

JOURNAL

of the

CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Volume 36 : 3

October 2001

多



中文
教師
學會
學報

Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association

Volume 36:3, October 2001

Articles

	Page
An Interview with Gao Xingjian 高行健 <i>Shih Chungwen 时钟雯, The George Washington University</i>	1
漢英詞兼類比較 <i>鄒溱 Zhen Zou, University of Minnesota</i>	11
Report on the 2000 CLTA Articulation Project <i>Chuanren Ke, Xiaohong Wen, Claire Kottenbeutel</i>	25
What Chinese and Americans Like to Hear? <i>Janet Zhiquan Xing, Western Washington University</i>	61
e 世代的中文教師如何面臨挑戰 <i>謝天蔚 Tianwei Xie, California State University, Long Beach</i>	75
Pedagogical Issues Raised and Discussed in <i>The Chinese Repository</i> <i>Der-lin Chao, Hunter College</i>	81

Reviews

<i>Chinese the Easy Way</i> . Philip F. C. Williams and Yenna Wu <i>Xiaohong Wen, University of Houston</i>	109
<i>All Things Considered: Advanced Reader of Modern Chinese</i> Chou Chih-p'ing, Xia Yan, Goh Meow Hui <i>Michael E. Everson, The University of Iowa</i>	113

JCLTA Style Sheet

Report on the 2000 CLTA Articulation Project

Chuanren Ke, University of Iowa
Xiaohong Wen, University of Houston
Claire Kottenbeutel, James Madison Memorial High School

Introduction

Articulation in foreign language education is defined as the “well motivated and well designed sequencing and coordination of instruction toward certain goals” (Byrnes, 1990). The issue of articulation has attracted the attention of many foreign language educators for more than two decades (Lange, 1982; Byrnes, 1995; Kramsch, 1995; Brown, 1995; Newsletter of National Association of Secondary School Principals 2000; and et al). It has also received increased attention in the field of Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) (Chi, 1999; Ke, 1995; Kottenbeutel, 1999; McGinnis, 1994, 1999; Moor, et al 1992; Kubler, et al. 1997; Wang, 1999; and et al). There is general agreement among CFL educators that lack of articulation among different instructional levels and among different schooling levels, particularly between college and pre-college, contributes to a large-scale attrition in enrollments. As enrollments for Chinese as a foreign language have been increased steadily in recent years (Brod and Welles, 2000) and as more than half of the CFL learners are now in pre-college programs¹, given the time-consuming nature of CFL learning to achieve working and professional level proficiency (Liskin-Gasparro, 1982), the issue of articulation has become even more important for Chinese language study as it transforms itself into an emerging field in entering the 21st century. It is against this backdrop that the 1999-2000 CLTA Board of Directors launched this articulation project.

The purpose of this articulation project was to conduct a survey eliciting comments from Chinese language teachers in both the college and pre-college programs

¹ This estimate is based upon the following sources: (1) the annual reports in the Secondary School Chinese Language Center Newsletter (for the 1998-99 academic year, 19,852 in K-12), (2) the figure of 82,675 (as of 1995) in NCACLS, Taiwan-associated Chinese heritage schools (Chao, 1996); and (3) the figure of enrollments “exceed[ing] 20,000” reported for the CSAUS, mainland China-associated Chinese heritage schools, in the program from their third annual conference (CSAUS, 1999, p. 9). Allowing for undeniable increases over the past several years, it is safe to say that as of this fall, there is at least 21,000 in K-12 and 140,000 in heritage schools, versus the 28,000+ that MLA reported for the fall of 1998.

on some articulation issues. Specifically, we wanted to obtain data on the perceived areas of strengths and weaknesses from the perspectives of our college and pre-college teachers for those students who have taken Chinese at pre-college programs and on the perceived curriculum areas that adjustment need to be made in both the college and pre-college programs. Although articulation projects tend to be more successful when conducted at the local level (Birckbichler, 1995; Jackson and Masters-Wicks, 1995; Metcalf, 1995; and et al), information collected at the national level can serve as useful guidelines for our local/regional articulation efforts and for our overall field building.

For the purpose of collecting data on the Chinese teachers' perceptions on articulation issues, we designed a questionnaire consisting of 10 questions that involve both quantitative and qualitative responses. (See appendix 1 for the questionnaire.) In the early spring of 2000, copies of the questionnaire were sent to all members of CLTA, CLASS (Chinese Language Association for Elementary and Secondary Schools), and SSCLC (Secondary School Chinese Language Center in Princeton University). Copies of the questionnaire were also sent to members of two Chinese heritage school associations: CSAUS (Chinese School Association in the United States) and NCACLS (National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools). In total, about 700 copies of the questionnaire were sent out for this project. 122 teachers from different schooling levels responded to the questionnaire. The responses were of high quality.

In the following sections, we will summarize the responses and provide our analysis of them. At the end of the report, we will submit our recommendations based on the major findings of the survey.

I. Profiles of respondents

Table 1. Profiles of Respondents

Level of Schooling	Number of Respondents	Average Years in Teaching the Target Courses
Colleges & Universities	51	10.3
Pre-college Schools	49	7.9
Heritage Chinese Schools	22	5.7
Total	122	

II. Textbooks and course objectives and programs goals

2.1. Textbooks

There are about a dozen textbooks used by the respondents at the different instructional levels. Table 2.1. lists the top three most-used textbooks by the respondents and by instructional levels. It should be mentioned that there are more teachers in pre-college programs mentioning the use of self-developed instructional materials (n = 12) than their counterparts in colleges (n = 5).

Table 2.1. *Top-3 Textbooks Used by Respondents and by Instructional Levels*

Instructional Level	The top 3 textbooks used by the respondents
College and University	1. Integrated Chinese by Yao et al (16) 2. Practical Chinese Reader by Liu et al (12) 3. Beginning Chinese by DeFrancis (5)
Pre-college Schools	1. Hanyu Series by .. (12) 2. Integrated Chinese by Yao and Liu ... (6) 3. Chinese Primer by Chen et al (5)
Heritage Schools	1. Mandarin Chinese 華語 by Ye Teh-Ming (7) 2. Standard Chinese 標準中文 by 北京大學 (4) 3. Chinese 漢語 by 暨南大學 (3)

Textbooks directly serve curriculum goals and course objectives. The most important curriculum goals and course objectives perceived by Chinese teachers at the college level include training students in the four language skills, and the ability to communicate in linguistically and socially appropriate ways as presented in Table 2.2.

2.2. Course objectives and Curriculum Goals

There seems to be confusion among many teachers on the difference between program goals and course objectives. These respondents consider program goals and course objectives similar or even identical. This may suggest that the Chinese programs where the respondents teach are frequently small in size. For the purpose of summarizing curricula features, we combined the responses for both the course objectives and program goals. Table 2.2. lists the six most frequently mentioned curricula features by instructional levels.

