

# **College-Level Chinese as a Heritage Language Curriculum Development: A Case Study**

**Han LUO**  
**Lafayette College**

**Ming-Ying LI**  
**Hunter College**

**Yu LI**  
**Emory University**

## **Abstract**

Research has shown that heritage language learners have characteristics that distinguish themselves from traditional foreign language learners. The number of Chinese as a Heritage Language (CHL) learners in U.S. has seen rapid increase in recent years. However, there has been little empirical research on curricula specifically designed for these learners. To offer new insight for CHL curriculum development, this paper reviews current literature, presents a case curriculum based on students' linguistic, cultural, and psychological learning needs, and discusses questionnaire and interview data of heritage students.

**Keywords:** Chinese, Chinese as a heritage Language, heritage language learners, curriculum development, learning needs

## **1. Introduction**

The number of Chinese as a Heritage Language (CHL) learners in the U.S. has seen rapid growth in recent years. This may have to do with the expansion of Chinese American population in general. According to U.S. Census, the number of Chinese Americans reached 3.8 million in 2010, constituting 25.9% of the Asian and 1.2% of the national population (U.S. Census Bureau 2012), and was the largest subgroup of Asian Americans. In addition, the number of persons who spoke Chinese (all varieties) at home increased from 2.02 million in 2000 to 2.46 million in 2007 (U.S. Census Bureau 2010), ranking Chinese speakers the second largest group among

those who spoke a language other than English at home (Ryan 2013). Not surprisingly, the number of CHL learners in the U.S. has also been increasing rapidly in recent years (He and Xiao 2008; Xiao 2016).

CHL learners require curricula specifically designed to meet their needs. Extensive research (e.g., Fishman 2001; Valdés 2001; Kondo-Brown 2003, 2005; Weger-Guntharp 2006, 2008; Li and Duff 2008; Xiao 2008a; Comanaru and Noels 2009; Tallon 2009; Wen 2011; Luo 2013, 2015a) has shown that Heritage Language Learners (HLLs) differ from traditional Foreign Language Learners (FLLs) not only linguistically, but also affectively. In general, however, CHL learners have been learning through curricula – albeit sometimes accelerated – designed for traditional FLLs (He and Xiao 2008). Consequently, CHL learners’ needs are not fully met and their learning outcomes can be further improved (McGinnis 1996; Xiao 2008b; Luo 2015b).

This paper presents a second-year college-level curriculum designed for CHL learners enrolled in a private research university in the U.S., and analyzes student data gathered through questionnaires and interviews. The results may be able to provide some constructive insight into CHL instruction and curriculum development.

## **2. Understanding Heritage Language Learners: A Brief Literature Review**

### **2.1 Definition of Heritage Language Learners**

In a broad sense, the term “Heritage Language Learners” has been used to refer to all learners of the same ancestral language (Fishman 2001), “learners with a heritage motivation” (Van Deusen-Scholl 2003:222), or learners who have familial or cultural connections with his or her heritage language (Campbell and Peyton 1998; Lacorte and Canabal 2003; Hornberger and Wang 2008). A frequently referenced proficiency-based definition of HLLs comes from Valdés (2001), who defines the HLL as the learner “who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or at least understands the language and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English” (p. 38). Following this definition, a CHL learner in the United States could be identified as a language learner who is raised in a home where Chinese is spoken, who speaks or at least understands Chinese, and who is to some degree bilingual in Chinese and English (cf. He 2006). Students who enroll in

college-level heritage-track Chinese language courses largely fit this definition.

## 2.2 Characteristics and Needs of Heritage Language Learners

Scholars seem to have reached a consensus that HLLs possess cultural and linguistic characteristics that distinguish them from traditional FLLs (Clyne 1991; ACTFL 1996; Campbell and Rosenthal 2000; Draper and Hicks 2000; Wiley 2001; Valdés 2001, 2005; Renganathan 2008; Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci 2011). For example, ACTFL's *Standards* (1996) indicated that HLLs generally had listening and speaking skills sufficient to conduct everyday conversations in their HLs with their family or community members, but had limited skills in reading and writing. They appeared to be more comfortable with speaking their HLs in informal settings. Similarly, in a study comparing HLLs and traditional FLLs with two years of formal language instruction, Campbell and Rosenthal (2000) found that HLLs had more advanced oral abilities than their FLL peers, but were less proficient in reading and writing. Based on previous research and their own observations, Campbell and Rosenthal (2000) generalized seven "working hypotheses" to describe HLLs at the university level. In their descriptions, these students had a fairly good mastery of phonology, grammar, vocabulary, and culture. They had also acquired sufficient sociolinguistic awareness to choose appropriate registers and were motivated to study their HLs for a wide range of reasons. However, their vocabulary was limited to just a few socio-cultural domains and they rarely had opportunities to develop literacy skills beyond elementary levels. These "working hypotheses" present an insightful description of HLLs' linguistic, cultural and personal characteristics, and have become a valuable resource for heritage language instructors. However, it should be noted that they have not been tested with empirical evidence. Campbell and Rosenthal's observation of HLLs' knowledge of register, as a matter of fact, is not completely consistent with some other scholars' findings. For example, Valdés (2001) explored the characteristics of HLLs' oral performance, and found that "the spoken language of these students may often contain a number of features typical of casual and informal registers of the language that are totally inappropriate in the classroom" (p. 44). In other words, HLLs may have basic interpersonal communication skills (Cummins 1994), but have little knowledge of register and limited linguistic skills for

formal situations.

More recently, Carreira and Kagan (2011) summarized the characteristics of university-level HLLs of eight languages (Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Russian, Korean, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Persian) based on a national heritage language survey conducted by the National Heritage Language Resource Center at the University of California, Los Angeles from 2007 to 2009. They found that a university-level HLL is a student who:

(1) is an early sequential bilingual-who acquired English early in life, after acquiring the HL; (2) has limited exposure to the HL outside the home; (3) has relatively strong aural skills but limited reading and writing skills; (4) has positive attitudes and experiences with the HL; and (5) studies the HL mainly to connect with communities of speakers in the United States and to gain insights into his or her roots, even though career plans feature prominently in learners of some languages as well. (Carreira and Kagan 2011:62)

Carreira and Kagan's (2011) findings echoed and complemented many aspects of Campbell and Rosenthal's (2000) hypotheses as well as existing findings by other scholars. HLLs are linguistically, culturally, and psychologically different from traditional FLLs due to their unique backgrounds, learning experiences, and learning contexts. Linguistically, they have relatively strong aural and oral skills due to home exposure, but their literacy skills are limited because of lack of formal training; their linguistic skills (e.g., grammar, vocabulary) even in areas of listening and speaking are limited to immediate personal needs at home, so they have very little knowledge of register and are less competent in relatively formal situations. Culturally, they have acquired a certain level of cultural literacy through home exposure and are eager to read more contextualized content that expresses their ethnic identity and delve into the cultural aspects in which they are particularly interested. Psychologically, they are very motivated to gain insights into their roots and to explore their own ethnic identity. Thus, they are interested in connecting with people of similar backgrounds, communities of HL speakers in the U.S., and family members or relatives living in their parents' home country.

In the past decade, a number of studies have specifically focused on CHL learners and investigated CHL learners' linguistic and cultural characteristics (e.g., Weger-Guntharp 2006, 2008; Hendryx 2008; Wu 2008), linguistic knowledge and development (e.g., Xiao 2004, 2006, 2008a, 2013; Jia 2008; Jia and Bayley 2008; Ming and Tao 2008), identity issues (Wong and Xiao 2010; Wu and Leung 2014), and affective factors such as anxiety and motivation (e.g., Wen 2011; Xiao and Wong 2014; Luo 2015a). These studies show that the characteristics and learning needs of HLLs identified in the general literature of heritage language education also apply to CHL learners.

Curricula that are specifically designed for HLLs need to take into consideration their characteristics and learning needs. In addition, since HLLs bring a significant amount of prior linguistic and cultural knowledge to the classroom, it is important to see their existing knowledge as a resource rather than a barrier for teaching and learning, even though their knowledge may be incomplete (Scalera 2003).

