

Problems and Reflections in the Elementary Level of International Chinese Teaching

Wang Wenlong

Department of Long-term Chinese Teaching
Beijing Chinese Language and Culture College
Beijing 102206, China

Abstract—Firstly, this paper reviewed descriptions of elementary level of teaching Chinese as a foreign language in programmatic documents as well as related discussions in the educational circles, aiming to depict natures and characteristics of the elementary level of international Chinese teaching. It is generally acknowledged that the elementary level of teaching is a kind of “reinforcement” and “practical” teaching, which is characteristic of “short time, extensive contents and high requirements”. Secondly, we conclude that high student loss rate and low teaching efficiency are two major constraints against elementary level of Chinese teaching. Moreover, causes of these challenges were discussed from the perspective of learners, teaching philosophy, teaching method and Chinese characteristics. Finally, the teaching method and model for elementary level as well as corresponding problems and shortcomings were reflected. We pointed out the significance of formulaic language on elementary level teaching.

Keywords—international Chinese teaching; elementary level; teaching model; formulaic language

I. INTRODUCTION

Language teaching is a “decomposed activity, i.e., it is a step-based and level-based process from simple to complex and from low level to high level according to composition factors, pragmatics rules and culture depth of the language” (Li Yang, 1999)[1]. Level-based international Chinese teaching is not a new teaching mode. Wang Ruojiang (1999) pointed out that “oral Chinese teaching must be implemented level by level, same like other subjects. It is a consensus of individualized teaching and determining learning objectives and training strategies according to different levels”[2].

Among different levels of language teaching, importance of the elementary level is evident. Elementary level learning is not only the basis of the whole language learning and provide foreshadowing, accumulations and necessary safeguards as well as sufficient supports for further learning, but also the key period for training learners’ language sense, correct understanding, correct habits, interests and confidence. A good elementary level teaching can protect the smooth

implementation of follow-up teaching activities. On the contrary, poor elementary level teaching will cause a lot of problems to and even suspending the middle and high level teaching activities. Therefore, elementary level teaching determines the quality of whole language teaching.

What is the “elementary level”? What are natures and characteristics of the “elementary level”? What challenges does the elementary level teaching are facing with and what are their causes? Which deserves further reflection?

II. NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Does the elementary level of international Chinese teaching have a unified and clear boundaries or measurement standards? Whether there’s an agreement on “elementary level”? The *HSK Grading Standards and Grammar Outline* (hereinafter referred as the *Standards*) formulated by HSK Department of the National Leading Office for International Chinese Teaching in 1996 regulated boundaries and description on grading standards of international Chinese teaching. The *Standards* is not only a normative grading standard and level outline for international Chinese teaching, but also the “main references for overall design, textbook compiling, classroom teaching and performance assessment for international Chinese teaching” (Preface: 1)[3]. Therefore, it can be viewed as the representative opinion and a consensus of the international Chinese teaching circles on Chinese grading and teaching levels. The Chinese teaching grading standards in the *Standards* can be summarized into “three levels, five classes and three elements”. The “three levels” are elementary level, middle level and high level. Among the five classes, the first and second classes form the elementary level. “Three elements” refers to topic content, language range and verbal ability of every sub-level.

The *Standards* also pointed out its relationship between *Vocabulary Outline*, *Chinese Characters Outline*, *Grammar Outline*, teaching grade and HSK level. Details are listed in Table 1[4].

TABLE I. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE STANDARDS AND OTHER OUTLINES, TEACHING GRADES AND HSK LEVEL

<i>The Standards</i>	Table Column Head	Vocabulary Outline	Chinese Characters Outline	Grammar Outline	Teaching grade	HSK
Elementary level	Class-1	Class-A words: 1,033	Class-A characters: 800	Class-A grammar: 129	Grade 1	Elementary level
	Class-2	Class-B words: 2,018	Class-B characters: 804	Class-B grammar: 123		
Middle level	Class-3	Class-C words: 2,202	Class-C characters: 601	Class-C grammar: 400	Grade 2	Middle level
High level	Class-4	Class-D words: 3,569	Class-D characters: 700	Class-D grammar: 516	Grade 3	High level
	Class-5				Grade 4	

