Michael SINGH, Jinghe HAN

Educating Teachers of “Chinese as a Local/Global Language”: Teaching “Chinese with Australian Characteristics”

Abstract How can the education of teacher-researchers from China be framed in ways so that they might make Chinese learnable for primary and secondary school learners for whom English is their everyday language of instruction and communication. The concept “making Chinese learnable” and the characters of the language learners are explained in the introduction to the paper. The review of an extensive range of literature focuses on the challenges facing Chinese language education. This review of literature from China, the UK, the USA, and Australia leads to a focus on the need for improved teacher education in this field. We explain the theoretic-pedagogical framework for the education of Chinese language teacher-researchers from China. The “case” employed to develop this account an Australia-China partnership called the Research Oriented, School/Industry Engaged Teacher-Researcher Education (ROSETE) Program. Key aspects relating to the educational research process employed in this study are explained. The description of the ROSETE Program introduces the key ideas of “cross-sociolinguistic similarities” and “recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities.” The Ningbo Volunteers, as teacher-researcher candidates use these ideas to investigate efficient ways of making Chinese learnable for learners in Australian schools for whom English is their everyday language of instruction and communication. Through exploring these issues this paper addresses an important and under researched area. It provides inspiration for further teaching and research.

Keywords Chinese as a local sociolinguistic practice, English/Chinese cross-sociolinguistic similarities, educating teachers of Chinese, making Chinese

Michael SINGH (✉), Jinghe HAN

School of Education, University of Western Sydney, Penrith NSW 2751, Australia

E-mail: m.j.singh@uws.edu.au

learnable, teaching for English-to-Chinese transfer

Introduction

Policy makers are intensifying their demand for Chinese to be made learnable by monolingual English-speaking learners in the UK (Li & Zhu, 2011; Zhang & Li, 2010), the USA (Zhang, 2010), and Australia (Australia in the Asian Century Implementation Task Force, 2012; Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2011). However, in Australia teachers of Chinese struggle against high drop-out rates (Orton, 2008; State of Victoria, 2012). These drop-out rates are indicators of an array of educational problems in making Chinese learnable in largely English speaking nations. In the US there are multiple issues at stake. These issues include “program, development, curriculum approaches, teacher training, teaching materials development, pedagogical resources, and integrating with other language teachers” (Chen, Wang, & Cai, 2010, p. xvii). This study reported here addresses one aspect of this set of problems, namely the unmet need for appropriately qualified teacher-researchers. They have to develop the professional stance and capabilities for making Chinese learnable for learners in schools where English is the primary medium of instruction and the prevailing language of societal communication. More specifically, this study links the aim of improving the learning of Chinese by learners in Australia through innovations in the professional learning of prospective teachers of Chinese.

Based on a longitudinal study, this paper explores the prospects of developing a theoretic-pedagogical framework for the education of Chinese language teacher-researchers (Singh & Ballantyne, 2014). Specifically, we focus on developing the capability of teacher-researchers from China for making Chinese learnable for learners in schools where English is the primary medium of instruction and the prevailing language of societal communication (Singh et al., in press). The concept of “making Chinese learnable” puts the learners’ and their sociolinguistic knowledge at the center of the effort to teach Chinese (Zhu, 2010). We use the concept of “making Chinese learnable” to refer to three interrelated educational aims, namely:

- 1) using learners’ recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities undertaken in English to teach the same activities in Chinese, capitalizing of cross-sociolinguistic similarities;

2) creating successful and rewarding language learning experiences for learners through using resourceful and innovative teaching/learning strategies that maximize time on practising Chinese in their everyday lives; and

3) creating supportive learning environments involving school principals, teachers and parents, to build the desire of learners to continue learning Chinese, about modern twenty first century China, and making person-to-person relations with Chinese people.

Further, it is also necessary to explain the rationale for using the concepts of (a) monolingual English-speaking primary and secondary school learners, and (b) English as the primary medium of instruction and the prevailing language of societal communication. First, in Australia there are multilingual learners who collectively speak more than 150 different languages. However, the school learners who are the primary concern of this paper are those who only speak English. Most Australian schools use English as their instructional language. Second, there is a considerable sociolinguistic pressure throughout society for the exclusive use of English (Berg, 2011). This is reinforced by the politics claiming that English is the global language (Gil, 2010; Zhou & Feng, 1987) and “sinophobia” (Nyland Forbes-Mewett, & Thomson, 2011). Thus, we use the term “monolingual English” instead of “non-background Chinese speakers” more adequately to capture the status of English in these school learners’ language education and the place of Chinese in augmenting the possibility of nurturing bilingual learners (Achugar, 2009; Cummins, 2009; Canagarajah & Wurr, 2011; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Pavlenko, 2003).

Chinese is now understood to be a newly emergent local/global language of considerable importance (Ding & Saunders, 2006). The increasing relevance and popularity of Chinese worldwide means that “in expanding its boundary, Chinese has also got its national and cultural identity blurred, becoming more and more inclusive and hybridized like English” (Ning, 2010, p. 167). Duff and others (2013), argue that for Chinese to become a truly local/global language there is a need for “a greater sense of linguistic and cultural ownership ... shared with sinophones worldwide” (p. 195). English is no longer owned by the English and has taken on multiple forms, including China English. There is a need to learn from this process to produce Australian Chinese. This is in preference to positioning Chinese as “foreign” that is as alien, remote or strange. This suggests one of the Australian characteristics of teaching Chinese is that its sociolinguistic ownership is increasingly shared by native and non-native speakers alike. Further,

according to Duff and others (2013) the content of Chinese language education programs do not need to “be so strictly related to traditional Chinese cultural themes and places, but rather to issues and voices around the world” (p. 195). Thus, Australian characteristics of Chinese language education programs mean the content is related to the experiences and issues of the learning and using the language. Also Chinese is now a key language for Australia’s future historical-material development given that we are part of the local/global community having a shared trajectory. Producing Chinese-speaking communities among monolingual English-speaking Australians requires a strategy of “glocalization”. This may lead to innovations in teaching/learning strategies, the Chinese content that is learnt, and the uses of Chinese (cf. Ning, 2010).