### **3. The Case Curriculum**

The design of the curriculum presented in this section is guided by understanding of the three kinds of learning needs – linguistic, cultural, and psychological – of HLLs as outlined above. It also draws on existing works on HL curriculum development (e.g., Kagan 2005; Wu 2008; National Heritage Language Resource Center 2015), previous course syllabi adopted in the institution where the study was conducted, and insights offered by experienced CHL instructors. Evidence shows that this curriculum was perceived rather positively by the students as demonstrated by the high course evaluations administered by the college across the three different classes. For example, for the section taught by the first author, students' average response for items: "provide an overall rating of the instruction" and "provide an overall rating of the course" was 5.73 and 5.45 out of 6 respectively.

This curriculum was developed for a second-year heritage-track Chinese course at a private research university in the Midwest of United States. The Chinese language program at this university offered four-year Chinese language instruction for two separate tracks, the so-called "mainstream track" and "heritage track." This university adopted the quarter system and the second-year heritage-track Chinese

course under discussion was a year-long three-quarter sequence. This course had three parallel sections taught by three different instructors. Mandarin Chinese was the target language for this course. Students taking this course typically had exposure to Mandarin at home or were assessed to demonstrate similar proficiency levels through placement procedures. The total enrollment of this course was 35, with 16, 8, and 11 being in each section. The first author was the instructor of the class with 16 students. Among the 35 students, 32 spoke Mandarin at home. The other 3 students had home exposure to Cantonese, but they had experience attending weekend Mandarin Chinese schools. It should be noted that the Mandarin proficiency levels among the 35 students varied from person to person, depending on the intensity of exposure at home, opportunities of visiting Mandarin-speaking countries, years of taking Chinese classes before university, and so on.

The first author, one of the instructors and the course coordinator, developed the syllabi of this course. Please refer to Appendix A for the third-quarter course syllabus of the sequence. Students met for 50 minutes a day, four days (Mondays through Thursdays) a week. The rest of this section offers an overview of the curriculum, describes featured components, clarifies the structure of a typical lesson, and discusses how this curriculum addresses CHL learners' needs.

### 3.1 Overview

Two sets of textbooks are adopted for this course: *Integrated Chinese* (IC) Level 2, Part 1 and Part 2 (textbook and workbook), by Yuehua Liu, et al. (2009), and *Tales and Traditions: Readings in Chinese Literature Series* (TTRCLS), Volume 2, by Yun Xiao, et al. (2009). The three-quarter sequence covers all twenty units in *Integrated Chinese*, Level 2, Part 1 and Part 2. The first quarter (Fall quarter) covers the first seven units in Part 1, the second quarter (Winter quarter) the last three units of Part 1 and the first three units of Level 2, and the third quarter (Spring quarter) the last seven units of Level 2.

The companion workbook, originally designed for non-heritage learners, provides an abundance of exercises for all four skills. Students in this course are only asked to focus on reading, translation, and writing exercises.

Although IC is not specifically designed for heritage learners, the topics in level

2 go beyond those of immediate personal use in a familial context and range from course selection to gender equality to Chinese history. It also covers a significant amount of vocabulary and grammar typically used in higher-level register. Thus, this material appeared to have adequately challenged the CHL learners enrolled in the course. Other components of the course, such as supplementary materials and authentic materials accompanied with writing assignments, are selected to ensure that students of higher proficiency are adequately challenged as well.

TTRCLS is used as supplementary readings for the third-quarter of this course. This book includes twenty-four readings categorized into four subsections: fables and literary quotations, tales of traditional Chinese festivals, myths and fantasies, and classic tales of love and romance. It collects adaptations and selections from the most well-known works in the Chinese literary and folk canon, reflecting the wealth and depth of Chinese culture. Three readings (two required, one optional) are assigned each week and each of them is usually selected from different subsections. Please refer to Appendix A for a detailed weekly schedule of the readings.

One micro teaching cycle of this course includes one unit from IC and three supplementary readings from TTRCLS. Typically, three class hours are devoted to one unit in IC followed by one class hour of discussion on supplementary readings. There are two vocabulary dictations and a companion workbook assignment for every unit, a written quiz for every three units and a final written exam at the end. In addition, throughout the whole quarter, students need to write two compositions and two journal entries and give a final oral presentation on a cultural project. Written quizzes and major assignments (e.g., compositions, reflective journals, workbook exercises) are spaced out and arranged to be due on Mondays, which is easy to remember and allows students one weekend to prepare (see Appendix A).

### 3.2 Featured Components

The case syllabus (see Appendix A) outlines all the important components of the course under “grading.” This section will focus on those featured components deemed especially beneficial for HLLs: daily warm-up discussion, sentence construction, compositions, journal writing, reading and discussion, and the cultural presentation project.

### 3.2.1 Daily Warm-up Discussion

Three class meetings are devoted to each unit from IC, and each class meeting starts with a warm-up discussion. The topics of these discussions are related to the unit being taught at the time.

Students are encouraged to be responsible for creating the discussion questions. At the beginning of the quarter, students are divided into groups of two or three based on their own choice and each group is supposed to suggest questions for daily warm-up discussions for at least one unit during the quarter. Questions that require their classmates to communicate with their parents, relatives, or connect to virtual or local Chinese communities are especially encouraged. These questions are then polished and posted on the class website by the instructor before a new unit starts and are evenly distributed for discussion over three days. Students are supposed to preview and prepare for these questions before class, especially those requiring direct contact with native speakers.

Warm-up discussions are an interactive process. At the beginning of each class, the instructor shows the question(s) to be discussed on the screen and invites the whole class to stand up and talk to their classmates in pairs or small groups. They are especially encouraged to talk to those classmates with whom they are not yet familiar. When the instructor announces “move,” the students are supposed to move and talk to a different person or group. In addition to the suggested questions, they are welcome to introduce themselves and ask other appropriate questions to their classmates related to the general topic of the unit. Warm-up discussions typically last 7 to 8 minutes. When students go back to their seats, the instructor uses 2 to 3 minutes to invite students to share the highlights of what they have discussed.

### 3.2.2 Sentence Construction

For each of the three class meetings of a given unit, students have opportunities to learn new vocabulary and grammatical patterns. After the instructor provides explicit explanation and sufficient examples, students are given 1 to 3 minutes to work in pairs and create dialogues or contextualized sentences that are related to their daily life by incorporating the new vocabulary and grammatical patterns they have just learned. Each pair is then invited to share their “product” in front of the class. The



purpose of this activity is to push the students to put the new knowledge to use and produce output at the sentence or discourse level in meaningful contexts.

This activity emphasizes accuracy rather than fluency, so students' errors will be corrected once detected. The instructor will first invite the class to correct the errors and then provide possibilities of final corrections. To encourage creativity and facilitate a supportive environment, each class meeting will vote for a prize for "the funniest sentence" and a prize for "the most creative error."

### 3.2.3 Compositions

Composition topics are related to the lessons in IC. Two compositions are assigned each quarter. For each composition topic, the instructor provides a wide range of authentic materials (e.g., sample writings, newspaper articles, magazine articles, blog posts, YouTube videos, movie clips) that students can model on. Through these authentic materials, students receive extensive exposure to relevant vocabulary and grammar, appropriate register, different writing styles, and varied opinions on this topic. Students are supposed to study these materials on their own outside of class.

The instructor also provides a list of key vocabulary and sentence patterns and encourages students to use them in their compositions. Compositions that incorporate vocabulary and sentence patterns from the list and the authentic materials provided are graded more favorably. This is stated in the rubric of composition grading at the very beginning of the quarter.

For each composition, students turn in a draft, receive comments from the instructor, and then turn in a revised version. The draft accounts for 60% of the assignment grade, and the revision is 40%. When grading the first draft, the instructor points out the mistakes, or inappropriate sentences, raises questions, and provides general suggestions, but does not make specific corrections. This approach encourages students to further communicate with the instructor and engages them in deeper learning in the process of revision.

