The Teaching of Chinese to Heritage Language Learners at the Post-Secondary Level

Xuehua Xiang

Abstract This chapter presents an overview of the history, theories, research and practical issues in the area of teaching Chinese as a heritage language (TCHL) in the post-secondary setting in the United States. The theoretical aim of the chapter is to formulate interdisciplinary insights into TCHL, relating research from second language acquisition perspectives to identity research, curriculum development research, discourse analysis, and social constructionist views on language learning. The practical aim of the chapter is to provide teachers, program administrators and policy makers concrete pedagogical suggestions regarding TCHL.

Keywords Chinese heritage language learner (CHLL) • Community-based Chinese language schools • Dialect heritage language learners • Bilingualism • Linguistic systems of Chinese heritage language learners • Chinese heritage language curriculum • Textbooks for Chinese heritage language learners • Language assessment for CHLL

1 Introduction

As reported in the 2011 American Community Survey, the Chinese-speaking population in the U.S. has reached 2.9 million, quadrupling the number in 2000, marking Chinese as the third most spoken language in the U.S. after English and Spanish (Ryan 2013). Among those reporting to speak Chinese, 44 % also indicated they speak English very well (Ryan 2013). These statistics provide a snapshot of the widespread Chinese-English bilingualism in the U.S. A cogently related phenomenon is the increasing number of students in Chinese foreign language classrooms who have pre-existing abilities in Chinese due to their home background, viz. Chinese Heritage Language Learners (CHLLs). In an English-dominant society, children of Chinese-speaking families have extensive exposure to Chinese but typically become English-dominant once formal schooling starts. For many children of immigrant families, learning Chinese may remain a remote childhood memory or

X. Xiang (✉)
Department of Linguistic, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA
e-mail: xxiang@uic.edu

may constitute years of (reluctantly) attending community-based Chinese schools on weekends, as demanded by parents.

Such reluctance and amorphous identification with the family language may suddenly change once young individuals enter college, a critical period in which foreign language study is intricately connected to one's conscious identity formation, as well as intellectual development (He 2006; Li 2011). Foreign language study is a mandatory subject in the university setting. Students from Chinese families or other heritage backgrounds may elect to (re)learn Chinese both to fulfill their foreign language study requirement and to explore their personal, familial, and cultural connections with the language (He 2006, 2008, 2010; He and Xiao 2008; McGinnis 2008; Wen 2011; also see Polinsky and Kagan 2007; Valdés 2001). Meanwhile, since China has become a global economic force, Chinese is now a world language of considerable social capital (Bourdieu 1991). On the societal level, heritage language speakers are a national resource as they possess great potential to reach advanced Chinese language proficiency in a relatively short amount of time (Brecht and Ingold 1998).

Thus, teaching and learning Chinese as a heritage language is significant on many levels for individual learners, their families, the community, the language teaching profession, and the society and nation at large. At the same time, however, unprecedented complexities and challenges lie in the increasingly heterogeneous Chinese language classroom. Pedagogical challenges are no longer just about teaching the language itself, but also about understanding learner's different needs and creating curricula that take into account learners' different language backgrounds and proficiency profiles.

Teaching Chinese as a Heritage Language (TCHL) is a young but fast developing field. From the seminal collection of articles in X. Wang (1996b) on community-based Chinese schools, a special issue of the *Heritage Language Journal* dedicated to TCHL (Tao 2006), a comprehensive review of the evolution of Chinese language education (McGinnis 2008), a wide-scope foundational volume (He and Xiao 2008), and numerous original journal articles (e.g., in more recent years, Wen 2011; Wong and Xiao 2010; Xiao and Wong 2014; Xie 2014; Zhang 2014), a rich knowledge base is forming. However, critical reviews of research, theories, and pedagogical activities in TCHL specifically pertaining to the university setting are non-existent, with the exception of Duanduan Li and Patricia A. Duff's chapter in He and Xiao (2008). Since the time of Li and Duff's (2008) publication, diverse studies of CHLLs at the post-secondary level have emerged and the field of foreign language education as a whole has evolved and become more interdisciplinary.

The current chapter extends the discussion initiated in Li and Duff (2008) on university-level TCHL. Compared to the article by Li and Duff (2008), the current chapter focuses more on classroom-based research and insights. The chapter relates research from second language acquisition perspectives to identity research, bilingualism, discourse analysis, and curriculum development and materials design. The practical aim of the chapter is to provide teachers, program administrators, and

policy makers with concrete pedagogical suggestions regarding post-secondary TCHL.[1]

The chapter provides a critical review of the sociolinguistic contexts of TCHL, including a review of the theoretical constructs in TCHL literature, a discussion of home and community environments of TCHL, and discussion of the nuances of Chinese as a Heritage Language (CHL) for dialect speakers. It also offers a review of research directly pertaining to university-level TCHL, including research on learning motivation, identity research, and research on various linguistic structures and usages of HLLs. Pedagogical discussions and suggestions based on relevant research and the author's own practical experiences are also presented. The chapter concludes with suggestions for further research.

2 Heritage Language Learners (HLLs): Constructs and Contexts

2.1 Defining Heritage Language Learners

Drawing on Valdés' definition (2001, p. 38), He (2006) defines a Chinese HLL as someone "who is raised in a home where Chinese is spoken, who speaks or at least understands the language and is to some degree bilingual in Chinese and in English" (p. 1). The key elements of this definition are the learner's home environment and his/her existing Chinese proficiency. HLLs contrast with foreign language learners (hereafter FLLs). The latter encounter Chinese as True Beginners (Valdés 1997), i.e. they have not benefited from what Dai and Zhang (2008) call the Chinese linguistic habitus (Bourdieu 1991). As HLLs' exposure to Chinese primarily occurs in the home domain, Chinese language skills of HLLs have certain common limitations: generic and small-size vocabulary and vocabulary particular to home-based language use, unfamiliarity with language tasks not typically encountered in the home setting, unfamiliarity with a range of registers, style, and genres, and limited experience with written Chinese (He and Xiao 2008). Further, since Chinese has a non-alphabetic writing system, HLLs' aural-oral proficiency acquired in the home setting does not necessarily lead to fast-paced acquisition of reading and writing (Xiao 2008). A wide variability of literacy levels exists in HLLs.

Kagan (2011) defines HLLs as "those who have been exposed to a particular language in childhood but did not learn it to full capacity because another language became dominant" (p. 4).[2] This definition brings to the foreground two factors in the

---

[1] The chapter does not cover issues concerning language maintenance and indigenous language rights and national foreign language polices, all of which are however important dimensions of understanding the sociocultural context of heritage language learning.

[2] This definition is based on Polinsky and Kagan (2007) and is called the narrow definition of HLLs to contrast with the broad definition that focuses on an individual's cultural or heritage motivation to learn the HL, not necessarily considering existing language proficiency.

development of a Heritage Language (hereafter HL): the competition of English leading to unbalanced bilingual language skills and HLLs' initial exposure to Chinese in childhood. Children born in the U.S. tend to have a steep reduction of their Chinese exposure when formal schooling starts. In HL literature, the age at which HLLs shift from a Chinese-dominant environment to an English-dominant environment is correlated with subsequent HL proficiency. This correlation is particularly salient for "Generation 1.5" HLLs, i.e. HLLs who immigrated to the U.S. at a young age. Kagan (2011; also see Polinsky and Kagan 2007) suggested that HLLs who immigrated at the age of preschool have similar HL characteristics to U.S.-born HLLs. Those who have completed elementary school before emigrating differ considerably from the younger age group. Students who attended the equivalent of junior high school in their home country tended to have significantly higher Chinese literacy level. Completion of high school typically corresponds to the proficiency of a native speaker.

Adopting a classroom-based perspective, Weger-Gunther (2006) defines a Chinese HLL as "an individual who has one or more parents who speak Chinese as their first language and who self-identified themselves as taking Chinese classes in part because of their ethnic heritage" (p. 30). This definition marks HLLs' self-identification as critical to understanding students as HLLs (see also He 2006). In an interview given to *Korean Language in America*, Professor Jin Sook Lee (2013) emphasized, "The concept of heritage languages encompasses a wide range of personal, societal, linguistic, and cultural experiences" (p. 137). Ties to a heritage language include ethnic ties, psychological ties, proficiency ties, cultural ties, religious ties, and a myriad of other ways in which an individual can make connections to a language in ways different from a traditional foreign language learner (J.S. Lee in Lee 2013).

