How to Engage Chinese as a Heritage Language Learner? From Student Engagement Perceptions to Instructional Design and Practice

学生投入度原则在华裔课程设计和实践中的应用

Tingting Wang[1]   Ding Wang-Bramlett

Auburn University   Carnegie Mellon University

Abstract: This study discusses how to engage Chinese as Heritage Language Learners in their Chinese learning by exploring the characteristics of Chinese as Heritage Language learners and their perceptions of engagement elements. The qualitative study employs engagement surveys to understand students' perceptions of four engagement elements to figure out the indicators and facilitators of engagement to offer implications for instructional design. The results show that students at different language levels have different learning needs and learning interests, however, reading and writing skills are students' primary learning needs at all levels. Furthermore, the diverse modes of communication (e.g., teacher and student interaction, peer interaction) and instant feedback from the teacher are crucial for student language learning achievement. The results also show that the teaching of language skills (e.g., writing and speaking skills) and research-related assignments could encourage students to take a more active role in their learning process. Therefore, to engage Chinese as a Heritage Language learners, the difficulty level of the course should be balanced through the semester; the topics of the class should be distinctive from each other to trigger student interests for communication and discussion. At the same time, the instructor should create an open and communicative learning environment for various modes of communication. Besides, to enhance students' Chinese learning achievement, the instructors should use life-related learning and teaching materials and employ new technologies to create sufficient opportunities for students to practice what they have learned.

Keywords: CHL learners; student engagement; CHL instructional design

摘要: 这篇文章探讨了华裔汉语学习者的特点以及如何在教学中提高华裔学生的汉语学习投入度。此研究采用定性研究的方法，使用学生投入度问卷调查和采访的方式，对华裔学生在学习过程中对汉语学习投度原则的感知和学习感受进行研究分析，旨在对华裔教学设计提供指导。研究发现，不同的华裔学生在语言程度和文化背景上存在很大差异，不同语言水平和文化背景的学生有不同的学习需求，但提高读写水平是华裔学生普遍的学习需求。另外，多样性的交流模式和老师的及时反馈对提高学生的学习投入度有积极的作用。研究也表明，研究型的作业 （比如，让学生用目标语研究一个项目）或者教授学生写作和演讲的技巧可以提高学生的学习积极性帮助华裔学生设定明确的学习目标。基于上述研究，文章提出以下的教学建议。 第一，教师在课程设计时应合理

---

[1] Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tingting Wang (email: tzw0054@auburn.edu) at Auburn University.

地设定学习的难度，避免话题的重复,多使用研究和探索型的任务来激发学生的讨论和交流热情。第二，教师在教学中应尽量使用真实的语言材料创造真实的语境。第三，教师在教学中应积极地使用新技术和各种交流平台设计较流行的任务，为学生创造多样化的交流环境。

关键词：华裔汉语学习者；学生学习投入度；华裔汉语教学设计

Contextual Background

Ryan's (2013) research shows that Chinese is the third most spoken language at home in the United States after English and Spanish, McGinnis (2008) pointed out that this trend leads to a growing number of CHL learners in classrooms and the resulting need to teach this unique population appropriately. According to Li and Duff (2008), in many learning situations, CHL learners may lack a commitment to their learning process, and critical questions concerning CHL learning at the university remain. There is a raising need for a discussion on how to engage CHL learners in their Chinese learning. To date, there is no specific research showing how learning materials and classroom instructions could be designed to engage CHL learners in an active role in learning and using the target language. This research paper explores CHL student engagement perceptions of the Chinese courses in an American university to articulate the conditions and elements for engaging CHL students of different learning levels. Further, based on student engagement perceptions, the follow-up improvements for instructional design are discussed and enacted.