The class-1 and class-2 in the elementary level of the Standards are described as follows:

TABLE II. RELATED STANDARDS OF ELEMENTARY LEVEL IN THE STANDARDS

	Topic content	Language range	Verbal ability
Class-1	Basic daily life, limited learning activity and simple social communication	All phonologies of mandarin, Class-A words (1,300), Class-A characters (800), Class-A grammar (129)	Elementary reading, listening and speaking abilities
Class-2	Basic daily life, learning and social communication activities in the certain range	All phonologies of mandarin, Class-A and Class-B words (3,051), Class-A and Class-B characters (1,604), Class-A and Class-B grammar (252)	Basic reading, listening, speaking and writing abilities

The *Elementary Level Outline for International Chinese Teaching* mainly edited by Yang Jizhou which is the class-2 standards of *HSK Grading Standards and Grammar Outline* is used as the teaching goal of elementary level Chinese (1992:2)[5].

Some scholars believed that although there are no unified national grading standards, people often use other standard in actual operations, especially in non-degree education (Wang

Ruojiang, 1999). According to author's experiences and observations, this exists in practice and is particularly highlighted in class-division teaching. However, the author believes that this won't influence "consensus" of the elementary level. Firstly, such situation mainly exists in class-division teaching. Since different teaching units have different practical situations and considerations on teaching schedule, it is difficult to implement teaching program according to unified standards. It is acceptable to adopt some flexible treatment or the second best standard. Furthermore, most classes mainly follow to the uniform standards or generally appropriate one. Secondly, textbook compilation at present is mainly based on the Standards, which basically determines the limits and scope of the "elementary level". Besides, the *Standards* are formulated strictly and explicitly, known as a programmatic and guidance document. Considering different teaching objects, goals and conditions, the teach program allows flexible treatment according to places and time and the Standards also has left some elastic space. For example, the *Chinese Teaching Outline for International Students in Universities and Colleges (Long-term Further Education)* (hereinafter referred as the *Further Education*) adopted the three levels (elementary, middle and high levels) and 10 classes different from those in the Standards in teaching planning for long-term further education students. Indexes of four classes which compose the elementary level are described as follows[6].

TABLE III. DIVISION OF FOUR CLASSES IN THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL OF FURTHER EDUCATION

Level	Class	Class hours (week)	Pronunciation	Grammar	Words	Characters	Functions
Elementary level	Class-1	200h (10 weeks)	Learn basic phonology of mandarin.	Elementary level: 40	Elementary level: 500	Elementary level: 1,414	Elementary, middle and high level functions: 110
	Class-2	200h (10 weeks)	Review basic phonology of mandarin.	Elementary level: 60	Elementary level: 562		
	Class-3	200h (10 weeks)	Correct pronunciation, accent and tones	Elementary level: 40	Elementary level: 650		
	Class-4	200h (10 weeks)	Correct pronunciation, accent and tones	Elementary level: 45	Elementary level: 700~750		

It can be seen that the *Further Education* has lower requirements on class-4 than the class-2 in the *Standards*. The "elementary" level of the *Further Education* is between the class-1 and class-2, close to class-2. Due to difference of educational background between language advanced students and undergraduates, such different treatment is understandable and acceptable. However, their understandings on the "elementary" level are not conflict and even can be viewed approximately equivalent.

Therefore, some consensus on the understanding of "elementary level of international Chinese teaching" is

available at present. In teaching practice, the elementary level is often divided into three stages, namely, pronunciation stage, sentence and grammar stage as well as essay and vocabulary stage.

The *Standards* deems that "international Chinese teaching for elementary level and post-elementary level (Grade 1 and Grade 2) is a speed-up and reinforcement practical teaching mode" (1996:12). Li Jinghui et al.(1980) also believed that "elementary Chinese teaching"¹ has natures "short-term,

¹ Although no explicit boundary on "basic Chinese teaching" has been

concentrated efforts and speed-up program” and is characteristic of “short time, abundant contents and high requirements”[7].