These various definitions of HLLs help us to "highlight and differentiate" (Lee 2013, p. 137) the commonly shared but ultimately individual backgrounds of the students in our classrooms. While building on these common constructs, we need to keep in mind, as Wiley (2001, p. 30) noted, that the term HLL is "elastic" and includes a broad range of variables and individual differences. Family history, home literacy practices, family language policies, community efforts, the learner's life experiences, experiences learning Chinese, personalities, aspirations, interests, and learning styles all have a role to play in an individual's self-identification as a heritage speaker/learner, his/her bilingual proficiency, and developmental trajectory. Theoretical constructs such as "the HLL" thus need to be understood as no more than mnemonic shorthand for the complex, evolving, and individualistic nature of heritage language use and learning.

2.2   The Role of Home and Community

This section reviews research on the home and community environment of HL learning in order to help us understand the pre-existing knowledge and skills, as well as learning expectations, of HLLs when they enter the university-level FL

classroom. In the home setting, it is not unusual for parents to speak Chinese to their children and children to respond in English (Liu 2013). In the following extracts, two HLLs in a university heritage Chinese class describe their use of Mandarin at home.[3]

- *I usually speak/reply (in) English to my parents and my parents speak Mandarin Chinese to me. I usually only speak Mandarin to clarify when my parents don't understand what I am saying in English.*
- *The majority of the time I speak to my parents in Mandarin (like 90 %), but I mainly speak English to my brother.*

The students' descriptions reflect common bilingual practices in Chinese immigrant families. Aural skills, the ability to understand Chinese, are the most typical skill set that HLLs bring to their university-level Chinese classes. It is also common for Chinese parents to implement a "Chinese-Only" home language policy, creating an environment where not only listening but also speaking in Chinese is enforced. The extent of parents' home language policy will affect the degree of oral proficiency of learners. Although, as He (2008) cautions, children may develop a negative attitude towards the controlling of language use at home, it is also through this home language policy and conscious effort of parents that a child develops both aural and oral skills despite the constant competition of English.

Aural-oral skills in Chinese are much easier to foster compared to the development of literacy skills due to the non-alphabetic writing system of Chinese. Koda et al. (2008) examined HLLs' literacy development at home and in community-based Chinese schools. The authors found that HLLs' print-based input was heavily restricted in amount and type. Similar findings were seen in Xiao (2008) who showed that Chinese families' home literacy practices were exemplified by children's learning to write their name and reading flashcards of Chinese characters, picture books, and nursery rhymes. However, once kindergarten begins, formal schooling results in a drastic reduction of time spent on Chinese literacy learning. Both studies suggest that HLLs' home background does not necessarily position them in an advantageous position over FLLs in university-level Chinese classrooms due to the limited exposure HLLs may have had to print texts.

Community-based Chinese language schools extend HLLs' heritage language exposure and development. These schools tend to follow the instructional approaches of the school director's home country (McGinnis 2008). Schools organized by Taiwanese Chinese immigrants versus schools organized by Mainland Chinese immigrants adopt different textbooks and form their own respective national heritage school coalitions, i.e., the Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS, 全美中文学校协会) and the National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools (NCA-CLS, 全美中文學校聯合總會)[4] (see Wang 1996b and Liu 2013 for detailed discussions).

---

[3] Learner excerpts used in this chapter were from the author's own research.

[4] Traditional-style characters are used here in accordance with the script-choice of NCA-CLS. Likewise, simplified-style characters are adopted in referring to the name of CSAUS also in accordance with the Organization's script-preference.

Community-based Chinese schools attended by immigrants from Taiwan tend to adopt 注音符号 (Zhuyin Fuhao), the phonetic system used in Taiwan, along with 拼音 (Pinyin, the Romanization system used in Mainland China), traditional characters (as opposed to simplified characters used in Mainland China) and the textbook series "美洲華語課本" *Huayu* (as opposed to "中文" *Zhongwen* used in Chinese schools administered by individuals from Mainland China) (Liu 2013; CSAUS 2013; NCA-CLS 2014).

Despite these curricular differences, community-based Chinese schools are similar in their methodological approaches. Both of the core textbook series, *Huayu* and *Zhongwen*, zero in on the characters as building blocks and the phonetic symbols as a bridge to written Chinese. The textbooks are accompanied by workbooks that drill on proper stroke orders and sensitize students to single character's combinatorial potentials with other characters. Heritage Chinese textbooks do not present explicit grammatical instructions nor are there instructions on listening and speaking. Poems, picture stories, and other such small bits of literacy input engage learners in reading and writing in a manner similar to that found in mainland China or Taiwan for Chinese monolingual speakers. The speed of reading development is estimated at 400–500 characters per proficiency band, each proficiency band corresponding to the amalgomeration of 4 levels in the 12-level system in the adopted textbook series. Learners are expected to acquire 1,350 characters upon completion of the 12 levels (Wang 1996a).[5]

Since instructors in community-based language schools tend to be parent volunteers,[6] methodologies in the classroom vary, but rote-memorization and drills are commonly practiced. A critical review of curriculum used at heritage language schools (Wang 1996a) suggested that instruction in Chinese community schools tends to be too textbook-driven. Teacher training in using textbooks in flexible ways and in creating context-rich supplements is much needed. Because of the sole focus on reading and writing, the needs of dialect speakers to practice speaking and listening in Mandarin Chinese may also be left unattended. By directly adopting teaching methods for Chinese monolinguals in mainland China or Taiwan, the teaching may not explicitly focus on morphology and grammar, assuming that students will have internalized grammatical rules. Research has not shown yet if implicit grammar instruction is suitable for bilingual learners who do not encounter the abundance and variety of input that Chinese monolinguals apparently enjoy (O'Grady et al. 2011). But we may anticipate that HLLs in university-level FL classrooms have some degree of implicit grammatical knowledge even if they are unable to use meta-

---

[5]The author is not aware of more recent publications that specifically address the vocabulary and skills coverage of the textbook-based curriculum of Chinese community schools and is thus unable to extend the insights offered in P-F. S. Wang (1996a) nearly two decades earlier.

[6]As one of the editors of this volume points out, depending on the locale, sometimes graduate students from local universities or community volunteers who are non-parents also serve as instructors. It would be an interesting research project to study the extent to which graduate students bring different methodologies and perspectives into the community language classroom.

language to explain that knowledge. In this regard, the heavy focus on grammar in current university-level FL classrooms may present a challenge to HLLs.

Another major difference between community-based schools and the typical university-level foreign language classroom is the community school's abundant use of Chinese as the language of instruction and considerable incorporation of cultural practices (dancing, calligraphy, arts, etc.). In community-based Chinese schools, curricula often link to Chinese summer camps and various community activities (such as New Year celebrations) (Wang 1996a). Teachers also act as "parenting figures," instilling in the students Chinese moral values, such as respecting authority in classroom teacher-student interactions (He 2000). Parents' direct and in-depth involvement in all aspects of the school's affairs and the heavy cultural and extra-curricular activities result in community-based Chinese schools becoming a part of HLLs' personal life.

Having experienced such personal feelings for the community school, HLLs arriving in university Chinese classes may welcome the diversified learners in the classroom and enjoy a sense of independence and freedom. But on the other hand, a traditional university foreign language classroom tends to treat language learning as an academic endeavor where experiential approaches and extra-curricular activities may play a small role.[7] Culture and worldviews are not traditional components of the university-level foreign language classroom. Compared to community-based Chinese classes, university-level Chinese classes, if run in a heavily traditional and structural way, may feel intensive, isolated, and austere to HLLs.

2.3   Dialect HLLs

The Chinese language is not a monolithic language. Rather, it is a language family of numerous regional dialects, including Cantonese, Hakka, Taiwanese, to name just a few (Chao 1968; Li and Thompson 1981). In the context of U.S. Chinese immigrant communities, speaking a particular dialect is associated with certain geo-cultural values and the sociopolitical and historical contexts that gave rise to waves of immigration (Chao 1996). Tension exists between the social prestige currently enjoyed by Mandarin Chinese and the familial and personal values dialect speakers feel towards their home dialect (see, for example, Dai and Zhang 2008; Wong and Xiao 2010; Xiao 2008; see critical discussions in He 2006, 2008).

As Wong (2010) suggested, the various definitions of HLLs may prove problematic for dialect Chinese speakers. Regional dialects such as Cantonese are mutually unintelligible from Mandarin. Thus, Mandarin is neither the home language nor does it occur frequently in a Cantonese-speaking HLL's immediate community.

---

[7] See, for example, Jack Richards' (2001) discussion of academic rationalism as a widespread language curriculum ideology that has had a great influence on how languages are taught in the U.S. Academic rationalism constructs language as a subject matter, an end in itself, an embodiment of knowledge, and generational wisdom (Richards 2001, p.114).