Table 2.2. Summarized Curricula Highlights and Direct Quotes from Respondents

Schooling Level	Commonly mentioned Goals & Objectives.	Examples (Direct Quotes)
College and university	1. Four skills 30 2. Communication 22 3. Character 21 4. Appreciation in Culture 16 5. Structure 15 6. Read and writing 11	1. Enhance intermediate level proficiency in the four language skills. 2. To obtain proficiency of basic social interaction in Chinese. 3. Active Control of Characters 4. Acquire appreciation of relationship b/t language and Culture. 5. Understand the basic grammar concept. 6. To read as much as what the textbooks provide and to write simple notes, letter & essays.
Pre-college schools	1. Interest in Chinese culture 22 2. Four skills 20 3. Daily communication 17 4. Character 16 5. Read and write 8 Grammar	1. Appreciate Chinese culture through cultural activities in class and club. 2. Master the learning skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing, with emphasis on listening and speaking at first, followed by reading and writing. 3. To use Chinese in a Chinese environment 4. Learn 400+ characters. 5. Be able to read and write using these characters in sentences and short paragraph. 6. Basic grammar, sentence structures (making sentences and simple composition).
Heritage Chinese schools	1. Knowing the culture 12 2. Reading/writing 7 3. Four skills 6 4. Daily Chinese 6	1. To understand what Chinese and Culture are. 2. Improve student's reading and writing abilities. 3. 应用中文於听、说、读、写

5. Three skills (w/t listening) 3	4. To be able to communicate in simple daily Chinese.
6. Morals 2	5. To teach how to speak, read, and write Chinese.
	6. 实践静思语的涵义

Curriculum goals and objectives are based on student's needs and interests and on what the administrators and instructors consider as essential at a particular stage of the students' learning. The data in this study reveal that the needs of students at different instructional levels vary considerably. Therefore, the priorities perceived by teachers of different instructional levels differ accordingly.

Respondents at the college level consider the goal of understanding Chinese culture less urgent than acquisition of four language skills and communicative strategies. Curriculum design and instruction at the college level emphasize skills to communicate in real life situations. For the pre-college respondents, interest in Chinese culture, four skills' development, and daily communication are marked as the top three priorities respectively. As for the heritage schools, acquiring knowledge of Chinese culture is predominately considered the top priority among their curriculum goals and course objectives. In addition, for most heritage schools, the skills of reading and writing are more emphasized than those of listening and speaking.

III. Students' strengths and challenges

3.1. Students' Strengths

Table 3. 1. Shows the results on Question 4 that asks the pre-college and heritage school respondents to identify the strengths of their graduating students and asks the college respondents to identify the strengths of their incoming students who have studied Chinese in pre-college programs before entering the college programs.

Table 3.1. Percentage of Responses on Students' Strengths Before Entering College

	GR	LS	PR	RD	SP	CH	CP	CUL	PER
Colle	0	50	40	20	30	0	0	70	50
Preco	53	74	49	63	77	58	28	70	58
Herit	35	90	60	65	85	45	25	70	40
Avrg	41	75	51	58	73	47	23	70	52

GR = grammar

LS = listening

PR = pronunciation

RD = reading

SP = speaking

CH = character writing

CP = composition

CUL = culture

PER = persistence in learning Chinese

From Table 3.1., one can see that more teachers believe listening (75%), speaking (73%), and culture (70%) are students' strong areas. However, when we look at the data closely, we found fewer teachers in college checked speaking, grammar, reading, and character as incoming students' area of strength than their colleagues in pre-college and heritage programs. Difference also exists in students' listening ability.

Different priorities in curriculum goals and course objectives yield different learning results. When evaluating students' strengths, respondents across all levels agreed that students who graduated from pre-college schools and entered college programs possessed the strength of understanding Chinese culture. The rating percentage on students' knowledge of Chinese culture, a consistent 70% across all instructional levels, is considerably high. The consensus on the strength of pre-college graduating students suggests that pre-college programs are successful in reaching their top curriculum goal of helping students understand Chinese culture.

A discrepancy between the respondents of different instructional levels exists in the areas of the standards and student performance on grammar, reading, speaking, and character writing. Big discrepancies are in the areas of grammar and character writing. None of the respondents from college setting considered the areas of grammar and character a strength of incoming students from pre-college schools. Fifty-three percent of the respondents from pre-college and 58% of the respondents from heritage schools considered grammar and characters a strength of their graduating students. These discrepancies reveal a difference in standards of different instructional settings. Curriculum goals and course objectives, and criteria of evaluating students' performance seem to differ considerably between the college and pre-college settings.

3.2. Students' Challenges

Table 3.2. presents the results on Question 5 asking the respondents to identify the most difficult challenges for students who are taking or have taken Chinese at the pre-college level.

Table 3.2. Percentage of Responses on Question 5

	GR	LS	PR	RD	SP	CH	CP	CUL	PER
Colleg	48	33	46	26	37	70	39	09	24
Preco	34	18	30	25	14	59	48	11	14
Herit	36	0	14	32	09	68	59	09	45
Avg	40	21	33	27	22	65	46	10	24

GR = grammar LS = listening PR = pronunciation RD = reading
SP = speaking CH = character writing CP = composition CUL = culture
PER = persistence in learning Chinese

As it is shown the top three most-checked areas of students' most difficult challenges are Chinese characters (65%), composition (46%), and grammar (40%). In other words, the data suggest that writing is the most challenging skill among the four Chinese language skills. Writing is difficult because the process requires several tasks such as memorization and production of characters, writing skill for communication, and application of grammar. It should be noted that there are acute differences in the number of checks in the areas of speaking, listening, and pronunciation among respondents from differing schooling levels. It should also be mentioned that for the heritage Chinese schools, "persistence" is the number three most challenged area.

The most challenging areas for students, however, may not necessarily be their weaker areas. More than half of the pre-college respondents considered the areas of character writing and grammar to be strengths of their graduating students. They also believed, however, that their students' strengths and challenges were not mutually exclusive. For example, 59% of pre-college respondents considered that writing characters was challenging to their students and 58% thought it was their strength. Students were able to excel in certain areas such as character writing and grammar even though these areas were perceived as challenging.

There seems to be discrepancies in the perceived challenges of listening and speaking among college and pre-college respondents: 33% and 37% by college teachers, 18% and 14% by pre-college teachers, and 0% and 9% by heritage school teachers respectively. One possible explanation for the fact that college teachers perceive listening and speaking skills as more challenging for the students than pre-college teachers perceive may be due to the different standards for assessing these skills.

IV. Communication for articulation purpose among teachers of different instructional levels

Table 4.1. indicates the response to Question 6 that asks the respondents whether they maintain regular contact with their pre-college/college colleagues for coordinated continuity of different schooling levels.

Table 4.1. Percentage of Respondents Who Maintain Regular Contact with Colleagues for Articulation Purpose

College	33%
Precollege	61%
Heritage School	25%
Average	42%

On average forty-two percent of the respondents had regular contact with their colleagues in the other level of schooling for articulation purpose. Breaking down by instructional levels, 33% of college respondents had regular contact with their colleagues at the pre-college level whereas 61% of pre-college respondents kept contact with their colleagues at the college level. It is interesting to find that nearly 50% more pre-college teachers had regular contact with teachers in colleges than their counterparts in colleges in communication with pre-college teachers. A close examination of the comments made by college respondents revealed three reasons why two thirds of college respondents did not have regular contact with their colleagues at the pre-college level. Eight college respondents (16% of the total college respondents) stated that there were no Chinese programs available in their local area. Four stated that time constraint was the difficulty. Three teachers mentioned that lack of mechanisms such as conferences and workshops accounted for the absence of contact. The college respondents who had regular contact with their colleagues at the pre-college level reported that they contacted their colleagues through conferences, workshops, and/or through personal communication. Therefore, the data suggest that mechanisms such as conferences and workshops play an important role in promoting communications among teachers of different instructional levels.

