Biggs, J. B. (1996). Western misperceptions of the Confucian-heritage learning Culture. In D. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 45-67). Hong Kong: Comparative Education and Research Centre and Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Biggs, J. B., & Watkins, D. A. (2001). Insights into teaching the Chinese learner. In D. A. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and Pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 277-300). Hong Kong/Melbourne: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong/Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Bruner, J., & Sherwood, V. (1975). Peekaboo and the learning of rule structures. In J. S. Bruner, A. Jolly, & K. Sylva (Eds.), *Play: Its role in development and evolution* (pp. 277-285). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Chai, C. S. & Khine, M. S. (2008). Assessing the epistemological and pedagogical beliefs among pre-service teachers in Singapore. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), *Knowing, knowledge and beliefs: Epistemological studies across diverse cultures* (pp. 287-299). The Netherlands: Springer.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Chan, C. K. K. (2009). Classroom innovations for the Chinese learner: Transcending dichotomies and transforming pedagogy. In C. K. K. Chan & N. Rao (Eds.), *Revisiting the Chinese learner: Changing contexts, changing education* (pp. 169-210). Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre/Springer Academic.
- Chan, C. K. K., & Rao, N. (2009). The paradoxes revisited: The Chinese learner in changing educational contexts. In C. K. K. Chan & N. Rao (Eds.), *Revisiting the Chinese learner: Changing contexts, changing education* (pp. 315-349). Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre/Springer Academic.
- Chan, K. W. (2008). Epistemological beliefs, learning, and teaching: The Hong Kong cultural context. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), *Knowing, knowledge and beliefs: Epistemological studies across diverse cultures* (pp. 257-272). The Netherlands: Springer.
- Chan, K. W., & Elliot, R. G. (2004). Relational analysis of personal epistemology and conceptions about teaching and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(8), 817-831.
- Chan, L. K. S., & Chan, L. (2003). Early childhood education in Hong Kong and its challenges. *Early Child Development and Care, 173*(1), 7-17.
- Cheng, D. P. W. (2006). The translation of Western teaching approaches in the Hong Kong early childhood curriculum: A promise for effective teaching? *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 7*(3), 228-237.

- 1
2
3 Clark, A. (2006). Changing classroom practice to include the Project Approach. *Early*
4
5 *Childhood Research & Practice*, 8(2). Retrieved from
6
7 <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v8n2/clark.html>
8
9
10 Cleghorn, A., & Prochner, L. (2010). *Shades of globalization in three early childhood settings:*
11
12 *Views from India, South Africa, and Canada*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense
13
14 Publishers.
15
16
17 Denzin, N. K. (2009). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*.
18
19 New York: McGraw-Hill.
20
21
22 Education Bureau: The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (2015).
23
24 *Overview of kindergarten education in Hong Kong*. Retrieved from
25
26 <http://www.edb.gov.hk/en/edu-system/preprimary-kindergarten/overview/index.html>
27
28
29 Education Department (Hong Kong Curriculum Development Institute) (1996). *Guide to the*
30
31 *pre-primary curriculum*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
32
33
34 Education Department (Hong Kong Curriculum Development Council) (2006). *Guide to the*
35
36 *pre-primary curriculum (revised)*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
37
38
39 Helm, J. H., & Katz, L. (2010). *Young investigators: The project approach in the early years*
40
41 (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
42
43
44 Katz, L., & Chard, S. (2000). *Engaging children's minds: The project approach* (2nd ed.).
45
46 Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
47
48
49 Kilpatrick, W. (1918). The project method. *The Teachers College Record*, 19(4), 319-335.
50
51
52 Lee, J., Zhang, Z., Song, H., & Huang, X. (2013). Effects of epistemological and pedagogical
53
54 beliefs on the instructional practices of teachers: A Chinese perspective. *Australian*
55
56 *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(12), 120-146.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Lee, W. O. (1996). The cultural context for Chinese learners: conceptions of learning in the Confucian tradition. In D. A. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological, and cultural influences* (pp. 25-41). Hong Kong/Melbourne: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong/Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Li, H. (2005). *Developing school-based curriculum in Hong Kong kindergartens: Insights, challenges and solutions*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Li, H. (2013). Teaching Chinese literacy in the early years: A comparison of L1 and L2 preschool classrooms in Shenzhen and Singapore. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, 7(3), 19-43.
- Li, H., & Rao, N. (2005). Curricular and instructional influences on early literacy attainment: Evidence from Beijing, Hong Kong and Singapore. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 13(3), 235-253.
- Li, H., Rao, N., & Tse, S. K. (2011). Bridging the gap: a longitudinal study of the relationship between pedagogical continuity and early Chinese literacy acquisition. *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development*, 31(1), 57-70.
- Li, H., Rao, N., & Tse, S. K. (2012). Adapting Western Pedagogies for Chinese Literacy Instruction: Case Studies of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, and Singapore Preschools. *Early Education and development*, 23(4), 603-621.
- Li, Y. (2012). The negotiated project-based learning: Understanding the views and practice of kindergarten teachers about the implementation of project learning in Hong Kong. *Education 3-13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and early Years education*, 40(5), 473-486.

- 1
2
3 Mitchell, S., Foulger, T., Wetzel, K., & Rathkey, C. (2009). The negotiated project
4 approach: Project-based learning without leaving the standards behind. *Early*
5
6 *Childhood Education Journal*, 36(4), 339-346.
7
8
9
- 10 Nsamenang, A. B. (2007). A critical peek at early childhood care and education in Africa. *Child*
11
12 *Health and Education*, 1(1), 14-26.
13
14
- 15 Ng, S. S. N., & Rao, N. (2005). Teaching mathematics in Hong Kong: A comparison
16
17 between the pre-primary and early primary years. *Hong Kong Journal of Early*
18
19 *Childhood*, 4(1), 30-36.
20
21
- 22 Ng, S. S. N., & Rao, N. (2008). Mathematics teaching during the early years in Hong Kong: A
23
24 reflection of constructivism with Chinese characteristics? *Early Years: An International*
25
26 *Journal of Research and Development*, 28(2), 159–172.
27
28
- 29 Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks,
30
31 CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
32
33
- 34 Pearson, E., & Rao, N. (2003). Socialization goals, parenting practices, and peer competence in
35
36 Chinese and English preschoolers. *Early Child Development and Care*, 173(1), 131-146.
37
38
- 39 Rao, N., McHale, J. P., & Pearson, E. C. (2003). Links between socialization goals and child-
40
41 rearing practices in Chinese and Indian mothers. *Infant and Child Development*, 12(5),
42
43 475-492.
44
45
- 46 Rao, N., Ng, S. S. N., & Pearson, E. (2009). Preschool pedagogy: A fusion of traditional
47
48 Chinese beliefs and contemporary notions of appropriate practice. In C. K. K. Chan, & N.
49
50 Rao (Eds.), *Revisiting the Chinese learner: Changing contexts, changing education*
51
52 (pp. 255–280). Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong, Comparative Education
53
54 Research Centre/Springer Academic.
55
56

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Tang, F. L., & Maxwell, S. (2007). Being taught to learn together: An ethnographic study of the curriculum in two Chinese kindergartens. *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development*, 27(2), 145–157.
- Trawick-Smith, J. (2006). *Early childhood development: A multicultural perspective*. New York: Pearson.
- Tzuo, P. W. (2007). The tension between teacher control and children's freedom in a child-centered classroom: Resolving the practical dilemma through a closer look at the related theories. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(1), 33-39.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89-100.
- Yuen, L. H. F. (2010). A valuable experience for children: The Dim Sum and Chinese restaurant project. *Early Childhood Research & Practice*, 12(1). Retrieved from <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v12n1/yuen.html>

Table 1. Similarities and Differences between the Project Approach and the Hong Kong Style of the Project Approach.

	The Project Approach¹ (Child-Centered)	Hong Kong Style of the Project Approach (Teacher-Directed + Child-Centered)
Decision Making	Mostly children with guidance from teacher.	Mostly teacher with input from children.
Determination of Next Step of the Project	Guided by teacher's observations of children's investigation and interest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes preplanned by teacher. • Sometimes guided by teacher's observations of children's investigation and interest.
Topic Selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiated between teacher and children with consideration to curriculum goals. • Derived from children's interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driven by curriculum goals/syllabus. • Negotiated between teacher and children, with consideration to children's interest.
Duration of Project	Determined by project development.	Predetermined by curriculum/teaching plan.
Initiation of Project	Emerged from children's interest or initiated by teacher.	Guided by teacher incorporating children's interest.
Instructional Organization	Whole-group and small-group.	Mostly whole-group.
Knowledge Acquisition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through answers to posed questions or investigation by children. • Children participate in determining activities for learning or finding answers to posed questions or investigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through mostly answers to questions posed by teacher with input from children. • Both teacher and children participate in determining activities for learning or finding answers to questions posed by the teacher. • Some activities are preplanned by teacher to learn specific concepts.
Project Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on investigating and finding answers to questions using available resources by children. • Teacher webs to assess children's prior knowledge. • Project led by children, but teacher facilitates acquisition and integration of new knowledge. • Teacher integrates curriculum goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on investigating and finding answers to questions posed by teacher. • Teacher webs to assess children's prior knowledge. • Teacher orchestrates project to facilitate acquisition and integration of new knowledge. • Teacher integrates curriculum goals and objectives. • Involve a four-step scaffolding process: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher instruction/facilitation 2. Teacher demonstrating/modeling 3. Child demonstration 4. Group participation

¹ Helm & Katz (2010).

Project Integration	Project is integrated throughout the day, the classroom, and curriculum areas and skills.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted at a specific predetermined time in the day, the project is visible in the classroom and is related to curriculum goals and objectives.
Project Product	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation (e.g., drawing, writing, constructing) enhances children's integration of concepts and documents project learning. Representation activities are repeated to demonstrate acquisition of knowledge and skills. 	Representation is related to specific activities. For example, drawing a picture of food found in a particular type of restaurant.
Role of Teacher	Facilitator	Instructor, guide, tutor, and facilitator
Sources of Resources for Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources from teacher, children, guest experts, and field-site visits. Field trips are an integral part of project process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources from teacher, children, and families. No field trips due to time limitation, curriculum demands, and other contextual constraints.