Dialect-background HLLs thus face a triple-challenge in a Mandarin Chinese FL classroom: learning to speak and understand Mandarin, learning the standard written form of Chinese, and maintaining proficiency in the home Chinese dialect. The following excerpt is from a blog entry written by an HLL fluent in Cantonese who was taking a beginning-level University Mandarin class for HLLs. The student explained his reason for enrolling in the Chinese class.

> 我一岁的時侯我在香港讀書。我六岁的時侯回来。我想讀中文因为我不可以讲，讀和寫中文。
>
> *I was studying in Hong Kong when I was one-year old. I came back (to the U.S.) when I was six years old. I want to study Chinese because I can't speak, read and write Chinese.*

The excerpt illustrates some typical HL linguistic characteristics. For example, instead of using null pronouns as a cohesive device, typical in L1 Chinese, the student uses a first-person pronoun in the subject position in every clause (cf. Xiao 2010). The excerpt also shows the predominance of the SVO sentence structure. What is worth noting though is the student has explicit awareness of his needs for not only reading and writing in Chinese but also speaking in Mandarin. As Wong and Xiao (2010) suggested, in the classroom, teachers may have unrealistic expectations for dialect speakers, assuming they should learn Chinese in the same way as Mandarin heritage speakers. At the same time, in a heritage-track FL classroom, instruction tends to cater to the Mandarin-speaking HLL majority in the classroom, primarily focusing on reading and writing. The needs of HLLs to develop Mandarin speaking and listening skills are left unaddressed (Wong and Xiao 2010).

Further, social stigma may attach to speaking a regional dialect of Chinese as opposed to Mandarin, and ideological tensions may result from the choice of a particular script system, i.e., the simplified Chinese script or the traditional Chinese script. Wong and Xiao (2010), based on their interview research with Chinese dialect speakers and Mandarin speakers, found that dialect speakers are conscious of the official status of Mandarin, and students from Hong Kong and Taiwan immigrant family backgrounds express preference for the traditional script for writing. In this vein, teachers, as language educators, should not force their own ideology and cultural upbringing on learners. There should be space for discussion and awareness of the sociolinguistic landscape of China. While classroom instruction has to adopt a particular phonetic system and writing system, the teacher should give students flexibility to choose one code over another while raising awareness of the implications of their code choices. Such sociolinguistic awareness is increasingly commonplace in Chinese textbooks. A textbook series may provide both the traditional and the simplified characters as written input and include explicit cultural notes on the diversity of Chinese dialects. It is also important for teachers to build sociolinguistic knowledge about Chinese and be able to respond to contingent and emergent questions that may arise in the classroom and need to be expertly addressed in an ad hoc manner (Wong 2010).

3   CHLLs in the University Setting: Motivation, Identity and Linguistic Profiles

The U.S. post-secondary setting presents a unique context for understanding heritage language learning and teaching. On the one hand, it is typically at this stage that HLLs become acutely aware of the pertinence of their HL proficiency to their personal identity, and, in turn, become strongly motivated to (re)learn Chinese (He 2006, 2008, 2011; Li 2011). On the other hand, the higher-education setting differs greatly from the K-12 setting and the community setting (Li and Duff 2008). In the post-secondary setting, heritage language teaching typically constitutes a specific unit of foreign language teaching. Historically, heritage language learners were an emergent phenomenon that seemed to have just caught the attention of many language educators. William O'Grady (2013) relayed that the first time he heard the term "Heritage Language Learner" was in the 1980s when it came to be realized that some students in the foreign language classroom "have no native language," being neither a native speaker of English nor a native speaker of the family language (p. 141).

Heritage language learning is intrinsically "sociocultural" (He 2010). Proficiency considerations alone are never sufficient to provide a coherent and sufficient understanding of CHLLs. Three major strands of research have been carried out with HLLs in university FL classrooms: (1) motivation to learn, (2) identity and bilingualism, and (3) acquisition in specific language areas.

3.1   Motivation

Generally speaking, foreign language learners may be motivated to study the foreign language for practical reasons, i.e. "instrumental factors," such as better job prospects, greater salary, etc. (Gardner and Lambert 1972). On the other hand, learners may be motivated by "integrative factors" where the learner appreciates the language, its culture, its people, and wishes to be a member of the target community (Gardner and Lambert 1972).

TCHL research shows that similar to FLLs, HLLs have strong instrumental motivation to study Chinese (Lu and Li 2008; Wen 1997, 1999), sometimes even more so than FLLs (Lu and Li 2008). Lu and Li (2008) found that while both HLLs and FLLs are motivated by instrumental factors, as well as integrative factors, FLLs' motivation to learn Chinese is also influenced by "situational factors" (such as prior learning experience and teaching approaches experienced), a phenomenon not apparent in HLLs. In other words, for FLLs, experience with a supportive teaching approach and learners' self-monitoring and learning strategies play a significant role in learners' motivation to study Chinese. In contrast, HLLs maintain heritage-related motivation. The National Heritage Language Resource Center's (NHLRC)

2009 survey showed that the majority of HLLs are motivated to study due to their cultural and linguistic heritage and their need to communicate with family members (Carreira and Kagan 2011).

Such different motivational profiles were confirmed by Wen (2011), who compared the motivation of HLLs with some degree of HL proficiency to HLLs with little pre-existing proficiency and to FLLs. Her survey results showed that HL proficiency did not impact HLLs' motivation to learn Chinese. Wen (2011) also suggested that for all background groups, positive classroom experience and interactive instructional processes strengthen learners' motivation for continued study. Simply put, for both HLLs and FLLs, classroom experiences should be "challenging yet fun" (Wen 2011). This, nevertheless, presents a great challenge for a mixed-group FL classroom since what is "challenging yet fun" for HLLs may likely be considerably different for FLLs.

Xie (2014) studied learner motivation using a wider group of learners from six universities across five states, all at the university introductory level. The study found that FLLs had a "linear" experience with Chinese while HLL's motivation to study Chinese was "non-linear," characterized by struggles at an early age, rebellion and rejecting Chinese learning during adolescence, and finding confidence and motivation to study Chinese again in college along with a search for coherence in self-perception and identification.

This body of motivation research, all of which is based on learners' responses to surveys and interviews, suggests that understanding HLLs' motivation is extremely important when planning curriculum and materials for HLLs. HLLs' motivation and non-linear history of such motivation is closely related to learner's evolving perceptions of how they should and will be able to master their HL.

3.2 Identity and Bilingualism

Research provides abundant evidence that HLLs consider Chinese language proficiency part of their identity and seek to improve their Chinese proficiency so that their language proficiency reflects their ethnic identity (He 2006, 2008, and inter alia; also see Polinsky and Kagan 2007; Kagan 2011). Ideally, classroom instruction should both facilitate HLL's endeavor toward advanced language proficiency and facilitate HLLs in their search for a deeper understanding of their multifaceted heritage identity. This section reviews a number of recent studies that theorize the relationship of HLLs' identity and bilingualism to their proficiency development in the post-secondary setting.

First, identity is multifaceted, evolving, and contextualized (He 2004, 2006, 2010, 2013; Lee 2005; Li 2011). J. S. Lee conducted a survey of 530 college-level learners and found that HLLs construct their identities in relative terms related to the perceptions and identities of others (Lee 2005). HLLs think of themselves as both an HLL and an FLL, two fluid constructs that necessarily intersect. As eloquently stated in He (2013), an HLL's language system is "a complex system that is

self-organizing (without being guided by any external principle or source), emergent (unplanned, evolving as the interaction unfolds), creative (always different, always changing), and unpredictable, but bounded by the entire linguistic repertoire of the speaker. It is as a collage and calibration of holistic resources" (p. 314).

However, this dynamic and holistic view of the language system of HLLs may not be embraced by teachers in a traditional FL classroom. Weger-Gunther (2006) illustrated a case where in a university-level FL classroom the teacher had high expectations for HLLs and expressed to them, "You should learn better than other students because you already speak the language." But at the same time, HLLs' use of outside vocabulary and structures not from the class textbook was censored by the teacher. Teacher's censoring of HLL's existing knowledge, on the one hand, and stereotype-based high expectations, on the other hand, may frustrate and alienate HLLs in the FL classroom.