Valdés (2001) defines a heritage learner as a person — "who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language" (p. 38). Because different homes have different traditions and ways of living. Heritage learners are not exposed to the same language environment and, therefore, their degree of bilingual in English and the heritage language varies. CHL learners are no exceptions. Their language skills differ due to the variation of their cultural experiences, socio-psychological contexts, and the amount of schooling in the home country (He & Xiao, 2008). Hendryx (2008) classifies CHL learners into five proficiency groups. Learners in the lowest proficiency level have very little linguistic knowledge of Chinese and know

only words and phrases. They do not possess listening abilities. Level two learners have some speaking and listening skills. However, the abilities are not well-developed. Learners in the third level possess higher speaking and listening skills but only marginal reading and writing abilities. Level four learners, according to Hendryx (2008), are speakers who are "fluent or nearly fluent in a dialect of Chinese but have little knowledge of spoken Mandarin." Learners in the highest level have balanced and well-developed skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills.

From Hendryx's (2008) distinction in the proficiency of CHL learners, we can see that lower-level Chinese heritage learners have mismatched proficiencies in reading/writing and speaking/listening. This difference could be the result of the unique learning environment to which the CHL learners were exposed. CHL learners mainly acquired their HL in family environments. Chinese was restricted to oral daily family interactions. Reading and writing were not emphasized. Therefore, CHL learners are usually illiterate in Chinese (Dai & Zhang, 2008). In addition, age of acquisition and type and amount of input are also crucial factors to understand HL learners' linguistic abilities (Montrul, 2012). CHL learners have a wide range of age of acquisition and type and amount of input. This leads to a wide variety of vocabulary and grammar knowledge among students. The difference in the learning environment, age of acquisition, and type and amount of input together contribute to the heterogeneousness of lower-level Chinese learners.

High-proficiency CHL learners have more balanced proficiencies in the four areas (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) if we do not take regional variation into consideration. However, CHL learners come from different dialect regions. Hendryx (2008) classifies high-proficiency dialect speakers as level four proficiency learners while Mandarin speakers as level five proficiency learners. This classification privileges Mandarin speakers over dialect speakers. Although not all institutions follow Hendryx's classification when placing CHL learners, the

placement of dialect speakers, especially high-proficiency dialect speakers, is problematic for programs that only offer Mandarin classes.

The heterogeneity of CHL learners poses challenges for language educators. CHL classes often face the challenge of designing materials that match the students' imbalanced skills. Materials that are suitable for the students' reading/writing abilities may be too easy for their speaking/listening abilities. Students who are placed at lower-level classes may find the class to be too easy due to their relatively higher speaking/listening ability and, therefore, are less engaged. Moreover, CHL learners perceive attribution to their failure and success differently than other language learners. For CHL learners, they tend to attribute success to external factors (e.g., the help from teachers and parents) and failure to internal factors (e.g., themselves) (Wen, 2011). Learners' attribution may affect the amount of effort put in, strategies applied, and long-term goals in language learning (Weiner, 1985). Instructors of CHL learners should be aware of the unique needs and qualities of CHL learners and promote an engaging and encouraging environment to assist the learning process.

Theoretical Framework

Designing classroom instruction and using pedagogy built on engagement principles, educators could facilitate learners' active participation, which in turn could lead to engagement (Egbert & Ernst-Slavit, 2010). This section serves to explore such engagement facilitators from theories.

Defining Engagement

A growing body of research shows that engagement is one component that can positively influence an individual's learning, and highly engaged learners show higher achievement than less engaged learners (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Lin, 2011; Newmann, 1992; Shernoff et al., 2003).

According to researchers, student engagement is an educational concept that works to explain how and why students learn; this concept is primarily defined as "involvement" during learners' learning process (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Dörnyei & Ushida, 2011; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004). Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) Flow Theory presents that when students experience "flow" (deeply engaged), they will: concentrate on what they are doing; not worry about failures; have self-consciousness evaporate; and experience a distorted sense of time. Flow Theory suggests that flow experiences (characterized by a balance between challenge and skills and by a person's interest, control, and focused attention during a task) can lead to optimal learning.

