Medium-of-Instruction Policy and Practices in CSL Classrooms

Danping Wang

Abstract This chapter provides a critical review of medium-of-instruction (MoI) policies and practices in CSL education in China. MoI is the language used in the process of teaching or learning a language, which may include the target language and students' L1 and/or a common language shared by teachers and students. The purpose of this chapter is to examine language use and language choice in the CSL classroom, to offer pedagogical suggestions for CSL teachers and teacher educators, and to consider why, when, and how to effectively manage MoI for everyday teaching. The chapter also seeks to shed light on understanding the functional role and the sensible use of English in Chinese teaching and learning in the United States.

1 Introduction

A typical CSL classroom in China is comprised of multilingual learners with diverse linguistic backgrounds, life experiences, and knowledge acquired from learning other foreign languages. Foreign language education scholarship has thoroughly investigated the effectiveness of teaching and learning a foreign language entirely through the target language. Tollefson and Tsui (2004) argue that the most important policy decisions in language education are those related to the choice of language(s) as a medium of instruction (MoI). This chapter seeks to analyze MoI policies in China and to offer implications for teachers, teacher educators, and policy makers of CSL in China and the United States. It also seeks to shed light on understanding the functional role and the sensible use of English in Chinese teaching and learning in the United States.

D. Wang (✉)
Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China
e-mail: dpwang@vtc.edu.hk

In analyzing medium-of-instruction policies, it is imperative to include both pedagogical and socio-political perspectives. In the classroom, the question of which language to use has a tremendous impact on the learning outcome. It is useful to consider how an MoI policy can support the goals and objectives of the curriculum. For example, in a low-level class, some teachers may find it beneficial to provide all classroom instruction exclusively in Mandarin Chinese, while others may prefer to explain difficult concepts or methodology in a common language shared by teacher and student. However, the rationale behind each teacher's decision is shaped by many factors, such as his/her teaching philosophy, previous experience, his/her understanding of second-language acquisition, as well as his/her ability in using a common language to teach. Many studies in foreign language education provide models and suggestions for MoI policy regulations and implementation in hopes of achieving the most desirable learning outcomes (e.g. Turnbull and Arnett 2002; Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain 2009; Swain and Lapkin 2000). However, only a few articles exist that focus on medium-of-instruction for CSL teaching in particular, and MoI is treated in a piecemeal way in these articles. Thus, when speaking of CSL education, the importance of medium-of-instruction policy reviews and research has not been fully recognized.

Although decisions about medium-of-instruction are often justified within pedagogical frameworks, these policies are not formed in a vacuum (Tollefson and Tsui 2004, p. 283). They emerge in the context of social and political forces, including, but not limited to, the global linguistic environment, the internationalization of English, the stability of economic growth, and the national political climate. Power distribution among competing interest groups in a socio-political sphere can be implicitly but proportionally transferable to the classroom. Some teachers, much to their surprise, discover that their good intentions, say, in forcefully banning the use of students' L1s or a common language in order to increase their exposure to the target language, is in fact a deprivation of students' right to speak their minds in the classroom. Discussions in the scholarly community concerning the influence of ideological, social, and political elements in MoI policy focus on English as a Foreign/Second Language (EFL or ESL) (e.g. Hashimoto 2013; Pennycook 1998; Phillipson 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000).

Nevertheless, research on MoI in the CSL context remains scant. In spite of a number of articles on possible hazardous consequences of using English in CSL classrooms (e.g. Liang 1998; Wang 2007), there is little actual research exploring the ramifications of MoI in a CSL-specific context. Which language to use, and how often to use it, is as essential an issue in a CSL classroom as any other; yet, it is an issue that remains peripheral or inconsequential to CSL research. As Wright (2005) argues, classroom management is the central element of every teacher's daily professional experience, but it is often a neglected topic in debates on language education (p. 1).

A critical review of MoI policy and practice is beneficial to the development of innovative pedagogical techniques and teacher education. This chapter begins with

a historical account of MoI policy development over the last 60 years. It will then discuss reasons and factors that have impeded research on MoI policies in CSL. Taking into account prior studies, I propose a multilingual paradigm toward MoI policy development and suggest some basic guidelines and principles for a practical and sensible use of MoI. The final portion of this chapter extends this discussion to the socio-political dimension and the controversial role of English in the CSL classroom.