The first section of this paper reviews an extensive range of literature from Australia, China, the UK, and the US concerning the education of teachers of Chinese to monolingual English speakers. Section two provides an introduction to the methodological advances being made through a longitudinal study of the Research Oriented, School/Industry Engaged Teacher-Researcher Education (ROSETE) program. ROSETE is a dedicated Chinese language teacher education program in Australia into researching the problem of developing a teacher education curriculum framework to make Chinese learnable for learners, that is those whose primary language of instruction and communication is English. The third section presents an analysis of two key themes. The first theme relates to the content and the methods informing the development of curriculum framework for making Chinese learnable for beginner learners. The second theme relates to Chinese to learners’ locality, and employing bilingual approaches to Chinese language education. The final section explores what is meant by the idea of “teaching Chinese with Australian characteristics”. This concept is defined in terms of the concepts of making Chinese a recurring everyday local sociolinguistic activity and making pedagogical use of the learners’ perceptions of cross-sociolinguistic similarities between the English and the Chinese that they are learning.

Debating the Education of Teachers of Chinese to Non-Background Speakers

The need for marked improvements in the education of teachers of Chinese to non-background speakers is now talked about both locally and globally. For

instance, the literature points to concerns about the quality of existing teachers in Australia (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2011; State of Victoria, 2012), China (Gao, 2011; Shum et al., 2011; Tsung & Cruickshank, 2011b; Zhang et al., 2011), the UK (Li & Zhu, 2011; Zhang & Li, 2010), and the USA (Zhang, 2010). In Australia these concerns are also directed at programs for the education of teachers of Chinese (Orton, 2008).

In Australia, the government aspirational target is for at least 20% of learners to study an Asian language through to the end of Year 12. The problem is that “94% of those who begin Chinese at school quit before Year 10; and beginners at university drop out at rates close to 75%” (Orton, 2008, p. 8; see also State of Victoria, 2012). Orton (2008) reports that “at Year 12, nationally, a scant 3% of learners take Chinese, 94% of whom are first language speakers of Chinese” (p. 5). That is to say, teachers for whom Chinese is their first language seem to be able to teach Chinese to Chinese-Australian learners, but not sufficiently well that non-background speaking learners are able to study it in Years 11 and 12. Wang, Moloney and Li (2013) identify the “teacher factor” as one of the causes of a very high attrition rate...with learners of Chinese being prevented from becoming functional users of Chinese due to barriers” created by their teachers (p. 116). 90% of teachers of Chinese in Australia speak Chinese as their first language. However, schools reject many as “unsuitable...due to poor self-presentation socially and linguistically, and [due] to doubts about their ability to relate well to Australian children and manage a local classroom” (Orton, 2008, p. 21). Schools point to these teachers’ intercultural difficulties. Specifically, they do not know “how to relate to Australian school learners, colleagues and parents. The teachers, themselves, recount the same problems” (Orton, 2008, p. 21). Rather than a general lack of teachers of Chinese, Wang et al. (2013) contend that:

it is the shortage of well-trained teachers that is hindering development. ... many CFL teachers in Australia have a difficult time in adapting to the expectations of Western pedagogy. Criticisms have been made of native speaker teachers’ pedagogy, and their reliance on character teaching at the expense of communicative oral work. (pp. 119, 127)

The Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (2011) states that the uptake of Chinese by non-background learners continues to be “fragile at all phases of Australian schooling” (p. 5). Dissatisfaction with such high attrition

rates gives principals little incentive to ensure continuity for learners to learn Chinese from Year K to 12, or for increasing the amount of time invested in teaching/learning Chinese (Orton, 2008). To date, the various initiatives undertaken to increase studies of Asian languages in Australia's schools by governments and education authorities,

have not produced a significant cohort of young Australians completing secondary education with deep knowledge of our region or high levels of proficiency in Asian languages. ...the share of Australian students studying languages, including many Asian languages, is small and has fallen in recent times. (Australia in the Asian Century Implementation Task Force, 2012, pp. 167, 168)

In China, there are also debates regarding the need for improvements in the education of teachers of Chinese to non-background speakers (Gao, 2011; Shum et al., 2011; Tsung & Cruickshank, 2011b; Zhang et al., 2011). For instance, Gao (2011) argues that there is frequent use in language education in China of the "dichotomous opposition between majority [Han] culture ([as] advanced) and minority culture ([as] backward)...[that] makes many minorities in China second-class citizens and creates a sense of inferiority among them" (pp. 85–86, 91). Similarly, Tsung and Cruickshank (2011a) report that Han teachers of Chinese construct Uyghur learners "negatively and monolingualism in Uyghur as indicating lack of intelligence" (p. 105). No allowance is made for teaching Chinese as a second language. Teachers' expectations, methods and materials tend to be grounded in principles of first language education, which tend to be irrelevant. A study by Zhang et al. (2011) found that teachers of Chinese to South Asian immigrants in Hong Kong "had inadequate preparation, [used] inappropriate curriculum and [taught learners] as if they were first language speakers of Chinese." The teachers themselves questioned the inappropriateness of their teaching methods. This self-questioning including their lack of encouragement and patience with the learners and the tendency to blame them instead; the way they produced negative attitudes towards the Chinese language in their classrooms, and the lack of appreciation of the value of the learners' first language in learning a second language. Zhang et al. (2011) study indicates

"teachers' low skills in communicating with minority students inadequate initiatives to promote mutual understanding and collaborative learning.... teachers' lowered

expectations of student performance; and exclusion of [learners’] linguistic background [knowledge]” (p. 77).

There are similar debates in the UK regarding the negative impact that teachers of Chinese have on the retention of English-speaking learners of Chinese and the education of such teachers (Zhang & Li, 2010). The reasons for the unmet learning needs of language learners in the UK are that there are few qualified teachers of Chinese and even fewer who have gained formal teacher education in the UK. Zhang and Li (2010) report indicates that teachers lack the necessary education in second-language teaching/learning. They also lack the capability to adapt existing curriculum materials or to create their own materials to meet the learning needs of L2 learners. They are unable to meet the needs of English speakers learning Chinese because they are not equipped with the knowledge and skills to research their own teaching. The result is that language learners in the UK find Chinese learning less rewarding because they are made “to feel that Chinese is inaccessible and impossible to learn” (Zhang & Li, 2010, p. 93).