Student engagement has received wide attention in recent years. The consensus of the conceptualization of engagement is yet to reach due to different perspectives and contexts that research is situated in. Most of student engagement definitions, such as "energy in action" (Russel et al., 2005), "energized, directed, and sustained actions" (Skinner et al, 2009, p. 225), "visible and invisible actions that learners take toward learning" (Oga-Baldwin, 2019, p. 9) highlight "action" in this psychological construct. Engagement is also widely acknowledged as multifaceted, comprising behavioral (acting), emotional (feeling), cognitive (thinking), and agentic (making) dimensions (Fedricks et al., 2004; Reeve & Tseng, 2011). Following this perspective, language researchers have investigated engagement in the language classroom, adding social (collaborating) as another dimension, and suggested engagement should focus on learning goals and processes of language learning (e.g., Philp & Duchesne, 2016; Svalberg, 2009).

Other researchers define engagement as a construct that has multiple dimensions (e.g., behavior, cognition, affection, and motivation) (Dörnyei, 2003; Lin, 2012; Lutz et al., 2006). Their studies show that when students are engaged in a learning task, at the affective level, they feel happy and joyful; at the behavioral level, they show active participation; at the cognitive level,

they use more learning strategies; at the social level, they share learning outcomes through social interactions. Further, researchers suggested a dynamic relationship among the different dimensions of engagement; they claimed that the multiple dimensions are closely related to each other (Dörnyei, 2003; Egbert, 2003; Lin, 2012), therefore, to enhance student engagement, educators and course designers should consider a variety of components and factors in their pedagogy and instructional design (Dörnyei, 2003).

Egbert and Ernst-Slavit (2010) suggested that educators should first develop a good understanding of student learning needs to provide students authentic learning materials and meaningful learning tasks (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Dörnyei, 2003; Egbert, 2003; Lee, 2007; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004; O'Neill & Mcmahon, 2005; Schweinle, Turner, & Meyer, 2008). Other researchers, who emphasize providing the appropriate amount of work and scaffolding to students, note that to promote student engagement, the challenge of the learning tasks has to meet students' skills to create a safe learning environment (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Egbert, 2003; Lee, 2007). Besides, the importance of offering students opportunities to set up clear learning goals is affirmed by researchers who emphasize students' active roles in their learning process (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Dörnyei, 2003; Egbert, 2003). For instance, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) claimed that individuals who are experiencing flow (i.e., they are deeply engaged) usually have clear goals in mind. Besides the aforementioned studies, other researchers have also emphasized offering students clear instructions and directions; they suggested that explicit instructions could help students avoid confusion and focus more of their energy on tasks (Herrell & Jodan, 2008; Strayer, 2012).

A theoretical framework grounded in engagement theory could offer criteria to guide the research process, and also helps explain how the course might support student engagement

perceptions. Correspondent to the literature reviewed above, Wang (2015) identified four engagement principles as critical standards for course evaluations and instructional design, which are:

1) Meeting student learning needs;

2) Matching the challenges of tasks with student abilities and skills;

3) Offering opportunities for students to set up learning goals;

4) Providing enough opportunities to practice what they have learned.

Under the guidance of these engagement principles, this study explores the following research questions through the design process:

1. How do CHL learners perceive themselves in each engagement element?

2. The influential factors of their perceptions?

3. How could the course be designed better to engage CHL students more?

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research methodology as an approach to explore CHL students' engagement perceptions in their Chinese learning. Rather than generate numbers to answer the research questions about "how many" or "how much"; qualitative research methodology generally aims to understand the experiences and the attitudes of participants to answer the research questions about the "what", "how" or "why" of a phenomenon by generating patterns (Bricki & Green, 2007). The purpose of this study is to find out "how" and "why" students perceived the presence of the engagement elements. Therefore, a qualitative research methodology is appropriate for this study to obtain insight into students' attitudes towards their engagement experiences in CHL learning and the reasons for their perceptions.