Li Jinghui et al.(1980) thought that “relative stage-based and concentrated teaching” is one basic principle of short-term and speed-up teaching program. The first practice principle is an important principle of basic Chinese teaching. “Through a short-term learning, students are able to communicate fluently with learned language from zero level. This is a process with high requirement and complicated skill attainment. It couldn’t be accomplished without tremendous practices”. (49-50)

III. CHALLENGES AGAINST ELEMENTARY LEVEL TEACHING AND CAUSES

A. Challenges against elementary level teaching

Challenges against elementary level of international Chinese teaching are mainly manifested in two aspects. The first is high student loss rate and the other is low teaching efficiency and effect. These two aspects are highly interrelated.

In a teaching unit, there are relative more students in elementary class, but students decrease with the increase of teaching level. On one hand, this reflects the general learning law. During the advancement, students will be lost or washed out with the increase of learning level. On the other hand, it also reflects importance and difficulties of elementary level teaching. Different types of learners generate interest and desire to learning the language for different reasons. Therefore, whether the elementary level teaching can meet their learning demands, realize their learning expectations and hold their learning interests and momentum are more prominent and urgent tasks compared to other teaching levels.

When taking challenges against Chinese teaching in America, Wen Xiaohong (2011) pointed out very serious student loss. According to statistics, the population of Chinese learners in America only accounted for 3.6% of total population of foreign language learners in 2009. She believed that this is related with failures of elementary level students to go to the next learning stage. More than 60% students stopped learning Chinese or Japanese in Grade 2. This is caused by several factors, such as “great difficulties in Chinese learning”, “students’ underestimation on learning difficulties” and “different learning goals of students at different grades”. Based on Wen’s survey (2011) on 317 students attending Chinese course in the American University, “positive learning attitude and learning experiences”² and “instrumental motivation”³ are two major variable indexes for predicting whether learners will continue to learn Chinese. In other

determined, it can be viewed that basic Chinese teaching is equal to the “elementary level” in the Standards according to its descriptions (42 weeks, about 3,000 vocabularies, about 1,200 characters and common grammars that involve about 100 basic sentence structures).

²“Positive learning attitude and learning experiences” includes some sub-items, such as that Chinese learning is a mental challenge, Chinese learning is interesting, be fond of communicative classroom activities. (Wen Xiaohong, 2011:543)

³“Instrumental motivation” means, for example, learners are expected to achieve some language capabilities and can accomplish their job tasks and career with Chinese. (Wen Xiaohong, 2011:543)

words, these two indexes are vital to student loss. Therefore, “this requires teachers to design good classroom teaching, train positive attitude of students and offer positive learning experiences. Teachers also should emphasize application of language. They shall give students a sense of achievement by accomplishing tasks with languages and let them perceive progresses, which are conducive to attract them in further Chinese learning program”. (Wen Xiaohong, 2011)[8].

Fundamentally, student loss rate is closely related with teaching efficiency and effect. In fact, teaching efficiency has been a great challenge against international language teaching, especially the elementary level. According to statistics, China has trained 350,000 overseas students since 1970s, but only less than 10,000 students were admitted to postgraduate program, accounting for only 3% (Yang Huiyuan, 2000)[9]. Chen Xianchun (2005) pointed out that “the foreign language teaching circles have been struggling with low teaching efficiency. There are a lot of foreign language learners, but only few become skilled at foreign languages” (48). Chen believed that existing Chinese teaching is successful in term of pronunciation and grammar. For instance, the concentrated training of phonology and sentence teaching during the elementary level achieved good effect. Nevertheless, there’s still a great problem in character and vocabulary teaching. “Inadequate vocabularies are the main constraint that restricts language improvement of students”[10].

B. Causes

Yang Huiyuan (2000) believed that low teaching efficiency is related with the single teaching model. Chen Xianchun (2005) pointed out that “existing teaching method and textbook for the second language have many disagreements with language acquisition law” (48). Li Jianfeng (2009) summarized problems in skill-based teaching model during the elementary level. He believed that these problems are the direct cause of “low teaching level and efficiency as well as students’ antipathy on listening, speaking and writing skills”, thus resulting in the “great gap between the speaking ability of graduates and the teaching program standards as well as practical demands for speaking abilities”[11].