Understanding the complexity and evolving nature of HLL's identity goes hand in hand with understanding the bilingual skills of HLLs. HLLs, with proficient aural-oral skills in Chinese easily mix English and Chinese. Traditional classrooms may view HLLs' English-Chinese code switching as "rebellion to the teacher's authority" or a sign of underdeveloped Chinese language proficiency (He 2010, 2013). Through ethnographic research and interviews, He (2010, 2013) demonstrated that HLLs' code switching to English is more customary than intentional. There are proficiency-related reasons to switch, but overall, no one single theory can account for all instances of code switching across learners in various situations. He (2010) hypothesized that HL bilingual speakers are able to access both English and Chinese language systems simultaneously, which results in their complex, nonuniform code switchings. Therefore, HLL's English-Chinese code mixing is not to be viewed as a sign of deficiency in Chinese, but as the ability to operate between languages. Correspondingly, the goal of HLL learning is not Chinese "linguistic competence" *per se*, but "translingual and transcultural competence" (MLA 2007, p. 237).

He's (2010, 2013) theorizing of the "multicompetence" of HLLs is echoed in Li (2011)'s study of the language use of multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. Li used the term "translanguaging" to depict bilingual youth going between linguistic codes. Their creative use of English-Chinese code mixing is a source of group rapport, aesthetic pleasure, and self-identification. Li (2011) also suggested that the university is an important context for HLLs to re-connect to their heritage background. It is in this setting, along with finding like-minded friends, that HLLs experience multilingual opportunities and create a "translanguaging space".

He (2006, 2008) used Identity Theory to explicitly relate HLLs' self-identification to language proficiency development. He (2006) theorized that an HLL's HL development is dependent on the degree to which "s/he is able to find continuity and coherence in multiple communicative and social worlds in time and space to develop hybrid, situated identities and stances" (p. 1). It would seem fruitful for university-level HL instruction to incorporate identity as a focal point to organize instructional content and provide ample discursive opportunities for HLLs to express, articulate, understand, and broaden their sense of being a multilingual and multicultural individual.

3.3   Literacy Development and Grammar

As Xiao (2006) and many others have suggested, CHLLs' primary challenge in learning the HL is to connect their oral skills with literacy skills, including the ability to read and write and sensitivity to genre, register, and style shifts. These literacy skills are facilitated through grammar and vocabulary development.

Xiao (2008) studied the degree that HLL's heritage background facilitates their literacy development and found that HLLs have a relative advantage over FLLs in speaking, listening, grammar and sentence construction, but not in reading comprehension, vocabulary learning, and character writing. The study suggested that oral exposure does not necessarily lead to HLLs' acquisition of reading and writing skills at a faster pace than FLLs, especially if the HLL has no prior exposure to written Chinese (see also Ke 1998, which focused on character recognition and production skills and also found that HLLs did not demonstrate advantages over non-HLLs).

In a university setting, but shifting from overall literacy development to discourse features of HLL's writing, Xiao (2010) examined HLLs' writing samples vis-à-vis FLLs' writing samples and compared their writing with native speakers' re-writing of the same learner texts. The study found that after a semester's interval of learning, both the FLLs and HLLs improved in their written Chinese, but both cohorts also showed overall simplistic, loosely structured syntax. The re-written texts by native speakers used various devices to maintain discourse cohesion (i.e., topic chains), such as null pronouns and register-specific subordinate and coordinate conjunctions. Compared with native speakers' re-writing, HLLs used very few null pronouns while explicit subject pronouns and conjunctions were overused, resulting in repetitive and fragmentary discourse. The author hypothesized that such reliance on explicit devices was due to the visibility of these explicit features and their similarity to English cohesive devices. Chinese-specific devices, such as null subject pronouns, are challenging and rarely used by HLLs. Within the range of conjunctions used by HLLs, the usage tended to be formulaic and mirrored textbook input. Xiao indicated that discourse building is more important than sentence building for HLLs, compared with FLLs. To that end, compound sentences and complex sentences should be a focus of instruction. This is an important insight for language programs that adopt textbooks designed for FLLs and use them for HLLs in a fast-paced manner. FLLs' introductory textbooks tend to focus on oral skill development. Consequently, input texts tend to be based on sentence-level, constructed short dialogues. Such sentence-level input does not address the discourse needs of HLLs and is a shortcoming to be addressed by supplemental input.

Research on the linguistic systems of Chinese HLLs is scarce compared to research on more commonly taught heritage languages, primarily languages using inflectional morphology, such as Russian and Spanish (see, for example, Lynch 2003; Montrul 2002; Polinsky 2008a, b; Polinsky and Kagan 2007). The results of these studies, based on heavily inflected language, cannot be directly used to understand Chinese HLLs' grammar acquisition (and in turn, their development of

literacy). Chinese has an isolating morphology, relying heavily on word order, discourse context, and grammatical particles.

Nevertheless, there have been some illuminating studies in this area. Jia and Bayley's (2008) study of the perfective marker -*le* found that HLLs born in China outperformed their U.S.-born HLL peers in using this particular grammatical marker. This finding suggested that abundance of input plays a role in HLLs' grammar knowledge. Xing (2006) also suggested that HLLs have the ability to internalize grammar without explicit instruction although the nature of such grammatical knowledge is subject to further study.

A significant challenge to learning written Chinese, unique to the situation of Chinese literary history, is the considerable, even formidable, difference between modern written Chinese and spoken Chinese. Li and Thompson (1982) suggest the non-alphabetic logographic writing system preserves the heavy presence of classical Chinese in modern written Chinese, and consequently maintains (and widens) the gap between spoken Chinese and written Chinese. Written Chinese uses much briefer clauses, very few explicit grammatical morphemes, and distinctive lexical choices, which are features of classical Chinese (文言文 *wenyan-wen*). The gap between modern written Chinese and spoken Chinese is so great that literate Chinese are in fact "bi-dialectal." Essentially, learning written Chinese is much more complicated than simply matching the sounds of Chinese to logographic symbols.

Very little research exists that gives us a coherent picture of how HLLs learn and understand written Chinese as a hybrid code. We also do not know the extent to which HLLs grasp the specific discourse and lexico-grammatical features of written Chinese. But several studies on CHLLs' discourse characteristics in writing, including Xiao (2010), are beginning to provide valuable information.

Zhang (2014) conducted an interesting and revealing study on a specific conjunction type particular to Chinese compound sentences. Chinese compound sentences are typologically distinct. Numerous correlative pairs depict specific logical and discourse relationships (i.e. such as 但是 and pairs 只要…就…; 哪怕…也…), a device-set critical for written discourse development. Zhang focused on HLLs' vs. FLLs' knowledge of compound sentences at the university beginning level. Using acceptability judgment tasks, the study revealed that HLL's internal grammar in this area, at the beginning level, is similar to FLLs who have had 2 years of study as a True Beginner. FLLs' knowledge corresponded to what they had been taught explicitly in the classroom while HLLs performed better on items that were more frequent in natural input in the kind of situations HLLs are exposed to. The results suggest that HLL's grammatical knowledge is based on extracting rules from natural input (cf. Xing 2006). Further, HLLs were unaware of high-register pairs, such as 既然…就… and other such pairs which were correctly understood by FLLs due to explicit learning from textbooks. It is also interesting that HLLs treated many unacceptable constructions as acceptable at a higher rate than FLLs. This grammatical "leniency" also suggests that HLL's implicit grammar is rather crude, and explicit instruction is potentially very helpful.

Although few studies focus on the hybrid characteristics of modern written Chinese, studies such as Xiao (2010), on null pronouns and topic chains, and

Zhang (2014), on register-specific correlative conjunctions, suggest to us that the advantage of HLLs due to their heritage background should not be overstated when it comes to literacy development. Fast-paced learning, the typical model in the university-level Chinese FL classrooms for HLLs, may not adequately address the learning needs of HLLs. More appropriate may be a qualitatively different curriculum that caters to HLLs' need for explicit awareness of discourse characteristics of spoken Chinese (see, for example, Ming and Tao 2008) and the hybrid features of modern written Chinese (Li and Thompson 1982).

4 Curriculum and Methodology for TCHL in Post-Secondary Settings

Due to budget limitations and the relatively smaller number of HLLs in university settings, HLLs are either mixed with other FLLs in the same classroom or are grouped in a fast-paced heritage language track. Consequently, CFL classrooms may be multi-leveled and present considerable pedagogical challenges. This section provides pedagogical suggestions based on research and the author's experience administering and teaching Chinese language classes in an urban setting.

4.1 Placement and Tracking

To my knowledge, research has not yet been carried out on designing appropriate placement assessments for Chinese HLLs. Before such research becomes available, we draw insights from non-Chinese HL assessment insights. Polinsky and Kagan (2007) and Benmamoun et al. (2010) suggested that vocabulary is a good measure of HL proficiency, especially lexical range, specificity, and accuracy. Polinsky and Kagan (2007) and Benmamoun et al. (2010) also suggested that speech rate is a reliable measurement of HL proficiency since near-native speech rate correlates with general high-proficiency. Applying such insights, it would seem appropriate that a placement assessment should have learners display their vocabulary knowledge and, if resources allow, demonstrate their natural speech rate.