V. Teachers' perception on placement results

Table 5.1. shows the results for Question 7 and Question 8. Question 7 asks the respondents if they think that their students are placed appropriately in their high school/college programs based on their achievement in Chinese learning. Question 8 asks the respondents to judge from the student's perspective whether their placement expectations are met.

The majority of the respondents (75%) believed that their students were placed appropriately in their high school/college programs based on their achievement in Chinese learning. However, when the respondents were asked to judge from the student's perspective whether their student's placement expectations were met, 92% of

*Table 5.1. Percentage of Positive Response on Question 7 and 8
from the Teachers' and Students' Perspectives*

	Teachers' Perspectives Question 7	Students' Perspective Question 8
College	75%	92%
Pre-college	77%	79%
Heritage Schools	60%	90%
Average	75%	86%

the college respondents chose the “yes” answer. One recurring qualitative comment for Questions 7 and 8 seems to provide some answer to this discrepancy. Many students who have had substantial Chinese language background before entering the college Chinese programs liked to be placed at a lower level because they wanted to get good grades. The following quote from one of the respondents seems to represent this sentiment. “If they are real beginners, they are in the right class. If they are false beginners, they should not be in my first year class! Students pretend!”

VI: Adjustment

Table 6.1. shows the results of Question 9 which asks the respondents their opinions on what adjustment they would like their colleagues in the pre-college or college programs to make in the areas of standards/-curriculum, materials, classroom methodology, assessment/placement.

Table 6.1. Percentage of Teachers Who Checked Each of the Four Listed Curriculum Areas for Adjustments for Articulation Purpose

	ST/CU	MAT	METH	ASSE	OTHE
Colle	71	47	56	43	20
Preco	67	76	61	48	18
Herit	92	69	62	31	23
Avrg	73	60	58	43	20

ST/CU = standards/curriculum, MAT = materials, METH = classroom methodology.
ASSE = assessment/placement, OTHE = others

In general, the respondents from all schooling levels feel that adjustment in the four listed areas, namely standards/curriculum, materials, classroom methodology, and assessment, need to be made for greater articulation between different schooling

levels. In addition, many respondents also provided qualitative comments on the kind of adjustment that need to be made for each of these curriculum areas. The qualitative responses for this question are summarized in Table 6.2.

Table 6.1 shows that 71% of the college respondents, 67% of pre-college respondents, and 92% of heritage school respondents considered program goals and curriculum standards the top areas of focus in adjustment. Qualitative comments, as shown in Table 6.2., from respondents of all instructional levels, also reveal the urgent need to implement instructional standards that are academically vigorous, broad, and consistent across all school settings.

Another area that was perceived to be in urgent need of adjustment for greater articulation is the development of instructional materials. Sixty percent (60%) of the respondents of all instructional levels considered that more varied teaching materials were needed to serve different needs of students and varied purposes of curriculum and instruction. These needs include a variety of textbooks for teachers to choose from, supplementary materials that are incorporated into the curriculum, ample exercises for students, learner specific textbooks, and authentic materials that incorporate Chinese culture as well as local American life into the textbook. It should be mentioned that while there seems to be no big discrepancy among respondents from differing schooling levels in considering the importance of making adjustment in the areas of standards and curriculum, classroom methodology, and assessment, there seems to be a difference in the response regarding the area of instructional materials among the respondents from differing schooling levels. The pre-college and heritage school teachers feel more strongly about adjustment in the areas of teaching materials than their counterparts in colleges and universities. This indication that instructional materials for pre-college and heritage schools are even more limited than for colleges is reinforced in the responses on Question 10 regarding articulation priority.

One most consistently perceived need for adjustment is in the area of classroom methodology, although this area is not as urgent as the areas of standards and instructional material development. As Table 6.1 shows, respondents of all the levels agreed that teachers need the introduction of new teaching methodologies. A variety of teaching techniques and methods should be used to accommodate different learning styles.

Table 6.2. Summarized Qualitative Comments on Question 9

College and University	Precollege	Heritage Schools
<p><i>Standard/curriculum</i></p> <p>a. Standard-based curriculum for both precollege and college programs. (8) “I hope CLTA can give us some guidelines.”</p> <p>b. Higher standards . (6) “I found many of the Chinese (ethnic) teachers very lenient.”</p> <p>c. Produce Chinese users not Chinese scholars. (4) “Go easy on writing.”</p>	<p><i>Standard/curriculum</i></p> <p>a. Use a common standards (9) “I like to see a general standard for the whole nation if possible. Resolve the problem of simplified and traditional character conflicting.”</p> <p>b. Segregation of learners (3) “Need to have honors class, and AP course.”</p> <p>c. Teach age appropriate topics (1)</p> <p>d. Encourage learners to read. (1)</p>	<p><i>Standard/curriculum</i></p> <p>a. Connecting with other levels (3) “Let our teachers know college and high school teaching content.”</p> <p>b. Standard-based curriculum (2) “We need to have a standard curriculum for teaching Chinese in community language schools.”</p>
<p><i>Teaching materials</i></p> <p>a. Variety of materials (5) “ More teaching materials for different teachers and schools to chose from.”</p> <p>b. Supplementary materials (3) “More attention be paid on class activities and exercises (materials).”</p> <p>c. Learner specific text books. (2) “I wish there are materials</p>	<p><i>Teaching materials</i></p> <p>a. More practice materials including videos. (7) “We need some videos appropriate for language learners.”</p> <p>b. Population Related materials (7) “Like to see more materials designed to the American society or local life.”</p> <p>c. More uniform materials (3)</p>	<p><i>Teaching materials</i></p> <p>a. Culture related materials (4)</p> <p>b. More practice materials including videos (2)</p> <p>c. Bilingual textbooks (1)</p>

<p>developed for 6 years of pre-college studies.”</p> <p>d. Authentic text books. (2) “It (textbooks) contains some dated content or Chinese culture and traditions.”</p>	<p>“Create better uniform materials across the U.S. Publish a list of the most commonly used textbooks, so that at least we can prepare out students.”</p>	
<p><i>Classroom methodology</i></p> <p>a. Classroom for language in use (12) “Chinese teachers stop talking too much. Incorporate more performance/proficiency-based instruction.”</p> <p>b. More focus on reading over writing. (1)</p> <p>c. More homework (1)</p>	<p><i>Classroom methodology</i></p> <p>a. Use variety of methods (6) “Because of learning styles, different methods work on different students.”</p> <p>b. Activity oriented teaching (5) “Culture based activities surrounded the topic.”</p> <p>c. Pay attention to learner’s psychology (4) “Have fun and don’t be so uptight.”</p> <p>d. Better training in methods (3) “...must have FL methods courses designed for them...”</p>	<p><i>Classroom methodology</i></p> <p>a. Use variety of methods (3)</p> <p>b. Uniform Chinese phonetic system (1)</p> <p>c. Separate heritage learners from true beginners (1)</p>
<p><i>Assessment/placement</i></p> <p>a. Use standards based tests. (3) “Mandatory placement mechanisms. A unified standard of assessment.”</p> <p>b. Use variety of tests (4)</p>	<p><i>Assessment/Placement</i></p> <p>a. Use standards based assessment (5) “Use citywide assessment guides. Evaluate four language skills.”</p> <p>b. Use variety of tests (3)</p>	<p><i>Assessment/Placement</i></p> <p>a. Use standardized tests (2)</p>

<p>“(Use) constant quizzes. Assessment places too much emphasis on written proficiency. Use more performance-based tests.”</p>	<p>“Formative and summative assessment for each semester. Student’s learning portfolios.”</p> <p>c. Communication cross levels. (3) “Keep secondary schools posted regarding how our students placed.”</p>	
--	--	--

VII: Articulation priority

Question 10 presents 10 elements of the articulation process and asks the respondents to rank them in the order of immediate need. Respondents are also asked to provide qualitative comments on their justification for their selected rank order for the provided list. The quantitative results are summarized in Tables 7.1. and 7. 2. A category summary of the qualitative comments is presented in Table 7.3 with direct quotes for each of the category presented in section 7.4.