Data Collection

Glesne (2011) and others claim that using multiple data sources could help researchers make the research trustworthy and credible. To achieve this goal, this study employed two data sources. An engagement perception survey was employed to evaluate participants' perceptions of engagement. Follow-up interviews and participants' online discussions were also used as data to explore the reasons for students' perceptions, as noted below.

Engagement perception survey. In the engagement perception survey, participants were provided with questions that addressed the engagement elements identified as the theoretical framework. For example, "What are your learning needs for this course? Do you think the challenge of the course match your ability?". The purpose of this survey, presented in the Appendix, was to help the researcher understand students' perceptions of engagement in learning. In addition, the results of the surveys helped the researcher design and modify the follow-up interview questions. Before implementing the survey, an introduction was given to make sure participants understood the aims of the survey and to reduce their confusion. Participants were informed that their survey participation was on a voluntary basis and the responses would not influence their course grades. Students give the open-ended comments for each engagement element. Participants were encouraged to finish the surveys individually and had no access to others' responses.

Interview. In this study, individual interviews were conducted to get a deeper understanding of the reasons why students were engaged or not in their learning tasks. The individual interviews were conducted as a follow-up to the engagement perceptions survey. Based on the findings of the engagement perceptions survey, the researcher chose the most and least representative opinions from students' answers and then interviewed these students individually to obtain a further understanding of their opinions by asking open-ended questions (e.g., "In your survey you commented that… what do you mean?" "Could you give a specific example for your comments

that…?"). Ten individual interviews were conducted in total, and the researcher took notes of each interviewee's comments for data analysis.

Participants

The participants of this study were CHL students who enrolled in Chinese Intensive courses at an American university. Among them, eighteen students were enrolled in the beginning level intensive Chinese course, fifteen students enrolled in the intermediate level of intensive Chinese course, and nine students enrolled in the advanced level of Chinese course. These students were from twenty to twenty-four years old, with twenty-six females and sixteen males. All of the students' parents are Chinese native speakers, fifteen students use Chinese frequently to communicate with their family members, sixteen students' parents use Chinese frequently while the students use English sometimes at home, eleven students and their parents use English to communicate at home.

Data Analysis

The findings from the engagement perception surveys were organized first. Students' comments were coded inductively to identify the major patterns of their perceptions, and then the categorized data was used to develop interview questions. Wang's (2015) four elements of engaging tasks worked as the theoretical framework for evaluation criteria for analysis. This means that students' responses were sorted to form patterns under each of the engagement elements to present how they perceived each element and the reasons for that.

The data from the interview questions and student documents were coded in the same way as the responses to the surveys. This data functioned as support for the interpretations from the perception survey data. This means that the data obtained from interviews and student discussions

were used to explain and offer examples for their responses in the engagement surveys. Also, new patterns found in the interview questions were also used as data.

Limitations and future directions

This research was conducted in one American University, to increase the generalization，diverse CHL student groups in other Universities should be addressed. Additionally, the researchers undertook a triple role of researcher, instructor, and course designer; this may bias how they analyzed the data. Therefore, the data were triangulated by using multiple sources (survey, follow-up interview, and student documents) to ensure that the researcher's position did not interfere with the results. Besides, the researcher may miss some points during the data collection process. To address this limitation, and to maximize the credibility of this study, the researcher conducted member checks with participants (e.g., asking participants checking questions to make sure of respondent validity). Instructional design and practice are an iterative process, the implications generated in this studies should be implemented through the collaboration among the instructors, and student engagement perceptions should be evaluated again for the further improvement of CHL instructional design and practice.

Result and Discussion

The data were summarized to present how students perceive each engagement element and to uncover patterns to explain the reasons for students' perception of their engagement. These patterns are presented under each of the four engagement elements in this section. The four engagement elements are meeting student learning needs; matching students' abilities and skills; offering opportunities to practice what they have learned; offering clear directions and opportunities for setting up clear personal learning goals.

Engagement element 1: Meeting student learning needs.