### 3.2.4 Journal Writing

Journal writing consists of three parts: summary, reading response, and reflection on Chinese language learning.

Three supplementary readings (two required and one optional) from TTRCLS are assigned each week. Students read these materials outside class and write two journal entries based on the readings throughout the quarter. In each journal, students write a brief summary of the stories they have read and a reading response. In the reading response, students are encouraged to reflect on the readings freely and creatively. They can comment on the characters in the stories, express their own opinions, raise questions, relate the story to their own life, discover and analyze cultural differences, or write down any other thoughts they have after reading the stories.

In addition, students reflect on their Chinese language learning experience (e.g., progress, challenges, ways to improve, tips for classmates, suggestions for the instructor, events related to Chinese language learning) in journal writing. At the beginning of the quarter, a sample journal and the rubric for journal grading are handed out to the students and the instructor's expectations for this assignment are explained.

Instructors respond to students' reflections on Chinese language learning through follow-up emails, one-on-one conversations, or in-class group discussions, and take immediate actions to incorporate student feedback into instruction or curriculum design to enhance teaching and learning, especially if students share some common problems.

### 3.2.5 Reading and Discussion

One class meeting is set aside for students to discuss the three supplementary readings assigned each week. Students are made responsible for creating discussion questions. The same groups created for daily warm-up discussion work together for this component. Each group indicates their week of duty at the beginning of the quarter. One week before the in-class discussion, the instructor reminds the corresponding group of formulating four or five questions related to the readings of the week. The instructor then polishes the questions and posts them on the class website. Students preview the questions before the "Reading and Discussion" class meeting.

During class, students are randomly divided into four or five groups depending

on the number of discussion questions that day. All the groups are given about 30 minutes to discuss all the questions; the instructor walks around the classroom to answer questions and facilitate discussions. Then, each group is asked to do a summary presentation on a topic randomly selected from the four or five. This component is graded in terms of students' preparedness, participation in discussion and presentation, and quality of topics and comments.

### 3.2.6 Oral Presentation on the Cultural Project

Students need to do an oral presentation on a cultural project at the end of the quarter, which involves collaboration with one or two of their classmates based on their own choice.

Students have two choices for this cultural project: a movie project or a culture research project. For the movie project, each group watches a Chinese movie, presents an introduction of the movie highlighting its cultural elements, and performs a featured scene of the movie as a skit in class. For the culture research project, each group works on a cultural topic that is relevant to the contents covered in the course (e.g., gender equality, environmental protection, money management in China). They are expected to watch a 10-minute video, interview at least one native speaker, give a 10-minute presentation, and perform a skit to highlight the cultural findings.

For both projects, students are encouraged to seek help from the instructor before presentation and are expected to turn in a polished piece of collaborative writing in the end. A document detailing requirements and grading rubrics for the cultural project is provided to the students before the project starts. For example, PowerPoint presentation is required and familiar vocabulary items are encouraged. Students are advised not to use more than five unfamiliar vocabulary items during presentations, and to gloss in Pinyin and English the ones they do use.

### 3.3 Structure of Each Lesson

According to the National Capital Language Resource Center (NCLRC 2004), a language lesson should include a variety of activities that combine different types of language input and output. Considering the fact that CHL learners in the same class are of various backgrounds and a wide range of speaking and listening proficiency levels, such variety is particularly important to promote differentiated instruction that

is crucial for all students to succeed. This course, thus, adopts the five-part model of structuring a language lesson advocated by the NCLRC. The five parts are: preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion. Following this model and considering the characteristics of CHL learners, a typical lesson plan for a 50-minute class is outlined as follows:

1. Preparation (10 minutes): to facilitate a supportive class environment
  - a) dictation
  - b) warm-up discussion
2. Presentation (15 minutes): to focus on accuracy through structured output
  - a) presentation of new vocabulary, grammar, and sentence patterns
  - b) comprehension questions related to the text
  - c) questions that elicit the usage of new vocabulary/grammar
  - d) sentence construction
3. Practice (15 minutes): to develop fluency through communicative output
  - a) video/photo/article/news as lead-ins
  - b) communication task
4. Evaluation (8 minutes): to reinforce and monitor
  - a) presentation of the results of discussion in front of the class
  - b) analysis of common errors and recap
5. Expansion (2 minutes): to increase exposure and develop student autonomy
  - a) utilization of online resources
  - b) utilization of community resources

The class starts with preparatory activities such as a broad outline of the day's goals and activities, a review, a dictation, warm-up discussions, or brainstorm questions that help students elicit their existing knowledge about the day's topics. As mentioned previously, warm-up discussions feature as a routine for almost every class meeting in this course. Students are encouraged to stand up and talk to different classmates, discussing questions prepared by their classmates in reference to the lesson and their life experience. Warm-up discussions set the tone for a lively and supportive classroom environment and at the same time prepare the students

linguistically for the next stage of the lesson.

Then, the class moves to presentation of the linguistic and topical content of the lesson (i.e., new dialogue, vocabulary, grammar, sentence patterns). Students are required to learn the new vocabulary/grammar and preview the text/dialogue on their own before coming to class. Thus, class time at this stage is mainly devoted to “structured practice,” although the instructor provides explicit explanations and examples when necessary. “Structured practice” refers to rounds of comprehension questions based on the text/dialogue and questions that elicit the usage of the newly introduced vocabulary/grammar. Sentence construction (see the section on Featured Components) is another type of structured practice. Ideally, structured practice should be as relevant to students’ real life as possible. In structured output, accuracy is important, so errors should be corrected.

Next, students work in pairs or small groups to complete a designated communication task. Since CHL learners are typically proficient in aural skills and tolerant of ambiguity (Wu 2008), authentic materials such as short YouTube videos or movie clips can be used as lead-ins to the communication task. For example, the theme of Lesson 9 in IC, Level 2 is “education” and the text discusses how Chinese children are fully booked with all types of extracurricular classes arranged by their parents. The YouTube video of the Chinese idiom *bamiao zhuzhang* (literary meaning: to help the shoots grow by pulling them upward) can serve as a lead-in, inviting students to discuss their childhood experience of education, to what degree they can relate this story to their experience, and in what sense Chinese and American education differ. For communication tasks, students are considered successful as long as they are able to get their message across and complete the tasks. At this stage, accuracy is not as important a concern as communication and fluency. Thus, errors are not corrected on the spot unless they interfere with communication, but the instructor can note down the errors for later use.

When all students have completed the communication task, they are asked to present their “products” in front of the class. Students are then encouraged to provide comments on each other’s work and reflect on how they have used the newly learnt linguistic items in this task. The instructor can now highlight common errors and recap the key points of the lesson. This stage reinforces learning and monitors student

comprehension and progress.

Finally, the instructor gives expansion assignments that allow students to apply what they have learned in class to out-of-class situations or to utilize online and community resources. Examples of expansion assignments include inviting students to interview their parents why they immigrated to the U.S., talk to Chinese international students on campus and ask about their summer plan, call their cousins or friends in China to ask about their criteria of an ideal boyfriend/girlfriend, or read the BBS forum of the Chinese international students on campus. One of the goals of this stage is to help students develop autonomy and be responsible for their own learning.

### 3.4 How does the Case Curriculum Address CHL Learners' Needs?

From the perspective of the instructor and curriculum designer, this case curriculum differs from non-CHL curriculum in that it takes into consideration CHL learners' characteristics and focuses on addressing their linguistic, cultural, and psychological learning needs.

In this course, students receive extensive training on writing and reading through assignments such as compositions and journals, supplementary readings, and a wide range of authentic materials. The topics covered in the textbooks and supplementary readings go beyond immediate personal use in order to build students' repertoire of vocabulary and grammatical patterns for higher-level registers. Their speaking and listening abilities are refined, sophisticated, and expanded through extended discussions, oral presentations, and video viewing on a variety of topics beyond daily interactions with family members.