2 A Historical Account of MoI Policy Development

Language use in the classroom has evolved alongside teaching methods. Over the last 60 years, changing trends in teaching methods have been observed and documented. Table 1 tracks the development of MoI policies and their effect on the prevailing teaching method of the time.

A multilingual MoI was most common during the period when the Grammar-translation Approach was dominant. Since this method encouraged literature analysis and dictionary skills (Xing 2006, p. 7), teachers emphasized the meaning of words and cultural knowledge rather than developing learners' oral proficiency. The major classroom activity was translation, which naturally entailed the multilingual use of Chinese, the students' L1s, and a common language. In the 1950s, most CSL courses required candidates to speak either fluent English or Russian (Cheng 2005, p. 58). At the same time that these early CSL classes were offered, English was adopted as the lingua franca in China. CSL teachers would usually begin instruction in English to introduce Chinese grammar knowledge and then assign exercises for students to practice (Zhao 2009, p. 219). The use of English as the MoI was highly valued by teachers, as well as students from various countries. This model was regarded as practical and effective in a class that emphasized communication.

The Directive Approach flourished in the 1960s, bringing with it a switch to a monolingual policy. The audio-lingual method and pattern drills became the most popular practices to teach a foreign language. The audio-lingual method is based on ideas from behaviorism in psychology and structuralism in linguistics. Behaviorism views language learning as the formation of habits and assumes that a person learning an L2 would start off with the habits formed in his or her L1. This perspective,

Table 1 The development of medium-of-instruction policies

1950s–1960s	1960s–1970s	1980s–2000s	2000s–present
Grammar-translation approach	Directive approach (e.g. audio-lingual method)	Various new communicative methods (e.g. task-based approach)	Various popular methods (e.g. immersion programs)
Multilingual	Monolingual	Eclectic but prone to multilingual	Eclectic but prone to monolingual

however, mistakenly blurs the distinction between L1 acquisition and L2 learning. Up to the 1960s, one's L1 was believed to be a major interference and the cause of errors when learning an L2. During the Directive Approach period, "classroom activities emphasized mimicry and memorization, and students learned dialogues and sentence patterns by heart" (Lightbrown and Spada 2011, p. 34). Because of its primary emphasis on spoken language, teaching effectiveness and students' progress were evaluated by how much the target language was used. The most salient principle of procedures underlying the Directive method is its monolingual language policy. "Classroom instruction was conducted exclusively through the target language" (Richards and Rogers 2001, p. 12). However, in many CSL classrooms, English and the students' L1s were also used occasionally for practical reasons, so this period in CSL was regarded as a "Relative-Directive Approach" (Cheng 2005, p. 58). The influence of this method was so profound that traces of audio-lingual-based techniques are still in practice today. During the 1970s and 1980s, CSL education in China was suspended due to the catastrophic Cultural Revolution.

The Communicative Approach became a popular idea in CSL teaching in China in the 1990s. A variety of alternative language teaching methods emerged at this time, all with the primary goal of developing communicative competence in real-life situations. During this period, there was no particular dominant method that met the goals and needs of all learners and programs. A Communicative Approach encompasses eclectic ways of teaching built upon disparate beliefs. In the same way EFL teachers were learning to adapt to diverse communicative techniques, CSL teachers introduced new methods such as "Suggestopedia," "Silent Way," and "Total Physical Response" (Liu 2006, pp. 84–99; Zhao 2010). Some of these teaching techniques never became widely used and had only a short lifespan while others are still in practice to this day. Teachers' attitudes toward language use were consequently different according to their preferred teaching methods. With the rise of empirical investigations of EFL learners' individual differences, CSL educators also began to accommodate different learner needs and preferences. The MoI policy during this period was rather flexible and more open to a multilingual paradigm.