Wang Zhonghua (1999) once pointed out that “we seems to form a concept in the past long period that: teaching speed of the phonetic stage shall be lower than that of the grammar stage and the teaching speed of the grammar stage shall be lower than that in vocabulary and essay stage. To ensure students’ understanding, the teaching program shall be implemented slowly repeat the word again and again, and requires students to stress on key words and character that the teacher though. This forms unique teaching language of teachers as time passes. However, such teaching language is a hidden danger against understanding on natural language. Deliberate slowing-down speech rate will cause understanding obstacles sometimes. This is because over slow speech rate prolongs the space for information transfer. We know that sentence is composed of words, but its meaning is not the simple addition of word meanings. Over slow speed rate will attract students’ attentions onto words and even roots, thus affecting their understanding on the whole sentence meaning”[12].

IV. REFLECTIONS ON ELEMENTARY LEVEL TEACHING

A. *Reflection on teaching model and teaching methods*

Liu Xun (2000) stated that “we are depressed for a long time on research and exploration of teaching method. The whole international Chinese teaching circles generally follows the same model and hardly achieve any breakthroughs. Our teaching effect is not satisfying and the teaching methodology system hasn’t been developed yet. These require great efforts in teaching reform and exploration”[15].

Actually, we have been exploring the elementary level teaching model continuously since 1950s when the research on international Chinese teaching model began.

With the reform and opening-up as well as rapid development of international Chinese teaching, the “skill-based teaching” model that “trains different language skills with different methods” (Lv Bisong, 1996)[16] is accepted by more and more teaching units since the middle of 1980s. It has become the most popular teaching model⁴. Discussion on the whole Chinese teaching model and elementary level teaching model, including reflections on existing “skill-based teaching model”, has attracted wide attentions. Cui Yonghua’s (1999) “three stage” basic Chinese teaching model[17], Yang Huiyuan’s (2000) experimental design on new teaching model, Lu Jianji’s (2003) teaching model of “separated speaking and writing teaching as well as developing intensive and extensive reading simultaneously” [18]and Zhao Jinming’s (2011) proof to the teaching mode of “listening and speaking first, reading and writing second”[19] are representative researches. Wang Ruojiang (1999) believed that skill-based teaching model is the consequence of “actual demands”, “learners’ goal of practicability” and “needs of subject construction”. In fact, same with the comprehensive teaching model, skill-based teaching model is also lack of sufficient theoretical references.

Many scholars highlighted the importance of “reinforcement teaching” during the elementary level from different perspectives. Chen Xianchun (2005) argued that implementing reinforcement teaching during the elementary level conforms to the psychological theory of language acquisition and is an effective way to improve teaching efficiency of the second language. In the elementary level, “strengthening exercises of basic sentence pattern can facilitate internalization of language”, thus enabling learners to master Chinese earlier and communicate fluently in Chinese. Some researchers got enlightenments from some successful language training program, such as the Middlebury Language-Teaching Model of America (Zhang Hesheng, 1997; Zhang Xirong and Tian Dexin, 2004; Ji Chuanbo, 2006; Cao Xianwen, 2007)[20][21][22][23]. The Middlebury language-teaching model is a “typical reinforcement teaching model” which is centered at immersion teaching, integrates listening and speaking, functions, task and other teaching methods, adopts the teaching mode of “lecture in big class, exercise in small class and one-on-one conversion” (Cao Xianwen, 2007).

⁴Some scholars (e.g. Lu Jianji (2003)) believed that there are two major teaching modes: comprehensive teaching model (1950s to late 1970s and early 1980s) and subject-based teaching model (after 1980s). These two models crossed mutually in a certain period.

Such situation is not rare and even is very common. It is manifested not only by speech rate and rhythms, but also by language structure. Teachers form a special “teaching language” during classroom teaching, which makes students perform well in classroom but poorly in practical communication. In view of characteristics of “elementary level”, teachers worried about that complicated form is difficult to be explained during the elementary level and two much contents will increase students’ burden. Therefore, they “prefer the easy ones and avoid the difficult ones” and express with easy-to-understand (or “easy-to-interpret”) but not nature terms. Although this reduces learning difficulties and teaching difficulties, it also decreases teaching and learning efficiency. It is against long-term language teaching and teaching more seriously.