Table 7.1. Rank Order for Articulation Priority by Combined Groups

Rank Order	Average Rating	Crucial Elements of the Articulation Process.
1.	3.6	Curriculum development
2.	4.1	Material development
3.	4.4	Standards development
4.	4.6	Agreement on the learning goals of the entire program
5.	4.9	Teacher development
6.	5.4	Consensus on learning outcomes for each year of the program
7.	5.5	Instruction that respects diverse interest, learning style, & learning strategies
8.	7.2	Outcomes assessment
9.	7.6	Better placement procedure for incoming students
10.	7.7	Technology

Small values indicate priority in ranking

This rank order is consistent with the result for Question 9, where the top two areas that teachers wanted adjustment are standards/curriculum and materials. In addition, from the qualitative comments for this question one can see a common trend: focuses on the standards and curriculum, teacher development, and teaching materials. However, respondents at different levels varied in rank ordering of the above areas. The data stratified by levels reveal more information. For example teachers in college viewed outcomes assessment more important than pre-college teachers did. The rank order for assessment by the Chinese heritage school respondents was even lower. Also, teacher development received more attention by both college and pre-college teachers than by the heritage school teachers. On the other hand, heritage school teachers placed more attention on the need of appropriate teaching materials.

Table 7.2. Summary of Quantitative Data by Level of Schooling for Question 10
(The lower the number, the higher it is rank ordered.)

	SDN	CUR	AGRE	CONS	PLAC	MAT	DIVER	OUT	TEAC	TECH
Colle	4.73	3.65	4.73	5.11	7.41	4.57	5.30	6.65	5.03	7.24
Preco	4.18	3.53	4.68	5.56	7.74	3.95	5.58	7.28	5.23	8.36
Herit	4.08	3.85	4.15	6.00	7.38	3.54	5.92	8.62	3.85	7.42
Avrg	4.4	3.6	4.6	5.4	7.6	4.1	5.5	7.2	4.9	7.7

SDN = standards development

CUR = curriculum development

AGRE = agreement on the learning goals of the entire program

CONS = consensus on learning outcomes for each year of the program

PLAC = better placement procedure for incoming students

MAT = material development

DIVER = instruction that respects diverse interest, learning style, & learning strategies.

OUT = outcomes assessment

TEAC = teacher development

TECH = technology

In summarizing the qualitative comments on Question 10, we found several recurring areas of emphasis. Table 7.3. is a summary of the recurring categories from the discursive comments on Question 10 with representative direct quotes for each category presented in section 7.4. Respondents all stated that standards and guidelines for Chinese program development and curriculum design were the top priority for articulation, as one respondent suggested “curriculum development is neglected and each instructor does what he/she feels important. We cannot unify the curriculum but do need some guidelines to develop one that works best.”

Another priority is instructional material development. This priority also corresponds to the adjustment need of teaching materials on Question 9 as presented in Table 6.1. The qualitative comments suggest that, although several Chinese text-

books are presently available, they are generally limited in both quantity and quality, as one college respondent pointed out, “appropriate text books are hard to find. There are problems with text grammar explanations.” Comments from respondents reveal that weakness of teaching materials is due to several factors. For one thing, standards are absent in our field and thus, curriculum development is unguided. For another, teachers frequently do not have good judgment on learning materials, as one college respondent stated, “I think high schools use a standard textbook, articulation is not a major problem. The only real placement problem I encounter is when high school teachers use their own material as the primary textbook. The students of these teachers tend to have very weak background.”

Both qualitative and quantitative data, especially from college teachers, show that teacher development is the immediate priority next to standards on curriculum development. As one respondent pointed out, successful implementation of the program largely relies on the performance of teachers: “without good work from the teacher, no matter how good the standards and curriculum are, there will not be effective learning.” Still another urgent priority perceived especially by college teachers is to establish standard assessment procedures. This priority is also one of the recurring areas in adjustment as indicated on Table 6.1.

Table 7.3. is a summary of the recurring categories from the discursive comments on Question 10 with representative direct quotes for each categories presented in section 7.4.

Table 7.3. Category Summary on the Qualitative Comments by Schooling Level on Articulation Priority

College	Precollege	Heritage Schools
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The key of articulation lies in the articulation of standards and guidelines. 2. Excellent teachers will take care of everything. 3. Textbooks development 4. Establish standard assessment procedures 5. Agreement on the learning goals. 6. All the elements are inter-related. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In need of qualified teachers 2. In need of standards of Chinese education. 3. Need more uniformed teaching materials. 4. Attract rather than scare away students 5. Communication with other teachers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need teaching materials.

7.4. Representative direct quotes for each category presented in Table 7.3. on articulation priority

7.4.1. College Teachers' Perspective:

1. The key of articulation lies in the articulation of standards and guidelines.

- Curriculum determines how you will develop the other items.
- Curriculum development is neglected and each instructor does what h/she feels important. We cannot unify the curriculum but do need some guidelines to develop one that works best.
- The National K-12 Foreign Language Standards are already in place. If local Chinese programs can develop a curriculum and assessment method accordingly, it will be easier for college level programs to make connections. On the other hand, instead looking just at the ACTLE guidelines, college programs should integrate the four Cs in the upper level of learning.
- I believe that standards and curriculum developments are crucial to the success of any language programs. Once these two areas are strong, everything else should fall into their places naturally.
- Have to have good tools to do a good job.
- Writing composition though important in beginning levels is not important later on
- Standards for Chinese can not be in terms of number of characters learned at each level.

2. Excellent teachers will take care of everything.

- Most untrained teachers simply assume that foreigners cannot pronounce properly in any case... Students who form bad habits in high school find good college programs even more difficult because of their own bad pronunciation. High school programs sometimes do more harm than good to students.
- Highly qualified instructors, with language proficiency in Chinese and English and modern teaching skills, is the greatest immediate need.
- Teachers need continuous development.

- If you have excellent teachers she will take care of the rest. The current situation is that we don't have any very good certification or training programs that are specifically designed for TCFL.
- Good teachers produce good students.
- Certainly teacher development is also very important without good teachers, no matter how good the standards and curriculum are, there won't be any good students.
- Majority of incoming students have skewed skills, e.g. conversation which is idiosyncratic but fluent, little reading, no composition etc. Difficult to place them or teach in diverse groups. Teachers and what goes on in class is critical.
- When the teachers are good with excellent instruction, the articulation process is a joy. When teachers are less than what is expected by colleagues, articulation becomes a problem-for both students and teachers.

Suggestions :

- I hope high school teachers will use accurate first, speed second for their principle. Which as a theory only dooms students to big trouble or total failure to learn Chinese.
- How to make everybody benefit from the same class is a big challenge.
- Variety (in instruction) increases retention, interest and persistence in learning Chinese.

3. Textbooks development

- Appropriate text books are hard to find. There are problems with texts' grammar explanations.
- I think high schools use a standard text book, articulation is not a major problem. The only real placement problem I encounter is when high school teachers use their own material as the primary text book. The students of these teachers tend to have very weak background.

Suggestions:

- It's important to have on-line materials to share between institutions.
- More access to video and computer aided textbooks is very useful to maintain student's interest in Chinese language and culture.

4. Establish standard assessment procedures

- Without the establishment of objective entrance and exit assessments on a level-by-level basis, and the subsequent response in the form of a curriculum that is tailored to the student population, no amount of teacher development or technology can meet the needs of classes that are so diverse in terms of linguistic, communicative and cultural proficiencies as to be essentially unteachable.
- For coordination between levels, it is self-evident that placement is very important.

Suggestions:

- If local programs can develop curriculum and assessment standards (aligned with the K-12 standards), it will be easier for college programs to make connections.

5. Agreement on the learning goals.

- At present, most incoming students need to take our elementary course, even if they took Chinese at a J.S. or in high school.
- (Learning outcomes is #1 because your) need to have your eyes on the ball.

Suggestions:

- It seems that articulation works the best when open relations are maintained across the levels, precollege-college.

6. All the elements are interrelated.

- First of all, instructors should be aware of the learning objectives and design curriculum accordingly. Moreover, learning activities should be student centered, so it is important to take motivation factors into consideration. Instructors should do their best to arouse

student interest, guide students to using proper learning strategies that help them learn the language more efficiently.

- Many of the above (elements) are inter-related and are difficult to arrange in proper order of importance.

Pre-college Teachers' Perspective:

1. In need of qualified teachers

- One of the bottlenecks that the Chinese field is experiencing is teacher certification issue. Without qualified teachers, the field cannot be expanded.
- In state of Texas does not have a Program to certify Chinese, it is bad for choose qualified teacher and teacher's career development.
- Getting a qualified credential Chinese teacher is one huge problem.
- Need good teachers who can successfully teach, will develop materials in a way that uses good learning styles and strategies. These aspects need to be reinforced by a nation-wide consensus of curriculum, learning outcomes, and goals so that placement can be fair and equally tested.
- The quality of teachers is the key to successful educate Chinese school students... Regional Chinese school association should be strongly supported by the professional Chinese teachers and engage in well-planned and well paced teacher preparation and in service programs. Sporadic and ill-focused training is not enough.
- In pre-college, non-native teacher skill remains the most severe restriction, ... Teaching a language that usually relies on didactic tactics to various learning styles is always the issue.
- Many of the teachers in Chinese language programs are native speakers of the language, but do not have very much teacher training, either in China nor in America. They often lack the cultural sensitivity to American kids and the appropriate methodologies in order to motivate continuing interest.
- To teach in the precollege level which is dramatically different from teaching in college level... Speaking the language is not the only criteria of being a Chinese teacher. ... lot of us learning on the job but no good modeling to reference or learn from.

Suggestions:

- I think college Chinese teachers need to study some psychology, especially teenage psychology, in order to understand those students. Their toughness has scared away many talented and interested young people.
- Teachers need training on a regular basis.
- Teachers meet on Saturdays.
- Teacher certification

2. Need standards of Chinese

- I've taught in several institutions, all of which had different standards...
- It's urgent for all pre-college teachers to see the importance of standard based teaching because it will meet the needs of the students and foreign language education in general.
- Many teachers of Chinese in the secondary schools have different goals and they construct their program accordingly, depending on a student population. There is little connection among teachers to try to reach a commonality.
- We need to have a local/state/national standards & curriculum to develop teaching materials that can make meanings for everyday learners and be effective communicator for teaching Chinese as a foreign language.
- Without a sound, long-term oriented curriculum, there will be no real program.

Suggestions:

- I wish there were some source or guidelines available to me about other teacher's programs.

3. Material unification

- There is simply a dearth of good materials, especially for secondary level. Materials are necessarily tied to learning styles. If we continue down the old road, we'll continue to lose (or not reach) 80% of learners, those who aren't linguistic/material learners. Materials

need to be made that are freely copyable by H.S. teachers (much like those available to the ESL community).

- We need instructional materials for (K to 12).
- There is a great need for uniform teaching materials.
- We need to have a local/state/national standards & curriculum to develop teaching materials that can make meanings for everyday learners and be effective communicators for teaching Chinese as a foreign language.

4. Attract rather than scare away students

- Many American kids are at the outset, but when they realize learning Chinese is hard work, they often lose interest and motivation.
- Their (college teachers who did not have training in psychology) toughness has scared away many talented and interested young people.

5. Communication with colleagues at colleges

- Networking with other Chinese colleagues is not as easy.

7.4.3. Heritage school teachers' perspective:

Need teaching materials.

- If we can develop a set of teaching materials that meet teachers and students' need, and can relate with college programs, Chinese teaching will be improved.
- Material development needs use current technology, such as internet, to develop more interesting teaching materials, so as kids can learn Chinese while play.
- Higher level students do not have interests in learning Chinese, because the materials are not interesting.
- Develop unified textbooks.
- We need more attractive teaching materials for kids.

VIII. Discussion

The purpose of this study is to investigate perceived areas of strengths and weaknesses of Chinese programs across different instructional settings for the purpose of greater articulation. Based on the findings, we attempt to implement an articulation process at all different instructional levels, start close collaborations on projects of common interest, and engage in meaningful discourse among all the Chinese teachers. Articulation of all instructional levels promotes students' learning by providing them with extended and well-articulated instructional sequences. Chinese programs should be able to more efficiently place students in learning environments according to their language background and to move students to more appropriate environments as necessary. With the articulation in place we will be able to provide a flexible framework within which students may move among different levels and programs. McGinnis (1999) insightfully summarized this issue of articulation from the Leadership Seminar of CLTA, "We must assume that students moving among various programs will increasingly become the rule rather than the exception, and we must plan our program design accordingly; that is, to maximize the student's ease in that movement rather than penalizing them for changing programs." (p. 333). The weaknesses of our current Chinese programs reveal the urgent need for greater articulation efforts. The findings of this study suggest four areas where articulation is the key to the success of Chinese program improvement. These areas include development of guidelines and standards for curriculum, standard-based assessment for learning outcomes, teacher training and communications, and instructional innovations.

Guidelines and Standards for Curriculum Development

All the respondents consider articulations for curriculum standards and agreement on learning goals as the top priorities in the articulation process. Clearly defined standards pave the way for the effective implementation of curriculum. Standards and guidelines determine curriculum design that substantially influences instructional strategies on one hand, and subsequently determine assessment processes on the other. One respondent put it succinctly: "standards and curriculum development are crucial to the success of any language programs. Once these two areas are strong, everything else should fall into their places naturally."

Nevertheless, the data show that Chinese program goals and standards vary considerably across different educational settings. Great variations are revealed in the responses to the Items of 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 and 10 of the questionnaire. First of all, the pro-

gram goals and course objectives established in different instructional settings vary in their priorities. The priority at the college/university level focuses on the four language skills and communicative proficiency whereas for pre-college schools, the emphasis is on understanding Chinese culture with a close second and third priorities on four-skill development and daily communication. The strengths of graduating pre-college and incoming college students were perceived differently by college and pre-college teachers, revealing the difference in learning goals and objectives at the college and pre-college levels. Pre-college teachers regard areas of grammar, character writing and composition as strengths of their graduating students, whereas college teachers regard these areas as weaknesses of the incoming students.

In spite of the variations in curriculum goals and objectives, there is strong consensus, however, on the urgent need to develop a set of standards at the national level that can guide our daily instruction, curriculum planning, and assessment development not only for K-12 but also for K-16+. Although we as a Chinese language organization published the K-12 Chinese National Foreign Language Standards, a supplement to the ACTFL National Standards, in 1999 (ACTFL, 1999), there was strong consensus on the urgent need to develop the K-16+ standards for Chinese. This survey indicates that these standards need to be in the hands of the teachers. We will provide our recommendation regarding standards development in Section IX.

Standard-based Assessments

Lack of consistency in program goals and curriculum standards will inevitably lead to different criterion on assessment of student performance. The variations in the judgment of students' strengths and challenges between teachers at college and pre-college levels, as revealed in Tables 3.1 and 3.2, suggest a disconnection between assessments of curriculum and instructional implementations. Curriculum standards and program goals guide assessment procedure. They allow for evaluation and improvement of Chinese programs by providing information on the feasibility of standards, feedback to teaching and learning processes, validity of curriculum design, and effectiveness of instructional implementation. With this information and feedback, we are able to improve Chinese programs and ensure their quality. Consequently we will be able to enhance the articulation of programs at all instructional levels.

When standards are established and applied, and curriculum is implemented, an assessment procedure to evaluate students' performance becomes an important and indispensable component. However, before the field has come to the agreement on

the specifics on standards, materials, and teacher training, we may have to depend on assessment to resolve our articulation difficulties. Perhaps, the importance of assessment was best summarized by one of the respondents: "Without the establishment of objective entrance and exit assessment on a level-by-level basis, and the subsequent response in the form of a curriculum that is tailored to the student population, no amount of teacher development or technology can meet the needs of classes that are so diverse in terms of linguistic, communicative and cultural proficiencies as to be essentially unteachable."

Offering students the freedom to move from level to level and program to program requires us to provide students with reliable assessments that objectively evaluate their levels of proficiency in order to place them in appropriate levels. It is self-evident that placement tests are the essential tool in articulation processes, as a college teacher noted in his/her response to the survey questionnaire, "if local programs can develop curriculum and assessment standards (aligned with the K-12 standards), it will be easier for college programs to make connections." With the increasing number of students who have taken Chinese in heritage schools and K-12 schools, the need to develop standard-based assessment procedures for each level of the K-16 becomes urgent. Such assessment procedures will serve three purposes. First, they can be used to place incoming students from pre-college settings when entering colleges. Second, they can be used as an early-assessment tool to evaluate the language proficiency of the pre-college students and provide feedback on their learning. Finally, the results of the test can be used for diagnostic purposes to provide teachers with the information on the student.

Without appropriate placement procedure, as indicated by many respondents, many of those students who have already had training in pre-college programs are more likely to be placed inappropriately. This phenomenon, as many respondents reported, is further complicated by the fact that many of those students are trying to score low in their placement tests for the purpose of getting good grades without exerting due efforts. For those students, "their earlier advantage seems to become a liability. By the time the course work has caught up with, and often passed what the students had in high school, many are trapped without adequate study habits and with over-confident attitudes that undermine their best efforts to keep up. These early bloomers too often fail, drop out of the program, or keep advancing with a shaky foundation." (Ke, 1995, p. 32) It appears that the combination of three mechanisms can help solve this problem: 1) developing good placement tests that can prevent students from deliberately trying to score low and can thus help teachers identify these kinds of uncooperative students (Mathews, 1992); 2) developing placement

procedures that tailors to the specific student body and local instructional resources (McGinnis, 1996); and 3) having a readjustment period during the first weeks of the semester for replacement purpose.

Teacher Training and Communications

Respondents across all instructional levels consistently saw the need for improved teacher training. Successful implementation of the program largely relies on the performance of teachers. Teachers implement program guidelines, curriculum standards, and instructional objectives. Without good work from the teachers, no matter how good the standards and curriculum are, there will not be effective learning. In this sense, success of a program to a great extent depends on the skill, ability, and enthusiasm of the teachers (Kubler et al, 1997).

This need for teacher certification and teacher training is even more urgent than in the past due to the ever-increasing enrollment of students taking Chinese language courses nationwide at all educational settings, particularly at the pre-college settings. When more elementary and high schools offer Chinese courses, more Chinese language teachers will be needed not only in pre-college schools but also at colleges / universities. When analyzing the need for teacher training of the K-12 educational system, Wang (1999) suggested that “because of the teacher certification requirement, or ‘endorsement’, from a state’s department of public institution /education, it is predicated that the shortage of certified Chinese teachers will be the biggest obstacle in establishing Chinese programs in K-12 schools.” (p.27). Many Chinese communities in the USA can immediately provide linguistic and cultural resources to the Chinese language teaching field. Experienced teachers from heritage schools could be trained and then recruited to teach in formal instructional settings. Many of them are native speakers of Chinese with advanced education degrees. They, however, lack sufficient pedagogical and linguistic backgrounds. They need training in foreign language education, curriculum design, pedagogy, and applied linguistics.

The findings of this study also reveal the need for continuous education and communication among Chinese teachers between pre-college and college levels. Teachers need continuous professional development on the current trend of foreign language research and education, and use of technologies in language instruction. Wang (1999) discussed long-term and short-term teacher training that can serve the purposes of certifying teachers and on-the-job development. Long-term training is targeted to Chinese teachers who do not have formal training in Chinese linguistics, second language pedagogy, and education. Short-term training intends to serve the

need of faculty continuous education. Workshops and conferences, although too short-term by nature to have long-lasting effect, are useful not only for training but also as a mechanism for teachers to maintain regular contact with their colleagues. Short-term programs such as conferences, workshops, and seminars, especially organized at the regional level, provide good opportunities for faculty development and articulation among teachers of different educational settings. Currently traditional academic-year graduate programs in teaching Chinese as a foreign language are offered in only a few universities², and thus, cannot meet the nation-wide demand for competent Chinese language teachers. In order to meet the demand for teacher development for K-12 and community schools, certification programs at the regional and national levels need to be established.

Instructional Innovations

Instructional innovations are another area consistently addressed by respondents across all instructional levels. Among instructional innovations, the biggest demand is for the development of teaching material, especially from teachers of heritage and high schools. After establishing program goals, designing curriculum objectives and assessment procedures, we have one more major task to complete: the implementation. Instructional implementation includes learning materials as well as methodologies and techniques. As several respondents stated, if we can develop a set of teaching materials that meets the needs of teachers and students, and connects standards with Chinese programs in different instructional levels, we can ensure the quality of Chinese teaching and improve the articulation of programs at all levels.

There will not be one set of instructional materials that can meet the needs of our students from different settings. What is important is to develop a variety of instructional materials having different teaching focuses and different targeted learners. Instructional materials should be designed on the basis of general national standards on one hand, and to serve the interest and needs of specific students on the other. These materials can serve as wide resources that include learner specific textbooks, class activities and exercises, supplementary materials integrated to the curriculum, collaborative learning, and task-based activities and projects. These instructional materials should be made available on-line for ease of sharing among institutions. Online materials can facilitate articulation processes and perform several functions

² Currently there are 5 graduate programs that offer graduate degree in teaching Chinese as a foreign language. They are in University of Hawaii, University of Iowa, New York University, Ohio State University, and Brigham Young University.

such as resources for teachers, programming learning for students, and distance learning. One should keep in mind that no matter how good the instructional materials are, the teacher must still creatively select and tailor teaching and learning materials to the needs and interests of his/her students.

IX. Recommendations

We believe this survey has provided much-needed data on the perceptions of major articulation issues from our instructors from differing schooling levels. Based on the findings in this survey, we would like to propose the following recommendations for future actions as a profession.

- Establishing curriculum goals and course objectives is one of the first steps for within and between programs' articulations. We need to take advantage of the K-12 Standards for Chinese Language Learning and based on these K-12 standards, expand to develop a K-16 standards for Chinese language learning. A K-16 standards that covers the entire K-12 and the first four years of college Chinese study can be used as guidelines or references for curriculum goals and course objectives development. The need for developing the Chinese K-16 standards is compelling. Without which, there will be even greater negative consequence for pre-college and college articulation and could lead to greater attrition at the college. Currently, the national standards for foreign language teaching is gaining ground in secondary schools and increased numbers of pre-college programs are implementing the standards. When those standards-taught students get into college/university, they will be expecting to continue to receive standards-based training at the college level. When such expectations are not met, it is more likely that the students will choose to discontinue their language study. Conducting business as usual in this standards oriented era may have even greater articulation problems.

- Once we have developed the K-16 standards, we will need to develop outcomes assessment procedures for each level of the K-16 standards. Standards do not exist without testing. These batteries of assessment procedures can not only serve as placement procedures for incoming students from pre-college for their Chinese study in colleges but can also serve as early-assessment guidelines to evaluate the language skills of the pre-college students, giving them a projection of their possible college placement and providing diagnostic feedback where appropriate (Birckbichler, 1995). However, before the field has come to the agreement on standards and curriculum development, it is crucial that indi-

vidual program develop appropriate placement and outcomes assessment procedures that are tailored to the individual program's instructional resources and program goals and objectives.

- Enhance teacher training and develop certification programs. It is true that once program goals and assessment have been established, everything else will fall into places. When all is said and done, what goes on in the classroom is still the most important. Success of our Chinese language education will to a great extent depend on the knowledge base, skills, and enthusiasm of our teachers. The current degree-offer graduate programs in teaching Chinese as a foreign language in traditional academic-year programs can not meet the national demand for Chinese language teacher development. Efforts should be made to develop teacher training and certification programs that can allow trainees to either seek certification or obtain a degree in Chinese language pedagogy with several consecutive summers of training or to receive in-service training with schedule-flexible summer (or winter) programs. For skill development in the area of classroom methodology in our teacher development programs, attention should be paid to handle linguistic diversity or mixed levels in the classroom. In addition, we as professionals need a network – perhaps a mentoring system. Many of the instructors are alone out there with no colleagues near to team, to bounce ideas off of, to create, and to sympathize. The field needs to develop an infrastructure conducive to networking. Several organizations such as CLASS and NCACLS, have regional coordinators and many college instructors are taking initiative to hold regular regional conferences and workshops, such as those in California, Mid-west, and East Coast. These kinds of regional efforts are important venues to networking and more systematic outreach efforts can be made to reach instructors who are geographically isolated and who do not have the resources to attend national and regional conferences and workshops. In addition, teacher trainers should make themselves available at the national level to serve as mentors for professional development.

- Encourage communications between instructors from differing schooling levels. We need to get pre-college and college instructors and administrators together if they are expected to articulate. College/university instructors and pre-college instructors should try to meet each other half way for articulation purpose instead of asking your counterparts to make all the adjustments in their programs to fit your curriculum specifics. In addition, we should encourage regional articulation efforts (Gjertson, Chung, and Su, 2000). The close connections between pre-college and college programs in the US education system dic-

tate that the flow of students from the secondary- to the tertiary-level is to a great extent regionally oriented. Given the geographic proximity, it tends to be more fruitful when articulation efforts are made at the regional levels. Resources and environment should be created to facilitate regional articulation projects in terms of instructional goals and objective, materials, methodology, and assessment.

- Develop the Chinese AP (Advanced Placement test) curriculum and test. The target testee population for the SATII Chinese test is for students who have taken Chinese in high school for two to four years. It is not for those who have substantial background in Chinese (such as heritage learners who have significant exposure to Chinese at their homes). Mixing the target test population with those advanced learners of Chinese can not only demoralize Chinese language study at the pre-college programs and thus impact enrollments at the college level but also threaten the legitimacy of SATII Chinese test, which was originally established in part to promote Chinese study at the pre-collage levels. The development of the Chinese AP, which carries college credits, will have positive effects on both pre-college and college Chinese language education.

- Conduct survey on the students' perspectives about articulation. The present survey is on the teachers' perception on articulation issues for Chinese language education in the US. Efforts should be made to conduct comprehensive studies aiming to understand our students' perspectives and performance in relation to articulation. Results of these kinds of studies can inform our articulation efforts (Chi, 1999).

- Pay increased attention to the use of Internet for providing programming learning to students for their Chinese language instruction. Internet-based learning can support language students from differing sectors requiring content-based approaches to foreign language learning. It should be mentioned that the dynamic and adaptive LangNet that is currently being developed by the National Foreign Language Center can potentially facilitate our articulation efforts tremendously. By selecting teaching and learning resources that are tailored to the needs and goals of language learners, this WWW-based system provides optimal learning development once a particular learner's profiles and zone of proximal development are identified. This kind of dynamic learning and assessment environment, which our individual institutions and conventional classrooms cannot provide, can expedite learning process at the rate optimal to the individual learner and can thus help solve placement and instruction difficulty in programs

where instructional resources do not allow flexible placement and instruction for learners whose linguistic profiles do not fall into conventional classes.

Acknowledgement:

We would like to recognize first and foremost the contributions made by the 122 Chinese language instructors from differing levels of instruction for taking time out of their extremely busy schedule to provide us their valuable responses for the survey. An equally important role was played by Professor Madeline Chu, Executive Director of CLTA, Ms. Su Chih-Wen, Membership Chair of the Chinese Language Association of Secondary-Elementary Schools, Professor Chou Chih-p'ing, Director of the Secondary School Chinese Language Center at Princeton University, Mr. Zheng Lianggen, President of the Chinese School Association in the United States, and Ms. Theresa Hsu Chao, Executive Director of the National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools, for helping with the mailing of the survey for this project. We would also like to give special acknowledgement to Professor Richard Chi, Professor Scott McGinnis, Dr. Lucy Lee, Mr. Zheng Lianggen, Professor Claudia Ross, and Dr. Wang Shuhan, for their valuable comments made during the panel presentation that reported this project at the 2000 CLTA Annual Conference in Boston in November.

Reference

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 1996. National Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press Inc.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 1999. National Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century. Including Chinese, Classical Languages, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press Inc.
- Birckbickler, Diane. 1995. Ohio's Collaborative articulation and assessment project. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26.3: 44-45.
- Brod, Richard and Elizabeth B. Welles. 2000. Foreign Language Enrollments in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1998. *ADFL Bulletin*, 31.2: 22-29.
- Brown, Christine. 1995. Foreign language education and education-reform movement: Opportunity or threat? *ADFL Bulletin*, 26.3: 18-24.
- Byrnes, Heidi. 1990. Addressing curriculum articulation in the nineties: A proposal.

- Foreign Language Annals*, 23: 281-92.
- Byrnes, Heidi. 1995. Response to Claire Kramersch. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26.3: 13-15.
- Chao, Theresa Hsu. 1996. Overview. In Wang Xueying (ed.), *A View From Within: A Case Study Of Chinese Heritage Community Language Schools In The United States*. Washington: National Foreign Language Center, pp. 7-13.
- Chi, Richard. 1999. Informing the articulation effort: What the senior of the Chinese language schools know and can do. Paper presented at the 1999 Chinese Language Teachers Association, Dallas, TX, November 19-21.
- Chinese School Association of the United States Third Conference Program. 1999. Held in December, 1999, in Washington, D.C.
- Gjertson, Donald, Su-chuan Chung, Chih-wen Su. 2000. High School to College Articulation in Chinese. Panel presentation at the 2000 CLTA meeting, November 16, Boston.
- Jackson, Claire and Karen Masters-Wicks. 1995. Articulation and achievement: The challenge of the 1990s in foreign language education. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26.3: 46-51.
- Ke, Chuanren. 1995. Aspects of accuracy in a proficiency-oriented program. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26.2: 28-35.
- Kotenbeutel, Claire. 1999. National standards for foreign language teaching – The Chinese connection. Mapping the Course of the Chinese Language Field (Chinese Language Teachers Association Monograph Series, Volume III), Ed. Madeline Chu, Chinese Language Teachers Association, Kalamazoo, Michigan, pp. 257-270.
- Kramersch, Claire. 1995. Embracing conflict versus achieving consensus in foreign language education. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26.3: 6-12.
- Kubler, Cornelius C., et al. 1997. NFLC Guide for Basic Chinese Language Programs. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University National Foreign Language Resource Center and the OSU Foreign Language Publications Office; Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.
- Langs, Dale. 1982. Problem of articulation. In *Curriculum, Competence, and Foreign Language Teacher*, (ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series 13) Ed. Theodore Higgs, Lincolnwood: National Textbook .
- Liskin-Gasparro, Judith. 1982. ETS Oral Proficiency Testing Manual. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.
- Mathews, Thomas John. 1992. Development of a Foreign Language Placement Test Using Item Response Scoring on a Multiple-Choice Cloze Test. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Delaware.
- Metcalf, Michael. 1995. Articulating the teaching of foreign languages: The Minnesota project. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26.3: 52-54.

- McGinnis, Scott. 1994. The less common alternative: A report from the task force for teacher training in the less commonly taught language. *ACFL Bulletin*, 25.2: 17-22.
- McGinnis, Scott. 1996. Teaching Chinese to the Chinese: The development of an assessment and instructional model. In J. E. Liskin-Gasparro (Ed.), *Patterns and Policies: The Changing Demographics of Foreign Language Instruction* (pp. 107-121). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- McGinnis, Scott. 1999. Articulation. Mapping the Course of the Chinese Language Field (Chinese Language Teachers Association Monograph Series, Volume III), Ed. Madeline Chu, Chinese Language Teachers Association, Kalamazoo, Michigan, pp. 331-344.
- Moore, Sarah Jane with A. Ronald Walton and Richard Lambert. 1992. Introducing Chinese into High School: The Dodge Initiative, National Foreign Language Center Monograph Series, Washington, DC.
- Secondary School Chinese Language Center Newsletter, 2000. Princeton University. Princeton, New Jersey.
- Wang, Shuhan. 1999. Crossing the bridge: A Chinese case from mother tongue maintenance to foreign language education. Mapping the Course of the Chinese Language Field (Chinese Language Teachers Association Monograph Series, Volume III), Ed. Madeline Chu, Chinese Language Teachers Association, Kalamazoo, Michigan, pp. 271-312.

Appendix: The Project Questionnaire
Chinese Language Teachers Association Articulation Project Survey

Name:

Affiliation:

1. Level(s) you are teaching and duration:

- a. Community language school _____ course level(s) _____ how long _____
- b. Elementary school _____ course level(s) _____ how long _____
- c. Junior high/middle school _____ course level(s) _____ how long _____
- d. Senior high school _____ course level(s) _____ how long _____
- e. Two-year college _____ course level(s) _____ how long _____
- f. College/university _____ course level(s) _____ how long _____
- g. Other _____ course level(s) _____ how long _____

2. Objectives and materials for the pre-college or lower-level college course(s) you teach:

Course One: Title:

Primary instructional materials used:

Course objectives:

Course Two: Title:

Primary instructional materials used:

Course objectives:

3. Goals of your Chinese language program:

4. Please check your graduating/incoming students' areas of strength from the following list:

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| a. Grammar _____ | f. Character writing _____ |
| b. Listening _____ | g. Composition _____ |
| c. Pronunciation _____ | h. Culture _____ |
| d. Reading _____ | i. Persistence in learning Chinese _____ |
| e. Speaking _____ | j. Other(s) _____ |

5. Based on your experience with students who are taking or have taken Chinese at the pre-college level, what do you think are their most difficult challenges?

- a. Grammar _____
- b. Listening _____
- c. Pronunciation _____
- d. Reading _____
- e. Speaking _____
- f. Character writing _____
- g. Composition _____

- h. Culture _____
 i. Persistence in learning Chinese _____
 j. Other(s) _____

6. Do you maintain regular contact with your pre-college/college colleagues for coordinated continuity of different schooling levels? Yes _____ No _____
 If yes, how?

If no, is there a simple reason?

7. Do you think your students are placed appropriately in their high school/college programs based on their achievement in Chinese learning? Yes _____ No _____
 If yes, why?

If no, is there a simple reason?

8. From the students' perspective, do you think their placement expectations are met?
 Yes _____ No _____
 If no, is there a simple reason?

9. What kind of adjustment in each of the following areas would you like your colleagues in the pre-college or college programs to make? (If you need more room for your comments, please use the back of this page.)

- a. Standards/Curriculum
- b. Materials
- c. Classroom Methodology
- d. Assessment/Placement
- e. Others

10. Below are some crucial elements of the articulation process. Please arrange them in a series from 1 to 12 with 1 being the greatest immediate need.

a. Standards development
b. Curriculum development
c. Agreement on the learning goals of the entire program
d. Consensus on learning outcomes for each year of the program
e. Better placement procedure for incoming students

f. Material development
g. Instruction that respects diverse interests, learning style, & learning strategies
h. Outcomes assessment
i. Teacher development
j. Technology
k. Other(s)
l. Other(s)

Please elaborate on your top choices for the above question and provide any additional comments on the articulation process. (If you need more room for your comments, please use the back of this page.)

Thank you very much for your time and your contribution to this project!