This eclectic approach to teaching continued into the 2000s with an inclination towards monolingual policies. CSL teachers in China became enamored with popular immersion programs as the most effective way to achieve fluency (Ji 2006; Zhang and Tian 2004). Some programs were famous for their rigorous monolingual pedagogy and their adherence to a strict language oath, which required students to pledge to use no language other than Chinese in all situations. Failure to follow the language oath would result in punishments including being dismissed from the immersion program. Observing the astonishing results of these methods, some CSL teachers assumed that using Chinese exclusively in the classroom could improve learning.

The limitation of these immersion programs was they could not accommodate low-level learners or those with little or no prior knowledge of Chinese, or those who only learn Chinese for fun. In addition to pedagogical considerations, socio-political factors also contributed to the formation of an overarching monolingual policy in CSL during this period. "Language purity" propaganda designed to remove

the English out of Chinese may have also reinforced teachers' decisions on language use in the classroom (Yan and Deng 2009).

Over the decades covered, MoI policy in CSL classrooms developed alongside changing teaching approaches. Although educators have introduced popular teaching methods, pedagogical development continues to remain on the periphery of CSL research. Apart from a limited recognition of the importance of MoI policy research, another critical issue that contributed to the tardy development of this area is the ambivalent definition of MoI.

3 Ambivalent Definition of MoI

Medium of instruction is "媒介语" in Chinese. The denotation of this term is slightly different from its established definition in English. In a broader sense, "medium of instruction" in the CSL context should include all languages used for teaching or learning Chinese, including Chinese (the target language), the CSL student's first language, and English (the lingua franca). In Chinese, however, the term "medium of instruction" usually excludes Chinese, the target language. It refers only to a foreign language shared by teachers and students. This foreign language is usually "the teachers' L2 or students' L1 or L2" (Fu 2005, p. 49). Studies related to MoI policy in CSL have widely adopted this definition. For example, a common expression in Chinese about this term can be seen from Xun Liu's work (2000, p. 351).

> 应尽量运用目的语与学习者沟通, 避免语言转换或夹杂学生的母语或媒介语。
>   ([Teachers] should use as much target language as possible to communicate with students and avoid switching or mixing students' L1 or a foreign language)

CSL instructors should reconsider their definition of the medium-of-instruction to avoid such implications. Ontologically speaking, to separate the target language from other languages used in the classroom can lead to profound problems. First of all, the supporting instructional code becomes "foreign" or "undesirable" as instructors following this definition consider it auxiliary. As a result, CSL research has focused on developing techniques to cleanse "foreign languages" out of the CSL classroom, rather than studying effective ways to employ MoI to improve interaction. Second, it may have reduced the importance of learning and understanding learners' languages and cultures. With the current MoI policy, foreign elements, such as students' L1 and a common language for communication, are eventually to be removed from the CSL classroom because they are not regarded as useful to learning the Chinese language. A good understanding of students' L1s or a common language can be a great advantage in keeping the L2 classroom communicative and tremendously helpful for alleviating anxiety for beginners.

CSL research has crafted MoI into an "enclave" due to its ambivalent definition. Liu's statement shows how the definition has classified language use in the CSL

classroom into three groups – Chinese, the student's L1, and a common language. The positive message from this definition is it acknowledges that the contemporary CSL classroom is multilingual, and in most cases, CSL teaching in China requires a common language as the communication medium. At the same time, this definition has marginalized MoI and largely excluded it from CSL research. As previously mentioned, typical CSL classrooms in China consist of students from a number of different countries, speaking a number of different L1s. Only in rare cases can CSL teachers speak the L1 of their students fluently. It would be ideal if a CSL teacher could speak several foreign languages and be able to use those languages to teach and communicate, but it is not realistic to expect CSL teachers to be able to speak all of their students' L1s. However, under such circumstances, English is indisputably the most common and widely used foreign language for both CSL teachers and students. Even if there is a class with students from one single country, such as Thailand, Germany, or Russia, it is less likely one will find qualified CSL teachers who can comfortably use Thai, German, or Russian as a common language from which to teach. It is important to note that the ability to speak the language and the ability to teach through the language are different. The latter requires professional training and guidance.