He Chongxian (1995) stated that in the elementary level, same with the native language acquisition of children, learning the second language of adults also requires tremendous inputs of language materials, which is impossible in practice. Students couldn’t acquire enough information from our textbooks and teaching. Therefore, it is suggested to expand language materials, increase learning contents, and improve teaching means during the elementary level teaching to “enrich their Chinese character library”[13]. Du Xin (2006) thought that an effective way that can connect the “small context” in classroom and “big context” out of classroom shall be developed. Meanwhile, teachers shall avoid language degradation (e.g. “academicism Chinese” or “written Chinese”) and encourage students to combine freely, revise and enrich their own languages based on learned vocabularies, grammar and comprehensive knowledge as well as practice. Moreover, teachers shall put forward corresponding requirements to students. For example, students are asked talk with social spoken language (e.g. idiom, common sayings and even polite formula) according to scenarios and functions before the oral class[14].

Based on above analysis, the author concluded main causes of challenges against the elementary level of current international Chinese teaching. Firstly, learners have inadequate knowledge reserves and very limited vocabularies and grammar knowledge in the initial stage, which restrict the implementation of high-efficiency teaching. Secondly, the teaching idea is still backward, which emphasizes on knowledge learning but pay few attentions to skill training. Besides, it is lack of practical teaching materials and teaching contents are less practicability, which couldn’t meet learning demands and expectation of learners. Thirdly, no effective teaching method and guidance on learning strategy is available. Without adequate opportunities to speak the language, learners couldn’t maintain high learning enthusiasm. Fourthly, due to the uniqueness of writing system, grammar parataxis and phonology, Chinese characters are difficult to be mastered by learners, especially the elementary learner without any Chinese learning background and whose first language is Indo-European languages.

“It is applicable to short-term reinforcement teaching of beginners” (Ji Chuanbo, 2006). To address the backward teaching methods, academic circles have been advocating “task-based teaching model” in recent years. At the same time, various new teaching ideas and methods are introduced and tried continuously. Considering limited language knowledge, some scholars put forward programs for intensive training and expanding vocabularies. Additionally, many scholars proposed teaching reform schemes or suggestions from different problems and perspectives (Lv Wenhua, 1998; Ma Jianfei, 2000; Zhang Baolin, 2008; Chen Yuhuan, 2009)[24][25][26][27].

These discussions and opinions not only reflect problems and shortcomings in current international Chinese teaching, but also echoes with the urgent requirements of teachers and learners on realizing teaching goal effectively and improving teaching effect and learning efficiency.

However, these reform schemes failed to change the teaching status of elementary level fundamentally or failed to achieve the expected effect. After analysis, this is caused by two aspects. Firstly, the teaching reform schemes or suggestions are good but less practicable. Secondly, the teaching reform schemes or suggestions can be implemented in teaching effectively, but presented poor practicability. Take intensive training for example. Everyone knows that intensive training can help to improve teaching effect to some extent, but it also requires promise of considerable credit hours and high matching with other classes. These are difficult in practical teaching. Some new teaching models and teaching methods only change in the form but not the content, thus failing to improve teaching conditions significantly. In this paper, it is important to note that although “task-based teaching method” has attracted wide research attentions in the past years and its role and feasibility in teaching have been widely accepted, it is not the whole teaching program. Teaching program is an organic system composed of many links and elements and it shouldn’t expect to solve all teaching problems thoroughly by depending on only one “advanced” teaching method. If the elementary level teaching couldn’t achieve any progress in other aspects, especially in teaching contents, all teaching methods including the task-based teaching methods can only contribute very limited teaching effect and the overall teaching situation won’t be improved substantially.