The supplementary materials, a selection of well-known and classic Chinese fables, tales, legends, and myths, help students appreciate the richness and depth of traditional Chinese culture. At the same time, authentic materials such as videos, movies, newspaper articles, and blog posts expose students to contemporary Chinese society. Through the final oral project (i.e., the movie project or the cultural research project), students get the opportunity to explore certain aspects of the Chinese culture in depth and compare Chinese and American cultures.

Finally, students are constantly required or encouraged to communicate with

their parents, relatives and friends in China, or the local Chinese communities to complete certain course assignments. For example, many warm-up discussion questions involve speaking to their family members and relatives; the final cultural project requires interviewing a native speaker of Chinese; students are encouraged to attend cultural events such as field trips to the local Chinatown organized by the instructor or celebrations of Chinese traditions held by local Chinese communities and incorporate such cultural experience into journal writing. Last but not least, they communicate and socialize extensively with their classmates, forming a Chinese community in and out of class. Through all types of communication and connection, they gain insights and develop pride in their ethnic identity.

Theoretically, this curriculum is designed to address the learning needs of CHL learners. It is interesting to see the students' perceptions of the usefulness of this curriculum in meeting their needs.

#### **4. Student Feedback on the Case Curriculum**

Three types of student feedback were examined to evaluate the case curriculum: course evaluation administered by the college, student responses to an end-of-the-quarter questionnaire (see Appendix B) and interviews with a number of students conducted by the first author.

##### **4.1 College Course Evaluation**

Evidence shows that this curriculum was perceived rather positively by the students as demonstrated by the high course evaluations administered by the college across the three different classes. For example, for the section taught by the first author, students' average response for items: "provide an overall rating of the instruction" and "provide an overall rating of the course" was 5.73 and 5.45 out of 6 respectively.

##### **4.2 The Questionnaire**

This section examines the results of students' responses to the questionnaire. The questionnaires were handed out to the students at the last class. Twenty-one learners from two of the three classes participated in this study and returned questionnaires with valid answers. Among these participants, 14 students were from

the class taught by the first researcher and 7 from the class with 8 enrollments. Students rated the curriculum, the textbook, and the supplementary readings on a 7-point Likert scale and provided reasons for their ratings. Means and standard deviations of student responses are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Students' Feedback on Curriculum and Materials (N = 21)

	Minimum	Maximum	Means	Standard Deviations
Curriculum	4.00	7.00	6.05	.80
Textbook	3.00	7.00	5.48	.98
Supplementary Readings	2.00	7.00	5.62	1.36

As can be seen from Table 1, student ratings on the item “please rate how well you like the curriculum of 125-3 this quarter in general” was fairly positive ( $M = 6.05$ ). Their opinions on the course materials were less impressive: they liked the supplementary materials ( $M = 5.62$ ) better than the textbook ( $M = 5.48$ ); however, the result of paired sample t-test indicated that the mean difference was not significant ( $t(20) = -.335, p = .09$ ). The standard deviations showed that student opinions on the supplementary materials ( $SD = 1.36$ ) were more varied than those on the textbook ( $SD = .98$ ) and on the curriculum in general ( $SD = .80$ ).

Students provided reasons for their ratings. In general, they had high opinions of the case curriculum. They cited reasons such as “the topics were pretty interesting,” “it gave good insight into Chinese culture,” “it was comprehensive and taught a lot of Chinese grammar and vocabulary,” “it was well structured and organized,” or “it improved speaking and reading fluency.”

As for the textbook, students provided positive comments such as “the textbook was comprehensive and contained a lot of interesting relevant scenarios,” “vocabulary seemed pretty practical,” or “the workbook and the textbook go well together.” At the same time, they raised the concern that the textbook lacked depth. For example, one student commented that the textbook “could have contained more depth in the grammar and vocabulary”; another considered it “adequate, but a little too basic.” In general, students demonstrated less enthusiasm for the textbook compared to their love for the curriculum.

Many students were very excited about the supplementary readings as indicated



in such enthusiastic comments as “I LOVED the supplementary readings,” “the stories were very interesting,” and “they helped with idioms and hard-to-understand aspects of Chinese speech.” However, their love for the readings seemed to be compromised by a number of other factors such as difficulty and relevance of the vocabulary. A number of students complained that the vocabulary in the stories were “not relevant” or “too difficult.” It is worth noting that their comments varied to a great extent, which was consistent with the standard deviation of the ratings on the supplementary-readings item.

The questionnaire also asked the students to rate the usefulness of the various components of the course in meeting their needs in learning Chinese. Table 2 summarizes the means and standard deviations.

Table 2: Students’ Feedback on Different Components of the Course (N = 21)

Course Components	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Vocabulary Dictation	4	7	5.86	1.06
Translations	3	7	5.81	1.25
Compositions	3	7	5.67	1.24
Journal Writing	3	7	4.95	1.24
Reading and Discussion	2	7	5.19	<b>1.36</b>
Daily Warm-up Discussion	4	7	5.80	.87
Grammar and Sentence Construction	4	7	<b>6.29</b>	.85
Cultural Project	2	7	<b>4.81</b>	<b>1.29</b>
Written Quizzes and Exams	4	7	5.90	.99

As the results showed, all the components were viewed fairly positively by the students. Grammar and sentence construction was rated the most useful, followed by written quizzes and exams, vocabulary dictation, translations, daily discussion, composition, reading and discussion, and journal writing, with the cultural project being regarded the least useful. Surprisingly, many featured components specifically designed to meet CHL learners’ needs such as compositions, journal writing, reading and discussion, and cultural project were rated not as high as those more traditional activities such as grammar/vocabulary explanation and sentence construction,

vocabulary dictations, translations, and exams.

The consensus among the students seemed to be that learning new and difficult grammar was particularly important for HLLs as “many heritage students have weak grammar.” In addition, they needed to “not sound unintelligent in China” and the grammar/vocabulary component helped them “repair grammar holes” and “expand variety of dictation.”

Another possible reason for the high rating of the grammar/vocabulary component could be that students perceived this component as learning the most amount of new knowledge with the least time investment. In other words, the learning outcome of this component may be the most tangible. Moreover, according to the instructors’ observation, the sentence construction activity following the grammar/vocabulary explanation stimulated the most amount of fun in class as students needed to relate the grammar/vocabulary just learned to their real life and compete for creativity. This task was challenging, and at the same time mobilized the whole class as a community and helped create a supportive environment.

It is surprising and interesting that the cultural project received the lowest rating on average. A close examination of student comments showed that the criticism for the cultural project ranged from being “irrelevant to the main textbook,” “not applicable,” “time-consuming,” to “lacking in clear guidelines.” Compared to other components of the course, the cultural project involved the most amount of work and required group collaboration outside of class. This project was time-consuming and a considerable amount of time needed to be used on logistics and collaboration rather than on learning itself. Moreover, this big project was arranged around the end of the quarter when students were stressed over other courses as well. It is then understandable why students, on average, perceived the cultural project to be the least useful. At the same time, it should be noted that many students loved the cultural project and gave very enthusiastic comments. They thought it was “cool,” “fun,” “educational,” “helpful in improving their speaking ability,” “added additional insight to what is happening in China that cannot be learned through a textbook,” and gave them a chance to choose what they wanted to learn. It was the instructor’s personal observation that more intrinsically motivated students tended not to mind the amount of work and showed more interest in the cultural project.

The average rating for reading and discussion was lower than that for daily warm-up discussions, but students welcomed them for similar reasons – they provided opportunities to mingle with their classmates and to practice speaking. For example, when commenting on reading and discussion, one student wrote, “These were the best. I learned vocabulary and enjoyed learning more on the culture as well. Best of all we got to talk about it and so I learned even more from our discussions.” Another student saw daily warm-up discussion as “good time to talk and have fun and good way to practice Chinese.”

