

Multilingual Education

Jiening Ruan
Jie Zhang
Cynthia B. Leung *Editors*

Chinese Language Education in the United States

 Springer

Multilingual Education

Volume 14

Series Editors

Andy Kirkpatrick

Department of Languages and Linguistics, Griffith University
Brisbane, Australia

Bob Adamson

Head, Department of International Education & Lifelong Learning
Hong Kong Institute of Education, Tai Po, Hong Kong SAR

Editorial Board

Jan Blommaert, University of Tilburg, The Netherlands

Feng Anwei, University of Wales at Bangor, UK

Ofelia Garcia, The Graduate Centre, City University of New York, USA

Saran Kaur Gill, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

Gu Yueguo, The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

Hartmut Haberland, Roskilde University, Denmark

Li Chor Shing David, The Hong Kong Institute of Education, Tai Po,
Hong Kong SAR

Li Wei, Birkbeck College, University of London, UK

Low Ee-Ling, National Institute of Education, Singapore

Tony Liddicoat, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

Ricardo Nolasco, University of the Philippines at Diliman, Manila, The
Philippines

Merrill Swain, Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, University of Toronto,
Canada

Virginia Yip Choy Yin, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, NT,
Hong Kong SAR

The book series *Multilingual Education* publishes top quality monographs and edited volumes containing empirical research on multilingual language acquisition, language contact and the respective roles of languages in contexts where the languages are not cognate and where the scripts are often different, in order to be able to better understand the processes and issues involved and to inform governments and language policy makers. The volumes in this series are aimed primarily at researchers in education, especially multilingual education and other related fields, and those who are involved in the education of (language) teachers. Others who will be interested include key stakeholders and policy makers in the field of language policy and education. The editors welcome proposals and ideas for books that fit the series. For more information on how you can submit a proposal, please contact the publishing editor, Jolanda Voogd. E-mail: jolanda.voogd@springer.com

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/8836>

Jiening Ruan • Jie Zhang • Cynthia B. Leung
Editors

Chinese Language Education in the United States

 Springer

Editors

Jiening Ruan
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK, USA

Jie Zhang
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK, USA

Cynthia B. Leung
University of South Florida St. Petersburg
St Petersburg, FL, USA

ISSN 2213-3208

Multilingual Education

ISBN 978-3-319-21307-1

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-21308-8

ISSN 2213-3216 (electronic)

ISBN 978-3-319-21308-8 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015950200

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland is part of Springer Science+Business Media
(www.springer.com)

Contents

Historical Overview of Chinese Language Education for Speakers of Other Languages in China and the United States	1
Wenxia Wang and Jiening Ruan	
Chinese Government Policies and Initiatives on the International Popularization of Chinese: An Economics of Language Perspective	29
Shuai Li and Jianqin Wang	
U.S. Policies and Initiatives for CFL Education.....	47
Jin'ai Sun and Roger Shouse	
Understanding Chinese as a Foreign Language from the Perspective of Second Language Acquisition.....	63
Jie Zhang	
Medium-of-Instruction Policy and Practices in CSL Classrooms.....	83
Danping Wang	
Technology in CFL Education	97
Yongan Wu	
Chinese as a Foreign Language in K-12 Education	123
Ke Peng	
CFL Education at the College Level	141
Yu Li and Zheng-sheng Zhang	
The Teaching of Chinese to Heritage Language Learners at the Post-Secondary Level.....	167
Xuehua Xiang	

Practice and Research on Chinese Language Learning in Study Abroad Contexts..... 195
Li Jin

Chinese Language Teachers’ Pedagogical Adjustment and Classroom Management in Cross-Cultural Contexts 211
Wenying Zhou and Guofang Li

CFL Teacher Preparation and Development..... 231
Michael E. Everson

Index..... 245

Contributors

Michael E. Everson University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA

Li Jin Department of Modern Languages, DePaul University, Chicago, IL, USA

Cynthia B. Leung University of South Florida St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, FL, USA

Guofang Li University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Shuai Li Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Yu Li Department of Russian and East Asian Languages and Cultures and the Program in Linguistics, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Ke Peng Department of Modern Languages, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY, USA

Jiening Ruan University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA

Roger Shouse Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA, USA

Jin'ai Sun North Central College, Naperville, IL, USA

Danping Wang Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

Jianqin Wang Center for Research on Chinese as a Second Language, Beijing Language and Culture University, Beijing, China

Wenxia Wang Second and Foreign Language Education, School of Teacher Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

Yongan Wu Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL, USA

Xuehua Xiang Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

Jie Zhang Department of Modern Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA

Zheng-sheng Zhang Department of Linguistics and Asian/Middle-Eastern Languages, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA, USA

Wenying Zhou School of Education, Auburn University at Montgomery, Montgomery, AL, USA

Introduction

Chinese civilization is one of the oldest civilizations in the world. The history of Chinese written language can be traced back to the Shang Dynasty (about 1700–1050 BC) when archaic Chinese characters were carved on oracle bones (Bai 1982), or possibly even earlier based on a recent archeological discovery in Zhuangqiao, China (Phillips 2013). In addition, the number of native speakers of Chinese greatly exceeds those of any other languages in the world.

However, Chinese has not been a popular choice of first foreign language of study for learners outside of China until recently. Historical records indicate that the learning of Chinese by foreigners began 2,500 years ago in the Qin and Han Dynasties when foreigners from China's then neighboring countries started to learn Chinese in order to live in China and engage in political, commercial, and/or religious activities (Dong 2002). It is generally agreed that the teaching of Chinese for foreign learners, as a field of study, began in the 1950s at Tsinghua University, serving students from Eastern Europe in China (Zhang 2000). The Cultural Revolution caused serious disruption, but the teaching and learning of Chinese for foreign learners resumed again in the late 1970s and early 1980s when China adopted the Open Door Policy and decided to reintegrate itself into the world community (Qiu 2010; Zhang 2000). Currently, the term referring to the teaching of Chinese to non-native speakers in China is 对外汉语教学, which has been translated into *the teaching of Chinese as a foreign language (TCFL)* or *the teaching of Chinese as a second language (TCSL)* (Qiu 2010).

In the United States, the first Chinese course, *Elements of Chinese*, was offered at Yale University by Addison Van Name in 1871 (Tsu 1970; Yao and Zhang 2010). In 1877, Yale University appointed Samuel Wells Williams, who was an established sinologist, Chinese linguist, and former missionary to China, to head its Chinese Language and Literature program and to teach courses in Chinese language and civilization. Yale University is hence regarded as the first higher learning institution in the United States to offer Chinese language education (Yao and Zhang 2010). In 1879, Harvard University also set up its Chinese program (Harvard University 2015). Early learners of Chinese were mostly Christian missionaries or serious

minded people who wanted to be sinologists, and the number of students they served was small at best (Tsu 1970). These people were subsequently instrumental in teaching Chinese in the United States.

Chinese language education (CLE) for foreigners witnessed its most rapid growth after the turn of the twenty-first century both in China and in the United States. With China becoming an increasingly influential world economic and political powerhouse in the last decade, CLE has gradually attracted more attention from governments, business sectors, and education communities in many countries around the world. An increasing number of universities, colleges, and K-12 schools have also begun to offer Chinese classes to their students over the last 10 years.

The growing popularity of CLE is a new trend in foreign language education in many parts of the world. As an emerging field whose “research tradition is still developing” (Ke 2012, p. 44), it is not surprising that our understanding of CLE is still rather limited. Most published research in the field is either linguistic or acquisition studies of Chinese or individual cases of teaching techniques and pedagogical strategies. There is a general lack of a coherent body of CLE research and theories that can provide educators, practitioners, and especially preservice and novice teachers with an overarching picture of the current state of CLE to guide Chinese language teaching and learning in practice.

Considering the complexity surrounding language development for any second language and due to page limitations, we chose to focus this book on CLE for non-native Chinese speakers in the United States. To better situate the discussion in a proper context, the book traces the evolution of CLE from its very beginning in China in the *Zhou Dynasty* (1046 BC–256 BC) to the latest developments in China and the United States. The main emphasis of the book is on CLE education after the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 and in particular the 汉语热 (Chinese Craze) after the turn of the twenty-first century when dramatic changes in CLE were witnessed along with the social, political, and economic influences taking place in both countries during its various contemporary historical periods.

It is necessary here to make a distinction between a second language and a foreign language. Richards and Schmidt (2002) suggested second language refers to a language that plays an important role in a particular country or region other than one’s first language. In addition, it is usually a language critical for survival and gaining access to education/occupational/political opportunities for a person with a different native language. For example, a native speaker of English living in America and studying German would consider German a foreign language while an immigrant from Mexico who is living in the United States would consider English his/her second language because English is the language of instruction in schools and the work place, as well as in government business.

According to Gass and Selinker (2001), foreign language learning concerns “the learning of a nonnative language in the environment of one’s native language.... This is most commonly done within the context of the classroom” (p. 5). They further explained:

Second language acquisition, on the other hand, generally refers to the learning of a nonnative language in the environment in which that language is spoken.... This may or may not take place in a classroom setting. What’s important is that learning in a second language

environment takes place with considerable access to speakers of the language being learned, whereas learning in a foreign language environment usually does not. (p. 5)

Based on the above views, Chinese as a Second Language (CSL) is related to Chinese learning taking place in a Chinese-speaking context where learners either acquire the language in naturalistic contexts or study the language in classrooms. Chinese as a Foreign Language (CFL) concerns the learning of Chinese in a foreign language context in which Chinese learning primarily takes place in classroom settings and learners do not usually have easy access to the language other than formal Chinese language instruction. So one may consider that learning Chinese in the U.S. or any non-Chinese-speaking countries is better called CFL learning, whereas the same effort taking place in China, Taiwan, or any other Chinese-speaking communities for nonnative Chinese speakers is CSL learning.

However, it is oftentimes difficult to maintain a clear distinction between the two terms as the boundary between the two can become blurred when learners travel back and forth between various learning contexts. Therefore, many educators and scholars in the field of Chinese education usually do not make strict distinctions between the two terms, and the terms are often used interchangeably (Ke 2012). While acknowledging the differences between the two terms, in this book we do not adopt a strict differentiation in keeping with the practice of many scholars and educators in the field.

Another group of learners who share many commonalities with CFL/CSL learners but have their own unique characteristics are heritage learners from a Chinese-speaking family background. In the literature, heritage learners are usually treated as a separate group from CFL or CSL learners (for example, He and Xiao 2008), but in reality not many Chinese programs in the U.S. offer a separate language track for these heritage learners due to limited resources. Therefore, heritage learners also constitute an indispensable part in our discussion of Chinese language education in the United States.

Content Highlights

The contributors of this book are well-recognized Chinese language educators in the U.S. and China from several interdisciplinary fields. The book seeks to provide in-depth, cross-disciplinary discussion and analysis of a wide array of pertinent, critical topics and issues related to CLE in the United States from historical, philosophical, economic, sociocultural, theoretical, and pedagogical perspectives.

Chapter 1 “[Historical Overview of Chinese Language Education for Speakers of Other Languages in China and the United States](#),” presents a historical overview of the field in the contexts of China and the United States, while each following chapter examines a critical aspect of CLE supported by a review of critical research related to the topic. Chapter 2 “[Chinese Government Policies and Initiatives on the International Popularization of Chinese: An Economics of Language Perspective](#),”

details the Chinese government's policies and initiatives for promoting CLE around the world, which has produced an undeniable impact on the current status of Chinese language education in the United States. Other chapters include current and recent U.S. government initiatives aimed at expanding CFL education, CFL learning and teaching from the perspective of second language acquisition (SLA), medium of instruction in Chinese classrooms, technology for CFL education, CFL in American K-12 schools, CFL in American higher education, CFL for heritage students at the post-secondary level, Chinese language learning in study abroad contexts, and Chinese teachers' pedagogical adjustment and classroom management issues in cross-cultural contexts. The book concludes with a focused discussion of CFL teacher preparation and training. All chapters either directly address a specific aspect of CLE in the United States or cover topics or issues with strong implications for CLE in the United States.

Although the authors come from different disciplines and bring with them different theoretical and epistemological perspectives, a common understanding that runs through the chapters is the view that CLE development is closely connected to various factors, including social, cultural, political, and economic factors, and that these factors constantly interact to shape and change the status and direction of CLE in China and the United States. Interestingly, religion is also found to be a unique, strong driving force behind the spread of the Chinese language among non-Chinese speakers historically (Zhang 2008). CLE enables different cultures to connect, contest against, and integrate with each other. This process also has transformed the Chinese language itself into the modern day Chinese that is used and taught to native Chinese and non-Chinese learners. It is our hope that the book will provide valuable insights for CLE researchers, practitioners, language educators, and policy makers in China, the United States, and across the world and for those who are interested in gaining a better understanding of the various issues related to CLE and language education in general.

Future Directions

Building upon earlier research syntheses conducted by eminent researchers and scholars (e.g., Everson 1993; Ke 2006; Ke and Everson 1999; Ke and Li 2011; Ke and Shen 2003), Ke (2012) carried out an extensive review of the most significant studies in CFL since the late 1980s. He concluded that research in CFL has largely focused on four areas, namely, "aspects of the CFL reading process, grammar competence development, pronunciation development, pragmatic development and field building" (p. 44). He noticed a significant lack of studies in CFL listening and speaking. In addition to urging more studies from cross-linguistic perspectives to further contribute to our understanding of Chinese L2 learning, he also called for more research on K-12 CFL learning, learning of advanced CFL learners and the integration of their language and disciplinary study, effectiveness of CFL computer technology, and the cognitive processes, attitudes, and interests involved in the use

of technology. Also mentioned is capacity building of CFL researchers and more funding to support future CFL research. We agree with Ke's (2012) assessment of the research aspect of CFL education. Furthermore, we have identified several areas that demand greater attention.

Historical Research on CLE

A review of literature in both English and Chinese reveals a lack of attention to the historical development of CLE in China and elsewhere in the world. In order for the field to maintain continuity and sustainability, a strong understanding of the factors that historically influenced the ebb and flow of CLE is needed. CLE has been shown to be a bilateral process where non-native Chinese learners acquired the Chinese language, but in the process of learning the language, they also contributed to the development, evolution, and dissemination of the modern Chinese language. Such a unique relationship needs to be better recognized and understood.

Theory Building

Currently, most theories that are used to inform CLE come from second language acquisition theories grown out of the teaching and learning of Western languages. Due to the unique social, cultural, and linguistic characteristics of the Chinese language, theory building grounded in thoughtful, systematic study of CFL teaching and learning is a critical task for CLE researchers and educators if we want CLE teachers and learners to achieve greater success in teaching and learning Chinese.

Affective Factors for CFL Learning

Since Chinese has been viewed as a challenging language for Western language learners, understanding the role of affective factors in the success of language learning and learning in general is vital. It is important for CFL educators to pay greater attention to supporting CFL learners in developing a positive attitude towards the learning of Chinese through building internal motivation. Currently, student interest in learning CFL is heavily tied to utilitarian considerations due to the economic and political prowess that China possesses. We need to explore ways to maintain their motivation towards learning Chinese so their interest in learning Chinese is less dependent on China's political and economic conditions.

Understanding CFL Learners at a Fuller Spectrum of Proficiency Levels and in Diverse Learning Contexts

Currently, most of our understanding of CFL centers on young adult college learners. On the one hand, as more Chinese programs are offered at a much younger age, an understanding of early-start learners in immersion programs or bilingual programs needs to be gained. On the other hand, as a result of the fast expansion of Chinese programs at the K-12 and college levels, more learners are achieving much higher proficiency than ever before. There is a need to track these highly proficient learners, not only in their language attainment but also in their language attrition and fossilization. As study-abroad programs are built into Chinese language programs at colleges and even in K-12 schools, we need to explore how different learning contexts contribute to learners' language development, perceptions of Chinese society and culture, and motivation in Chinese learning.

CFL Teacher Preparation and Training

Teacher quality determines student success. Since CLE in the United States is a field with a relatively short history, teacher preparation and training lags behind. In fact, CFL teacher preparation is the biggest challenge the field now faces. Teacher quality could be problematic, especially when we have to import teachers who complete their teacher education in China. Conflicts caused by differences between Eastern and Western educational paradigms, instructional approaches and strategies, as well as classroom management styles can all hinder future development, sustainability, and expansion of CFL education in general. Finding creative ways to build a highly qualified CFL teaching force and provide professional development and training for CFL teachers should be a major topic of discussion for the field. The field can turn to foreign language instruction for other languages, such as German, French, and Japanese, for ideas.

This book intends to inform its readers on issues pertinent to the growth and future success of CLE in China, as well as in the U.S. and other parts of the world where English still maintains its dominance. It is our hope that this scholarly work becomes an important and timely publication on CLE and serves as a great reference for researchers, teachers, language policy makers, graduate students or preservice teachers who want to pursue a career in teaching Chinese in China and the U.S., and students who are learning Chinese in various Chinese programs around the world.

University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK, USA

Jiening Ruan

University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK, USA

Jie Zhang

University of South Florida St. Petersburg
St. Petersburg, FL, USA

Cynthia Leung

References

- Bai, S. (Ed.). (1982). *An outline history of China*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.
- Dong, M. (2002). 古代汉语汉字对外传播史 [The history of dissemination of ancient Chinese language and characters]. 北京: 中国大百科全书出版社.
- Everson, M. (1993). Research in the less commonly taught languages. In A. O. Haley (Ed.), *ACTFL foreign language education series. Research in language learning: Principles, processes, and prospects* (pp. 198–228). Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.
- Harvard University. (2015). *Chinese*. Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations. Retrieved from <http://ealc.fas.harvard.edu/chinese>
- He, A. W., & Xiao, Y. (Eds.). (2008). *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry*. National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Ke, C. (2006). 21世纪汉语作为外语教学研究方向与理论建构刍议 [Initial discussion on the research and theorizing of Chinese as a foreign language in the 21st century]. *世界汉语教学* [World Chinese Teaching], 4.
- Ke, C. (2012). Research in second language acquisition of Chinese: Where we are, where we are going. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 47(3), 43–113.
- Ke, C., & Everson, M. (1999). Recent research in CFL reading and its pedagogical implications. In M. Chu (Ed.), *Mapping the course of the Chinese language field*. Vol. 3 of *Chinese Language Teachers Association monograph series* (pp. 189–203). Kalamazoo: Chinese Language Teachers Association.
- Ke, C., & Li, A. (2011). Chinese as a foreign language in the U.S. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 39(1), 177–238.
- Ke, C., & Shen, H. (2003). 回顾与展望: 美国汉语教学理论研究述评 [American Chinese language teaching in retrospect and looking forward]. *语言教学与研究* [Language Teaching and Research], 3.
- Phillips, T. (2013, July 11). 5,000-year-old “Chinese characters” discovered. *The Daily Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/10173291/5000-year-old-Chinese-characters-discovered.html>
- Qiu, J. (2010). 对外汉语教学与海外华文教育之异同 [A Comparative research on overseas Chinese education and teaching Chinese as a foreign language]. *教育研究* [Educational Research], 365, 89–92.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). London: Longman.
- Tsu, J. (1970). The teaching of Chinese in colleges and schools of the United States. *The Modern Language Journal*, 54(8), 562–579.
- Yao, T., & Zhang, G. (2010). 美国汉语教学历史回顾与现状 [Chinese language instruction in the United States: A look at its history and current status]. In H. Zhang, Z. Xue, & S. Jiang (Eds.), *北美中国学: 研究概述与文献资源* [Chinese studies in North America: Research and resources] (pp. 773–784). 北京: 中华书局.
- Zhang, D. (2000). Five decades of Chinese teaching as a foreign language: Review and thoughts at the transit of century. *语言文字应用* [Applied Linguistics], 33(1), 49–59.
- Zhang, X. (2008). 张西平. 世界汉语教育史的研究对象和研究方法 [On the subject and methodology in the history of worldwide Chinese language education]. *世界汉语教学* [Chinese Teaching in the World], 83, 122–132.

Historical Overview of Chinese Language Education for Speakers of Other Languages in China and the United States

Wenxia Wang and Jiening Ruan

Abstract This chapter seeks to trace the historical development of Chinese language education for speakers of other languages in China and the United States. The authors compare and contrast the development of Chinese as a foreign language education (CFL) in the two countries and identify several critical understandings. Most significantly, political, social, cultural, and economic forces have been important factors behind the ups and downs of CFL education, and they have constantly interacted to shape the direction of CFL development in both countries. Religion is also found to have played a very critical and complicated role in the history of CFL education in both countries. This chapter supports the ecological perspective on language education and extends Cooper's (Language planning and social change. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989) language policy and planning framework to include forces at both top and grassroots levels.

Keywords Chinese language education • Chinese as a Foreign Language (CFL) • Chinese as a Second Language (CSL) • CFL education • History of CFL education • Language Planning and Policy (LPP) • Sinology • CFL education in China • CFL education in the U.S. • Periods of CFL development

1 Introduction

The Chinese language, one of the oldest languages in the world, has weathered and witnessed the ups and downs of Chinese civilization for 5,000 years. Literature on Chinese language education for native Chinese language learners abounds. Even though over the past few centuries Chinese was taught to and learned by non-native

W. Wang (✉)

Second and Foreign Language Education, School of Teacher Education,
Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA
e-mail: wwang5@fsu.edu

J. Ruan

University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA
e-mail: jruan@ou.edu

Chinese speakers, Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) or Chinese as a second language (CSL) as a recognized discipline is a recent phenomenon.

Meanwhile, over the last two millennia, the spread of Chinese among non-native speakers of Chinese was slow and limited to a very small, special population. In recent years, Chinese has attracted significant interest from language educators, scholars, and policy makers due to its rapid growth as a foreign language around the world. This growing interest noticeably coincides with China's emergence as a world leader and economic powerhouse within the last two decades, especially since the turn of the century.

Yet as a discipline, due to its rather short history, CFL education is still in its initial stage of discipline building. Much work needs to be done so that continued growth of CFL education can be supported by a well-constructed, coherent disciplinary discourse and narrative. One area that deserves special attention is the history of CFL (Zhang 2008). An adequate understanding of any discipline cannot be achieved without a clear understanding of its history. Yet the history of CFL is an area that has not been well researched or understood.

This chapter attempts to fill that gap by tracing the history of CFL education from its origin in China to its emergence in the United States up to the present time. These two countries have been chosen as the focus of this chapter because they are the two most critical locations where CFL education has experienced the greatest growth and expansion in recent years, each with its own unique characteristics. While it does not require any justification to address CFL education in China in this paper, the examination of the history of CFL education in the United States is also warranted because it offers an illustration of the evolvement and development of CFL in a country where English is the dominant language as well as the super language of the world (Zhou 2011), which in itself is a disincentive (Lo Bianco 2011) for its learners to acquire a language with a completely different orthography and from a very different culture. In addition, the U.S. was chosen as a focus because it has the largest number of CFL related programs and learners outside of China, and the number is continuing to grow. The challenges that CFL education in the U.S. is facing can most likely be found in other countries around the world.

2 Theoretical Framework

In searching for a theoretical framework that is broad enough but at the same time allows us to effectively focus on the most salient factors influencing the historical development of CFL education in the two countries, we turned to the theories and concepts in the field of Language Planning and Policy (LPP) to describe and analyze various forces and factors that impinge upon CFL education in the two nations.

Traditionally the goals of language planning and language policies are often viewed as ideologically neutral, non-political, and technical (Cooper 1989). However, Karam (1974) argues that language policies are directly associated with

political, economic, scientific, social, cultural, and/or religious situations (cited in Cooper 1989). Cooper (1989) also pointed out that language planning is motivated by political, economic, and scientific considerations. Moreover, policy-making “largely works in a top-down fashion to shape the linguistic behavior of the community according to the imperatives of policy-makers” (Canagarajah 2006, p. 153). Authorities often back up their policies with ideologies that are seen and accepted as common sense (Tollefson 2002). As vehicles to spread cultures and ideologies, languages can also be involved in “systematic distortion” to serve the interests of particular classes or for ethnolinguistic purposes (Tollefson 2002). Thus, the field of LPP has become increasingly concerned about the role of ideology and its interaction with political and economic motivations in LPP (Hornberger 2006; Hornberger and Johnson 2007; Ricento and Hornberger 1996; Tollefson 2002).

More recently, researchers have advocated investigating LPP from the bottom up (e.g., Canagarajah 2006; Hornberger 1996). They believe that “there is considerable policy formulation and institutionalization of linguistic practices at the other end of the policy spectrum – that is, local communities and contexts” (Canagarajah 2006, p. 154). Thus, researchers should study “life at the grass-roots level” to understand how language policies are formed there (Canagarajah 2006, p. 154). Although LPP has been a field for a few decades, most of its studies in the available literature are about domestic and national language policy and planning regarding endangered indigenous and/or small, less privileged languages in multilingual contexts (Hornberger 2006). Theoretical inquiry into foreign language policy is limited and much needed (Lambert 2001).

This chapter uses an integrated theoretical perspective that incorporates the approaches noted above to study both top-down and bottom-up initiatives and forces in forming CLF practices and policies and how these may interact but also compete with each other in the history of CFL development in China and the United States. Meanwhile, the chapter is structured and guided by Cooper’s (1989) descriptive LPP framework when examining the forces and factors in the two ends of the policy spectrum: “what actors attempt to influence what behaviors, of which people, for what ends, by what means, and with what results...under what conditions... through what decision-making process” (p. 97). This framework situates language education in the broader sociocultural and historical context and helps us attend to the various factors that impact CFL development in both countries.

This chapter seeks to trace and understand the historical development of CFL education in China and the United States. We start by describing the historical development of Chinese language education for non-Chinese natives within China. This section is followed by an overview of the historical development of CFL education in the United States, including its relationship to sinology. We then compare and contrast the development of Chinese language education between the two countries and identify important findings from such analyses. The chapter concludes with implications for continued development of CFL education in China, the U.S., and other nations that are taking interest in promoting CFL education to foreign language learners in their countries.

3 CFL Education in China

Researchers have different views about exactly when the Chinese language started its spread to other countries. In Western countries, CFL has been included in and closely interacted with sinology, “defined by Liam Brockey as the study of Chinese society based on Chinese sources” (Ringrose 2014, p. 161). Traditionally, sinologists were from countries other than China. Thus, the literature of sinology can provide not only rich information about the history of CFL, but also CFL resources and materials because many sinologists had to learn Chinese in order to study various aspects of Chinese society and its culture through the language (Zhang 2009).

Sinologists and other researchers tend to agree that China and the Chinese language began to be known to people from other countries at least 2,000 years ago. Greece is recognized as the first among the Western countries to have written records about China in three centuries B.C. or even earlier (Mo 2006). Meanwhile, the Chinese language was used for communication in and around China by people from other countries for business, political, and religious purposes in the early years of CFL (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009).

In the long history of CFL, it has contributed greatly to communication and understanding between China and other countries, which in turn has influenced the development of the Chinese language itself. In this chapter, the history of CFL in China is divided into three stages: (a) from ancient China to 1912; (b) from 1912 to 1949; and (c) from 1949 to present.

3.1 Stage One: CFL in Ancient China (Before 1912)

Recent research on CFL history indicates that Chinese characters first spread to ancient Korea even though no consensus has been reached on exactly when. Some scholars believe that the Chinese language began to be taught in ancient Korea around 1046 B.C. when the Zhou Dynasty was founded in China or even earlier (Dong 2002; Zhang 2000), and it was introduced to Vietnam and Japan around 221 B.C. and 284 A.D. respectively (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009). Within China, instruction of Chinese as a second/foreign language for people from other countries started around 103 B.C. or 285 A.D. (Zhang 2000, 2009), after the Silk Road was launched by Zhang Qian in the Han Dynasty (around 138 B.C.), which allowed other countries in the world, including Greece, to further get to know China and the Chinese language. CFL in China exhibited distinctive features in different dynasties due to various political, social, and cultural environments and policies across its long history.

3.1.1 Developing Period: From Zhou to Southern and Northern Dynasties (1046 B.C. to 589 A.D.)

CFL grew out of actual needs for communication and business and was not planned or supported by the imperial court system and its officials. People of Chinese descent migrated to other parts of East Asia and helped found kingdoms in ancient Korea and Vietnam. These kingdoms kept good relationships with ancient China and were proactive in learning Chinese by sending students to China.

Through the Silk Road, some Greek businessmen and scholars traveled to China, and they introduced ancient China to the West after they returned home. Under their influence, people from other Western countries also began to go to China (Mo 2006).

People from central Asia and the Middle East came to China for business, and they introduced Buddhism to China (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009). The Chinese dynasties were positive and supportive about such communication and interactions with other countries, so Buddhism began to spread in China. Therefore, CFL during this time was conducted mainly for three purposes – for business, political relationships, and religion, which all had a different influence on how CFL was conducted.

CFL for business happened spontaneously among businessmen, and CFL teaching thus was practical and for individual needs. Not much information can be found today on how CFL instruction was conducted for businessmen and which materials were used in CFL instruction, but one of the Persian dialects, Sogdian, might have served as the medium of instruction (Zhang 2009). According to Dong (2002), some East Asian countries, such as ancient Korea and Vietnam, had a long tradition of learning Chinese in their own countries. Sometimes some areas of ancient Korea and Vietnam were included in ancient Chinese borders and administered by Chinese governments. The ancient Korean and Vietnamese governments sent gifts and delegations to China and asked for CFL instructors from China. Some people from these countries came to China to learn the Chinese language.

However, research has not found evidence to suggest that CFL instruction for Korean, Japanese, and Vietnamese learners was administered by Chinese governments systematically during the long history of ancient China. Except in the Han Dynasty (around 66 A.D.) when a particular school was established as a reward by the Chinese government for the children of several international officials (Lu 1998), CFL instruction within China remained individualized and unsystematic. Very limited materials were designed for teaching CFL to these learners. Research shows that Confucian classics were used for CFL instruction for such learners. Some learners were able to achieve very high Chinese proficiency, which can be shown in their writings.

Religious purposes were dominant in CFL education during this period (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009). To introduce Buddhism to China, many monks living in countries to the west of China (especially India) came to learn Chinese, translate Buddhist scripts, and promote Buddhism in China. They were well treated and respected by the Chinese emperors and their court officials. X. Zhang (2009) commented that for these monks, learning Chinese and translating the Buddhist scripts were initially

individual acts. It was only towards the end of the fourth century that Chinese authorities began to support the translation of Buddhist scripts. During the South and North Dynasties (420 A.D.–589 A.D.), these religious activities reached their peak. Hundreds of Buddhist temples were built and thousands of Buddhist scripts were translated.

Little information is available in the literature about how these monks learned Chinese in China. Research shows that many Yuezhi (月氏) people in the northwest of China were bilinguals of Chinese and Yuezhi languages (Zhang 2009), but little literature can be found about how Yuezhi people learned Chinese. It is believed that the Indian monks learned Chinese through Yuezhi dialects and/or Sanskrit in the early days (Zhang 2009), but few records exist about the materials used for teaching CFL to these monks. Some researchers infer from other sources that Confucian and other classics and translated Chinese Buddhist scripts were used for CFL instruction (Zhang 2009). It is possible that CFL teaching was spontaneous and at the grass-roots level rather than planned and organized by the authorities.

A very important achievement for Chinese phonetics, *fanqie*, appeared during this period (from 202 B.C. to 220 A.D.) to describe Chinese pronunciation and help monks from other countries to learn CFL (Dong 2002). Created by ancient Chinese scholars influenced and enlightened by Indian languages during their interactions with monks, *fanqie* is a method to mark the pronunciation of a character by using two or more characters where each gives a part of the sound in the target character. This method has been highly regarded by Chinese linguists historically and even today (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009). Thus, *fanqie* not only facilitated CFL instruction during this period, but also contributed to the development of Chinese phonetics because much ancient work on Chinese phonetics was based on *fanqie* (Dong 2002). All of these led to the peak of CFL development in ancient China in the *Tang* dynasty.

3.1.2 Peak of CFL: From Sui to Song Dynasties (from 581 A.D. to 1279 A.D.)

From the Sui to Song Dynasties, CFL developed rapidly in all areas and reached its peak in ancient China during the Tang Dynasty. Scholars from several East Asian countries drew inspiration from the Chinese language when they were creating their own written languages and also contributed greatly to communication and cultural exchange between China and other countries. With its achievements in civilization, China attracted a large number of people from all over the world, including Western countries. In addition to business and diplomacy, people came to China to learn advanced technologies and all disciplines and to promote and/or learn Buddhism. The Chinese language served as a critical vehicle, and CFL played a pivotal role in all these economic, political, academic, and religious endeavors. During this period, official teaching of CFL became more systematic (Zhang 2009). However, CFL was mainly taught as a tool for learning other disciplines or for business, that is, it was content-based.

Despite its short existence, the Sui Dynasty (581 A.D.–618 A.D.) was involved in CFL, but mainly because of Buddhism. The Tang Dynasty (618 A.D.–907 A.D.) was one of the most prosperous and powerful dynasties in the history of China, making China one of the strongest countries in the world at the time, which attracted thousands of people from different countries, including some European and African countries, to visit China. These people admired the Tang's splendid civilization and lived in China for different periods of time to learn advanced science, culture, and language from Tang scholars. As a result, there was a great increase in terms of the numbers of CFL learners, including businessmen, monks, and more importantly, international students. Thus, in addition to serving the previous economic, political, and religious purposes of individuals, CFL education in the Tang dynasty was planned for cultural exchange and understanding and for facilitating international students' learning in the various disciplines they studied. CFL education was so successful and influential that many scholars often consider the Tang Dynasty the peak era of CFL in ancient China (e.g., Li 2008; Lu 1998; Zhang 2009). Although the Song Dynasty (960–1279) was not as strong and powerful as the Tang Dynasty, its achievements in many areas still attracted people from other countries to learn the Chinese language for different purposes. The Song government was also actively involved in CFL.

It was in the Tang Dynasty that the Chinese government started to develop a system for CFL instruction for international students, which included CFL curriculum, materials, standards, and evaluations. The Tang government received a large number of international students from various countries, such as ancient Japan, all three kingdoms in Korea, India, Vietnam, Sri Lanka, Cambodia, and Burma (Zhang 2009). The Chinese government administered tests for these students, and Chinese proficiency was one of the very important indicators. After passing the tests and being approved by the Chinese imperial court system, the international students were admitted to study different disciplines, including the Chinese language in *Guozijian* (国子监, the national higher education institute in ancient China) and were administered by *Honglusi* (鸿胪寺) (Zhang 2009). CFL teachers used the Chinese classics in their teaching instead of differentiating teaching materials for native and non-native Chinese speakers.

These students stayed for their studies in China for either long or short terms, and their costs were covered by the Chinese government. Research has found that Chinese classical works were used for CFL instruction. If students had difficulties, the institution also provided extra instruction and/or tutoring for them. Some international students made very impressive achievements in terms of Chinese proficiency – they were able to use Chinese to write essays and poems (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009). The international students could choose to take exams that were designed for Chinese students, and if successful, they were selected to work as imperial court officials. Many of them also went back to their own countries after they completed their studies in China. Their learning in China greatly contributed to the development of their own countries and their languages. For example, Korean and Japanese scholars developed their written languages by incorporating Chinese characters and other linguistic elements into their existing languages after they went back to their countries from China (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009).

In the Song Dynasty, there were government schools that taught CFL to international students, but the students were different from those in the Tang Dynasty. The Song Dynasty was engaged in business activities with about 60 countries through marine transportation, so ports in the southeast coastal areas hosted large communities of international businessmen. The Song government built schools for these businessmen's children to study foreign languages and Chinese language and culture (Zhang 2009), but not much literature can be found about the curriculum and textbooks used in such schools. The Song government also had a good relationship with Tibetan rulers, so it had particular schools for the Tibetan nobles' children. The literature indicates that Chinese teachers used the same books in these schools as those used in the national institute of higher education (国子监) for native Chinese speakers.

Buddhism continued to play an important role in CFL in the Sui and Tang dynasties, but its significance for CFL greatly declined in the Song Dynasty (Dong 2002). The Sui government encouraged Buddhism, attracting international monks, especially Indian monks, to China. These monks learned CFL and translated Buddhist scripts. During the Sui Dynasty, Japan started sending delegates and monks to China to learn CFL and Buddhism (Dong 2002). The role of CFL for religious purposes was further elevated in the Tang Dynasty. In addition to being taught to the Buddhist monks from India and some other Central Asian countries to enable them to translate Buddhist scripts or literature into Chinese, CFL was also taught to a large number of monks from Korea and Japan who came to China to learn Buddhism. The monks from India and other central Asian countries who came to China to learn Chinese came more on an individual basis, whereas Korean and Japanese monks were usually sent by their governments (Dong 2002). They studied Chinese and Chinese philosophies and translated Buddhist scripts in Buddhist temples. However, not much literature can be found regarding CFL curriculum and materials for the monks during this period.

Research indicates that both the quality and quantity of translated Buddhist scripts were greatly improved during the Tang Dynasty (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009). Korean and Japanese monks returned from China and introduced Buddhism to their own countries. Several of them even developed Buddhism to fit the unique social and cultural contexts in their own countries or created new branches of Buddhism (Zhang 2009). However, in the Song Dynasty, only a small number of international monks came to China, so the importance of CFL for religious endeavors decreased dramatically (Dong 2002).

It is worth noting that Christianity began to spread into China during the Tang Dynasty (Dong 2002; Mo 2006), which is recorded on a monument in Chinese by a Persian priest in 781 A.D. According to the monument, Christianity was approved by the Chinese emperor in the early Tang dynasty to develop in China. It is evident that the priests then used Chinese to promote Christianity in China, but no literature can be found about how they learned Chinese (Dong 2002). Although Christianity did not grow as significantly as Buddhism in the Tang Dynasty and the following Song Dynasty, the stories about its existence and development in China became known to the West and attracted many Western people, including Marco Polo, to

China (Mo 2006), which facilitated development of both sinology and CFL in Western countries.

Comparatively speaking, there are not many records on CFL for business purposes from the Sui to the Song Dynasties, nor are they as detailed as CFL for international students and monks. Although it is recognized that CFL for economic purposes occurred for both official and personal business, it was only lightly touched upon, if at all, in the literature related to the history of CFL (e.g., Zhang 2009).

3.1.3 Declining and Interacting with the West (from 1271 to 1912)

From the Yuan Dynasty (1271–1368) to the end of the Qing Dynasty, also known as China's last dynasty, CFL experienced a considerable decline due to the tumultuous political, social, and religious climate in China during the period. It nearly came to a halt before the Opium Wars erupted in the middle of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, CFL made some small gains and started to enter the scene of foreign language education in Western countries, including Spain, Portugal, England, and the United States.

The Yuan Empire (1271 A.D.–1368 A.D.) had the biggest territory claim in Chinese history, so there were a large number of ethnic groups within its borders. Meanwhile, the Yuan Empire was proactive in building diplomatic relationships with other countries in the world. All of these factors necessitated second language education, so both Mongolian and Chinese schools were built for people of all ethnic groups, including those from other countries (Zhang 2009). Thus, a bilingual language policy was implemented during the Yuan Dynasty, and CFL's importance actually decreased. CFL did not regain its prestige in the following Ming Dynasty (1368 A.D.–1644 A.D.). Although the first few Ming emperors resumed the practice of accepting Korean students to study in China, the number of students decreased greatly, compared to that of the previous dynasties. In the middle of the Ming Dynasty, the emperor even declined the Korean government's request to continue sending students to China (Dong 2002). Additionally, little literature has been found that indicates the Ming government accepted international students from other countries and/or had specific schools/instruction for international students.

Situations regarding CFL education did not improve much during the Qing Dynasty (1644 A.D.–1912 A.D.). Except for a few students from Korea, the Qing government did not seem to have accepted many international students to study in China. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, some Korean students also came to China to study for military purposes, but the number was not large. Thus, official influence on CFL education greatly decreased from the thirteenth to nineteenth centuries in China.

CFL for religious purposes continued from the Yuan to the Qing dynasties, but focused religious efforts began to shift to Christianity instead of Buddhism, which ultimately helped modern CFL to develop in China and spread around the world. When the Yuan Dynasty's Mongolian founders were fighting in Europe, the Pope sent his delegates to communicate with the Mongolian royals and nobles and

impressed them well, which laid a good foundation for re-starting and developing Christianity in China (Dong 2002; Mo 2006). After the Yuan Empire was established, rulers kept good relationships with the European Catholic Church (Dong 2002; Mo 2006; Zhang 2009), so missionaries and priests came to China, and Christianity began to take root in the Chinese context. However, Christianity and the conduct of its missionaries in China were in conflict with traditional Chinese ideologies and rituals, so Christian activities were discouraged by Ming emperors and officials (Mo 2006). In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries during the Qing Dynasty, the Roman Catholic Church and the Pope interfered and tried to prioritize Christianity over Chinese ideologies and traditions, but they were resisted by the Qing emperors, and Christian religious activities were banned in the Qing Dynasty before the start of the Opium Wars in the middle of the nineteenth century (Dong 2002; Mo 2006; Zhang 2009). After the Opium Wars, a large number of Christian missionaries from Western countries arrived in China, and Christianity spread quickly in China. As a result, interest in learning CFL among Westerners resumed again.

Persistent missionary work in China during this period not only helped Western countries to know China and the Chinese language but also led to great achievements in sinology and Chinese linguistics and thus made great contributions to modern CFL in Western countries and in China. Michel Ruggieri and Mattheus Ricci are well known Jesuit missionaries who came to China in 1579 and 1582 respectively. Different from other missionaries, they made efforts to learn the Chinese language and follow Chinese traditions, so they were allowed to conduct their missionary work in Macau and some areas in Guangdong province. In 1584 they collaborated and compiled the first Portuguese to Chinese dictionary. More importantly Mattheus Ricci began to use Roman letters to mark the pronunciation of Chinese characters, which laid the foundation for modern day Chinese Hanyu Pinyin (a.k.a., Pinyin) to develop in the 1950s (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009). Later they set up schools in Macau to teach missionaries Chinese language and culture and prepare them for conducting missionary work in China. In these schools learning the Chinese language was required, and Mattheus Ricci's Romanized Pinyin system greatly facilitated the missionaries' learning of Chinese.

From then on, more and more missionaries in China learned and studied Chinese language and culture. They continued their study after they went back to their own countries and introduced China and Chinese language and culture to the Western world, so sinology came into being in the nineteenth century (Mo 2006). The missionaries in China in the nineteenth century also started using punctuation marks for the Chinese language and made important contributions to the linguistic development of the language. The missionaries took some Chinese Christians with them when they returned home, and those Chinese became the early Chinese language teachers in Western countries (Dong 2002; Zhang 2009).

Moreover, many dictionaries that translate Chinese into other languages were compiled by missionaries who spoke different languages. In addition, Western scholars started their study of Chinese grammar in the nineteenth century, which has

greatly influenced modern Chinese linguistics. For example, two well-known sinologists in France and Britain, Abel Rémusat and Robert Morrison, published works on Chinese grammar and started sinology in the two countries (Mo 2006). All of these contributed to the development of sinology in Western countries in the nineteenth century, which also paved the way for CFL education in those countries. Thus, from the very beginning, sinology and CFL in Western countries have been integrated and facilitated each other's development (Zhang 2009).

3.2 Stage Two: CFL in the Republic of China (1912–1949)

During this period, there were many wars in China, including wars against Japanese occupation during World War II and numerous civil wars. China's economy was greatly affected. Thus, only a small number of students came to China to study Chinese (Ma 2013; Zhang 2009). Not much literature is available about CFL during this period, but the limited amount of related literature suggests CFL teaching was still conducted for various purposes.

Ma (2013) mentioned that Chinese was taught to international undergraduate and graduate students at Yenching University (the predecessor of Peking/Beijing University) in China, but the number was small, only 12 students in all. However, CFL seemed to be systematically taught at Yenching University at that time, with a language curriculum, textbooks, pedagogy, and instructors. For example, one instructor, Tianmin Wu, mentioned in an interview that she paid attention to both writing and speaking in her teaching instead of the traditional focus on either speaking or writing. Ancient academic Chinese and the Chinese classics were taught to graduate students. She published an article on how to teach Chinese vocabulary to international students, which is the first published article on CFL that can be found in contemporary China (Ma 2013). However, not much literature has been found about whether CFL was taught in K-12 settings in general education during this period.

Religion still played an important role in CFL during this period. To teach Chinese to missionaries who were new to China, a school was set up in Beijing in 1910, North China Xiehe Language Institute (Zhang 2009). The school also accepted students who learned Chinese for diplomatic, business, and other purposes. By 1925 when the school joined Yenching University and became the Yenching School of Chinese Studies, the school had around 100 instructors and 1,621 graduates, who were mostly Westerners (Zhang 2009). According to X. Zhang (2009), the school had a systematic curriculum, which looks similar to a current CFL curriculum at a U.S. college. The instructors developed their own Chinese textbooks and used the direct method to teach students the four Chinese language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The students also took elective courses in religion, Chinese history, culture, etc., depending on their needs and learning goals. It took students 4 to 5 years to complete their studies at the school.