B. Reflections on Grammar Outline items and Vocabulary Outline items

The *Standards* interpret the *Grammar Grading Outline*. It mentioned that “when compiling phrases and sentences (including spoken format, complex sentence, multiple complex sentence and sentence group) for grammar grading outline, we basically follow the principle of consistence and coordination between grammar and vocabularies of the same level. In other words, vocabularies of one grammar level are limited within the same level (including previous level(s)). This is an important reflection of scientificity, systematicness, contemporaneity, hierarchy and practicability of the *Grammar Grading Outline*”. (3) Although such treatment has some reasonability, it also brings some

problems. The “Grammar Outline items” may not be consistent with “Vocabulary Outline items”. Some phrases or spoken format composed of simple words may not be simple or uncommon, while some common terms composed of Class-2 or higher words may be enlisted as class-1 terms. Therefore, “grammar items” are not completely matching with “vocabulary items”. Low grade of vocabularies that composed the “grammar items” doesn’t mean the low grade of the “grammar item”. Similarly, grades of vocabularies in phrases, format and sentence couldn’t determine their grades. Hence, the overall language teaching scheduling based on vocabulary grade could neither reflect the overall situation and practical situations of language, nor conform to language acquisition law and realize ideal teaching effect. Li Jinghui et al.(1980) once pointed out that “we have to admit that when evolving basic grammars into basic sentence in the past, key attentions were paid to grammar rules but neglects the actual communication role of language to some extent, thus making some phrases, sentences and texts uncorrelated with actual life of students”. Zhao Jinming (1996) stated when discussing objectives of three stages of international Chinese teaching that students must master usage and conditions of different phrases and words when learning the basic sentence structure during the elementary level, because “the key of correct communication involves usage of phrases and words except for sentences”[28]. In a word, single structural method is inadequate in the second language acquisition and teaching. We shall explore methods to break bottlenecks positively and improve teaching efficiency and situations of elementary level.

C. Significance of formulaic language in elementary level teaching

Formulaic language has irreplaceable advantages in language learning and possesses great potentials in improving elementary level teaching because of its functions. Wray (2000) reviewed previous researches and summarized two major functions of formulaic language: saving effort in processing and achieving interactional functions[29].

Obviously, these two functions of formulaic language can offset problems of elementary level teaching. The low cost of memory storage and convenient information processing can solve the problem that learners didn’t have adequate knowledge reserve effectively. They can expand vocabularies and expressions of learners significantly without increasing teaching hours and learning burden greatly, thus improving the learning efficiency effectively. Becker (1975) once pointed out that “[they] give us ready-made frameworks on which to hang the expression of our ideas, so that we do not have to go through the labor of generating an utterance all the way out from S every time we want to say anything”[30].

The interactional communication can increase practicability and diversity of elementary contents, realize interactive teaching of elementary level, meet communication demands of learners, maintain and even strengthen their learning enthusiasm, and improve teaching effect effectively. Moreover, reasonable application of formulaic language plays a great role in solving the “difficult Chinese”. Pattern of formulaic language can help beginners to steer away from abundant “covert grammatical relations” beyond the basic

grammar rules, to perceive and master usage of phrases directly in specific interactive events and context, and to feel specialty of Chinese grammar gradually. This can avoid the teaching-learning dilemma. The uniqueness and richness of formulaic language also provide more possibilities for phonology teaching.

To sum up, the author believed that characteristics of formulaic language can integrate well with natures and characteristics of elementary level teaching. Introducing the formulaic language theory in elementary level of Chinese teaching and using it reasonably can cope with current challenges effectively to some extent.