As for compositions and journal writing, most students appreciated that they provided valuable opportunities for developing writing abilities. For example, they thought the compositions and journal writing helped “integrate ...knowledge of the Chinese language” and “express current thoughts and ideas that cannot be conveyed through class time.” However, interestingly, a number of students expressed that they did not really care about writing and just wanted to “focus more on speaking, grammar, and sentence structure.”

Student comments on the more traditional components such as vocabulary dictations, translations, and written quizzes and exams tended to be similar. They commented that these activities were “tedious” and “mainly involved memorization,” but “forced them to learn and keep up with the class,” “reinforced skills,” and “gauged how well the material was absorbed.” Perhaps the most representative comment was: “Not so fun, but ensures learning.” Interestingly, although these comments sounded much less enthusiastic, students provided higher ratings for traditional activities than innovative ones in terms of usefulness. It seems that whether an activity is perceived as ensuring learning is of great importance to the students.

The fact that students on average tended to favor more traditional exercises over the more innovative components was possibly related to their beliefs and styles of learning established from their previous language learning experience. It might take some time for some students to get used to and recognize the benefits of new learning methods. It was also perhaps because more innovative activities required more work. The three components that received the lowest ratings were: the cultural project, journal writing, and reading and discussion, which all required a large amount of work outside of class. In addition, the cultural project and reading and discussion

required group collaboration. An educated guess would be that motivation may be a significant factor for whether students would appreciate these innovative activities. The key to promoting CHL learners' motivation is to help them understand, appreciate, and develop their ethnic identity. As He (2006) pointed out, "identity is ... not ... a collection of static attributes or ... some mental construct existing prior to and independent of human actions, but rather ... a process of continual emerging and becoming, a process that identifies what a person becomes and achieves through ongoing interactions with other persons" (p.7). The instructor may create opportunities for such interactions and facilitate the process by helping students explore what heritage cultural identity exactly means to each individual.

Meanwhile, it is important to recognize that opinions varied widely from student to student for some components. The two components, reading and discussion ( $SD = 1.36$ ) and the cultural project ( $SD = 1.29$ ), received the most varied responses. The "innovative" components were "invented" by the first author and were relatively new to the other instructors, so it was possible that different instructors might have implemented them differently in individual sections, which might have led to a wider variance of opinions.

#### 4.3 The Interviews

The interviews were open-ended and were guided by three major questions: 1) How do you like the course? What do you like and dislike about it? 2) Does this course meet your needs of learning Chinese? Why? 3) Do you have any suggestions for improvement? The interviews were conducted in English and lasted from 15 to 20 minutes. In order to recruit participants for interviews, the first researcher first made a list of 9 students of different proficiency levels (i.e., 3 in the high proficiency group, 3 in the middle, and 3 in the low group) based on her own observation and sent them emails to invite them for participation. All the 9 students agreed to participate in the study, but one student from the middle group was not able to show up due to personal reasons. As a result, eight students from the section taught by the first author participated in the interviews, which were transcribed afterwards for this study.

Central to this study is whether and to what extent CHL learners' needs are met by the case curriculum. The interview transcripts were examined to gain more in-

depth understanding of the issue. Thematic analysis, a common form of analysis in qualitative research (Boyatzis 1998; Braun and Clarke 2006; Charmaz 2006; Saldana 2009; Guest 2012), was adopted to code and analyze the data. More specifically, this study performed coding in six phases - familiarization with data, generating initial codes, searching for themes among codes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report - as advocated by Braun and Clarke (2006). Six themes repeatedly surfaced: linguistic gains, learning environment, culture, practicality, variety, and responsiveness to student feedback.

During the interviews, students commented very positively on the case curriculum. They generously discussed their linguistic gains in grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, conversational skills, reading skills, and writing abilities. For example, one student said, “My Chinese has improved drastically since enrolling in this course. It challenged me with conversational and literary readings that expanded my vocabulary to include abstract concepts.” Others mentioned that this course pushed them to “speak like a Chinese person rather than an American.” Six out of eight interviewees mentioned that they now spoke with their parents in Chinese a lot more over phone after taking this Chinese course and their parents were very happy about their progress. One student said, “My mom, dad, and I are now on WeChat, which is cool. We send each other messages in Chinese. I am surprised that I can understand most of the messages.”

It emerged from the data that learning environment figured as an important factor in students’ overall experience in this course. Students enthusiastically welcomed and appreciated the “supportive,” “relaxing,” and “enjoyable” learning atmosphere. Here are some examples: “this class is a lot of fun and interactive;” “I love the class. It makes everyone enjoy and our class always has the best and happiest discussions;” “classes are always unstressful and a great learning environment.” Positive and active peer interactions in and outside of class seemed to have contributed to the lively and supportive learning environment. Here is a representative comment: “I totally love this class. We had so much fun standing up and talking to our classmates at the beginning of every class; the readings and discussions were so cool; listening to the sentences made by all of us were the funniest part. I think my classmates are really cool people. I love to hang out with

them out of class too. We need to work together for some of the group projects anyway. My schedule was very tight this quarter, but I gave up another class to take this class. My classmates are so fun!” Most students believed that the instructor played the major role in creating such a positive learning environment as she was able to “develop a class personality.”

Appreciation of cultural knowledge was another theme in the interview data. Students loved the fact that this course incorporated the cultural aspect in addition to teaching the language. Many students believed that heritage learners needed to know “the famous Chinese myths, traditions, and history that most people know in China.” They also thought the cultural aspect “gave a lot of depth to the class.” Some of them were particularly interested in Chinese idioms as they were “cool and the most puzzling.” Students also appreciated that cultural differences between China and the U.S. were analyzed in this class: “I did not realize how different my parents were from my American friends’ parents until I started thinking about it for one of the class discussion topic. They are so different! And it is pretty interesting to be aware of that.” Many of them had positive experience with the cultural project: “I learned a lot when preparing my group’s cultural presentation. I even called my cousin in China to learn about Chinese young people’s standards in choosing spouses, which is cool. I learned more by listening to my classmates’ presentations, though. Those topics are so fun. It’s great that we got to choose our own topics.” While acknowledging the fun and value of the cultural information, many students were not sure how relevant or beneficial it was for language learning. For example, a typical concern for the cultural project is that was “not too useful in terms of learning vocabulary and language.”

Practicality seemed to be a very important criterion for students to judge the contents or components of the case curriculum. When evaluating the course, they constantly made comments on whether the contents, components, or activities were applicable or relatable to their daily life. For example, one student particularly liked the grammar or vocabulary explanation because it built skills he/she “will have most opportunities to use.” Other students did not like the supplementary readings too much because “some of the words seemed old-fashioned” and “sparsely used in normal dialogue.” They showed great enthusiasm for daily warm-up discussions

because “they help with learning about things that go on in everyday life.” Obviously, relating the knowledge learned to their daily life is of great importance to the students.

Variety was another quality that students liked about the curriculum. Many students mentioned that the variety of activities or exercises made the class “engaging,” “interesting,” and “effective.” For example, one student said, “the course definitely helped me improve my Chinese skills and learn about the culture and history. The wide range of projects, writing prompts, and topics in class were all relevant and kept the class fresh and interesting.” When explaining why she/he enjoyed the class so much, a student commented, “we had lots of different assignments and methods of class instruction, such as peer-to-peer talking in the beginning of class, workbook discussions, multiple quizzes to stay focused, creating sentences using newly learned grammar structures, etc.” Such variety was not only important in class, but also out of class. This was reflected in another student’s comment: “In class, the engaging and active environment provided me a great chance to practice my Chinese almost every day of the week. Out of class, the assignments provided ensured I was up to date and ready to speak actively the following class.”

Responsiveness to student feedback was seen as an outstanding feature of the curriculum, and was very much appreciated by the students. Many students pointed out that they benefited from the changes the instructor made in response to student suggestions. Here is an example: “by the end of the quarter several major improvements had been made to make the class more enjoyable.” Responsiveness to student feedback seemed to be inseparable from the instructor’s willingness to “put student first” and to make teaching “student-centered.” Students observed that the instructor “asked everyone what they were most interested in learning before classes and was able to mold her class around what people wanted to learn.” They also appreciated the fact that the instructor liked to “get to know your personality and constantly check up on you to make sure you understand the class material.”