Comparable debates are occurring in the US. For instance, with regard to limitations in teacher education, S. H. C. Wang (2010) reports that the “quantity and quality of Chinese language teachers remains the key bottleneck in building capacity” (p. 21). Likewise, He and Jiao (2010) report that Chinese teachers find it difficult to teach effectively Anglophone American learners who are made to feel intimidated by the language. Similarly, Liu, Zhou, and McBride-Chang (2010) report that for many US learners teaching Chinese by “rote memorization (i.e., repeated copying of words and characters [is] somewhat inefficient and boring” (pp. 247, 251). In the USA (Zhang, 2010; Zhang & Slaughter-Defoe, 2009) as in the UK (Li & Zhu, 2011), there are reports about attrition among Chinese language learners extending to second-generation children of Chinese immigrants. Zhang’s (2010) study indicates Fujianese and Mandarin-speaking immigrants in the USA shift to English and prefer to use English after they complete their schooling. English-only pedagogy positions Chinese as inferior. Assimilationist pressures reinforce the intergenerational ambitions of migrant parents who regard English as a means to socioeconomic mobility and superior status. Integration into “white” schools/society is driven by the desire to avoid the pain and isolation of being ostracized. According to Zhang (2010), this is so despite the promise of a niche in the white English-speaking community

remaining unfulfilled.

Facilitating the learning of Chinese by monolingual English-speaking learners in Australian schools for whom English is their everyday language of instruction and communication is a major challenge (Australia in the Asian Century Implementation Task Force, 2012; Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2011; Orton 2008; State of Victoria, 2012). The debates in the literature point to multiple reasons for this challenge. It is possible that innovations in teacher professional education could better prepare teachers capable of focusing on language learners and the need for more appropriate teaching/learning strategies and materials (Liu, 2006; Shum et al., 2011; Zhang, 2010). Duff and others (2013) report on an innovative study of Chinese language education from the perspective of non-Chinese background adult learners. They argue that schools in English speaking countries do not want to educate “scholars of classical Chinese literature ... but people who can communicate in Mandarin for a variety of social, economic, and intellectual purposes” (p. 10). This study points to the potential gains to be made in educating Chinese teacher-researchers to identify those aspects of Chinese that are more likely to be of benefit to monolingual English-speaking learners of the language. That is, the study by Duff and others (2013) suggests there may be merit in adopting grassroots, learner-centered approach to making Chinese learnable, rather than the imposition of top-down pedagogies. The idea of language learning as interpersonal involves associating Chinese language learning with learners’ meaning-making in their everyday sociolinguistic contexts where they can learn and use the language (Pennycook, 2010). There is research which indicates that teachers of Chinese can be more effective when they engage L2 learners in using their knowledge of English for learning Chinese. The next section provides a brief introduction to key features of the “case” that provides the focus for investigating this phenomenon.

In sum, this review of an extensive range of literature from Australia, China, the UK, and the USA points to the need for innovation in the education of teachers of Chinese as a local/global language. The development of innovative programs for the professional education of teachers of Chinese is one of the bottlenecks in building language capabilities of learners. The next section provides a brief introduction to the methodological advances in Australian research into the problem of educating teachers capable of making Chinese learnable for learners whose primary language of instruction and communication is English.

Methodological Advances in Australian Research into the Education of Teachers of Chinese

This research focuses on making methodological advances in the emerging field of educating teachers of Chinese as a local/global language. Through a series of projects, a key strand of our research is exploring the prospects for constructing alternative theoretical frameworks through the co-production of Australia-China analytical concepts and metaphors (Singh, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012; Singh & Chen, 2012; Singh & Huang, 2012; Singh & Meng, 2011; Singh & Han, 2009, 2010). This is a means to internationalize otherwise Euro-American-centered teacher education. The project reported upon here focuses on an interrelated strand of our research, namely the problem of educating teachers capable of making Chinese learnable for learners whose primary language of instruction and communication is English.

Our research draws upon, elaborates, and stretches ideas from sociolinguistic theory (Cummins, 2008, 2009; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Pennycook, 2010; Ringbom, 2007; Ringbom & Jarvis, 2009; Zhu, 2010). We propose that the education of teachers of Chinese as a local/global language be researched as a learner-centered exercise in generating content and methods. Thus, this Australian research program builds on the interests of scholars in sociolinguistics to advance educational theorizing about making Chinese learnable. The assumption is that research which focuses on learners’ sociolinguistic capabilities is likely to generate evidence of more contextually sensitive, educative approaches to making Chinese learnable than a focus on linguistics and language acquisition.

Thus, one key research question that guided this study is what might be the key features of an innovative theoretic-pedagogical framework for teaching Chinese with Australian characteristics. This question intended to focus on key concepts concerning ways of framing the education of teacher-researchers of Chinese to prepare them with the professional capabilities for making Chinese learnable for monolingual English-speaking learners in schools where English is the primary medium of instruction and the prevailing language of societal communication.

A longitudinal ethnographic approach was adopted because this enabled the mapping, examination, and development of an innovative theoretic-pedagogical

framework for the education of teachers of Chinese to monolingual English-speaking learners in Australia. The educational research process of this study (2008–2014) involved the selection of a “case” to be investigated through participant observation. The particular case is an Australia/China partnership established by the New South Wales Department of Education and Communities, the Ningbo Municipal Education Bureau (China), and the University of Western Sydney. This partnership has given rise to the ROSETE Program, a longitudinal program (2008–2017) for the education of Chinese language teacher-researchers (Han & Yao, 2013; Singh & Ballantyne, 2014). Without this “official” status as an Australia/China partnership it is unlikely it would have materialized. The ROSETE Program was chosen because this case was tied to Action 7 of Australia’s National Research Investment Plan which supports “measures to provide research graduates with the generic skills and innovation capabilities needed to be productive in a wide range of employment contexts, including business” (DIISRTE, 2012, p. xiii). In other words, this partnership aligns with the scope of Australia’s Research Investment Plan, such that it aims to prepare teacher-research graduates for careers in the local/international education industry. To date, on their return to China, graduates have found employment in teaching languages or international education

In Australia, “it is common for teachers of Chinese to study methodology with peers in other language groups.... The generic teaching of the mixed group means there is limited explicit instruction in Chinese pedagogy” (Wang et al., 2013, p. 125). This is because those learning to be teachers of Chinese attend lectures with teacher education candidates in programs of up to a dozen other languages. As a consequence they

work on what they have in common rather than the challenges of their particular language. As a result, unless they are lucky enough to do a practicum at the right time, intending teachers of Chinese get no training in how to teach tones, characters and the special grammatical features of Chinese. (Orton, 2008, p. 21)

In marked contrast, the ROSETE Program is built on the Japanese immersion Language and Culture Initial Teacher Education Program (LACITEP) conducted at Central Queensland University in the 1990s (Singh, 1995, 1996). With up to 80% of all LACITEP units being taught in Japanese, the (predominantly)

Anglo-Australian teachers developed their professional knowledge of immersion methods of language education. The ROSETE Program is also informed by work undertaken at Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology that led to the establishment of the Global Cities Institute and an internship-driven, multilingual Bachelor’s degree in international studies (Singh, 2001; Singh & Scanlon, 2003).

Through work-integrated research education the Ningbo Volunteers endeavor to improve primary and secondary school learners’ learning of Chinese by producing evidence-driven and theoretically informed knowledge (Singh, 2013). The ROSETE Program integrates the Ningbo Volunteers’ teacher-researcher education into their work as Volunteer Chinese language teachers. This internship involves ten hours per week over three semesters (120 days) in Sydney primary and secondary schools (see also Xu, 2009). As part of their teacher-research education, the Ningbo Volunteers undertake workshops, tutorials, and seminars on evidence-driven approaches to making Chinese learnable. This includes higher degree research units on post-monolingual language learning; multilingual teacher-research, and the learning/teaching of Chinese as a local/global language. Together all this work leads to a Master research thesis of at least 40,000 words which is examined externally and the results of some are now being published (Singh, Harreveld, Gao, & Danaher, in press; Singh & Huang, 2012).

The Ningbo Volunteers in the ROSETE Program see themselves as part of China’s “post-90s” generations. They all come from urban areas centering on Ningbo and are the only children in their families. The majority of them are women, only a few men. They are all full-fee paying international students and their families invest heavily in their education abroad. All are interested in personal and professional career development, and work hard to bring honor to their families and to be honorable ambassadors for China. They expect that their education in Australia will lead to them having a stable job after they return home, and to marry well by their mid-twenties.

The section has provided a brief introduction to key features of the longitudinal research program of which this paper is a part. The focus of the next section is on the development of key conceptual tools for the education of teacher-researchers of Chinese. This means developing their capabilities for making Chinese learnable for learners in school communities where the prevailing medium of instruction and communication is English.

A New Angle on Teaching/Learning Chinese in Predominantly English Speaking Societies

This section presents an analysis of two key educational concerns. The first concern is the generation of content. Specific consideration is given to using learners' recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities to generate content. The second concern is the pedagogies for making Chinese learnable for learners who are just beginning to learn this language. The focus is on using pedagogies that link learners' existing sociolinguistic knowledge of English to the learning of Chinese.

Using Learners' Recurring Everyday Sociolinguistic Activities in English to Generate Chinese Content

A key educational principle the Ningbo Volunteers engage with throughout the ROSETE Program is that efficacy of making Chinese learnable comes from them developing their knowledge of learners' sociolinguistic activities as a basis for later establishing lesson content (Zhang et al., 2011). To do so they need to be curious about their learners recurring everyday English language use, and using this to generating content that replaces the English with Chinese in this particular locality. This means requires the Ningbo Volunteers to develop their understanding of their learners' locally situated sociolinguistic activities in order to contextualize the learning of Chinese (Harreveld & Singh, 2009). This provides the Ningbo Volunteers the means selecting and teaching Chinese language practices that their learners can actually enacted in their everyday local — social, spatial, and symbolic — environments. Zhu (2010) contends that teachers of Chinese have to understand learners' local culture, so that what (the content) and how (the pedagogy) of teaching Chinese can be made part of the actual sociolinguistic practices of learners (p. 55). In other words, the Ningbo Volunteers are challenged to generate content that uses the learners' local knowledge to select the Chinese they might best learn. This challenges those Volunteers' who focus on teaching pre-given linguistic structure, that language has to be taught as an already-made, rule-governed entity. Focusing on language education, the ROSETE Program challenges the assumption that a language exists outside human relations and interactions. Language education cannot be divorced from learners' everyday lives (Pennycook, 2010; Zhu, 2010).

The narrow assumption that Chinese instruction means teaching the rules of the language in a decontextualized manner is challenged through the idea of learners’ uses of language as a local practice. Central to the concept of “language as a local practice” (Pennycook, 2010) is the idea of learning Chinese as an *emergent* social everyday local act, that is “a material part of social and cultural life rather than an abstract entity” (p. 2). Likewise, Yang (2010) argues that Chinese must be positioned within learners’ sociolinguistic lives, the classroom and beyond. To do so, the Ningbo Volunteers as teacher-researchers observe what, when, where, and how learners use particular forms of English. This includes, for instance, school rules, songs, poems, playground games, sport and mealtimes. This means being curious about and becoming familiar with the learners’ diversity of sociolinguistic activities in English. The teacher-researchers then rehearse these English language activities in class, and then teach them in Chinese so learners can benefit from practising their Chinese in these situations. Following Pennycook (2010), making Chinese learnable requires the teacher-researchers to generate “a set of bundled activities that are repeated over time” (p. 3). These are embedded in the learners’ locality and embodied in their everyday sociolinguistic activities.

For Pennycook (2010), language is understood as a recurrent sociolinguistic act constitutive of the materiality of everyday sociocultural life. The Ningbo Volunteers observe and record learners’ uses of a range of classroom and school-based uses of English in their sociolinguistic activities. They record recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities such as teachers’ classroom instructional language, and the written and spoken language learners use in buying lunch at the school canteen. Based on this record they remake the English through learning/teaching exercises that use Chinese to have learners perform these sociolinguistic activities. For example, all the learners are taught to sing an English song, to ensure that they are all familiar with it (e.g., Happy Birthday, Jingle Bells). It is important to ensure that all learners know the English language version of the song. Second, they are all taught to sing the same song in Chinese. Through scaffolding they are progressively taught the pronunciation of the Chinese words in the lyrics. Difficult words are singled out detailed scaffolding. Third, once the learners are familiar with the Chinese version of the song and have grasped the Chinese words in the lyrics, they are asked to generate their own phrases and sentences in Chinese using words from the song. In other words, as they learn more of the Chinese vocabulary, grammar and related language rules

they are encouraged to construct new phrases and sentences using what they have learnt. This helps the Ningbo Volunteers develop an understanding of language learning from the learners' perspectives. The Volunteers learn to teach Chinese "with and through their learners knowledge of the English language and meaning it has in the spaces in which they live. Thus, Chinese language learning practices come to reflect the spaces in which the Volunteers' learners can use it to give meaning to that space (Pennycook, 2010).

Using Pedagogies that Link Learners' Existing Sociolinguistic Knowledge of English to Learning Chinese

In their work with beginner Chinese language learners, the Ningbo Volunteers explore a second educational principle. It is as stated by Zhang et al. (2011): "the most effective pathway to literacy in any language is through the language that children are strongest in" (p. 76). To do so the Volunteers learn to employ a bilingual rather than nativist monolingual approach to Chinese language education (Cummins, 2008, 2009; Littlewood & Yu, 2011). Through the ROSETE Program, the Ningbo Volunteers explore their learners' perceptions of the cross-sociolinguistic similarities between English and Chinese. This challenges the Volunteers to shift away from a monolingual emphasis which over emphasises the contrastive differences between these two languages (Wang & Honig, 2010). Zhu (2010) argues that teachers of Chinese need to recognize that learners perceive Chinese differently to native speakers. Further, they need to learn to use the learners' comparisons of their first language and Chinese as a basis for learning the latter. Likewise, in order to accelerate language learning by reducing the pain/gain ratio, He and Jiao (2010) argue for teachers' pedagogies to be based on their "students' needs and understanding of the Chinese language" (p.231). For us this means teaching for English-to-Chinese transfer using cross-linguistic similarities. For Shea (2008) this means teachers have to encourage language learners

to actively analyze how the structures and sound systems of their native language compare to their target language. Where they align, learning can be jumpstarted. Where they do not, differences can be analyzed and potentially rendered less intimidating (p. 701).

The ROSETE Program opposes the assertion of absolute difference between English and Chinese as an anti-educational. Ringbom (2007; Ringbom & Jarvis, 2009) has drawn attention to the cross-linguistic similarities between languages as having necessary facilitative effects for language learning. Good language learners, Ringbom (2007) reports “make efficient use of whatever cross-linguistic similarities they perceive” (p. 117). Likewise, Uhl Chamo and El-Dinary (1999) report that high-rated language learners make greater use of their existing sociolinguistic knowledge to make inferences and predictions than do low-rated language learners. Teaching for English-to-Chinese transfer can, if appropriately scaffolded focus on lexicon, pragmatics, phonology, discourse and rhetoric, grammar and the use of cognates (Cummins, 2008, 2009; Taylor et al., 2008). Pedagogically, this means that having learners learn anything new is best done by the Ningbo Volunteers relating what learners already know to what has to be learnt. For example, to teach the Chinese for “cat,” learners are asked what sound a cat makes. They all say “meow.” This is not only very close to the sound for cat in Chinese (“māo”) but provides a mnemonic to help them to remember.

The concept of cross-sociolinguistic similarities is used in the ROSETE program to have the Ningbo Volunteers generate innovative pedagogies that start with the similarities between English and Chinese as the basis for language learning. They consider three possible cross-sociolinguistic similarities as a basis for scaffolding students’ learning, namely: similar (one-to-one relationship), contrast (partial similarity) and zero relationships (Ringbom, 2007).

In a relationship of cross-sociolinguistic similarity between English and Chinese, learners identify a similarity, for instance in sound (how/hǎo). In a contrast relation, learners recognize a layer of difference between the English and Chinese, for instance in meaning (in what way/good). Learners perceive a zero level relationship when they initially perceive little or no similarity between the Roman text (how) and the Chinese character. Teachers employing pedagogies that start with zero relations between learners’ English and Chinese create immense difficulties for beginner language learners (Wang & Honig, 2010). In effect this means understanding Australian learners as “active learners,” who “are actively contributing to their own development, [requiring teachers] to observe their children carefully and listen to them attentively...to provide the best possible support for their bilingual or multilingual development” (Wang, X. L., 2010, p. 191).

The Ningbo Volunteers develop innovative pedagogies that focus on the cross-sociolinguistic similarities between English and Chinese that the learners perceive. Their pedagogies focus on what the learners perceive as similar between the English they know and the Chinese they are learning. It is not the cross-sociolinguistic similarities that the native speaking Chinese teacher-researchers perceive that provides the pedagogical focus. It is the English/Chinese similarities as perceived by the learners that are of pedagogical importance.

In sum, this section has presented an analysis of two key educational concerns central to making Chinese learnable for students in school communities where English is the primary medium of instruction and communication. With respect to curriculum content consideration was given to using learners' recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities. This requires teachers of Chinese to carefully observe the sociolinguistic features of learners' locality and to use their everyday English activities to generate content. With regard to pedagogies for making Chinese learnable the focus is on teaching for English-to-Chinese transfer using learners' knowledge of English and their perceptions of similarities with Chinese. This means employing bilingual pedagogies to capitalize on learners' existing sociolinguistic knowledge of English to learn Chinese. The final section of this paper explores what we mean by the concept of "teaching Chinese with Australian characteristics."

"Teaching Chinese with Australian Characteristics"

What then is meant by the idea of "teaching Chinese with Australian characteristics"? It is a mistake to assume that this concept lampoons the slogan of "socialism with Chinese characteristics". The "Australian characteristics" includes employing an educational for the professional learning of teacher-researchers of Chinese. This is preference to an exclusively linguistic focus on language acquisition. Further, the "Australian characteristics" also embraces a learner-centered approach to the methods and content for making Chinese learnable. This means the teacher-researchers learn to take responsibility for the students' actual learning of Chinese. To do so they generate content for the teaching/learning of Chinese from learners' recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities performed in English and thus build on their existing

sociolinguistic knowledge. They teach forms of Chinese learners can use in everyday lives. Further, they develop innovative pedagogies of teaching for transfer from the learners’ L1 (English) to Chinese (L2). They do so by focusing on the cross-sociolinguistic similarities between the sounds of the two languages, rather than over-accentuating the differences. Our concept of “teaching Chinese with Australian characteristics” is situated within a range of research literature which focuses on language as a local practice (Jirata, 2012; Maybin, 2009; Orton, 2008; Pennycook, 2010; Yang, 2010). This concept provides a markedly innovative conceptual extension on existing understandings.

Pennycook’s (2010) concept of “language as a local practice” focuses on English and does not directly speak to Chinese language education. Through the concept of recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities we have opened up possibilities for innovative pedagogical investigations into ways of making Chinese an everyday local sociolinguistic practice in English-speaking school communities. Pedagogically, this suggests educating Chinese teacher-researchers to use sociolinguistic ethnography (Maybin, 2009) to investigate learners’ actual uses of the English language in their own school community. This includes learners’ games, riddles, sport and songs (Jirata, 2012). Thus, no matter how global Chinese may now be, language learning is situated practices that happen locally. This represents a shift in perspective from teaching forms of Chinese on the pretext that learners will be using the language in China after flying there the next day.

With reference to the concept of cross-linguistic similarities, Ringbom (2007) makes the following contentious statement:

A learner who knows only *Indo-European languages* and starts learning *Chinese* will find it difficult to relate anything to his previous linguistic knowledge. *The zero, or near-zero, relation of Chinese to English poses great difficulties at the early stages of learning.* (emphasis added, p. 7)

Ringbom (2007) extends this questionable assertion (also see Yang, 2009 for example), claiming that cross-linguistic similarities cannot be perceived due to cultural incompatibilities:

as in the case when European learners are confronted with a language such as Chinese, the new learner has the more complex task of often having to establish a one-to-one

relationship between a concept and a linguistic TL form. Cultural differences prevent cross-linguistic correspondences being naturally established between items. (p. 10)

In terms of “Australian characteristics” we developed the concept of “cross-sociolinguistic similarities” to inform the professional learning of the Ningbo Volunteers as teacher-researchers. It stands in opposition to the idea that learning Chinese is difficult, but acknowledges that the Volunteers may find it difficult to teach if they mistakenly assume a zero relationship between Chinese and English. This creates many difficulties for them at the early stages of their teaching.

Our concepts of “cross-sociolinguistic similarities” and “teaching for transfer from English-to-Chinese” provide the Ningbo Volunteers useful theoretic-pedagogical tools. They use these concepts to investigate ways of teaching for transfer from what learners know in English to what they can learn in Chinese. The focus on cross-sociolinguistic similarities reduces the pain/gain ratio of language learning. The Volunteers have to develop a curriculum based on actual, perceived and assumed similarities learners’ see between their first language and the language to be learnt. The Volunteers then have to learn to use these similarities to facilitate the learning of Chinese.

An Australian Government project investigated a range of initiatives that support candidates undertaking a doctorate or masters by research degree (Department of Education. 2014). This Government project aimed to investigate the quality of research education in Australia and its relevance to labor market requirements in the private, government and not-for-profit sectors. The ROSETE Program is featured in this Government report. The key findings from the report indicate that the ROSETE Program represents a strategic, coordinated partnership in teacher-researcher education that targets a key area of importance for Australia/China relations. This initiative enables the Ningbo Volunteers as teacher-researcher candidates, the partnership organizations and Australian school students to develop skills, knowledge and experience that extend their research skills, disciplinary knowledge and academic experiences. There are a number of ways in which the capabilities of the Ningbo Volunteers are enhanced to prepare them for careers in a range of employment sectors. These include internships through Volunteering in schools; interdisciplinary research training courses, and joint University/Department professional learning activities. The Ningbo

teacher-researchers, the partner organization’s program managers and school principals who actively participate in this partnership see it as providing positive educational experiences and strongly supporting the graduates and school students’ learning outcomes. The organizations in this Australia/China partnership are now working to pursue further opportunities through greater collaboration.

Here it should be noted that further research is necessary. Mindful of our cautions about Ringbom’s (2007) preference for foreground cross-linguistic differences, the following axioms for language learning provide entry points for future research:

- 1) language learning can be similarity driven: the learning of new knowledge and skills (i.e. Chinese) is likely to benefit from learners relating it to their existing knowledge and skills (i.e. English);
- 2) item learning precedes system learning: item (rather than vocabulary learning) and system learning may characterize different stages of English-to-Chinese language learning;
- 3) learning for production and comprehension: learning for production of Chinese language and learning for comprehension of Chinese may vary depending on item or system focus;
- 4) relating languages: the points of departure for English-speaking learners of Chinese may or may not differ for learners who use a related language such as Japanese.

Such research could elaborate on both what these teacher-researchers from China initially assume to be an appropriate way to teach Chinese, and on the actual characteristics of Australia’s educational culture and Australian learners’ sociolinguistic activities with which they need to become familiar (Singh & Han, *in press*; Singh et al., *in press*). More data needs to be generated and analysed about these teacher-researchers’ experiences of the teaching of Chinese to Australian learners to help explain the Ningbo Volunteers’ difficulties in making Chinese learnable. There is a need for further studies to explore the content and pedagogies that can increase Chinese learnability, and what is needed to educate teacher-researchers from China to be more effective in teaching Chinese to Australian learners. The aim of this future research is to build a collection of empirically grounded and theoretically informed research that provides an innovative angle on teaching/learning Chinese in predominantly English speaking

societies. Key research questions include:

- 1) how can learners' recurring, everyday local sociolinguistic activities better inform Chinese language learning;
- 2) how might locality better inform and enhance learners' Chinese language practices; and
- 3) how might the practice of Chinese language inform learners' locality.

Conclusion

In exploring the teaching of Chinese with Australian characteristics, this paper has addressed an internationally significant topic. Specifically, it has reported on the ways in which university graduates in language studies from China are being educated in Australia to be teacher-researchers capable of making Chinese learnable for school learners whose primary medium of instruction and communication is English. This innovative Australian program of research oriented, school/industry engaged teacher-researcher education has developed the concepts of "cross-sociolinguistic similarities" and "recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities" in reference to making Chinese a local language for Australian school learners. These ideas are likely to have wider implications for the learning/teaching of Chinese as a local/global language in English speaking countries as well as others.

The literature review indicates the many challenges for teachers of Chinese to learners for whom English is their everyday language of instruction and communication (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2011; Orton, 2008; State of Victoria, 2012; Zhang, 2010; Zhang & Li, 2010). This literature speaks to the lack of attention to mobilizing the recurring everyday sociolinguistic activities of beginner learners. It refers to the failure to address learners' needs for rewarding and successful language learning experiences. It signals the absence in the provision of forms of language education that will sustain learners' desire for learning Chinese, learning about modern China and interacting personally with Chinese people. This study of ROSETE teacher-researchers points to the prospects for generating a theoretic-pedagogical framework for making Chinese learnable that is worthy of further investigation.

The concept "teaching Chinese with Australian characteristics" provides openings for reconceptualizing the knowledge base of Chinese language

teacher-researcher education. It makes possible the reconfiguring of the relationship between learners’ uses of English and Chinese. This means making Chinese *interesting*, *rewarding* and *desirable* for learners for whom English is their everyday language of instruction and communication. They already possess sociolinguistic knowledge of English which can be used to help them learn Chinese. The idea is to make Chinese a sociolinguistic presence in their daily activities.

This study provide a lens through which to generate a new perspective on how to make Chinese learnable for beginner learners (Ringbom, 2007; Ringbom & Jarvis, 2009; Cummins, 2008, 2009; Taylor et al., 2008; Pennycook, 2010). The focus is on deepening and extending the entry-level capabilities of learners by using *their* perceptions of the cross-sociolinguistic between English and Chinese, and having them use Chinese in their recurrent, everyday sociolinguistic activities. In this way, this study contributes to the scholarly debate within China (Gao, 2011; Shum et al., 2011; Zhu, 2010), and internationally (Chen et al., 2010; He & Jiao, 2010) about making Chinese learnable. Further educational research is needed to investigate ways of improving the theoretic-pedagogical frameworks to enable teacher-researchers to make Chinese learnable.

References

- Achugar, M. (2009). Constructing a bilingual professional identity in a graduate classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8(2/3), 65–87. doi: 10.1080/15348450902848387
- Australia in the Asian Century Implementation Task Force. (2012). *Australia in the Asian Century: White Paper*. Canberra, Australia: Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2011). *Shape of the Australian curriculum: Languages*. Sydney, Australia: Author.
- Berg, L. (2011). “Mate speak English, you’re in Australia now.” *Alternative Law Journal*, 36(2), 110–115.
- Canagarajah, A. S., & Wurr, A. J. (2011). Multilingual communication and language acquisition: New research directions. *The Reading Matrix*, 11(1), 1–15.
- Chen, J. G., Wang, C., & Cai, J. F. (2010). Introduction. Teaching and learning Chinese in a global era: Issues and perspectives. In J. G. Chen, C. Wang, & J. F. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese* (pp. ix–xx). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in

- bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Bilingual education* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 65–75). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Cummins, J. (2009). Multilingualism in the English-language classroom: Pedagogical considerations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 317–321. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00171.x
- Department of Education (2014). *Initiatives to Enhance the Professional Development of Research Students*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Department of Innovation, Industry, Science, Research and Tertiary Education. (DIISRTE). (2012). *2012 national research investment plan*. Canberra, Australia: Author.
- Ding, S., & Saunders, R. A. (2006). Talking up China: An analysis of China's rising cultural power and global promotion of the Chinese language. *East Asia*, 23(2), 3–33. doi: 10.1007/s12140-006-0021-2
- Duff, P., Anderson, T., Ilnyckyj, R., VanGaya, E., Wang, R. T. X., & Yates, E. (2013). *Learning Chinese: Linguistic, sociocultural and narrative perspectives*. Boston, MA: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gao, F. (2011). Bilingual education and Korean minorities in China. In L. Tsung & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese in global contexts* (pp. 81–96). London, England: Continuum.
- Gil, J. (2010). The double danger of English as a global language. *English Today*, 26(1), 51–56. doi: 10.1017/S0266078409990575
- Han, J. H., & Yao, J. (2013). A case study of bilingual student-teachers' classroom English: Applying the education-linguistic model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2), 118–131. doi: 10.14221/ajte.2013v38n2.3
- Harreveld, B., & Singh, M. (2009). Contextualising learning at the education-training-work interface. *Education+Training*, 51(2), 92–107. doi: 10.1108/00400910910941264
- He, W. W., & Jiao, D. (2010). Curriculum design and special features of “computer Chinese” and Chinese for tomorrow. In J. G. Chen, C. Wang, & J. F. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese* (pp. 217–236). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Jirata, T. J. (2012). Learning through play: An ethnographic study of children's riddling in Ethiopia. *Africa*, 82(2), 272–86. doi: 10.1353/afr.2012.0028
- Li, W. C., & Zhu, H. (2011). Changing hierarchies in Chinese language education in British Chinese learners, In L. Tsung & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese in global contexts* (pp. 11–28). London, England: Continuum.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. H. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 41(1), 64–77. doi: 10.1017/S0261444809990310

- Liu, P. (2006). Community-based Chinese schools in southern California: A survey of teachers. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(2), 237–247. doi: 10.1080/07908310608668765
- Liu, P. D., Zhou, Y. L., & McBride-Chang, C. (2010). Morphological awareness: Why and how to link it to Chinese literacy teaching and learning. In J. G. Chen, C. Wang, & J. F. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 237–256). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Maybin, J. (2009). A broader view of language in school. *Children & Society*, 23(1), 70–78. doi: 10.1111/j.1099-0860.2008.00177.x
- Ning, W. (2010). Global English(es) and global Chinese(s): Toward rewriting a new literary history in Chinese. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 19(63), 159–174. doi: 10.1080/10670560903335884
- Nyland, C., Forbes-Mewett, H., & Thomson, S. B. (2011). Sinophobia as corporate tactic and the response of host communities. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 41(4), 610–631. doi: 10.1080/00472336.2011.610617
- Orton, J. (2008). *Chinese language education in Australian schools*. Melbourne, Australia: The University of Melbourne.
- Pavlenko, A. (2003). “I never knew I was a bilingual”: Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 251–268. doi: 10.1207/S15327701JLIE0204_2
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Abingdon, England & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Ringbom, H., & Jarvis, S. (2009). The importance of cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 106–118). London, England: Blackwell.
- Shea, C. (2008). Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning (review). *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64(4), 700–702. doi: 10.1353/cml.0.0011
- Shum, M. S. K., Gao, F., Tsung, L., & Kia W.-W. (2011). South Asian students’ Chinese language learning in Hong Kong. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(3), 285–297. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2010.539693
- Singh, M. (1995). Edward Said’s critique of orientalism and Australia’s “Asia literacy” curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 27(6), 599–620. doi: 10.1080/0022027950270602
- Singh, M. (1996). Studying Asia for the national economic interest: An analysis of the Australian Governments’ strategy for schools. *Discourse*, 17(2), 153–178. doi:

10.1080/0159630960170203

- Singh, M. (2001). Advocating the sustainability of linguistic diversity. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp.123–148). Melbourne, Australia: Language Australia.
- Singh, M. (2009). Using Chinese knowledge in internationalising research education: Jacques Rancière, an ignorant supervisor and doctoral students from China. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7(2), 185–201. doi: 10.1080/14767720902908034
- Singh, M. (2010). Connecting intellectual projects in China and Australia: Bradley’s international student-migrants, Bourdieu and productive ignorance. *Australian Journal of Education*, 54(1), 31–45. doi: 10.1177/000494411005400104
- Singh, M. (2011). Learning from China to internationalise Australian research education: Pedagogies of intellectual equality and “optimal ignorance” of ERA journal rankings. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 48(4), 355–365. doi: 10.1080/14703297.2011.617090
- Singh, M. (2012). Pedagogies of intellectual equality for connecting with non-Western theories: Alternatives to celebrating multicultural or sanctioning fundamentalist identities. In H. K. Wright, M. Singh, & R. Race (Eds.), *Precarious international multicultural education: Hegemony, dissent and rising alternatives* (pp. 237–258). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Singh, M. (2013). Designing research to improve students’ learning: “industry/university” collaborations for educating teacher-researchers. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 40(5), 549–566. doi: 10.1007/s13384-013-0117-9
- Singh, M., & Ballantyne, C. (2014). Making Chinese learnable for beginning second language learners? In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 199–216). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Singh, M., & Chen, X. F. (2012). Ignorance and pedagogies of intellectual equality: Internationalizing Australian doctoral education programs and pedagogies through engaging Chinese theoretical tools. In A. Lee & S. Danby (Eds.), *Reshaping doctoral education: International approaches and pedagogies* (pp. 187–203). Abingdon, England & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Singh, M., & Han, J. H. (2009). Engaging Chinese ideas through Australian education research: Using “chengyu” to connect intellectual projects across “peripheral” nations. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(4), 397–411.
- Singh, M., & Han, J. H. (2010). Peer review, Bourdieu and honour: Connecting Chinese and

- Australian intellectual projects. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(2), 185–198. doi: 10.1080/01425690903539107
- Singh, M., & Han, J. (in press). Strategies for increasing the retention of beginning second language learners: Making Chinese learnable, rewarding and desirable. In F. Dervin & A. Lahtinen (Eds.), *Chinese students and scholars abroad*. London, England: Palgrave.
- Singh, M., & Huang, X. W. (2012). Bourdieu’s lessons for internationalising Anglophone education: Declassifying Sino-Anglo divisions over critical theorising. *Compare*, 43(2), 203–223. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2012.687128
- Singh, M., & Meng, H. (2011). Democratising western research using non-western theories: Rancière and mute Chinese theoretical tools. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(6), 907–920. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2011.607493
- Singh, M., & Scanlon, C. (2003). Managing risks and opportunities in multilingual knowledge economies: The possibilities of ethical investment movement to sustaining biolinguistic diversity. *3L Journal of Language Teaching, Linguistics & Literature*, 8, 8–17.
- Singh, M., Harreveld, B., Gao, T., & Danaher, P. (in press). Mobility and local/international knowledge co-production: Innovation in the post-monolingual learning of Chinese. In R. Arber & A. Vongalis-Macrow (Eds.), *Contesting international education*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- State of Victoria. (2012). *Languages in Victorian government schools, 2011*. Melbourne, Australia: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.
- Taylor, L. K., Bernhard, J. K., Garg, S., & Cummins, J. (2008). Affirming plural belonging: Building on students’ family-based cultural and linguistic capital through multiliteracies pedagogy. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 8(3), 269–294. doi: 10.1177/1468798408096481
- Tsung, L., & Cruickshank, K. (2011a). Minority education for exclusion or access: Teaching Chinese as a second language in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. In L. Tsung & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese in global contexts* (pp. 97–116). London, England: Continuum.
- Tsung, L., & Cruickshank, K. (Eds.) (2011b). *Teaching and learning Chinese in global contexts*. London, England: Continuum.
- Uhl Chamo, A., & El-Dinary, P. B. (1999). Children’s learning strategies in language immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(3), 319–338. doi: 10.1111/0026-7902.00025
- Wang, S. H. C. (2010). Chinese language education in the United States: A historical overview and future directions. In J. G. Chen, C. Wang, & J. F. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese* (pp. 3–32). Charlotte, NC: IAP.

- Wang, X. L. (2010). Acquiring Chinese simultaneously with two other languages: Effective home strategies. In J. G. Chen, C. Wang, & J. F. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese* (pp. 175–198). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Wang, H.-H., & Honig, A. S. (2010). What difficulties do children experience while learning to read and write Chinese? In J. G. Chen, C. Wang, & J. F. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese* (pp. 139–154). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Wang, D. P., Moloney, R., & Li, Z. (2013). Towards internationalising the curriculum: A case study of Chinese language teacher education programs in China and Australia. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(9), 116–135. doi: 10.14221/ajte.2013v38n9.8
- Xu, Y. Z. (2009). School-based teacher development through a school-university collaborative project. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(1), 49–66.
- Yang, H.-C. (2010). Literacy practices in the family household of Taiwanese American children. In J. G. Chen, C. Wang, & J. F. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese* (pp. 155–174). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Yang, J. (2009). Chinese borrowings in English. *World Englishes*, 28(1), 90–106. 10.1111/j.1467-971X.2008.01571.x
- Zhang, D. (2010). Language maintenance and language shift among Chinese immigrant parents and their second-generation children in the U.S. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 33(1), 42–60. doi: 10.1080/15235881003733258
- Zhang, G. X., & Li, L. M. (2010). Chinese language teaching in the UK. *The Language Learning Journal*, 38(1), 87–97. doi: 10.1080/09571731003620689
- Zhang, D. H., & Slaughter-Defoe, D. T. (2009). Language attitudes and heritage language maintenance among Chinese immigrant families in the USA. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 22(2), 77–93. doi: 10.1080/07908310902935940
- Zhang, Q. Y., Tsung, L., Cruickshank, K., Kia, W.-W., & Shum, M. S. K. (2011). South Asian students' educational experience and attainment. In L. Tsung & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese in global contexts* (pp. 63–80). London, England: Continuum.
- Zhou, Z. P., & Feng, W. C. (1987). The two faces of English in China. *World Englishes*, 6(2), 111–125. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1987.tb00186.x
- Zhu, Z. P. (2010). A historical perspective on teaching Chinese as a second language. In J. G. Chen, C. Wang, & J. F. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and learning Chinese* (pp. 33–72). Charlotte, NC: IAP.