REFERENCES

- [1] Li Yang. Limits and Freedom in Language Teaching. *Chinese Teaching in The World*, 1999(2). (In Chinese)
- [2] Wang Ruojiang. Reflections on Oral Class. *Chinese Language Learning*, 1999(2). (In Chinese)
- [3] HSK Department of the National Leading Office for International Chinese Teaching. *HSK Grading Standards and Grammar Outline*. Beijing: Higher Education Press, 1996. (In Chinese)
- [4] HSK Department of the National Leading Office for International Chinese Teaching. *HSK Vocabulary and Character Grading Outline*. Beijing: Beijing Languages College Press, 1992. (In Chinese)
- [5] Yang Jizhou (editor in chief) et al. *Elementary Level Outline for International Chinese Teaching (I)*. Beijing: Beijing Language and Culture University Press, 1999. (In Chinese)
- [6] National Leading Office for International Chinese Teaching. *Chinese Teaching Outline for International Students in Universities and Colleges (Long-term Further Education)*. Beijing: Beijing Languages College Press. (In Chinese)
- [7] Li Jinghui, Cheng Meizhen, Liu Yinglin. *Elementary Chinese Teaching for Overseas Students*. *Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies*, 1980(4). (In Chinese)
- [8] Wen Xiaohong. Challenges against Chinese Teaching in America and Coping Strategies. *Chinese Teaching In The World*, 2011(4). (In Chinese)
- [9] Yang Huiyuan. *New Teaching Model for Secondary Language (Experimental Design)*. *Chinese Language Learning*, 2000(6). (In Chinese)
- [10] Chen Xianchun. *Reinforcement Teaching: Road to Higher Efficiency --- Compilation and Experiment of Intensive Chinese Training Textbook*. *Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies*, 2005(6). (In Chinese)
- [11] Li Jianfeng. *Teaching Model, Problems and Countermeasures in Elementary Chinese Teaching*. *Exam Weekly*, 2009(7). (In Chinese)
- [12] Wang Zhonghua. *Four Questions on Elementary Level of Chinese Teaching*. *Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies*, 1999(3). (In Chinese)
- [13] He Chongxian. *Primary Investigation on Elementary Chinese Teaching and Cultural Contents for Overseas Students*. *Journal of Wuhan University (philosophy and social science)*, 1995(6). (In Chinese)
- [14] Du Xin. *Faces of Spoken Chinese Teaching in the World*. *Applied Linguistics*, 2006(S2). (In Chinese)
- [15] Liu Xun. *Theoretical Construction on Chinese Teaching as A Foreign Language in the Past Two Decades*. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 2000(1). (In Chinese)
- [16] Lv Bisong. *Systematic Problems of Skill Training in Chinese Teaching*. *Collected Papers of the 5th International Chinese Teaching Seminar*. Beijing: Peking University Press, 1996. (In Chinese)
- [17] Cui Yonghua. *Reform of Elementary Chinese Teaching Model*. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 1999(1). (In Chinese)
- [18] Lu Jianji. *Separated Speaking and Writing Teaching and Developing Intensive and Extensive Reading Simultaneously----- A Concept on International Chinese Teaching Improvement*. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 2003(2). (In Chinese)
- [19] Zhao Jinming. *Effective Ways for Elementary Chinese Teaching -----Dialectics on "listening and speaking first, reading and writing second"*. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 2011(3). (In Chinese)
- [20] Zhang Hesheng. *Chinese Teaching in Middlebury College*. *China Higher Education*, 1997(1). (In Chinese)
- [21] Zhang Xirong, Tian Dexin. *Chinese Teaching in Middlebury College*. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 2004(1).
- [22] Ji Chuanbo. *Construction of International Chinese Teaching Model-----A case based on Chinese teaching in Middlebury College*. *Chinese Language Learning*, 2006(4). (In Chinese)
- [23] Cao Xianwen. *Comparison between Middlebury Language-Teaching Model and Elementary Chinese Teaching of Universities in China Mainland-----A discussion on differences and complementation between elite model and common model*. *Journal of College of Chinese Language and Culture*, Jinan University, 2007(4). (In Chinese)
- [24] Lv Wenhua. *An idea of Combining Sentence Teaching and Semantic Analysis*. *Chinese Language Learning*, 1998(6). (In Chinese)
- [25] Ma Jianfei. *A New Short-term Chinese Teaching Model based on "Interactive Tasks"*. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 2000(4). (In Chinese)
- [26] Zhang Baolin. *A New Teaching Model for International Chinese Grammar Knowledge*. *Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies*, 2008(3). (In Chinese)
- [27] Chen Yuhuan, Chen Chengzhi and Zhang Yonghui. *Exploration on the Metacognition-dominated and IT-assisted Speaking Language Teaching Model*. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 2009(4). (In Chinese)
- [28] Zhao Jinming. *Three Stages of International Chinese Teaching and Objectives*. *Chinese Teaching in the World*, 1996(3). (In Chinese)
- [29] Wray, A. 2000 "Formulaic Sequences in Second Language Teaching": Principle and Practice. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 463-489. (In Chinese)
- [30] Becker, J. 1975 "The phrasal lexicon". Reprinted in R. Shank & B. L. Nash-Webber (eds.), *Theoretical issues in natural language processing*. Cambridge, MA: Bolt Beranek & Newman, 60-63. (In Chinese)