20 students at the beginning level reported that two of the major learning needs are reading and writing, therefore, they would like to pay more attention to Chinese characters. However, 10 students pointed out that learning characters separately cannot meet their learning needs and they prefer to learn the characters in context. For example, one of the students said that "I would have preferred an emphasis on writing sentences more than on character sheets since I feel that creating new sentences is a better way to memorize new characters."

Thirty-five students at the beginning level strongly agree that the learning materials are relevant to their lives, one student said that "I found the textbook readings interesting and relevant to me as a person of Chinese heritage". Students also pointed out that one of the major reasons why they take Chinese is to communicate more effectively with their family members, therefore, they have a strong need to learn materials addressing everyday topics, and they are thankful for individual sessions during which they could hold real-life conversations. To engage them more, seven students indicate they would like to learn more natural conversational structures and conversational skills in class. Further, ten students point out that a major learning need of beginning level CHL learners is to maintain their family ties, therefore, they would have had learning materials of Chinese history and culture as well. Seventeen students indicate that they are more interested in the topics more closely related to China, such as news reports, Chinese history, politics, and marriage, but are less interested in broader, more general topics (such as sports and patriotic). Eight of them said they will appreciate it if the teachers could offer life-like videos or clips (e.g., news) as well.

The students at the intermediate level have the learning needs of developing a good understanding of Chinese people and society and of expressing their opinions on the social

problems in the U.S., therefore, they have a strong eagerness to participate in a discussion of common social topics in China and the US (e.g., relationships, birth control policy, aesthetic and personal perspectives, and shopping habits). They perceived more engagement in-class discussion and pointed out that any discussion with relationships or applying to relationships is interesting to them since these materials are relevant to daily use. Some topics such as the Taiwan issue and Chinese architecture seem less interesting to them. Five students also reported that to engage them in their discussion, the topics of the texts should be distinctive from each other, they explained that "sometimes the topics in the readings were repeated, which made the discussions less interesting."

Engagement element 2: Matching students' abilities and skills.

Eight students at the beginning level reported that they perceived a good balance between their learning abilities and the challenges in this course. They said that they have been offered help from teachers promptly and have received instant feedback on homework; it is extremely important for clarifying their confusion and solving their learning difficulties. However, five students claimed that sometimes the arrangement of the course did make the course harder for them to learn, they indicated that some lessons were super hard but other lessons were too easy. One student suggested that "it would have been nice to balance the hard and easy material among different lessons so that we would not be overwhelmed by super hard lessons in one week." the students at the intermediate level agree that making the course materials progressively harder but not in a particularly shocking or unnoticeable way is essential for them to perceive this engagement element. Ten students also indicated that when teachers are open to questions and show a willingness to help, they feel generally easier to participate in. Besides, five students pointed out that they perceived more on this engagement element when teachers have better pacing and spend more time on difficult parts and less on easier ones during class. Seven

students indicated that sometimes teachers ask them to answer the questions with the grammars they have learned, this could make their learning task drier and less engaging.

Engagement element 3: Offering opportunities to practice what they have learned.

The students at the intermediate level would love to see more emphasis on discussion. They ask to have more chances to use learned grammar structures in more than just one essay. One student said that "I tended to find myself sticking to the same few words and not incorporating new vocabulary and grammar into my speaking". They complained that the flow of in-class discussion is quick somehow so that they cannot fully practice the grammar and vocabulary. Besides, students reported that there seems to be less collaborative learning during class time; further, they indicated that this course may lack peer interaction. They suggested that to help them fully practice the materials, they would generally like to see more student involvement and participation amongst each other. They said that "I wish there was more of a focus on discussion and speaking because I felt like in class sometimes there was more of an emphasis on the lesson but less on actually having conversations with each other." They indicated that they perceived this engagement element less when they were often asked to repeat sentences aloud as a class that had not been said yet (the sentence was in the teachers' minds), so they would just stumble over the sentence together as we tried to say it." Also, students pointed out that when they take a more active role in their learning process they can practice better. For example, they said that when the homework encourages them to research on their own, they perceive more engagement in this course.