MoI research becomes even more complex when considering the diversity of languages in the classroom. The assumption of many studies on this topic is students in the classroom share their L1 with their teacher and the teacher uses their commonly shared L1 to teach L2. Many studies concentrate on, for example, how a Spanish teacher creatively uses this language to help his or her Spanish students learn English faster and more easily. However, in CSL teaching, a Chinese teacher often uses English as a lingua franca to teach a group of international learners who speak a number of different L1s. For this reason, how to effectively use this common language (English) to teach and learn is a pressing issue in MoI research. However, such research would be highly complex since it requires professional knowledge about L2 acquisition, classroom management, pedagogical innovations, curriculum development, teacher education, and English education studies.

4   The Monolingual Façade

Chinese-only is the predominant language policy for CSL programs in China. Examples of MoI regulation are evident in teaching syllabi and many other documents dictating language use in CSL classrooms. For example, the CSL teaching syllabus excerpted below explicitly states that English and other foreign languages should be prohibited in everyday classrooms.

> 教学的主要用语是汉语。鉴于一般教材都有适量的翻译， 多数正规教学单位基本上是混合编班，因此，课堂教学中原则上不允许使用某种学生母语 (例如:英语、日语等) 或其他媒介语。
>
>   (Chinese is the primary MoI. Considering translation is provided in textbooks and a class is made up of students from different countries, students' L1 (e.g., English, Japanese, etc.) and other foreign languages are not allowed in the CSL classroom. (Yang 1999, p. 5)

Teachers who support Chinese-only pedagogy argue that Chinese is best taught through the target language exclusively because using English will be detrimental to the process of learning Chinese (e.g. Liu 2006, p. 118; Lü 1993, p. 84). In addition to teaching syllabi, more examples can be found in instructional materials for CSL teacher-training programs. Table 2 shows a few examples of explicit regulations on MoI.

Lü (1993) argues that Chinese language education should abide by a Chinese-only pedagogy and should avoid using students' L1s except as a last resort. It is assumed that all supporting instructional languages are detrimental to students' learning of Chinese. Teacher educators advise CSL instructors to exhaust alternative methods, such as body language or flashcards, before resorting to a student's L1. Classroom teaching efficiency is clearly not taken into consideration in this model. H. Yang (2004) acknowledges that a "foreign language" can be useful for explaining linguistic knowledge but otherwise rejects the notion that this foreign language can be similarly helpful as well in managing learning activities. Likewise, in the last example, Liu (2006) suggests that the only appropriate situation in which to include other languages is for practicing translation in class. Other than this, teachers and students are strongly encouraged to strictly follow Chinese-only pedagogy. However, to this date in CSL research, there are no studies focusing on which aspects of classroom teaching can or cannot be taught effectively in the non-target language. Little research exists to substantiate the advantage of the target-language-only principle. This assertion is based on groundless assumptions that have influenced teachers' attitudes and beliefs about pedagogical development.

Proponents of a Chinese-only pedagogy have developed teaching techniques to help teachers conform to the monolingual principle in CSL classes. For example, if teachers find it necessary to speak another language, they should instead use flashcards, make gestures, ask students to find the answers to their questions in dictionaries, and invite students to explain answers to each other (Liang 1998, pp. 41–42). Classes that follow these principles are considered highly teacher-centered, in that the effective and spontaneous communication between teachers and students might

Table 2 Regulations on MoI in CSL classrooms

Use only as the last resort	Use only to explain linguistic knowledge	Use only for translation practice
我们原则上不反对在第二语言教学中使用媒介语,但主张把媒介语的使用减少到最低限度,只是在不得已的时候使用。	教师在讲解的时候可以适当使用外语,但是课堂用语绝对不能使用外语。	课堂上则应严格体现"沉浸法"的精神,尽可能使用目的语,除了必要的翻译练习外,不使用母语或媒介语。
In principle, we do not object to the use of English as the MoI in Chinese teaching, but we aim to minimize its use, or only to use it as the last resort (Lü 1993, p. 84)	Teachers can use some foreign languages to explain a language point, but never use any foreign languages when giving directions (Yang 2004)	We should strictly follow the spirit of "immersion approach" in class and use the target language as much as possible. Except for necessary translation, the students' L1 or English is forbidden (Liu 2006, p. 118)

be postponed or impeded at the discretion of the teacher. All of these methods are guilty of falling into pure formalism. To prohibit any student's L1 or a common language in the classroom, particularly in the case of beginners, would create a rigid monolingual environment. Such a monolingual principle may not only slow the acquisition of Chinese but also denies students the ability to draw on their linguistic resources and strengths, and to build the new on the foundation of the known.

5   Towards a Multilingual Paradigm

Recent research on MoI in the CSL classroom reveals a discrepancy between a monolingual norm and a multilingual reality. Empirical evidence supports the notion that a multilingual model, using students' L1s and/or English, is very helpful for improving CSL learners' command of Chinese and aids in understanding Chinese culture.

In a small-scale study, Ouyang (2003, p. 76) discovered that CSL beginners from Korea struggled with their class instruction and often needed to rely on bilingual Chinese tutors to help them translate their Chinese-only notes into Korean after school. In recent years, the Chinese government has made some effort to develop professional multilingual CSL teachers who are expected to speak, in addition to English, another less commonly taught foreign language, such as Korean, Japanese, French, Russian, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Arabic, etc. These multilingual CSL teachers are expected to teach Chinese in the countries where the language is spoken as the L1, instead of teaching in multilingual classrooms at universities in China. Such training is urgently needed. However, many overseas CSL teachers and volunteers struggle to overcome huge cultural gaps and have a difficult time understanding classroom norms and their students (Deng 2008).

Some Chinese articles have articulated at length what circumstances, for what purposes, and in what way English may be used to achieve practical goals. These studies have proposed the principle of moderation (适度原则). Xu (2008) highlighted four factors for CSL teachers to consider when they decide what language to use: (1) to whom (a student's linguistic background), (2) at what level (a student's L2 level), (3) for how long, and (4) how much. Following Xu's proposal, Jiao (2009) speculated that 50 % of classroom language should be in Chinese for intermediate or lower level CSL students, while 80–100 % should be used for advanced CSL students (p. 24). In another study, Lai (1996) investigated the teaching practices of four pre-service ESL teachers in Hong Kong and suggested a few ways for teachers to use students' L1 to trigger the use of L2. Furthermore, Cook (2001), in her seminal article on language use in the classroom, identified three positive roles that L1 could play in an L2 classroom, including "to convey meaning," "to organize the class," and for "students' use of L1 within class" (pp. 413–419). Based on these studies, this chapter proposes three major principles for a medium-of-instruction policy.

(a) Comprehension. Use L1 as long as it helps explain or translate to increase students' comprehension of CSL.
(b) Communication. Use L1 as long as it aids in communication, the organization of or participation in activities, or sharing information.
(c) Efficiency. Use L1 as long as it saves time and energy, for example, the avoidance of completely resorting to body gestures and making flashcards.

As long as the use of English (or L1s) enhances comprehension, maintains communication, and increases efficiency, it can be regarded as a good practice. There are plenty of empirical studies of EFL learning one may refer to on how to judiciously use students' L1s and common languages to accomplish practical goals (e.g. Polio and Duff 1994, p. 317; Swain and Lapkin 2000, p. 258). There are many similarities between these studies and the ones previously mentioned. Based on an empirical study, D. Wang (2014) summarized three major functions of using English and students' L1s in a CSL classroom as shown in Table 3.

These activities are integral to keeping modern foreign language classrooms running smoothly in a communicative way. Without a properly planned MoI, many of the activities listed in Table 3 would be difficult to carry out effectively, particularly in a lower-level class. There have been an increasing number of studies calling for pedagogical reforms in CSL classrooms. Future studies on MoI should focus on making Chinese teaching methods more learner-centered rather than teacher-centered and more theory-informed rather than based off myths and blind assumptions (Levine 2011; Orton 2011; Scrimgeour and Wilson 2009; Wang et al. 2013).

This multilingual paradigm emphasizes the need to liberate constraints on classroom language use and to regulate language use in a sensible way. However, it does not imply that non-target language use can be used without limits. This recommendation for MoI policy is premised on the belief that development of the target language should always be maximized.

Table 3 Functions of English and students' L1s as MoI in CSL classrooms

The explanatory function	Defining and explaining metalinguistic terms, e.g. grammar, new words, new characters, difficult concepts
	Comparison: comparing the relationship between Chinese and English/ students' L1 and Chinese culture with other cultures
	Confirmation: checking comprehension
	Response: answering questions/correcting mistakes
The managerial function	Giving instruction for classroom activities
	Introducing new materials/techniques
	Arranging homework, quizzes, and tests
	Building rapport (free chat/joke around)
	Sharing experiences and learning methods
The interactive function	Helping teachers translate
	Giving class information to others
	Managing tasks when their Chinese is not sufficient enough
	Confirming teacher's instruction
	Translating to stimulate memory

6   English in CSL

Language choice is a question of ideology. An MoI policy determines which social and linguistic groups have access to political and economic opportunities, and which groups are disenfranchised (Tollefson and Tsui 2004, p. 2). The major contention regarding MoI lies in its intricate relationship with English.

The globalization of English has made it the most commonly used MoI in the CSL classroom (Zhang 2007, p. 162; Wang and Kirkpatrick 2012). However, English in CSL education has never been free from complications. Some teachers are not comfortable with English as the sole medium of instruction, arguing that its use would only help disseminate English to CSL students (Wang 2007). The discussion of MoI in CSL teaching can also be a rather sensitive topic to teachers who are educated and trained to teach Chinese as an L1 or teachers who are unable to speak a foreign language. With such conflicted feelings and constant hostility towards English, scholars have only sparsely discussed or investigated the pedagogical role and function of English.

China has experienced extraordinary economic growth and active cultural diplomacy in the last few decades. The Chinese language is also regarded as essential for future success in the global economy. China constantly launches "language-purity campaigns" to combat the invasion of English on Chinese. Two recent articles, "China's War on English" (Roberts 2014) and "Save Chinese from English" (The Economist 2010), have had a profound impact on Chinese society, including CSL teaching. The articles assert that refusing to learn or speak English makes one more patriotic towards China and more legitimate and professional as a Chinese language teacher. For example, D. Wang (2014) found that some CSL teachers believe that English is a threat to the purity of the Chinese language and using English in their class would tarnish their professional identity (p. 154). According to Chen (2010), CSL teachers are portrayed as cultural messengers who "have a responsibility to spread Chinese culture in addition to their role as a language teacher" (p. 2). Therefore, in their own outlooks and from the information provided by their training instructors, CSL teachers see their choice and use of language in the classroom as a response to the country's own language regulations. However, the best way to regulate the use of English might be found through a multilingual paradigm that allows a distinctive mix rather than a single language that is kept "pure."

This chapter discourages the extremists who wish to enact a "one-size-fits-all" language policy in the CSL classroom. A monolingual pedagogy is ideologically rooted and not only forces a focus on simple uses of language, but also excludes the possibility of critical reflection (Auerbach 1993, p. 22).

7   Implications for Chinese Teaching in the U.S.

Chinese language teaching in the United States has a long history and has achieved remarkable success in teaching and research (Everson and Shen 2010; He and Xiao 2008; Xiao 2011). One of the most well-known models of Chinese language

teaching developed in the U.S. is the summer programs that strictly implement a language pledge in an immersion environment in or outside the U.S. Over the years, the total immersion approach adopted by, for example, Middlebury College and Princeton in Beijing, has been regarded as one of the essential preconditions that enable a rapid progress of learning (McGinnis 1997, p. 232). However, with the growing number of learners of Chinese in the U.S. and the diverse teaching methods in other foreign language classrooms, it is imperative that Chinese language educators and researchers begin to research classroom language practices using empirical research methods and to create a dialogue concerning sensible and practical guidance and recommendations for future language policy development.

This critical review underscores the need for sound theoretical guidelines and sufficient training for MoI practices in Chinese classrooms. In order to effectively implement popular teaching approaches, such as the task-based approach, the communicative approach, or the content and language integrated approach, a professional understanding and command of MoI is essential to classroom learning activities and communication. Without this command, teachers' improper use of English hinders students' learning of Chinese in China and overseas (Ruan 2012, p. 94). Teachers might overuse or misuse English in the Chinese classroom or use awkward or incorrect linguistic terms in their instruction. Corresponding to the promotion of English language education in China (Lam 2005), Chinese teachers' English language competence as a whole is rapidly improving (Zhang 2006), yet far from enough to be used effortlessly in managing foreign language classrooms in English-speaking countries. In light of the fact that currently most Chinese teachers in the U.S. are either immigrants from China or teachers on termed contracts under the sponsorship of the Chinese government or various organizations that promote language and cultural exchange between the two countries (e.g., Confucius Institute, Luce Foundation, and Freeman Foundation), this issue deserves more attention. Finally, Chinese language teachers are encouraged to further deepen their understanding of linguistic differences between Chinese and English, and learn to systematically and effectively use English as an MoI to maximize students' Chinese learning experience and learning outcome, rather than simply focusing on maximizing passive exposure to Chinese for the students. Moreover, Chinese teachers also need to have a solid understanding of second language acquisition (e.g. the relationship between L1 and L2, code-switching), as well as sufficient knowledge of and support for pedagogical innovations to make Chinese a desirable foreign language in the United States (Singh and Ballantyne 2014; Wang et al. 2013).

References

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*, 9–32.

Chen, F. (2010). 汉语国际推广与对外汉语教学 [International promotion of Chinese and Chinese as a foreign language teaching]. In Beijing Language University (Ed.), *汉语国际教育"三教" 问题: 第六届对外汉语学术研讨会论文集* [*"San Jiao" in international Chinese as a foreign language teaching: Proceedings of the 6th conference of teaching Chinese as a foreign language*] (pp. 1–12). Beijing: Beijing Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Cheng, Y. (2005). 新中国对外汉语教学发展史 [*History of Chinese as a foreign language teaching in new China*]. Beijing: Peking University Press.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*, 402–423.

Deng, X. (2008). 汉语环境与非汉语环境下汉语零起点班之比较 – 以汕头大学汉语中心和泰国 *Wang Klaikangwon*学校汉语教学为例 [*Comparisons between beginner classes in Chinese and non-Chinese learning environment – Examples of Chinese teaching at Chinese Center in Shantou University and Wang Klaikangwon in Thailand*]. Paper presented at the 6th Conference of International Chinese Language Teaching and Learning, Beijing.

Everson, M. E., & Shen, H. H. (Eds.). (2010). *Research among learners of Chinese as a foreign language*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Fu, C. (2005). 对外汉语教学语言研究 [Medium of instruction in Chinese as a foreign language teaching]. Unpublished master thesis, Fudan University, Shanghai.

Hashimoto, K. (2013). 'English-only', but not a medium-of-instruction policy: The Japanese way of internationalizing education for both domestic and overseas students. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *14*(1), 16–33.

He, A. W., & Xiao, Y. (Eds.). (2008). *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ji, C. (2006). 论对外汉语教学模式的构建-由美国明德大学汉语教学谈起 [The model construction of teaching Chinese as a foreign language – Examples from Middlebury College in the United States]. 汉语学习, *4*, 64–69.

Jiao, J. (2009).浅谈对外汉语教学中的媒介语使用的"适度原则" [The principle of moderation for medium of instruction practices in Chinese as a foreign language teaching]. 成都中医药大学学报（教育科学版）, *11*(3), 23–24.

The Economist (2010). Chinese purism: Saving Chinese from English. *The Economist*. Retrieved from http://ww3.economist.com/blogs/johnson/2010/12/chinese_purism

Lai, M. L. (1996). Using the L1 sensibly in English language classrooms. *Journal of Primary Education*, *6*(1/2), 91–99.

Lam, A. (2005). *Language education in China: Policy and experience from 1949*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Levine, G. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Liang, N. (1998). 不用媒介语从事对外汉语教学的探讨 [Teaching Chinese through Chinese only]. 汉语学习, *3*, 40–43.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2011). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liu, X. (2000). 对外汉语教育学引论 [*Introduction Chinese as a foreign language education*]. Beijing: Beijing Language University Press.

Liu, X. (2006). 汉语作为第二语言教学简论 [*A brief introduction of Chinese as a foreign language education*]. Beijing: Beijing Language University Press.

Lü, B. (1993). 对外汉语教学研究 [*Research on Chinese as a foreign language education*]. Beijing: Beijing Language University Press.

McGinnis, S. (1997). Tonal spelling versus diacritics for teaching pronunciation of Mandarin Chinese. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(2), 228–236.

Orton, J. (2011). Educating Chinese language teachers – Some fundamentals. In L. Tsung & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese in global contexts* (pp. 151–164). London: Continuum.

Ouyang, W. (2003). 对外汉语教学运用两种语言"过渡式"教学方法初探 [A preliminary study on a transitional model of teaching through two languages in Chinese as a foreign language teaching]. 天津成人高等学校联合学报, *4*, 76–78.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 313–326.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, D. (2014). China's war on English. *Bloomberg Businessweek*. Retrieved from http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2014-05-22/china-moves-to-protect-its-language-from-english

Ruan, Y. (2012). Can tasks be used to teach Chinese culture at the beginner level? In X. Du & M. J. Kirkebæk (Eds.), *Exploring task-based PBL in Chinese teaching and learning in a Danish context* (pp. 78–98). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Scrimgeour, A., & Wilson, P. (2009). International curriculum for Chinese language education. *Babel*, *43*(3), 3.

Singh, M., & Ballantyne, C. (2014). Making Chinese learnable for beginning second language learners. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 199–214). Dordrecht: Springer.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education – Or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*, 251–274.

Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' use of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 204–218.

Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (Eds.). (2009). *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Wang, H. (2007). 对外汉语教学中的媒介语问题试说 [Problems of medium of instruction in teaching Chinese as a foreign language]. *世界汉语教学*, *2*, 111–117.

Wang, D. (2014). *English in Chinese foreign language classroom*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Wang, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). Code choice in the Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Multilingual Education*, *2*(3), 1–18.

Wang, D., Moloney, R., & Li, Z. (2013). Towards internationalizing the curriculum: A case study of Chinese language teacher education programs in China and Australia. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(9), 116–135.

Wright, T. (2005). *Classroom management in language education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Xiao, Y. (2011). Chinese language in the United States: An ethnolinguistic perspective. In L. Tsung & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese in the global contexts* (pp. 181–196). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Xing, Z. (2006). *Teaching and learning Chinese as a foreign language: A pedagogical grammar*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Xu, P. (2008). 初级阶段对外汉语课堂教学中媒介语使用问题探讨 [Discussions on medium of instruction for beginners of Chinese as a foreign language]. *现代语文*, *9*, 119–121.

Yan, Y., & Deng, T. (2009). On Chinese loanword from English language. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(4), 33–37.

Yang, J. (1999). *对外汉语教学初级阶段教学大纲* [*Teaching syllabus for beginners of Chinese as a foreign language*]. Beijing: Beijing Language University Press.

Yang, H. (2004). 试论课堂教学研究 [Classroom language teaching in TCSL]. *语言教学与研究*, *3*, 37–42.

Zhang, H. (2006). 对外汉语教师素质与培训研究的回顾与展望 [Studies in quality and training of TCASL teachers: A review and a vista]. *北京师范大学学报 (社会科学版)*, *3*, 108–133.

Zhang, Y. (2007). 对外汉语教学中学习者的语码转换分析 [The analysis of code-switching of learners of Chinese as a foreign language]. *语文学刊 (高教版)*, *7*, 161–164.

Zhang, X., & Tian, D. (2004). 美国明德学院的中文教学 [Chinese teaching in Middlebury College in the United States]. *世界汉语教学*, *1*, 108–110.

Zhao, J. (2009). 教学环境与汉语教材 [Chinese language teaching environment and textbooks]. *世界汉语教学*, *2*, 210–223.

Zhao, J. (2010). 对外汉语教学法回视与再认识 [Review and re-evaluation of the methodology in teaching Chinese as a foreign language]. *世界汉语教学*, *2*, 243–254.

Danping Wang is Assistant Professor in the Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong. She completed her bachelor's and master's degree at the Renmin University of China and her doctoral degree at Hong Kong Institute of Education. Her research interests include medium of instruction in the CFL classroom, curriculum development for CFL teacher education, learning autonomy and bilingual research literacy.