The first three themes - linguistic gains, gains in cultural knowledge, and learning environment - corresponded well to HLLs’ linguistic, cultural, and psychological needs. Students improved their linguistic skills in a wide range of areas and learned about different aspects of Chinese culture through various channels in this course. The peer interactions that they enjoyed so much not only helped create a supportive

learning atmosphere, but more importantly built a CHL community in and out of class, where students could connect, communicate, and celebrate their cultural identity. Practicality, variety, and responsiveness to student feedback were among the qualities that students valued most about this course.

## **5. Limitations and Future Work**

The case curriculum was designed based on the instructor's understanding of CHL learners' needs through literature review. However, the questionnaire and interview data showed that students' perceived needs and preferences could be different from the instructor's initial expectations. For example, they favored traditional methods of teaching and assessment over innovative components, and not all students were interested in improving reading and writing abilities, presumably their weakest skills. This discrepancy thus underscores the need to examine more carefully about students' perceptions of their needs vis-à-vis what the literature tells us about their needs. An essential question is whether students' perceptions of their needs are accurate. Some could argue that students are not in fact aware of their needs whereas others may argue that students' perceptions matter most. This study basically does not specify where the researchers stand in regard to this issue. Further careful investigation of this issue is necessary as it informs us on what should drive curricular considerations, students' perceptions or insights from the literature?

In addition, a number of concepts such as culture, motivation, and identity were touched upon but not explored in depth in this study. As these concepts are closely related to CHL learners' needs, in-depth discussions on these concepts can inform CHL curriculum design. For example, according to the instructor's personal observation, intrinsically-motivated students seemed to hold more positive opinions of the more innovative activities specially designed for CHL students. This observation needs to be further investigated. An analysis of intrinsically-motivated vs. extrinsically-motivated students' evaluations of the curriculum would be an interesting topic for follow-up studies.

The participant sample also imposes some limitation. The number of students ( $N = 21$ ) who provided their feedback on the curriculum was limited, and more participants will be necessary to make the results more generalizable. In addition,



future studies need to collect more background information about the participants, such as prior learning experience, home language use, experience of visiting their homeland. Such information may help language instructors relate the results of this study to their own teaching contexts.

Another limitation of this study stems from the evaluation of the case curriculum. It was completely based on the learners' perception, and no production data were examined. Future studies of a similar type need to provide production data sampled through classroom activities or tasks.

Inconsistency in instruction among the multiple instructors is another potential limitation of this study. In the future, proper training should be provided to all instructors to ensure consistency of instruction and to maximize the effectiveness of the curriculum.

Finally, the textbook was obviously a limitation of the case curriculum. CHL learners perceived the textbook, IC, which targeted traditional FLLs, to be too elementary to meet their needs. Thus, the field of CHL education needs energetic material development.

## References

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 1996. *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*. Yonkers, NY: National Standards in Educational Project.
- Boyatzis, Richard E. 1998. *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3.2:77-101.
- Campbell, Russell, and Joy Kreeft Peyton. 1998. Heritage language students: A valuable language resource. *The ERIC Review* 6.1:38-39.
- Campbell, Russell, and Judith W. Rosenthal 2000. Heritage languages. *Handbook of Undergraduate Second Language Education*. ed. by Judith W. Rosenthal, 165-184. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carreira, Maria, and Olga Kagan. 2011. The results of the national heritage language survey: Implications for teaching, curriculum design, and professional

- development. *Foreign Language Annals* 43.3:40-64.
- Charmaz, Kathy 2006. *Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clyne, Michael G. 1991 *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Comanaru, Ruxandra, and Kimberly A. Noels. 2009. Self-determination, motivation, and the learning of Chinese as a heritage language. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 66:131-158.
- Cummins, Jim. 1994. The acquisition of English as a second language. *Kids Come in all Languages*, ed. by Robert Pritchard and Karen Spangenberg-Urbschat, 36-62. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Draper, Jamie B., and June H. Hicks. 2000. Where we've been; what we've learned. *Teaching Heritage Language Learners: Voices from the Classroom*, ed. by John B. Webb and Barbara L. Miller, 15-35. Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 2001. 300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States. *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource*, ed. Joy Kreeft Peyton, Donald A. Ranard, and Scott McGinnis, 81-97. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Guest, Greg. 2012. *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- He, Agnes Weiyun. 2006. Toward an identity theory of the development of Chinese as a heritage language. *Heritage Language Journal* 4.1:1-28.
- He, Agnes Weiyun, and Yun Xiao. 2008. *Chinese as a Heritage Language: Fostering Rooted World Citizenry*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Hendryx, Jason. D. 2008. The Chinese heritage language learners' existing linguistic knowledge and abilities. *Chinese as a Heritage Language: Fostering Rooted World Citizenry*, ed. by Agnes Weiyun He and Yun Xiao, 51-64. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Hornberger, Nancy. H., and Shuhan C. Wang. 2008. Who are our heritage language learners? Identity and biliteracy in heritage language education in the United States. *Heritage Language Education: A New Field Emerging*, ed. by Donna M.

- Brinton, Olga Kagan and Susan Bauckus, 3-35. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jia, Gisela. 2008. Heritage language maintenance and attrition among first generation Chinese immigrants in New York City. *Chinese as a Heritage Language: Fostering Rooted World Citizenry*, ed. by Agnes Weiyun He and Yun Xiao, 189-204. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Jia, Li, and Robert Bayley. 2008. The (re)acquisition of perfective aspect marking by Chinese heritage language learners. *Chinese as a Heritage Language: Fostering Rooted World Citizenry*, ed. by Agnes Weiyun He and Yun Xiao, 205-224. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Kagan, Olga. 2005. In support of a proficiency-based definition of heritage language learners: The case of Russian. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8:213-221.
- Kondo-Brown, Kimi. 2003. Heritage language instruction for post-secondary students from immigrant back-grounds. *Heritage Language Journal* 1.1:1-25.
- Kondo-Brown, Kimi. 2005. Differences in language skills: Heritage language learner subgroups and foreign language learners. *Modern Language Journal* 89:563-581.
- Lacorte, Manel, and Evelyn Canabal. 2003. Interaction with heritage language learners in foreign language classrooms. *The Sociolinguistics of Foreign-Language Classrooms: Contributions of the Native, the Near-native, and the Non-Native Speaker*, ed. by Carl Blyth, 107-129. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Li, Duanduan, and Patricia A. Duff. 2008. Issues in Chinese heritage language education and research at the postsecondary level. *Chinese as a Heritage Language: Fostering Rooted World Citizenry*, ed. by Agnes Weiyun He and Yun Xiao, 13-36. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Liu, Yuehua, Tao-chung Yao, Nyan-Ping Bi, Liangyan Ge, and Yaohua Shi. 2009. Integrated Chinese, Level 2, Part 1 and Part 2. Boston, MA: Cheng and Tsui Publishing Company.
- Luo, Han. 2013. Chinese language learning anxiety and its associated factors. *Journal*

- of Chinese Language Teachers Association* 48.2:109-133.
- Luo, Han. 2015a. Chinese language learning anxiety: A study of heritage learners. *Heritage Language Journal* 12.1:22-47.
- Luo, Han. 2015b. Curricular goals and curriculum design: The case of a college-level Chinese language program. *Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association* 50:23-44.
- McGinnis, Scott. 1996. Teaching Chinese to the Chinese: The development of an assessment and instructional model. *Patterns and Policies: The Changing Demographics of Foreign Language Education*, ed. by Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro, 107-121. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Ming, Tao, and Hongyin Tao. 2008. Developing a Chinese heritage language corpus: Issues and a preliminary report. *Chinese as a Heritage Language: Fostering Rooted World Citizenry*, ed. by Agnes Weiyun He and Yun Xiao, 167-188. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- National Capital Language Resource Center (NCLRC). 2004. *The Essentials of Language Teaching*. Retrieved from <http://www.nclrc.org/essentials/planning/structure.htm>
- National Heritage Language Resource Center. 2015. *Curriculum Guidelines for Heritage Language Classrooms at the University of California*. Retrieved from <http://nhlrc.ucla.edu/nhlrc/page/curriculumguidelines/>
- Renganathan, Vasu. 2008. Formalizing the knowledge of heritage language learners: A technology-based approach. *South Asia Language Pedagogy and Technology* 1:1-12.
- Ryan, Camille. 2013. Language use in the United States: 2011. American Community Survey. US Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acs-22.pdf>.
- Saldana, Johnny. 2009. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scalera, Diana. 2003. The invisible learner: Unlocking the heritage language treasure. *Language Association Journal* 55.2:1-4.

- Tallon, Michael. 2009. Foreign language anxiety and heritage students of Spanish: A quantitative study. *Foreign Language Annals* 42:112-137.
- US Census Bureau. 2010. Language use in the United States: 2007. American Community Survey. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/acs-12.pdf>
- US Census Bureau. 2012. *The Asian population: 2010*. 2010 Census Briefs. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf>
- Valdés, Guadalupe. 2001. Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource*, ed. by Joy Kreeft Peyton, Donald A. Ranard, and Scott McGinnis, 37-77. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Valdés, Guadalupe. 2005. Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *Modern Language Journal* 89.3:410-426.
- Valdés, Guadalupe, and Michelle Geoffrion-Vinci. 2011. Heritage language students: The case of Spanish. *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*, ed. by M. Díaz-Campos, 598-622. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Van Deusen-Scholl, Nelleke. 2003. Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 2.3:211-230.
- Wen, Xiaohong. 2011. Chinese language learning motivation: A comparative study of heritage and non-heritage learners. *Heritage Language Journal* 8.3:41-66.
- Weger-Guntharp, Heather. 2006. Voices from the margin: Developing a profile of Chinese heritage language learners in the FL classroom. *Heritage Language Journal* 4.1:29-46.
- Weger-Guntharp, Heather. 2008. The affective needs of limited proficiency heritage language learners: perspectives from a Chinese foreign language classroom. *Teaching Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Heritage Students: Curriculum, Needs, Materials, and Assessment*, ed. by Kimi Kondo-Brown, and James Dean Brown, 211-234. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wiley, Terrence. 2001. On defining heritage languages and their speakers. *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource*, ed. by Joy Kreeft Peyton, Donald A. Ranard, and Scott McGinnis, 29-36. Washington, DC: Center

- for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Wong, Ka F., and Yang Xiao. 2010. Diversity and difference: Identity issues of Chinese heritage language learners from dialect backgrounds. *Heritage Language Journal* 7:153-187.
- Wu, Ming Hsuan, and Genevieve Leung. 2014. Re-envisioning heritage language education: A study of middle school students learning Mandarin Chinese. *Heritage Language Journal* 11:207-223.
- Wu, Sue-mei. 2008. Robust learning for Chinese heritage learners: Motivation, linguistics and technology. *Teaching Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Heritage Language Students: Curriculum Needs, Materials, and Assessment*, ed. by Kimi Kondo-Brown and James Dean Brown, 271-297. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Xiao, Yang, and Ka F. Wong. 2014. Exploring heritage language anxiety: A study of Chinese heritage language learners. *Modern Language Journal* 98:589-611.
- Xiao, Yun. 2004. L2 acquisition of Chinese topic-prominent constructions. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* 39.3:65-84.
- Xiao, Yun. 2006. Heritage learners in foreign language classroom: Home background knowledge and language development. *Heritage Language Journal* 4.1:47-57.
- Xiao, Yun. 2008a. Home literacy environment in CHL development. *Chinese as a Heritage Language: Fostering Rooted World Citizenry*, ed. by Agnes Weiyun He and Yun Y. Xiao, 151-166. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Xiao, Yun. 2008b. Teaching Chinese as a heritage language: Key to success. *Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language*, ed. by Michael Everson and Yun Xiao, 177-194. Boston, MA: Cheng and Tsui Publishing Company.
- Xiao, Yun. 2013. Effect of home background on advanced heritage language learning. *Chinese as a Second Language Research* 2.2:193-220.
- Xiao, Yun. 2016. Chinese education in the United States: Players and challenges. *Global Chinese* 2.1:1-28.
- Xiao, Yun, Hui Xiao., and Yang Wang. 2009. *Tales and Traditions: Readings in Chinese Literature Series* Vol.II. Boston, MA: Cheng and Tsui Publishing Company.

[審查：2017.04.26 修改：2016.06.12 接受：2017.06.19]

駱涵

Han LUO

美國賓夕法尼亞州伊斯頓海街 730 號 拉法耶特學院

Lafayette College

No. 730, High St., Easton, PA 18042, U.S.A.

luoh@lafayette.edu

李明穎

Ming-Ying LI

美國約紐公園大道 695 號 亨特學院

Hunter College, City University of New York

No. 695, Park Ave., New York, NY 10065, U.S.A.

mingyingli0406@gmail.com

李煜

Yu LI

美國喬治亞州亞特蘭大 S. Kilgo 圓環 532 號 埃默里大學

Emory University

No. 532, S. Kilgo Circle, Atlanta, GA 30322, U.S.A.

yu.li@emory.edu

## Appendix A : Course Syllabus

### Textbooks:

1. Textbook: Integrated Chinese, Level 2, Part 2 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)
2. Workbook: Integrated Chinese, Level 2, Part 2 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)
3. Tales and Traditions: Readings in Chinese Literature Series Volume 2

### Prerequisite:

Completion of Accelerated Chinese 125-2 with C- or above or by placement.

### Course Description and Objectives:

Accelerated Chinese 125 (125-1, 2, 3) is an intermediate course in Mandarin Chinese designed for heritage learners with intermediate to advanced-low listening/speaking proficiency in Mandarin Chinese or other students who have reached the proficiency level to be in this class. This course aims to help students further hone all four language skills with emphasis on reading and writing abilities, develop awareness of register, expand vocabulary, refine knowledge of grammar, and deepen understanding of Chinese culture. Chinese 125-3 is the third course in a three-course sequence. Mandarin Chinese is the means of instruction.

By the end of the course, students' Mandarin Chinese abilities are expected to achieve the Advanced Low in listening and speaking, Intermediate High to Advanced Low in reading, and Intermediate Mid to Intermediate High in Writing based on the American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines (<http://actflproficiencyguidelines2012.org>). More specifically, students will achieve the following:

- They are able to understand the main idea plus many (but not all) supporting details in a wide range of simple narrative and expository texts.
- They could write paragraph-length or multi-paragraph-length narrative and expository compositions on familiar topics with detail and organization.
- Their vocabulary range expands beyond those of immediate personal use: they are able to comprehend generic and specialized vocabulary on topics related to their experience and high frequency idiomatic expressions; they are able to produce a broad variety of vocabulary related to topics of personal



and public interest.

- They will develop explicit and practical knowledge of Mandarin Chinese grammar particularly problematic to heritage learners.
- They will be familiar with multiple written text genres, develop awareness of register, gain knowledge of discourse characteristics of written Chinese, and be able to articulate personal opinions and explain information with appropriate register and discourse structure in relatively formal settings.
- They will expand their cultural literacy through extensive reading, media exposure, and guided direct contact with their family, relatives, and local Chinese communities.

**Tentative Course Outline:**

<b>Week of</b>	<b>Text and Unit</b>	<b>Written Quizzes and Oral Reports</b>	<b>Weekly Readings</b>
		Mondays	
03/31	Orientation and L. 14		1 and 15, 11(optional)
04/07	L. 14 and 15		2 and 16, 12(optional)
04/14	L. 15 and 16	Composition 1	3 and 17, 13 (optional)
04/21	L. 16 and 17	Journal 1	4 and 18, 14 (optional)
04/28	L. 17 and 18	Written Quiz I	5 and 23, 20 (optional)
05/05	L. 18 and 19	Composition 2	6 and 24, 22 (optional)
05/12	L. 19 and 20	Journal 2	7 and 8, 19 (optional)
05/19	L. 20	Written Quiz II	9 and 10, 21 (optional)
05/26	Memorial day (no classes)		
05/27	Report and Review	Oral Report (Tuesday and Wednesday)	
06/02	Review		
06/03	Reading Week		
06/09	Final Examination Week		

Grading:	Point Score and Letter Grade Conversion:
Participation.....10%	100-95.....A
Daily warm-up discussion.....5%	
Sentence construction .....5%	
Homework..... 25%	94-90 .....A-
Workbook..... 5%	
Compositions .....10%	
Journal Writing .....10%	
Reading and Discussion.....10%	89-85 .....B+
Vocabulary dictations (Drop 3) ...10%	84-80.....B
Written Quizzes .....15%	79-75.....B-
Oral Report..... 10%	74-70 .....C+
Final Exam .....20%	69-65 .....C
Total.....100 points	64-60.....C-
	Less than 60.....F

### Attendance Policy

1. Class starts promptly as scheduled. Please be in the classroom on time so that you will neither miss any instruction and activity nor disrupt the class. Being **late for ten minutes or more will be considered as an absence. A half point will be deducted for each penalty-free absence.**
2. If you have to miss a class for a school activity such as competition, serious illness, or job interview, please submit an official letter from the person in charge so that your absence can be excused. Absence due to other personal reasons will not be excused. However, the first two absences will be penalty-free, and will not affect your attendance grade. **A student who has one or more unexcused absences (after the first two penalty-free ones) cannot get an A for the final grade.**
3. When you miss a class, it is your responsibility to make up for the class. If you have any questions regarding the materials covered on that day, see your instructor during the office hours or go over the materials with your classmate(s).

### **Participation**

You are expected to come to class **prepared**. That means studying the new word list and the new chapter (or the new section) to be introduced, volunteering to answer questions and responding to questions when called upon, and participating in pair/group work. In particular, participation in the following two components will be graded.

#### Daily Warm-up Discussion

Three class meetings will be spent on each unit from Integrated Chinese, Level 2, Part 2. We will start each regular class with daily warm-up discussions. The topics of these discussions are related to the unit we are learning at the time. You will be divided into groups of two or three and each group need to suggest topics/questions for discussion based on the text at least once during the quarter.

#### Sentence Construction

For each regular class meeting, we will have opportunity to learn new vocabulary and grammatical patterns. We will work in pairs and create sentences or dialogues that are related to your daily life by incorporating the new vocabulary and grammatical patterns we have just learned.

### **Homework**

Homework provides an opportunity for students to understand and digest what has been taught in class. It is an essential part of the learning process. Your professor can do a lot to help you, but real learning takes place only when you do your own learning. There is no shortcut to it. Homework for this course consists of three components: workbook exercises, compositions, and journal writing. **Late compositions and journals submitted after the due date will receive at most 60% of the grade.**

#### Workbook Exercises

Workbook homework is checked every Monday **at the beginning of class**. If you arrive after the class has started, you should hand in your homework right away. **A half point 0.5** will be deducted for each piece of missed homework. Workbook homework will be graded on timeliness and completion only. Workbook exercises assigned typically include translation, reading comprehension, and writing tasks. You

are expected to be responsible for your own work and to seek help from the instructor for questions you do not fully understand. You will be tested on (variations of) some of the workbook questions in written quizzes and the final exam.

### Compositions

We will cover seven lessons this quarter. Two compositions will be assigned on similar topics that have been covered during the quarter. For each composition, you will turn in a draft, receive comments from the instructor, and then turn in a revised version. The draft accounts for 60% of the assignment grade, and the revision is 40%.

### Journal Writing

Extra reading materials will be provided each week. Students are supposed to read these materials outside class and write two journals based on the readings. In addition to a summary of the reading(s) and a reading response, students are also expected to reflect on their Chinese learning (such as progress, challenges, ways to improve, tips for classmates, suggestions for the instructor, events related to Chinese learning, etc.) in their journal writing. Thus, journal writing consists of three parts: summary, reading response, and reflection on Chinese learning.

### **Reading and Discussion**

There are two pieces of required and one piece of optional reading assignments from our supplementary materials each week. Students are supposed to read these materials outside class and discuss the materials in class. This component will be graded in terms of students' preparedness, participation in the discussion, and quality of comments. Students will be divided into groups of two or three and each group need to suggest topics/questions for discussion based on the readings at least once during the quarter.

### **Vocabulary Dictations**

Almost on a daily basis (depending on the instructor's teaching schedule), 5 minutes after the class begins, there will be a vocabulary or sentence dictation on the section of a chapter that has been just covered. Students are to write down characters with pinyin and tone marks. **The three lowest grades will be dropped. There will be no make-ups for any missed dictation without reasons acceptable to the instructor.**

### **Written Quizzes**

There will be two written quizzes for this quarter. A written quiz will be given after every three lessons. These quizzes are not cumulative. Make-up tests are not permitted except in cases of unexpected illnesses and emergencies. You will need to present written proof of legitimate absence to reschedule, and must take the test within three days of the original test date. Please also keep in mind that you cannot take a make-up test more than once in a semester.

### **Oral Report**

There will be one oral report project for this quarter, which involves collaboration with your classmates. For this oral report project, you will work with one or two of your classmates to work on a cultural topic that is relevant to the course and that interests you the most. You are supposed to watch at least one 10-minute video and interview at least one native speaker on this topic. You and your partner are expected to give a 10 minute presentation on this topic. You could perform a skit to illustrate the cultural elements.

### **Final Exam**

The final exam is a written test and it is cumulative. Final exam dates are set by the college. No early exams will be given before the final exam week. There will be no make-up for a final exam.

## **Appendix B : End-of-quarter Curriculum Questionnaire**

Instructions: Please give a rating of the following questions and give your reasons.

1. Please rate how well you like the curriculum of 125-3 this quarter in general.

Very Low 1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very High

Reasons:

2. Please rate how well you like the textbook (Integrated Chinese Level 2, Part 2) of 125-3 this quarter.

Very Low 1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very High

Reasons:

3. Please rate how well you like the supplementary readings (Tales and Traditions) of 125-3 this quarter.

Very Low 1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very High

Reasons:

Please rate the usefulness of the following class components of 125-3 in meeting your needs in learning Chinese and explain your reasons.

### **Vocabulary dictations**

Not Useful 1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very Useful

Reasons:

### **Workbook translations**

Not Useful 1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very Useful

Reasons:

### **Compositions**

Not Useful 1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very Useful

Reasons:

**Journal Writing**

Not Useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Useful

Reasons:

**Supplementary Reading and Discussion**

Not Useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Useful

Reasons:

**Daily discussion on topics related to the textbook**

Not Useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Useful

Reasons:

**Grammar/vocabulary explanation and sentence construction**

Not Useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Useful

Reasons:

**Cultural Oral Project**

Not Useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Useful

Reasons:

**Written Quizzes and Final exam**

Not Useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Useful

Reasons:

## 大學階段華裔傳承語課程設置：個案研究

駱涵  
拉法耶特學院

李明穎  
亨特學院

李煜埃  
默里大學

### 摘要

研究表明傳承語學習者和傳統外語學習者有很大不同。近年來美國大學華裔漢語學習者的人數增長很快，然而對華裔漢語的課程設計進行的實證研究尚不充分。本文通過文獻研究發現傳承語學習者有三大學習需求，即語言需求、文化需求和心理需求。基於傳承語學習者的這些需求，本文針對在美國大學就讀的華裔漢語學習者設計了一門中級課程，並通過問卷和訪談的方式分析和討論了學生對課程的回饋，希望能為促進華裔漢語課程的設置和發展盡綿薄之力。

**關鍵詞：**漢語 華裔漢語 傳承語學習者 課程設置 學習需求