Engagement element 4: Offering clear directions and opportunities for setting up clear personal learning goals.

Ten students at the beginning level agree that the weekly quiz can help them evaluate their writing outcomes effectively, however, they would like to take a more active role in their learning process,

for example, they said that they would like to be taught more knowledge of characters, and they also want to be taught speaking and writing skills. Furthermore, five students indicate that the success of in-class learning depends on how well they preview the materials, however, ten students received no guidance on how to preview or review the text. Two students suggest that teachers may give them pretest or post-test to help them evaluate their learning outcomes before and after class.

Nineteen students at intermediate-level and advanced-level indicated that to involve them in taking a more active role in their learning, they would like to receive more instructions on speaking and writing skills. Also, eight students are interested to see Chinese peers' works, since they think it could be helpful for them to identify the gap between their works and their Chinese counterparts. Further, thirty students agree that the teacher's instant feedback during class discussion is essential for them to evaluate their speaking. Eleven students also pointed out that sometimes they were not offered instant feedback during class discussion without being corrected on spoken grammar, it is hard for them to set up clear learning goals.

Pedagogical Implications

Because of heritage learner's unique needs, universities and colleges should try to offer separate classes for beginning heritage. Separating the two groups of students has many benefits. First of all, findings of this study show that reading and writing are two main needs for heritage students while non-heritage students need to practice all four skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). Therefore, focusing too much on speaking and listening may disengage the heritage learners from the class. Second, findings of this study suggest that heritage students, because they want to connect to their cultural roots, prefer to learn more about China-related topics, such as history, culture, custom, and news, instead of more general topics. Mixing the two groups of

students may make selecting teaching materials challenging. In conclusion, by separating the two groups of students, instructors can design the classes and select teaching materials based on the needs of the students to further engage CHL learners and non-heritage learners. The following paragraphs will further discuss the selection of teaching materials, focus of instruction, technology-assisted teaching, and assignment design.

The learning materials should be related to students' real-life experiences (e.g., their Chinese learning experience, the development of their heritage identity in the United States). However, the instructor should be clear that the learning needs of students at different learning levels vary. For example, some students' learning needs are interacting with their family members, some students' learning needs are gaining a deep understanding of the economy, culture, and society of China. Therefore, the instructor needs to design their instructions and develop materials by using life-related resources based on students' language levels. For the beginning level, the learning materials may target natural conversational structures. The emphasis of classroom teaching could lead students to generate longer sentences and passages in speaking. During the class, the instructor could generate real communicative contexts to involve students in structured conversations and at the same time offer instant feedback for language improvement. For the intermediate and advanced levels, teaching texts abstracted and articulated from documentations and news could be employed to address students' learning needs. During the class, the instructor could use charts or other data to analyze real-world problems to help students practice the language. Also, according to the results, reading and writing should be emphasized at all levels and while characters should be taught more in contexts. Therefore, during the class, the instructor could use reading as a part of learning tasks, for example, students need to read the text to finish speaking tasks.

With the development of technology, technology-enhanced language teaching can also be applied to CHL teaching. To engage students, the instructor could integrate new technologies, such as life-related videos and reading materials, Padlet, voice thread, and discussion board into teaching. For example, lower-level CHL learners expressed the needs of engaging in discussions that go beyond daily topics. Instructors could first exemplify discussions on social issues with Chinese bloggers' posts and the comments from readers. Then, instructors could encourage students to start their own blogs and comment on each other's posts. If instructors would like to integrate more technologies into their classes, they may consult institutes such as Carnegie Mellon University. Researchers at Carnegie Mellon University are developing cutting-edge technologies with the support of the Askwith Kenner Global Languages and Cultures Room, such as virtual reality tours and interactive learning materials, to escalate the learning experience for students. With virtual reality tours, students can "walk around" streets in China. With interactive learning materials, students are not passively receiving information but actively pursuing information. The impact of COVID-19, though poses numerous challenges for language instruction, also provided remarkable opportunities, such as museums offering online shows and tours. Instructors can make use of the opportunity to overcome the challenge of student engagement during this unprecedented period of time. Similar technologies, if possible, can be used for CHL instructing to enhance student engagement.