As to tracking, research has predominantly pointed to the benefits of separate instruction for HLLs because of their pre-existing aural-oral skills, different degrees of exposure to reading and writing, earlier age of exposure, language exposure in naturalistic settings, different motivation profiles, and centrality of identity and culture as content to explore, among other factors (Kondo-Brown 2003; McGinnis 1996, 2008; Xiao 2006; Xing 2006; Valdés 1997, 2001).

In many FL programs, HL classes are designed as fast-paced classes with the same textbooks as FL classes, but as Xiao (2006) indicated, what heritage learners need is a different type of instruction from fast-paced instruction. A mixed group class is likely frustrating to both learner groups. To explore if HLLs benefit more

from a mixed-level class or a separate HL class, Shen (2003) situated a study in the CFL program at the University of Virginia where a separate HL track was established in the fall of 1999. A one-semester HL class was equivalent to a two-semester FL class using the same textbook series (Yao et al. 1997). Shen tested the HLLs' reading ability with vocabulary tests and the SAT II Chinese test in the mixed-background class vs. the separate HL class. The results showed that HLLs in the separate HL class performed significantly better after one year of study than HLLs in the mixed group class after two years of study. The study suggested that tracking based on similar backgrounds improved HL achievement. This achievement was attributed to the class environment that enabled abundance of learning opportunity, peer pressure, and more level-appropriate input and output activities, such as the use of short plays and movies, recordings of oral commentaries, reading accompanied by audio recordings, all from the beginning of instruction and learning. In contrast, the mixed-group class spent much more time on Pinyin training, focused on oral skill development, and delayed writing until the second year. Language practice was also more centered on drills than open-ended responses.

Putting research and theories aside, in reality, without a significant population of HLLs, university level foreign language programs have to mix HLLs with FLLs in the same class due to budgetary considerations (Kondo-Brown 2003). Carreira (2013) indicated that less than half of current higher education FL programs have separate courses for HLLs. Less commonly taught languages, such as Chinese, have an even lesser chance of offering separate-track HL classes. It is important, thus, for program administrators to engage in program advocacy and to foster positive enrollments through careful curriculum development. Before separate HL classes are encouraged and fostered in the university setting, the FL classroom has to make conscious use of strategies to manage multi-level classes, such as tasks and projects to sequence learning (Willis and Willis 2007), explicit instruction on self-monitoring and learning strategies (Hurd et al. 2001), and the use of blended learning models to provide flexibility in pacing for students (Goertler 2011). It remains to be explored if similar instructional approaches that have benefited HLLs would also be applicable to FLLs (i.e. enriched input and output activities). Instructional interventions effective in mixed-group classes also need to be explored.

4.2   Learning Goals

Explicit formulation of learning goals can guide curriculum development (Graves 2000; Richards 2001). Two frameworks for articulating learning goals are particularly pertinent to HLL curriculum design due to their explicit contextualized consideration of culture and identity formation. The frameworks are KASA (Knowledge, Awareness, Skills and Attitudes) (Fantini 2007) and ACTFL's "Five C's" Foreign Language Education Content Standards (ACTFL 2014). The Five C's stand for Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities.

Fantini's (2007) KASA framework was originally proposed to assess Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC) and relates to the interconnection of knowledge, awareness, skills, and attitudes one encounters when learning about a new culture. Such encounters contribute to new ways to "perceive, conceptualize, and express thoughts" (Fantini 2007, p. 185). This performance-oriented framework provides concrete learning targets (knowledge, skills, attitudes, and awareness) that underscore the overall "translingual and transcultural competence" HLLs ideally should possess (He 2010).

Valdés (2001) advocated the use of ACTFL's Five C's framework for planning instruction for HL speakers, a sentiment also echoed in Kagan (2011, 2013). The Five C's provide both guidelines for curricular goals and curricular content. Particularly important, in Valdés' view, is the Communication goal. ACTFL's Communication goal statements specify language skills for different communicative modes (interpersonal, interpretative, and presentational), oral and written modalities, and communicative situations. Indeed, ACTFL's Five C's standards closely address the language needs of HLLs, as has been suggested in current TCHL research.

Communities is another important goal among the Five C's statements. It makes relevant not only the target Chinese-speaking communities but also the HLL's home and immediate community as sociocultural realities to be explored and understood. Recent years have seen the increasing adoption of service-learning models in foreign language classrooms (e.g. in Spanish FL classrooms, Lear and Abbott 2008; in French FL classrooms, Grim 2010). Service learning situates language development and critical thinking in community-based activities. For example, McPherron and Randolph (2013) reported a curricular project (albeit for an ESL class) where language learners were guided to conduct critical cultural observations and interviews in their community in the manner of a layperson ethnographer. Learners not only develop language skills through designing questionnaires, interviewing community members, and formulating an expository essay, but also gain deeper, personalized cultural understanding.

4.3   Adopting a Macro-Micro Approach

Kagan (2011, 2013) proposes the combination of a macro and micro approach to building a HL curriculum. A macro approach would mirror native speakers' experiences learning Chinese, with language as a tool for obtaining information, communicating, and creating discursive products, i.e., theme-based, content-based, or project-based learning (Kagan 2011, 2013; cf. Graves 2000; Richards 2001). A micro approach would focus on grammar and vocabulary development and fine-tuning grammatical-lexical awareness.

Project-based learning appears to be particularly suitable for HLLs and a mixed-level class. PBL is an entirely different approach from traditional instruction, which focuses on discrete knowledge, rote memorization, mechanics, close-ended applica-

tion, and display of accuracy as the primary means of assessment. In accordance with the performance-based goals of TCHL (e.g., KASA; ACTFL's Five C's Goals), well-designed projects help students discover, problem-solve, create, and formulate new angles and perspectives, and gain and expand their heritage language proficiency throughout the process. Because projects are performance-oriented and language takes place on an individual level, organizing courses around sequenced projects would work as a response to the multi-level nature of a mixed-group class (for examples of using projects in the Chinese FL classroom, see Cai 2012; Lee 2011; Shih 2006; Xiang 2014; Zhang 2011).

4.4 Making Use of Existing Knowledge, Transitioning from the Familiar to the Unfamiliar

This principle should work both as a general sequencing principle of the syllabus (Graves 2000) and as a sequencing principle for small-scale activities, instruction, and homework. While each student has to be understood individually, typically HLLs have better aural-oral skills than reading-writing skills and better receptive skills (listening, reading) than productive skills (speaking, writing). Making use of a learner's aural skills, we can provide audio recordings that accompany his/her input text, but delay reading to the extent that he/she is motivated to see the script that matches the familiar audio text. Within a macro syllabus unit, it may also be advisable to delay writing (Kagan 2011, p. 87) until students have gained sufficient print exposure and have personalized reading through guided discussion and critical thinking (Xiao 2006). We also want to expand students' register awareness by moving from the familiar modes and registers (informal communication with familiar addressees) to different, less familiar communication modes and from an everyday register to an academic register (Kagan 2011). Classroom activities and homework should help students make different types of "association," from sound to print, from print to meaning, from reading to writing (Koda 2002, p. 242).

4.5 Providing Instruction from Discourse Analytical Perspectives

Chinese grammar is heavily discourse-oriented (Tao 1996; Chu 1998). Without explicit mentoring on discourse characteristics of Chinese, HLLs may not notice the various meaning-making systems in Chinese grammar and consequently may have few resources to build advanced proficiency, such as knowledge of correlatives (Zhang 2014) and null pronouns (Xiao 2011). A CHL class should incorporate explicit instruction on target discourse features and use good modeling texts to demonstrate how communicative intentions and discourse development are achieved

through lexical-grammatical means (cf. discourse analytic frameworks explicated in Strauss and Feiz 2013). We also need to develop effective writing and discussion prompts to lead students to incorporate their learned linguistic resources in a meaningful and productive manner and off-set the tendency of avoidance, i.e., avoiding using features that are difficult and not fully understood (e.g. Xiao 2010). For example, as a consciousness-raising activity, students may be challenged to rewrite the same story/news in different styles, genres, or formality (a narrative vs. a news headline vs. a conversation; addressing family members vs. professors in an academic setting).

4.6 Building Learner Communities, Fostering Confidence, and Reducing Anxiety

HLLs are a learner community connected by comparable language backgrounds, Chinese learning experiences, and the ability to tap into both English and Chinese cultural and linguistic resources on a daily basis. Teachers may benefit from using community-building techniques, as well as providing opportunities for supportive, collaborative learning.

Further, we should not assume that because of their heritage background, HLLs are confident in the learning process. Xiao and Wong (2014) studied the anxiety levels specific to Chinese HL learners based on surveys of 87 CHLLs in heritage-track classes from a larger sample of 192 Chinese FL students at two U.S. universities. The study showed that HLLs felt most anxious about writing while FLLs had the most anxiety in speaking. Class dropout rates were higher among students with high-anxiety. The study shows the importance of creating classroom environments where anxiety is anticipated, understood, and strategically addressed. Thus, in reading and writing, it is not sufficient just to provide writing tasks and expect students to produce the desired results. We should explicitly train students in the writing process, including brainstorming, planning, drafting, revising, self-editing, as well as providing teacher feedback that is sensitive to learners' potential anxiety of the process (cf. illustrations of such approaches, albeit in the ESL writing context, in Stauss et al. 2006; Strauss and Xiang 2006).

4.7 Providing Explicit Instruction in Grammar and Discourse-Oriented Grammar

Research on the grammar of HLLs has shown that explicit grammar instruction is beneficial and necessary (Montrul and Bowels 2010). Montrul and Bowels (2010) suggest that explicit grammar can help to "restructure" what is dormant and implicit in HLLs due to early exposure in naturalistic settings (p. 48).

Since HLLs have a wide variability in their grammar knowledge, workshop-style instruction in grammar may be more suitable than teaching the same grammatical features at the same pace to HLLs. In the workshop, students' own productions are analyzed in a supportive and anonymous manner (Strauss 2014). Through rewriting learner sentences, they understand what is possible or not in the Chinese language, and they learn alternative and more appropriate ways to express the same intended meaning related to a particular task, audience, genre. These strategies expand HLLs' command of the Chinese lexico-grammatical systems while always putting meaning making at the center of concern. In this area, a learner corpus would be very useful to help the teacher see generalizable patterns of the HLL's grammar and focus on areas of most difficulty. Research using learner corpora is rare, but Ming and Tao (2008) made a valuable initial attempt.

4.8 The Role of Textbooks and Materials

In the field of TCHL, critical use of textbooks and the ability to develop engaging teaching materials are especially important, due to the complex learning needs of the learners, and the young, underdeveloped textbook market for HLLs. Because there are fewer HLLs compared to FLLs, publishers are hesitant to publish textbooks exclusively catering to HLLs, especially for a less commonly taught language such as Chinese.

Popular among the choices of textbooks written for HLs in the university context are Duanduan Li's (2009) *A Primer for Advanced Beginners of Chinese* (大学语文) published by Columbia University Press and *Me and China* (我和中国) published by MacMillan (He et al. 2006).[8] Both textbooks adopt a topical syllabus, either building on the study of China (history, geography, social issues, culture and customs, idioms, and folklore) (Li 2009) or incorporating everyday life of Chinese immigrant families in written narratives (He et al. 2006). Such theme-based units and narratives appeal to HLLs with their interest in Chinese culture and society. Further, these textbooks build on linguistic research on the frequency of words and grammatical structures. The implicit grammatical and lexical syllabus, embedded in the thematic syllabus, also provides a good structural support for building an HL course.

But a number of limitations are also present that are arguably common in newly developed textbooks for HLLs. First, unlike mainstream FL textbooks that enjoy financial resources to develop companion materials, HLL textbooks do not offer an abundance of companion workbooks, multimedia components, web-based support, etc. to facilitate learners in building fluency and to extend their exposure to print materials. Secondly, the textbooks usually contain little use of authentic texts, realia, or culture notes. Understandably, copyrighted materials are expensive to license.

---

[8] Another popular textbook for CHLLs is *Oh*, *China*! (哦,中国!) by Chou et al. (2011), published by Princeton University Press.

Having authentic input in the textbook is not a feasible option financially. Teachers can supplement their HL textbooks with a variety of text types and authentic images, realia, media etc. to add cultural exemplification, to facilitate discussion, and to stimulate interest. Thirdly, the methodology adopted in the textbooks tends to be monotonous and traditional (short questions for schema activation, text-based input, fill in the blanks, and sentence construction exercises). Teachers need to provide extensive schema-activating activities, group-work, pair work, fluency building activities, problem solving, tasks, etc. to engage students in collaborative learning, meaning-negotiation, and open-ended inquiries (Tomlinson 2012). Reading exercises tend to be closed-ended and on discrete items, treating reading as information-retrieving, comprehension-checking, and grammatical exercises. Writing prompts also tend to be generic. Teachers will have to create more tailored tasks to engage students in language use during and after class in a more open-ended and exploratory fashion.

While textbook limitations need to be addressed, experienced teachers do not expect any textbook to have perfect explanatory adequacy and pedagogical relevance for their own particular cohort of students (Carreira 2004). After all, commercial textbooks are meant for an audience as wide and general as possible. To this end, it is very important to educate teachers in evaluating and writing instructional materials. It is critical not to build a course around a textbook, but to use existing textbooks to provide structural support and grammatical-lexical sequencing. As the field develops and matures, as teachers gain more professional expertise, and as the Chinese language classroom becomes increasingly more diversified and connected to other disciplines, textbooks will begin to play more of a supportive role than a controlling role as is currently the case.

5   Suggestions for Further Research

5.1   *Classroom-Based Assessment*

The current tendency for CFL classrooms to be mixed-group makes assessment a highly important issue to consider in the curricular process. Particularly needed are knowledge and research regarding placement assessments, performance-based assessments, and ways to use assessment results to inform classroom practice (cf. McGinnis 1996).[9] McGinnis (1996) proposed a three-stage curricular model for HLLs that begins with placement diagnostics, which then feeds into setting learning goals and designing performance-based assessments to foster proficiency development. To continue to explore the path set forth by McGinnis (1996), we need classroom-based research that measures the effectiveness of current assessment

---

[9] To this end, McGinnis (1996) specified a model for developing curriculum for HLLs based on and starting with placement diagnostics. McGinnis (1996) also suggested the use of performance-based assessment methods for HLLs.

methods. We also need to use classroom-generated data to understand which performance-based assessments are best for which purposes and how we can use assessment not only for assessing learning but as a tool for learning (Tomlinson 2005).[10] It is also important to gauge learners' entry-level proficiency with ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and to design curriculum to explicitly address the gaps between entry-level and exit-level benchmarks. Throughout a course, students should be assessed based on performance at the discourse level (such as presentational vs. interpersonal modes of communication, written modes vs. spoken modes of communication, control and use of lexico grammatical resources for meaning-making). Such performance-based assessment, both for the purpose of initial diagnostics and for assessing achievement and exit-level proficiency, arguably will exert a positive impact on other components of the curriculum.

5.2 Corpus and Discourse-Driven Research on Learners' Language Use as Meaning Making

Previous research has primarily used SLA research methods (e.g., surveys, grammaticality judgments). Further research needs to investigate the nature of HLL's language perception and production in naturalistic settings. A considerable void in current research is how HLLs' current linguistic system enables them to or falls short of facilitating their need to express communicative content. Learners are experimenting with the meaning potential of the linguistic devices they learn (Byrnes 2006). Combining corpus and discourse perspectives and situating research in actual classrooms, we will gain a more finely-grained understanding of learners' use of Chinese for meaning making and in turn make classroom instruction relevant and applicable to what learners need.

5.3 Materials, Curriculum, Methodology, and Their Effects in the Classroom

We not only need to understand linguistic and language acquisition phenomena, but also we need to gain insight into the process of material design and curriculum development. Although theories and research in TCHL have begun to guide classroom practice, there has been an absence of research on the effects of materials, as well as curriculum and instruction, on learning (Lynch 2003; Valdés 2001).

---

[10] Similar needs pertain to community-based Chinese language schools as well, as anticipated in Wang (1996b) and still remain a persistent problem today.

5.4 Longitudinal Studies to Track HHLs' Development of Multi-competence and Translingual Skills

If, as He (2006, 2008) hypothesized, HLLs' proficiency strongly correlates with finding a coherent heritage identity, it is through longitudinal case studies that we will best be able to test such hypotheses and guide classroom practice. In this vein, ethnographic and biographical research methods will lead to valuable insights.

5.5 Oral Proficiency Development

Current research has not focused on the development of HLLs' oral proficiency. It would be interesting to see what oral skills HLLs bring to the classroom and to what extent they can develop oral proficiency in classroom settings. It is important to ascertain the interconnection between oral proficiency development and literacy development and the effect of developing literacy skills on learner's proficiency development in spoken Chinese. Perhaps by socializing students into written Chinese and associated literary styles, HLLs' oral competence will evince a transfer of discourse features from written to oral Chinese, thus becoming an effective way to broaden learner's spoken communicative repertoire.

5.6 Genre, Style, and Register

Although it is well known that knowledge of genre, style, and register are missing elements in HLL's linguistic repertoire, research on these aspects is extremely scarce. To what extent are these relevant to beginning-level HLLs and when should genre, style, and register be introduced into the HL curriculum? Further, what are learners' existing abilities in and awareness of genre, style, and register and what would be effective approaches to expand HLLs' linguistic repertoire? Further, how do we socialize students into the hybrid and mixed-register nature of modern written Chinese, and to what extend will students' existing proficiency in spoken Chinese facilitate their development of advanced proficiency in written Chinese? All these questions remain to be understood.

5.7 Dialect Speakers

Another under-explored area of TCHL is the learning of Mandarin by HLLs who speak a different dialect compared to Mandarin-heritage speakers and FLLs. Specifically, how do grammar and macro-skills develop in dialect HLLs? In the

learning process, what psychological factors (identity development, perceptions, and motivation) play a significant role in dialect speakers' Chinese learning? In what ways does maintenance of one's home variety of Chinese compete with or complement dialect HLLs' learning of Mandarin Chinese?

5.8   Teacher Education

Teacher training is particularly important for TCHL since classrooms are likely to be multi-leveled and contain multiple ability groups. Teachers need to be able to think on their feet to guide learners and address their needs (He 2010). From designing the course, evaluating textbooks, creating supplemental materials, developing assessment methods to teaching the Chinese grammatical system and socializing students into the written mode of Chinese, teachers constantly need to make informed decisions. Teacher education and teacher support is a separate subfield in need of dedicated research and practical efforts.

5.9   The K-16 Pipeline

As S. Wang (2010) cautions, the teaching efforts of community-based Chinese schools are often ignored by FL programs in formal K-16 contexts, especially at the university-level. HLLs with community-based language learning experience, or those who have studied Chinese in K-12 settings, may still be placed in a beginning level university FL class due to existing gaps in curricula, as well as the focus on explicit grammar in the university setting. S. Wang (2010) observed that HLLs unfortunately "start early and stay long," repeating the beginning-level classes in different places. The broken K-12 to post-secondary level pipeline is largely due to different curricula and assessment methods adopted in community-based schools, K-12 schools, and post-secondary settings. But since all FL classes are beginning to embrace ACTFL's Five C's standards, and as teacher professional knowledge and expertise have increased, we are hopeful that the field will see efforts to streamline the K-16 Chinese learning process.

5.10   Policymaking, Community Support, and Teachers' Professional Resources

For HLLs, learning the HL is not only learning the language but also maintaining it. As Montrul (2013) suggested, the sociopolitical status of the HL as a minority language in the U.S. and in the world interplays with HLLs' motivation to learn the

language and sustain its use beyond the classroom. Policy advocacy for supporting heritage language programs, collaborations between community and university FL programs, and the building of Chinese teacher professionalism and networking forums/online portals are all efforts that will have a long-lasting impact on the teaching of Chinese as a heritage language.

TCHL is a unique subfield of second language education and research. It is also a field that intersects with a range of other fields, such as multilingualism and language maintenance and revival. Its very basis in the sociolinguistic context of language learning challenges language educators to go beyond the classroom to see language learning as a social, dynamic, individualistic, and evolving process. It challenges researchers to find inspiration and insights in the classroom and in the community. For heritage language learners, the heritage language is a galvanizing agent that will transform learners and the world around them. This field thus benefits the most from, and is also in the most need of, symbiotic collaborations between learners and teachers, teachers and researchers, community and formal school settings, administrators and practitioners, as well as interdisciplinary collaborations.

References

ACTFL (American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages) (2014). *ACTFL world-readiness standards for learning languages*. Retrieved from www.actfl.org

Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2010). *White paper: Prolegomena to heritage linguistics*. National Language Resources Center, Los Angeles, CA.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. In J. B. Thompson (Ed.), (trans: Raymond, G. & Adamson, M.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brecht, R. D., & Ingold, C. W. (1998). *Tapping a national resource: Heritage languages in the United States*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearing House on Languages and Linguistics (ERIC Digest No. EDO-FL-98-12).

Byrnes, H. (2006). What kind of resource is language and why does it matter for advanced language learning? An introduction. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 1–30). London: Continuum.

Cai, S. (2012). The impact of an online learning community project on university Chinese as a foreign language students' motivation. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*, 307–329.

Carreira, M. M. (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term "heritage language learner". *Heritage Language Journal*, *2*(2), 1–25.

Carreira, M. M. (2013). Advanced proficiency: A practitioner's perspective on this special issue. *Heritage Language Journal*, *10*(2), 1–14.

Carreira, M., & Kagan, O. (2011). The results of the National Heritage Language Survey: Implications for teaching, curriculum design, and professional development. *Foreign Language Annals*, *44*, 40–64.

Chao, Y.-R. (1968). *A grammar of spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chao, T. H. (1996). Overview. In X. Wang (Ed.), *A view from within: A case study of Chinese heritage community language schools in the United States* (pp. 7–14). Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

CSAUS (Chinese School Association in the United States 全美中文学校协会) (2013). Association website retrieved from www.ncacls.orgwww.csaus.org

Chou, C.-P., Link, P., & Wang, X. (2011). *Oh China!*[哦, 中国!]. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chu, C. C. (1998). *A discourse grammar of Mandarin Chinese*. New York: Peter Lang.

Dai, J.-h. E., & Zhang, L. (2008). What are the CHL learners inheriting? Habitus of the CHL learners. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 37–52). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Fantini, A. E. (2007). Intercultural competence: Exploring its multiple dimensions. In D. Scheu & J. Saura (Eds.), *Discourse and international relations* (pp. 183–204). New York: Peter Lang.

Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Goertler, S. (2011). For a smoother blend: Lessons learned from blended instruction. In S. Huffman & V. Hegelheimer (Eds.), *The role of CALL in hybrid and online language courses*. Ames: Iowa State University.

Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers*. New York: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Grim, F. (2010). Giving authentic opportunities to second language learners: A look at a French service-learning project. *Foreign Language Annals*, *43*, 605–623.

He, A. W. (2000). Grammatical and sequential organization of teachers' directives. *Linguistics and Education*, *11*, 119–140.

He, A. W. (2004). Identity construction in Chinese heritage language classes. *Pragmatics*, *14*, 199–216.

He, A. W. (2006). Toward an identity theory of the development of Chinese as a heritage language. *Heritage Language Journal*, *4*(1), 1–28.

He, A. W. (2008). Chinese as a heritage language: An introduction. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 1–12). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

He, A. W. (2010). The heart of heritage: Sociocultural dimensions of heritage language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *30*, 66–82.

He, A. W. (2011). Heritage language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 587–609). Oxford: Blackwell.

He, A. W. (2013). The wor(l)d is a collage: Multi-performance by Chinese heritage language speakers. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*, 304–317.

He, A. W., & Xiao, Y. (Eds.). (2008). *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry*. Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

He, Q., Wu, Y., & Ying, Y. (2006). *Me and China* [我和中国]. McGraw-Hill Education, Boston, MA.

Hurd, S., Beaven, T., & Ortega, A. (2001). Developing autonomy in a distance language learning context: Issues and dilemmas for course writers. *System*, *29*, 341–355.

Jia, L., & Bayley, R. (2008). The (re)acquisition of perfective aspect marking by Chinese heritage language learners. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 205–224). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Kagan, O. (2011). *Heritage languages: At the crossroads of research and teaching*. PowerPoint slides accompanying paper presented at Interagency Language Roundtable, Department of Education, Washington, DC.

Kagan, O. (2013). An interview with Olga Kagan, University of California, Los Angeles by Hee Ju. *The Korean Language in America*, *18*, 121–127.

Ke, C. (1998). Effects of language background on the learning of Chinese characters among foreign language students. *Foreign Language Annals*, *31*, 91–100.

Koda, K. (2002). Writing systems and learning to read in a second language. In W. Li, J. S. Gaffney & J. L. Packard (Eds.), *Chinese children's reading acquisition: Theoretical and pedagogical issues*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Koda, K., Zhang, Y., & Yang, C.-L. (2008). Literacy development in Chinese as a heritage language. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 137–150). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Kondo-Brown, K. (2003). Heritage language instruction for post-secondary students from immigrant backgrounds. *Heritage Language Journal*, *1*(1), 1–25.

Lear, D. W., & Abbott, A. R. (2008). Foreign language professional standards and CSL: Achieving the 5 C's. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *14*(2), 77–86.

Lee, J. S. (2005). Through the learners' eyes: Reconceptualizing the heritage and non-heritage learner of the less commonly taught languages. *Foreign Language Annals*, *38*, 554–563.

Lee, S. (2011). Online components for advanced Chinese reading classes: Design and implementation. *Journal of Technology and Chinese Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 1–22.

Lee, M. (2013). An interview with Jin Sook Lee, University of California, Santa Barbara by Mina Lee. *The Korean Language in America*, *18*, 136–140.

Li, D. (2009). *A primer for advanced beginners of Chinese* [大学语文]. New York: Columbia University Press.

Li, W. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5), 1222–1235.

Li, D., & Duff, P. A. (2008). Issues in Chinese heritage language education and research at the postsecondary level. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 13–36). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mnoa.

Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A. (1981). *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A. (1982). The gulf between spoken and written language: A case study in Chinese. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language* (pp. 77–88). Norwood: ABLEX.

Liu, N. (2013). The linguistic vitality of Chinese in the United States. *Heritage Language Journal*, *10*(3), 1–11.

Lu, X., & Li, G. (2008). Motivation and achievement in Chinese language learning. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 89–108). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Lynch, A. (2003). The relationship between second and heritage language acquisition: Notes on research and theory building. *Heritage Language Journal*, *1*(1), 1–18.

McGinnis, S. (1996). Teaching Chinese to the Chinese: The development of an assessment and instructional model. In J. E. Liskin-Gasparro (Ed.), *Patterns and policies: The changing demographics of foreign language instruction* (pp. 107–121). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

McGinnis, S. (2008). From mirror to compass: The Chinese heritage language education sector in the United States. In D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 229–242). London: Routledge.

McPherron, P., & Randolph, P. T. (2013). Thinking like researchers: An ESL project that investigates local communities. *TESOL Journal*, *4*, 312–331.

Ming, T., & Tao, H. (2008). Developing a Chinese heritage language corpus. Issues and a preliminary report. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 167–188). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

MLA AdHoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, *2007*, 234–245.

Montrul, S. (2002). Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense/aspect distinctions in adult bilinguals. *Bilingualism Language and Cognition*, *5*, 39–68.

Montrul, S. (2013). An interview with Silvina Montrul, University of Illinois at Urbana- Champaign by Ihnhee Kim. *The Korean Language in America*, *18*, 128–135.

Montrul, S., & Bowles, M. (2010). Is grammar instruction beneficial for heritage language learners: Dative case marking in Spanish. *Heritage Language Journal*, *7*(1), 47–73.

National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools [全美中文學校聯合總會/NCA-CLS] (2014). Association website retrieved at www.ncacls.org

O'Grady, W. (2013). An Interview with William O'Grady, University of Hawai' i at Manoa by Mi Yung Park. *The Korean Language in America*, *18*, 141–144.

O'Grady, W., Lee, O.-S., & Lee, J.-H. (2011). Practical and theoretical issues in the study of heritage language acquisition. *Heritage Language Journal*, *8*(3), 23–40.

Polinsky, M. (2008a). Russian gender under incomplete acquisition. *Heritage Language Journal*, *6*(1), 40–71.

Polinsky, M. (2008b). Heritage language narratives. In D. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education. A new field emerging* (pp. 149–164). New York: Routledge.

Polinsky, M., & Kagan, O. (2007). Heritage languages: In the "wild" and in the classroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *1*, 368–395.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Ryan, C. (2013). Language use in the United States: 2011. *American community survey. US Census Bureau*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acs-22.pdf

Shen, H. H. (2003). A Comparison of written Chinese achievement among heritage learners in homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. *Foreign Language Annals*, *36*, 258–266.

Shih, C. (2006). The language class as a community: A task design for speaking proficiency training. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, *41*(2), 1–22.

Strauss, S. (2014). *Discourse analysis and the teaching of L2 writing*. Workshop presented at the summer workshop series, Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research, Pennsylvania State University.

Strauss, S., & Feiz, P. (2013). *Discourse analysis: Putting our worlds into words*. New York: Routledge.

Strauss, S., & Xiang, X. (2006). The writing conference as a locus of emergent agency. *Written Communication*, *23*, 355–396.

Strauss, S., Feiz, P., Xiang, X., & Ivanova, D. (2006). The dialogic construction of meaning in advanced L2 writing: Bakhtinian perspectives. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 184–204). London: Continuum.

Tao, H. (1996). *Units in Mandarin conversation: Prosody, discourse, and grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tao, H. (Ed.). (2006). Special issue on Chinese. *The Heritage Language Journal*, *4*(1). Retrieved from http://www.heritagelanguages.org/Journal.aspx

Tomlinson, B. (2005). Testing to learn: A personal view of language testing. *ELT Journal*, *59*(1), 39–46.

Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, *45*, 143–179.

Valdés, G. (1997). The teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speaking students: Outstanding issues and unanswered questions. In M. C. Colombi & F. Alarcón (Eds.), *La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes* (pp. 8–44). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Blueprint for the future* (pp. 37–77). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Wang, P.-F. S. (1996a). Academic curriculum. In X. Wang (Ed.), *A view from within: A case study of Chinese heritage community language schools in the United States* (pp. 21–26). Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.

Wang, X. (Ed.). (1996b). *A view from within: A case study of Chinese heritage community language schools in the United States*. Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.

Wang, S. (2010). Chinese language education in the United States: A historical overview and future directions. In J. Chen, C. Wang, & J. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 3–32). Raleigh: Information Age Publishers.

Weger-Guntharp, H. (2006). Voices from the margin: Developing a profile of Chinese heritage language learners in the FL classroom. *Heritage Language Journal*, *4*(1), 29–46.

Li, Wei. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 1222–1235.

Wen, X. (1997). Motivation and language learning with students of Chinese. *Foreign Language Annals*, *30*, 235–252.

Wen, X. (1999). Chinese learning motivation: A comparative study of different ethnic groups. In M. Chu (Ed.), *Mapping the course of the Chinese language field* (The Chinese Language Teachers Association Monograph Series, Vol. III, pp. 121–150). Kalamazoo: Chinese Language Teachers Association.

Wen, X. (2011). Chinese language learning motivation: A comparative study of heritage and non-heritage learners. *Heritage Language Journal*, *8*(3), 41–66.

Wiley, T. G. (2001). On defining heritage languages and their speakers. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 29–36). McHenry: Center for Applied Linguistics. Washington, DC: CAL, ERIC. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wong, K. F., & Xiao, Y. (2010). Diversity and difference: Identity issues of Chinese heritage language learners from dialect backgrounds. *Heritage Language Journal*, *7*(2), 153–187.

Xiang, X. (2014). *Designing projects for the Chinese classroom*. Workshop presented at the summer workshop series, Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research, Pennsylvania State University.

Xiao, Y. (2006). Heritage learners in the Chinese language classroom: Home background. *Heritage Language Journal*, *4*(1), 47–56.

Xiao, Y. (2008). Home literacy environment in CHL development. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 151–66). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Xiao, Y. (2010). Discourse features and development in L2 writing of Chinese. In M. Everson & H. Shen (Eds.), *Research among learners of Chinese as a foreign language* (pp. 135–53). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Xiao, Y., & Wong, K. F. (2014). Exploring heritage language anxiety: A study of Chinese heritage language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*, 589–611.

Xie, Y. (2014). L2 self of beginning-level heritage and nonheritage postsecondary learners of Chinese. *Foreign Language Annals*, *47*(1), 189–203.

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

Yao, T.-C., et al. (1997). *Integrated Chinese*. Boston: Cheng-Tsui.

Zhang, P. (2011). 利用 VoiceThread 提升语言技能-注重能力表现的活动设计 (Using VoiceThread to boost proficiency development: Performance-based activity design). *Journal of Technology and Chinese Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 63–80.

Zhang, L. (2014). College Chinese heritage language learners' implicit knowledge of compound sentences. *Heritage Language Journal*, *11*(1), 45–75.

Xuehua Xiang is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Illinois, Chicago. Her research interests include using empirical lenses (discourse analysis, semiotics, corpus tools, and cognitive-functional perspectives) to study the interface of grammar and interaction and the interplay of language, culture, and communication. She also conducts research in second/heritage language curriculum development using cognitive, semiotic, and discourse-oriented perspectives.