As an important form of practice, assignments should also be designed in ways that engage CHL learners. Based on the findings of the study, the researchers would like to make the following recommendation on assignment designs. First, assignments should be designed in innovative ways that can both help students expand their linguistic repertoire and connect to their needs of connecting with family members and maintaining culture-ties. Activities such as writing a

letter/card to your family members is an ideal task for beginning-level CHL learners that fulfills the two needs simultaneously. For intermediate CHL learners, integrated tasks such as listening/reading a piece of news and commenting on the news either orally or in writing can better engage students in the learning of Chinese language. Second, assignments can incorporate elements of cooperative learning. As the students reported in the survey, they would like to have more peer interactions. Assignments such as group skits, research projects, and debates can promote peer interactions and, hence, improve student engagement.

References

Akasha, O. (2013). Exploring the challenges facing Arabic-speaking ESL students & teachers in

middle school. *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 12-31.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York, NY:

Harper Collins.

Dai, J. E. & Zhang, L. (2008). What are the CHL learners inheriting? Habitus of the CHL

learners. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted

world citizenry* (pp. 37–51). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language

Resource Center.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in

theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, *53*(1), 3-32.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd Ed.). Harlow:

Longman.

Li, D., & Duff, P. (2008). Issues in Chinese heritage language education and research at the

postsecondary level. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language:

Fostering rooted world citizenry* (pp. 13–36). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, National

Foreign Language Resource Center.

Duff, P. A., & Li, D. (2004). Issues in Mandarin language instruction: Theory, research, and

practice. *System, 32*(3), 443-456.

Egbert, J. (2003). A study of flow theory in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern

Language Journal, 87*(4), 499-518.

Egbert, J., & Ernst-Slavit, G. (2010). *Access to academics: Planning instruction for K-12

classrooms with ELLs.* Allyn & Bacon.

Everson, M. E. (1988). Speed and comprehension in reading Chinese: Romanization

    vs.characters revisited. *Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association, 23*(2), 1-15.

Everson, M. E. (1994). Toward a process view of teaching reading in the second language

    Chinese curriculum. *Theory Into Practice, 33*(1), 4-9.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the

    concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59-109.

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil,

    P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Volume*

    III (pp. 403-418). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

He, A. & Xiao, Y. (2008). *Chinese as a heritage language.* Manoa, HI: The University of

    Hawaii Press.

Hendryx, J. D. (2008). The Chinese heritage language learners' existing linguistic knowledge and

    abilities. In A. W. He & Y. Xiao (Eds.), *Chinese as a heritage language: fostering rooted*

    world citizenry (pp. 53-66). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, National Foreign

    Language Resource Center.

Herrell, A., & Jordan, M. (2008). *Fifty strategies for teaching English language learners (3rd*

    Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE. *Change, 35*(2),

    24-32.

Lee, C. D. (2007). *Culture, literacy, and learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lin, T. (2011). Student engagement and motivation in the foreign language classroom. Doctoral

    dissertation. Washington State University, Pullman.

Lin, T. (2012). Refining a model of motivation and engagement: perceptions of engaging tasks in
a foreign language classroom. Doctoral dissertation. Washington State University,
Pullman.

Lutz, S. L., Guthrie, J. T., & Davis, M. H. (2006). Scaffolding for engagement in elementary
school reading instruction. *The Journal of Educational Research, 100*(1), 3-20.

Montrul, S. (2012). Is the Heritage Language like a Second Language? *Eurosla Yearbook, 12*, 1-
29.

Newmann, F. M. (Ed.). (1992). *Student engagement and achievement in American secondary
schools*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Oga-Baldwin, W. Q. (2019). Acting, thinking, feeling making, collaborating: The engagement
process in foreign language learning. *System, 86*.

Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom.
Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, *36*, 50-72.

Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during
learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*(4), 257-267.

Russell, V. J., Ainley, M., & Frydenberg, E. (2005.) Student motivation and engagement. In
Schooling issues digest. Retrieved from: http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/26080/20051107-
0000/www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/publications_resources/schooling_issues_
digest/schooling_issues_digest_motivation_engagement.htm.

Ryan, C. (2013). Language use in the United States: 2011. American Community Survey, U.S.
Census Bureau. Retrieved January 9, 2019, from
https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/2013/acs/acs-22/acs-22.pdf

Shernoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Shernoff, E. S. (2003). Student

    engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of flow theory. *School*

    Psychology Quarterly, 18(2), 158-176.

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (2009). Engagement and

    disaffection as organizational constructs in the dynamics of motivational development. In

    K. R. Wentzerl & A. Wigfield (Eds), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 223-245).

    London, UK: Routledge.

Stepp-Greany, J. (2002). Student perceptions on language learning in a technological

    environment: Implications for the new millennium. *Language Learning & Technology,*

    6(1), 165-180.

Strayer, J. (2012). How learning in an inverted classroom influences cooperation, innovation and

    task Orientation. *Learning Environ Res 15*(2), 171.

Svalberg, A. (2009). Engagement with language: Interrogating a construct. *Language*

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: profiles and possibilities. In J.K. Peyton, D.

    Randard & S. McGinnis (Eds.), Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national

    resource (pp. 37-80). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wang, T. (2015). Engagement and Teamwork in Chinese as a Foreign Language and Culture

    Curriculum Development for Teacher Education. *International Journal of Computer-*

    Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT), *5*(2), 22-39.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attribution theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological*

    Review, 92, 548-573.

Wen, X. (1997). Motivation and language learning with students of Chinese. *Foreign Language*

    Annals, 30(2), 235-251.

Wen, X. (2011). Chinese language motivation, a comparative study of heritage and non-heritage learners. *Heritage Language Journal, 8*(2), 41-66.

Yang, Y-F. (2011). Engaging students in an online situated language learning environment. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning, 24*(2), 181-198.

Ye, L. (2011). Teaching and learning Chinese as a foreign language in the United States: To delay or not to delay the character introduction. Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University.

Zhang, G. X., & Li, L. M. (2010). Chinese language teaching in the UK: present and future. *Language Learning Journal, 38*(1), 87-97.

Zhang, Y., Shan, L., & Li, S. (2011). Educational game design for teaching Chinese as a foreign language by effective learning environment, flow, motivation. In X. Luo, Y. Cao, B. Yang, J. Liu, F. Ye, (Eds.) *New Horizons in Web-Based Learning-ICWL 2010 Workshops* (pp. 1-10). Springer: Berlin, Heidelberg.

APPENDIX

Student Engagement Perception Survey

Instruction: Please answer the following questions to the best of your understanding. Fill out the open-ended questions when applicable.

 1. What are your learning needs in this course?

 2. Does the content of the course meet your learning needs?

    If Yes, how so?

    If No, why not? What can be done so that it meets your learning needs?

 3. Is the challenge of the course appropriate for your abilities and skills? In other words, is the course too hard or too easy?

    If appropriate, what made it a good match for your abilities and skills?

    If too easy, how could it better match your abilities and skills?

    If it is too hard, what are its challenges?

 4. Are the learning materials relevant to your life? Which kinds of learning topics are most interesting to you? Which kinds of topics are less interesting? Why?

 5. Does the course provide enough opportunity for you to practice the skills or ideas presented and to obtain instant feedback?

    If Yes, in what ways?

    If No, how could it do so?

    If Somewhat, please explain:

6. Are the supplemental learning materials (e.g., movies, fiction readings, and videos) engaging? Which kind of supplemental materials would you like to see in the future?

7. Does the content of the course and instructions offer opportunities to set up personal learning

goals?

    If Yes, how so?

    If No, why not? What can be done so that it meets your learning needs?

    If Somewhat, please explain: