

		Teaching Listening Compre- hension	Activities Used	Useful
	or open-ended questions for them to answer.			
2.31	Guessing definitions. The teacher defines or describes something and the pupils guess what it is.	87–91		
2.32	Constructing models. Pupils listen to tape and construct a model according to the instructions given	70–6		
2.33	Summarising a familiar exercise.	45–7		
2.34	Prediction.	139–41		
2.35	Listening to a one-sided telephone conversation.			
2.36	Interpretive listening. Pupils listen to a dialogue and try to identify who and where the speakers are, the topic of conversation, etc.	160–4		
2.37	Problem solving. Pupils listen to a short description/narrative containing a problem. They discuss ways of solving the problem.			
2.38	Conflicting versions/jigsaw listening. Pupils listen to several versions of the same incident (e.g. an accident) which contain conflicting information and try to form a coherent version of the situation.	156–60		

William Cheng is Senior Lecturer in the School of Education, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER IN-SERVICE EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

John L. Clark

Introduction

There are two quotations which seem to me to sum up what lies behind effective teacher education and educational change. The first, a proverb from Confucius, is well known:

"If you give a man a fish, you feed him for one day. If you teach him how to fish, you feed him for a lifetime."

(Confucius)

The second quotation is less well-known, but is equally pertinent.

"But you, who are wise, must know, that different nations have different Conceptions of things and you will therefore not take it amiss, if our Ideas of this Kind of Education happen not to be the same as yours. We have had some Experience of it. Several of our young people were formerly brought up at the Colleges of the Northern Provinces: they were instructed in all your Science; but, when they came back to us, they were Bad Runners, ignorant of every means of living in the woods . . . neither fit for Hunters, Warriors, nor Counsellors, they were totally good for nothing.

We are, however, not the less oblig'd by your kind Offer, tho' we decline accepting it: and, to show our Grateful Sense of it, if the Gentlemen of Virginia will send us a Dozen of their Sons, we will take Care of their Education, instruct them in all we know, and make Men of them."

(Response of the Indians of the Six Nations to a suggestion that they send boys to an American College in Pennsylvania, 1744).

The Confucius quotation implies that rather than attempting to feed teachers with pre-cooked "fish" in the form of ready-made syllabuses, pre-packaged course books, externally-produced end-of-year attainment tests, in-service methodological recipes for instant communication, and the like, it is more effective to set about enabling teachers to look for, catch and cook their own "fish", i.e. to enable them to participate in the creation and renewal of their own syllabus, resources, classroom strategies, tests etc. Learning to do this, however, takes time and demands experience, and some may be better at it than others for a variety of reasons. It is important therefore to ensure that teachers who are still learning how to renew their own curriculum receive an appropriate level of guidance and support from existing syllabuses, resources, in-service courses etc. We must not leave those fishermen who are still learning to fish to starve.

The quotation from the Indians of the six Nations indicates that rather than attempting to create an ideal curriculum suitable for all contexts and all learners at all times, it is better to accept from the start that educational contexts will vary one from another, some in minor ways, others in major

ones. There may be important cultural differences, as between the indigenous Indians and the newly-arrived European Americans in Pennsylvania. Even within the same broad cultural group, classrooms will differ in terms of the values pursued by the community they serve, in terms of the characteristics of their learners, in terms of the experience, personality and teaching styles of the teachers, and most importantly, perhaps, in terms of the curiously unpredictable classroom atmospheres that emerge from the interaction between teacher, curriculum and pupils, and between pupils and other pupils. It is when we realise this that it becomes clear that curriculum renewal or educational change, which I take to be the same thing, must derive from the peculiar characteristics of each culture and of each classroom within it. This implies, I believe, that teachers and learners must play a central role in the development of their own curriculum.

Influences lying behind educational change

There would seem to be five major influences lying behind educational change in the language curriculum. They are:

- social-political attitudes, which are clearly subject to shifts of focus, as society and political groups attempt to come to terms with ways of promoting their economic growth, their social cohesion and their spiritual welfare. The role of language is clearly crucial in all three sectors
- educational value-systems, which are broad constructs created out of the interaction between the socio-political factors outlined above, educational philosophy, school practices, and new educational insights emerging from research and from studies of classroom teaching and learning
- applied linguistic insights, deriving from current developments in linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and other related fields, in so far as they are relevant to language teaching and learning
- teacher experiential wisdom, deriving from classroom practice — an often forgotten factor, but one which, as Atkin points out, is a crucial influence on successful curriculum renewal

“For centuries . . . skilled craftsmen have been making metals. They have learned to add a little of this substance and a little of that, then heat the batch for a certain length of time until it reaches a certain colour, then let it cool at a certain rate . . . Meanwhile, ‘scientific’ approaches to metallurgy have not succeeded in fully explaining all that the master craftsman does . . . Isn’t it possible that teaching is at least as complex as metallurgy?”

(Atkin 1968)

- pupil characteristics deriving from their changing aspirations and motivational patterns.

In this paper there is space only to trace the influence of two broad educational value-systems on the way in which teacher education and educational change is promoted.

Educational value-systems

There are perhaps two educational value-systems currently in contention. Skilbeck (1982a) has referred to these as reconstructionism and progressivism. These two conflicting value-systems have emerged from the slow move away from elitist education, which focussed on abstract knowledge and high-culture, towards egalitarianism on the one hand and learner-centredness on the other. Egalitarianism is bound up with reconstructionism, and learner-centredness with progressivism.

We shall examine briefly how each value-system influences teacher education and educational change. (For a fuller account, see Clark 1987).

Reconstructionism

Skilbeck's (1982a) analysis of reconstructionism indicated that it is an essentially optimistic ideology, which believes that man can improve himself and his environment. Reconstructionists envisage that social, economic, intellectual, and spiritual advance can all be rationally planned for. Education is seen as an important agent for bringing this about. It is seen as a means of redressing the injustices of birth and of early upbringing, and of working through consensus towards a better world in which all citizens are equally valued.

Reconstructionists tend to have great faith in the power of planning, of setting goals to be pursued, and of deliberate intervention in the education system to bring about the desired outcomes.

Examples of reconstructionist forces at work are as follows:—

- the move towards comprehensive schools and mixed ability classes
- “immersion” programmes in Canada, which derive from the political desire to foster greater national cohesion between English and French speakers.
- the Council of Europe Modern Languages project (Council of Europe 1981), which aims to bring about greater European Unity through better communication among speakers of different languages, and through preservation and promotion of linguistic and cultural diversity.

Reconstructionism gives rise to a centralised planning and control of education. It tends to adopt a “top-down” approach towards educational change, in which the government of the day appoints committees of carefully selected experts and representatives of different interest-groups to produce a global policy document. At a more technical level further committees are established to work out detailed subject syllabuses, teaching/learning resources and examinations. All of these can be said to form a curriculum “package”, which is created outside the classroom and then passed on to teachers to implement in their various schools.

In-service training centres are then charged with the task of training teachers to adopt the new package, and schools are offered incentives to implement it.

Reconstructionist educational change is thus a "top-down" affair, brought about from outside the classroom by committees of government-approved "experts". Teacher in-service education is seen as the means through which teachers learn to adopt the new packages.

Progressivism

Progressivism looks to Rousseau for its inspiration, and to Piaget among others for its pragmatic support.

It makes for a learner-centred approach to education, which attempts to promote the pupil's or teacher's development as an individual with intellectual, skill-based, and emotional needs, and as a social being. The learner is seen as a whole person and not just as a disembodied intellect or skilled performer.

Progressivists tend to see education as a means of providing learners with learning experiences from which they can learn by their own efforts. Learning is envisaged as a continuum which can be broken up into several broad developmental stages. For progressivists, "growth" through experience, (learning by doing and reflection upon this), is the key concept.

For progressivists, education is not seen as a process for the transmission of a set of closed truths, but as a way of enabling learners to create, then test and improve their own knowledge, and through this to learn how to learn. Teachers are not simply instructors, but creators of an environment in which learners can learn and learn how to learn by their own efforts. As Rogers (1969) puts it:

"The only man who is educated is the man who has learned how to learn; the man who has learned how to adapt and change; the man who has learned that no knowledge is secure, that only the process of seeking knowledge gives a basis for security."

The progressivist approach to educational change is to involve teachers in the renewal of their own classroom curriculum in the light of their own contextual requirements. It enables teachers to do this through in-service support which provides teachers with access to information, and with basic research, implementation and evaluation skills, so that over time they become increasingly responsible for their own curriculum. Progressivists stress the importance of teachers learning together in groups by their own efforts. As Rudd (1973) puts it:

"I regard it as axiomatic that the teacher who learns from his own experience understands in a way which is just not available to persons who merely try to follow the instructions of others . . . I see the local curriculum development group as a setting within which teachers can become the willing agents of their own continuing professional education."

Thus, in the progressivist approach, teacher in-service education brings about educational change, which is firmly rooted upon classroom reality.

The advantages and disadvantages of the reconstructionist approach to educational change

The advantage of a reconstructionist "top-down" approach to curriculum renewal is that it looks neat and tidy, because it can be centrally controlled by the government of the day, and can be easily sold to the public.

The major disadvantage is that the rhetoric incorporated in the policy and planning documents and in the new curriculum package is seldom translated into classroom reality. All classrooms are different, and what may work in one classroom may not be wholly appropriate in another. All too often new curriculum packages only work in the "best" classrooms, and need adaptation before they work in others. Classroom habits, uncooperative school managers, large class sizes, lack of resources, insufficient staff, timetable problems and other constraints are often conveniently allowed to block innovation. In addition, teachers tend to remove the innovatory parts of a new curriculum package and teach in the same way as they did before. They may do this because they are not convinced of the value of a new curriculum package, or because they have not internalised the new perceptions of the teaching and learning process embodied in it. Suffice it to say that "top-down" curriculum renewal has a history of limited success, despite the investment of huge sums of money in it (cf Skilbeck 1982b). It does not allow for teacher development or innovation, for flexible response to contextual requirements, or for spontaneity. Nor does it help teachers to learn how to learn to improve their own curriculum.

The advantages and disadvantages of the progressivist approach to educational change

Perhaps the main advantage of the progressivist "bottom-up" approach to educational change, which emphasises the importance of teacher-based development work, lies in the greater sense of commitment teachers feel towards a curriculum whose shape they themselves have had some say in. It is when teachers are committed to what they are doing, that teaching seems to be at its most effective. A sense of cooperative professionalism inspiring self-confidence is more likely to be engendered when teachers perceive that they are curriculum-makers, rather than servants to a curriculum created by outside agents, however expert the latter may be.

Teacher-based educational change leads to slow but permanent evolution, which, it may be argued, is preferable to the revolutionary style of change implied in reconstructionist practices, where lengthy periods of relative inaction are interrupted by sudden "top-down" inspired hiccups that everyone must quickly react to. Externally imposed change often leads to a loss of self-confidence and anxiety among teachers.

The disadvantages of the progressivist approach to educational change are that it is messy and difficult to control. It leads to great diversity, and can seem somewhat directionless. It also places an enormous burden on over-worked teachers, who in current conditions have little time to devote to the

reading, group discussion, reflection and action that is required for effective "bottom-up" curriculum renewal. Many Governments fail to perceive the need for extra personnel and resources to permit effective educational change to occur, and seem to prefer centralist reconstructionist practices over which they can be seen by the public to exercise control. On pragmatic grounds, therefore, it seems necessary to attempt to work towards some sort of integration of the best features of reconstructionist and progressivist practices.

Towards an integration of the reconstructionist and progressivist approaches to educational change

It would seem sensible, in so far as it is possible, to combine some of the advantages of the "top-down" and "bottom-up" approaches to curriculum renewal and to eliminate their least attractive features. This seems to imply that there should be a sense of direction provided from the "top", but that space should be left for those at the "bottom" to interpret that direction to suit their contextual requirements. In the ALL (Australian Language Levels) project, in which I was recently involved (Clark 1987: Chapter 7, Curriculum Development Centre Canberra 1988), the solution offered to this problem is to provide from the "top" a curriculum framework and principles of procedure to guide teachers and other curriculum developers to work together from the "bottom" on school language policies, syllabuses, schemes of work, resources, classroom strategies, assessment schemes, evaluation procedures etc. In their turn the syllabuses, schemes of work and resources created leave space for an appropriate level of pupil choice. The ALL project thus represents an attempt to integrate "top down" and "bottom up" work across the various sectors of education in the renewal of language curricula across the various states in Australia. It will be interesting to see how the project develops.

In terms of teacher in-service education, it would seem sensible to provide for an array of different styles of in-service work for different purposes. These would include:

- short in-service courses on particular limited areas of concern
- more lengthy courses for teachers to develop research, implementational and evaluative skills, and to upgrade the conceptual and pragmatic bases from which they currently operate
- lengthy secondments to individuals or small groups to work on particular tasks for which they have a particular aptitude (e.g. a syllabus, a set of resources, innovative classroom strategies etc.)
- Ongoing school-based curriculum development work, supported by appropriate consultants, to assist the school itself to improve its own curriculum and practices, since as Whitehead states:
"The first requisite for educational reform is the school as a unit with its approved curriculum based on its own needs, and evolved by its own

staff. If we fail to secure that, we simply fall from one formalism into another, from one dung-hill of inert ideas into another."

(Whitehead 1932:21)

—subject-specific teacher curriculum renewal groups, supported by appropriate consultants, to work on the permanent improvement of policy, syllabuses, resources, classroom practices, assessment etc. within their subject area (Clark 1987).

In-service teacher educators must strive to find the appropriate balance between "top-down" informational input, tutor-directed experiential tasks through which knowledge and awareness can be improved, and self-generated research and application work, attempting to combine the best of reconstructionist and progressivist methodological practices. The balance between these elements will change according to context.

Contextual influences

Apart from the obvious financial and administrative constraints and those deriving from socio-cultural traditions, there are two major contextual influences which should guide us in the choice of mode of teacher education and of educational change. The first of these influences derives from the stage of development reached by the educational system itself and the individual teachers within it. The second influence derives from the personality and attitudinal characteristics of those involved.

Beeby (1973) has outlined four stages of development through which educational systems seem to pass. They are as follows:

- The Dame School stage, in which Schools tend to follow a narrow curriculum with much rote-learning and little flexibility.
- The stage of Formalism, in which Schools follow a rigidly prescribed syllabus with approved materials towards tightly prescribed examinations. Teachers follow textbooks and prescribed methods slavishly.
- The stage of Transition in which contextually appropriate adaptations to the syllabuses and existing materials are encouraged. Experimentation, however, is usually restricted by the examinations in force.
- The stage of Meaning in which teachers are encouraged to participate in the curriculum renewal process. Individual differences are catered for, and teacher responsibility for the curriculum is promoted.

Beeby maintains that the four developmental stages are linear in nature, and that one cannot bring about changes that belong in the stage of Meaning, for example, in an educational context still engaged in the stage of Formalism. Equally it would seem counterproductive to will an educational system already approaching the stage of Meaning back into the stage of Formalism, as appears to be the current government's wish in Britain. It would seem important to provide the appropriate level of "top-down" guidance indicated by the level of development achieved by a particular educational system.

It is possible in very general terms to view the progress of individual teachers as passing through the same sort of stages as the systems they serve. Thus many teachers in their first years tend somewhat unthinkingly to adopt the practices of those who taught them at school (the Dame School stage), or need close guidance and tight supportive structures (the Formalistic stage), before they are ready to adapt or to innovate (the Transitional and Meaning stages). It would therefore seem sensible to accept that individual teachers will require different levels of guidance and support in the path leading towards responsibility for their own curriculum.

In addition to being at different stages of development, teachers vary in their personalities and in their attitudes towards the taking of responsibility and educational change. Some of this variation is culturally derived, while some is more individual. Although it is somewhat of a caricature, there are perhaps 4 basic attitudinal types among teachers — the conservatives, the adopters, the adapters and the innovators. As outlined in Clark (1987):

"The 'conservatives' are those who have discovered a style of teaching and who have developed an approach, strategies, and techniques that suit their existing knowledge, skills, and attitudes, and who do not wish to change these. They may not wish to do so through strong faith in the rightness of their attitude, through fear of the unknown, or because their own education has not equipped them with either the desire or the tools for learning how to learn any further. It is understandable that there are 'conservatives' among older teachers, whose education and teaching experience may have been acquired in less rapidly changing times, but one also finds a number of 'conservatives' among younger teachers too. They find it difficult to come to terms with ideas or strategies that do not accord with the approach they have developed. They adopt new curricula somewhat reluctantly, and, when they do, they often transform them to accord with their existing approach.

The 'adopters' are those who wait for the 'official' stamp of approval on any innovation before making a move. They are very concerned about whether they are doing the 'right' thing, and tend to have a somewhat naive faith in the notion of the 'official' panacea which will solve their problems.

The 'adapters' like to tinker with official guidelines and with course materials in order to make them more suitable for their own classroom circumstances. They are sufficiently independent to wish to bring their own personal ideas, attitudes, and practice to bear upon classroom procedures, but may not wish to jettison existing materials and practices entirely, often for very pragmatic reasons.

The 'innovators' believe that they can devise curricula which respond to their pupils' needs and aspirations better than any external body. They work best when they are experimenting with new ideas and new techniques. There are 'solo innovators', who find it hard to share their ideas

and experiences with others or to work with them, and there are 'interactive innovators', who work more naturally in group mode."

Given all of this, it would seem that we should attempt to provide the level and the style of support best suited to each context and to each individual teacher.

Conclusion

To return to the beginning of the paper and integrate the concerns of the two quotations, it seems sensible to accept that since all educational contexts and individual teachers are different, we must pitch the level of guidance and the style of support we offer in teacher education and curriculum renewal work to the characteristics of the educational system as a whole and of the individual teachers within it, while aiming nevertheless to get as far along the road as we can towards a stage of Meaning, in which teachers are supported to take responsibility for their own curriculum.

References

- Atkin, J. M. 1968. "Behavioural objectives in curriculum design: a cautionary note." *The Science Teacher* 35/5:27–30.
- Beeby, C. E. 1973. *The Quality of Education in Developing Countries*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and Oxford: Harvard University Press.
- Clark, J. L. 1987. *Curriculum Renewal in School Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Council of Europe. 1981. *Modern Languages (1971–1981)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra. 1988 *Australian Language Levels Guidelines*. Canberra: Curriculum Development Centre (4 books).
- Rogers, C. R. 1969. *Freedom to Learn*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.
- Rudd, A. 1973. "Local curriculum development" in R. Watkins (ed.): *In-Service Training: Structure and Content*. London: Ward Lock Educational.
- Skilbeck, M. 1982a. "Three educational ideologies" in T. Horton and P. Raggat (eds.) *Challenge and Change in the Curriculum*. Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Skilbeck, M. 1982b. "School-based curriculum development" in V. Lee and D. Zeldin (eds.): *Planning in the Curriculum*. Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton/Open University.

Dr. John Clark is Vice Principal (English) in the Institute of Language in Education, Hong Kong.

在方言環境中的語文教學與學習

李學銘

香港教育署語文教育學院

一、引言

一個人的語文學習，基本上會受到四大因素所影響，這些因素是：(1)家庭因素；(2)社會因素；(3)語言習慣因素；(4)學校因素。所謂「家庭因素」，指的是家庭環境和家庭成員對學生語文所造成的影響；所謂「社會因素」，主要指社會上的語文傳媒和學生所處社會環境對學生語文所造成的影響；所謂「語言習慣因素」，指的是口頭語和書面語對學生語文所造成的影響；所謂「學校因素」，指的是學校教師、環境、設備和各科課程、教材對學生語文所造成的影響⁽¹⁾。在四大因素中，「語言習慣因素」，往往特別受到語文教育學者和語文教育工作者的重視。他們認為，適當的語言環境，配應的語言習慣，特別有利於語文教學與學習。

香港居民，以廣東人為最多，溝通語言，一般以廣州方言為主。不過細察目前香港居民所用的廣州方言，其中已滲有新的成分，因此，無論是語音或詞匯，並不完全同於原來的廣州方言，就是與現時生活於廣州的居民比較起來，也有一些不同的地方；這當然是由於時間、地域所影響，所以才會出現這樣的情況。因此，有人索性把香港居民口頭說的所謂「廣州方言」，稱為「香港話」。學生處身在這樣的方言環境裏，由於受到語言習慣的影響，因而在運用書面語表情達意時，往往夾雜了大量方言和只有本地人才熟悉的外來語，這種情況，無疑使語文教師在批改學生的語文習作時，經常面臨孰是孰非的考慮，受到不少困擾。至於讀文教學的教材，除了古代漢語的教材外，都是符合標準語或接近標準語的現代漢語篇章，與學生平日習用的口語並不相同，於是學生在吸收、應用時，也不能得心應手。可見香港學生在寫作、閱讀時，往往需要一重詞匯、語法的轉化手續，而這一重手續，對語文能力還有局限的中、小學生來說，自然產生困難。簡而言之，目前香港學生的語文學習，所缺乏的正是一個有利的語言環境。因此，香港的語文教師，在這個方言環境中，既要為自己解決教學上的困難，同時也要幫助學生解決學習語文時所產生的困難。怎樣解決這些困難？這是我想在這裏討論的。

(1) 參閱何津《語言環境與語文教學》，《語文雜誌》第5期，1980年8月語文雜誌出版社，頁96至97。

二、解決困難的意見

在方言環境中，該怎樣解決語文教學與學習的困難，是一個受人關注的論題。不少語文教育學者和語文教育工作者，在這方面發表了不少解決困難的意見。綜觀他們的意見，大抵可歸納為幾點：

1. 在中、小學提供必修的普通話訓練課程，讓學生有學習普通話的機會，使他們的口頭語和書面語可以合而為一，達到「我手寫我口」的要求。
2. 採用普通話作為教學語言，使學生可以有較多機會聽普通話和說普通話，於是學生對標準語的語音、詞匯和語法，就會較為熟悉。
3. 推廣普通話在社會上的使用，把方言環境改變為標準語環境，讓學生浸淫其中，這是從語言學習的角度，為學生營造一個有利的語言環境。
4. 改革語文教學課程，強調聽、說、讀、寫的均衡訓練；改善語文教材素質，選用語文符合規範的教材或採用符合規範的標準語來撰寫教材。
5. 加強語文教師的培訓，為現職語文教師提供復修課程，藉以提高語文教師的素質。而每一位語文教師，都必須學習普通話和認識一些與普通話有關的語文常識，包括語音、詞匯、語法等等。
6. 推廣課外閱讀風氣，由政府鼓勵或津貼一些出版商多出版適合青少年程度、興趣的優良課外讀物，讓學生通過閱讀去改進、提高自己的語文能力。

三、意見的可取與不足

上述解決困難的意見，其中當然有可取之處，值得加以肯定，但也有不足的地方，值得我們留意。

從可取的角度看，他們建議改革語文教學課程、改善語文教材、提高語文教師的語文能力、改進語文教學素質，原則是對的，但怎樣改革、改善、提高、改進，則要看具體做法和實際效果。否則空有正確原則，對於實際困難，仍然未能逐一解決。在目前，提原則意見的人多，提解決方案的人少，因而所謂解決困難，其實並未能夠完全做到。有人建議在中、小學開設普通話課程，採用普通話為教學語言，藉以加強學生的語感，增加他們接觸普通話的機會。這個意見如果真能實現，對學生運用標準語的能力，無疑有提高的作用。只是一談到普通話課程的開設，就牽涉師資問題和各科教節分配問題，其中有待解決的困難，並不那麼容易解決。至於主張採用普通話作為語文科的教學語言，不能說不對，只是這裏頭既有師資的

要求，又有師生之間和學生之間的傳意問題，如果師資不足，傳意又有窒礙，就有實行的困難，在語文技能訓練和語文知識吸收方面，也不會收到預期的教學效果。推廣課外閱讀風氣，多出版適合青少年程度、興趣的優良課外讀物，的確有利於學生書面語的理解和表達，只是推廣風氣、出版讀物，牽涉面廣，這不單是學校、教師的事，其實也是政府、社會、出版商、家長的事。而且任何一種風氣，往往逐漸形成，不能一蹴即就；出版讀物，出版商不免會考慮市場和利潤，在商言商，也不能說不對。

從不足的角度看，他們的建議，更有可以商榷之處。「我手寫我口」，是民國初年提倡白話文時所喊出的口號。這個口號，在當時爲了提倡新事物，自有它的作用與價值，只是現時大家已寫了好幾十年白話文，應該可以看到一個事實，就是真正與口頭語合一的文章，目前還不多見，即使用方言寫的文章，與口頭語仍有距離。可見「我手寫我口」，只是一個漸向的目標，一個勉勵的口號！提倡用普通話教學和主張推廣普通話在社會上使用的人，自有他們良好的動機與遠見，對幅員廣大、種族繁多的中國來說，的確需要便於溝通的共同語，而生活在方言環境中的學生，也的確需要學習經過規範的共同語，也即是標準語，只是過分強調口頭語對書面語的影響，而不知道書面語的學習，仍該以書面語的接觸爲最有效，也是很笨的。而且，語文的教學與學習，往往須配合社會的條件與需求。漠視社會的條件與需求而去做一件事，結果會吃力不討好。普通話師資不足，需要應用普通話的場合不多，是目前本港在條件與需求方面的局限，如果要打破這個局限，並不是短期內可以解決的事。普通話是中國人的標準語、共同語，在方言環境中提倡學習，除了有積極的意義外，也是一種認同心態，我們可以理解、可以接受。只是有少數熟諳普通話或略諳普通話的人，不知在什麼時候開始，逐漸養成一種自尊、自重的優越心態，他們認爲，要提高本港學生以至社會人士的中文程度，尤其是書面語的程度，必須採用普通話教學和推廣普通話在社會上的使用。在他們的心目中，普通話是語文教學與學習的救厄解困靈丹，有了普通話，就不會有語文程度低降的問題。其實，在普通話通行地區，仍然有語文程度低降的困擾，能講字正腔圓而又流暢普通話的人，不一定能寫通順的中文，也不一定有豐富的語文知識和文化常識，能講普通話與中文程度之間，尤其是能講普通話與書面語表達能力之間，可說並無必然關係。昧於口頭語與書面語的差距，昧於某一社會的條件與需求，而侈談中文程度的提高，對方言環境中的語文教學與學習，是非常不利的。

四、認識存在的事實

談語文教學與學習，不宜迴避存在的事實，面對事實，深入認識，反而有利於教學與學習的改進。

事實之一，是現在我們所用的書面語，其實是雅俗兼收、古今並包、中西合璧的一種文體，其中既有方言，又有古文辭藻，更有歐化的詞匯和語法。這一種兼收並包的書面語，固然與各地方言——口頭語有差距，與經過規範的普通話比較起來，也總有些分別。夏濟安在《白話文與新詩》一文中，即清楚地指出書面語與口頭語的不同。他認為，幾十年來，真正和說話符合的白話文還很少見。而現代人所寫的書面語，其中不乏古文的表現方式，也即是有不少古文的詞匯和語法。夏氏更指出，我們的書面語之所以會歐化，其實是受了翻譯作品的影響。翻譯使書面語歐化，當然有不好的影響，但翻譯也使我們字詞的使用擴大了，同時又使我們在表達方面添了不少新的語法⁽²⁾。這些新的字詞和語法，對於一個國族語文的發展與增益，不能說沒有積極的作用。

事實之二，是口頭語固然影響書面語，書面語也影響口頭語，不過一個人閱讀能力的提高，主要是多接觸書面語的結果，而一個人寫作能力的提高，也主要是多模仿書面語的結果。換句話說，書面語對閱讀、寫作能力的影響，往往大於口頭語對閱讀、寫作能力的影響。一個經常閱讀文字資料、文學篇章的人，可能拙於詞令，但他的閱讀理解能力，決不會差到那裏去，而且因為他經常接觸文字資料和文學篇章，因而執起筆來，往往會想到人家怎樣寫、學習人家怎樣寫，因而他的寫作能力，也不會差到那裏去。夏濟安在《白話文與新詩》一文中指出，我們提筆寫文章，會想到人家怎麼「寫」，而很難想到人家怎麼「說」⁽³⁾。想到怎麼「寫」，是書面語的閱讀問題，想到怎麼「說」，是口頭語的聽說問題。我們如果同意夏氏的意見，就不會把一個人的普通話聽說能力，等同一個人的讀寫能力，更不會把推廣普通話的學習，視同救治中文程度低落的唯一靈丹妙藥。

事實之三，是知識面的廣狹，與一個人的理解能力和表達能力，有極密切的關係。換句話說，知識面廣，聽、說、讀、寫能力也高，知識面狹，聽、說、讀、寫能力也低。例如我們要理解、運用語文中的成語、典故，其中就有文化知識的要求。所謂文化知識，範圍極大，涵蓋極廣，可以是文學、歷史，可以是神話、傳說，可以是禮俗、風習，可以是山川、地理，可以是天文、曆算，可以是草、木、鳥、獸、蟲、魚……。缺乏文化知識，在理解或運用成語、典故時，往往會出問題。成語、典故，只是語

(2) 參閱《夏濟安選集》，1971年3月志文出版社，頁65至70。

(3) 參閱同上，頁66。夏氏在文中舉例說：「有位朋友在香港住了幾年，常常看廣東人的小報，現在也能寫廣東話的小說了，『乜』『有』『咁』等字，居然用來得心應手。這種驚人的成績，固然和這位朋友的語言天才有關，但主要的原因，並不是他的廣東話說得流利，而是他讀了很多文章。他的成功，並不是『模仿語言』的成功，仍舊是『模仿文章』的成功。」

文中的一部分，而且是極小的一部分，這極小的一部分，已需要相當廣闊的知識面，如果從整個語文的理解和表達來看，知識面的要求，就要更廣更闊了。一個人能聽、能說普通話，當然已掌握了一些特定的語音、語法、詞匯知識，但並不表示這個人已具有廣闊的知識面，更不表示這個人一定有很高的語文能力。判定一個人的語文能力高或低，要看他多方面的表現，而知識面較狹的人，必然在聽、說、讀、寫以至思考方面，都有較差的表現。

事實之四，是學習普通話，可使我們較熟習規範了的語音、詞匯和語法，可使我們對標準語的語感增強；而且，我們認識規範了的語音、詞匯和語法愈多，愈方便我們用來作為共同溝通的工具。只是我們也該知道，普通話對我們語文能力的提高，其實有本身的局限性。我曾經遇到過能聽普通話又能說漂亮普通話的人，但書面語的理解、表達能力，卻並不怎樣高明。據我們所知，在以北京話或普通話作為日常溝通語言的地區，仍然有文盲和中文程度低落的現象。有人主張在本港推廣普通話的使用，把本港的方言環境，改為標準語環境。這種主張，目的是為本港學生營造一個有利於語文學習的環境，可謂「用心良苦」。可是語言環境的出現，應該是自然而然的事，刻意營造一個語言環境，如果只是個小範圍，也還容易控制、安排，如果要一個方言環境的社會，整個變而為標準語的語言環境，就不是一件那麼容易的事。一個大的語言環境，是不能硬造的。例如廣東省根據國家的語文政策，由官方和教育界極力提倡、推廣普通話的使用，只是實際的情況是，在廣東省，仍然以方言作為主要的溝通語言媒介；社會上，仍然是多用方言。直到現時為止，廣東省仍未出現一個完全屬於標準語的語言環境。

五、解決困難的建議

在方言環境中的語文教學與學習，的確有不少困難，要全部解決這些困難，恐怕不大可能。不過，如果我們並不苛求，要解決部分困難，或盡量使一些困難的干擾減少，也不是不可能的事。我在下面，試提一些建議：

1. 不忽視標準語的訓練與學習：在本港這個方言環境中，普通話的應用，在日常生活中並不那麼需要，不過為了與外地的人溝通，例如國內、台灣、新加坡，普通話的學習，也還是需要的。而且，我們雖不必厚望普通話可大幅度提高我們的語文能力，但到底可幫助我們認識一些規範了的語音、詞匯和語法，這其實是一種知識的增益，同時也有助於我們對語文的運用，尤其是現代漢語的運用。
2. 提高閱讀興趣，推廣閱讀風氣：一個社會、一個國家的語文程度，往往與那個社會、那個國家的閱讀風氣，有很密切的聯繫。要

推廣閱讀風氣，就要提高大家的閱讀興趣。站在教師的立場，要提高閱讀興趣，首先須從自己做起，然後再進而鼓勵學生。懂得怎樣閱讀和有興趣閱讀的教師，才可以具體指導學生怎樣閱讀和影響學生多閱讀。如果閱讀風氣普遍存在於語文教師與他們的學生之間，逐漸推而廣之，一家學校、各家學校、整個社會，就會有較多人有閱讀的興趣。當渡海輪上、地車中、酒樓或餐室裏，都有較多人埋首書刊的時候，也就是這個社會形成閱讀風氣的時候。閱讀風氣較濃盛的社會，才會是一個語文程度較高的社會。

3. 多出版符合標準語要求的優良讀物：如果我們同意，多讓學生接觸書面語，是提高學生閱讀、寫作能力的有效方法，那麼，多出版符合標準語要求的優良讀物，無疑是當前的急務。只要這些讀物的內容、性質符應學生的興趣、程度，學生就會受到讀物的吸引，久而久之，他們的閱讀興趣，就培養起來了。只要學生肯閱讀，讀物的語文與內容，一定對他們的語文能力，有提高的作用。除了政府，本港有能力的團體、機構、商人，是不是可以撇開利潤的考慮，撥出資金，配應人手、資源，為這個社會、為大家的子弟，出版價廉質優的讀物？
4. 切實做好語文教學工作，加強閱讀、寫作指導：在方言環境中的語文教學與學習，不時會受到語言習慣因素的干擾。為了要使學生從語文訓練方面得到較大的收益，語文教師就得要切實做好語文教學工作，加強閱讀、寫作指導。例如在詞匯、語法方面，多做一些分析、比較，使學生對方言與標準語的異同，有較深刻的印象。此外，多安排課內、課外的語文活動，多利用視聽教材、教具作為教學的輔助；語文練習類型的設計，又多考慮多樣化和趣味化的問題，於是學生就會從語文教師方面，得到較大、較多的幫助。加強閱讀、寫作指導，即是強化書面語對學生的影響，於是學生就可以以優秀篇章作為學習對象，認識人家怎樣寫和模仿人家怎樣寫。在語文課中，教師應鼓勵學生多讀、多寫、多想，尤其是應鼓勵他們多讀語文符合規範要求的好作品。
5. 擴大學生的文化知識面：一個國族的文化，與一個國族的語文，是交結而不可分的。缺乏文化知識，不但在理解字詞、句段、篇章時有困難，而且也減損了語文表達時的精微與光彩，要提高學生的語文程度，講求課程、教材、教法的改善，講求教師的培訓，是需要的，同時也要想辦法擴大學生的文化知識面。學生的文化知識面愈廣，理解和表達能力就愈高，在理解時，就會減少誤解，在表達時，就會減少錯失。談語文教學與學習，只專注於技

能訓練，只強調語文的實用性，是不夠的，我們應該提供切合學生程度的文化知識，來配應技能訓練的需要！以學習普通話為例，我們如果只留意語音、詞匯、語法的正誤，而不去了解北方語言區域內的事物、禮儀、風習、生活等等，那麼，我們的普通話，一定掌握得不好。而書面語的學習，更需要文化知識的幫助。

6. 充分利用校外環境的語文資料；所謂校外環境的語文資料，範圍非常廣泛，其中包括：一般人的談吐，電台、電視的廣播，家庭中的讀物（如報刊、書籍）、公共場所、商品、器材的書面說明、宣傳、指示或各種規章、通告等等。這一切，都產生語文影響的作用，向學生甚至全社會的人，進行語文訓練。這種力量十分強大，所起的作用也十分深遠⁽⁴⁾。怎樣充分利用這方面的力量、作用？怎樣把消極的語文資料變為積極？怎樣把積極的語文資料變為更積極？在語文教學上，是值得研究的問題。而且，語文學習，必須切合社會的實際需要，必須結合社會文化。社會文化，包括社會中日常應用的語文資料。屏除校外語文資料的語文教學，也即是屏除一部分社會文化的教學，這對學生的語文學習，是非常不利的。因此，語文教師應該把校外環境有關的語文資料，想辦法帶入學生學習語文的範圍，使校外環境和校內環境，藉着語文教學，發生緊密聯繫。而語文教學在講求教學技巧時，要特別留意一點，就是：語文訓練，應該打破校內的局限，因為它不單是教室裏的事，也不單是學校裏的事。充分認識方言環境中各種有利或不利的情况，充分利用有利語文訓練的校外資料，我們的語文教學和學生的語文學習，才會取得較大的成果。

7. 不必視方言為洪水猛獸：方言環境之所以稱為方言環境，是因為在這個環境中，大多數人都用方言來作為口頭語的溝通。除非書面語的影響大於口頭語，否則，學生、教師以至社會人士，他們在筆底下常常出現方言的詞匯或語法，那是無可避免的事。在書面語中夾雜太多方言，的確會影響人與人間的溝通。中國幅員廣大，方言極多，我們之所以要學習規範了的標準語，就是為了大家要有互相溝通的共同語。一般兒童、少年、青年，如果平日較

(4) 張志公在《語文訓練問題需要加緊研究》中說：「每個有文化的、能讀能寫的成年人如果仔細查看一下自己的語文能力，他將發現，他認識的字，掌握的詞、成語、諺語等等，能夠熟練運用的表達形式，相當不小的一部分不是從語文課中、從學校裏，而是從別的學科中、從自己的閱讀活動中、從社會生活裏的接觸和實踐中學到的。他還將發現，他說話的習慣和能力之中，無論好的方面或者不大好的方面，大都能從語文課堂以外的其他接觸和活動中找到對他有過影響、起過作用的來源。」（見《語文教學論集》，1981年2月福建教育出版社，頁47。）

少閱讀，或所閱讀的大多是不規範的語文資料，於是他們的筆底下，就會出現不少方言的詞匯或語法。鼓勵他們多接觸書面語，多讀語文優良的讀物，是救治的良方。但多讀所產生的效果，往往在短期內並不那麼明顯，於是他們所寫出來的句、段、篇，也就免不了會夾雜一些方言。而對這些方言，語文教師倒不必驚怪駭汗，視為洪水猛獸。不少學者、作家，筆底下還不是出現方言！只是有些是廣州方言，有些是北京方言，有些是四川方言，有些是福建方言……。我們只要按照學生可以吸收的能力，酌量加以提示、糾正，也就夠了。在小學、初中階段，不妨多提規範意見，多舉規範實例，到了高中、大學階段，學生如果肯多閱讀語文優良的讀物，他們一定可從大量書面語的接觸中，受到較大、較佳的影響。其實一個國族的共同語，必然會吸納不少方言，只不過這些方言，有些已受到規範的認可，有些則因為有增加表達力的作用，也逐漸為較多人所接受，最後也許會走入共同語的範疇(5)。

六、結語

談論語文教學與學習的人，都很憂慮方言環境對學生的語文程度，有不良的影響。由於社會發展，科技進步，資訊發達，因此學生的語文，明顯地受到有益和有害的影響，而學生更因在日常生活中，減少了接觸和運用書面語的機會，於是在閱讀和寫作方面，表現不如理想。這種現象，其實不單是方言環境中才出現的問題，也不單是中文教育問題，而是全世界、全人類、任何一種語文教育、任何一個語言環境，都會遭遇的問題。要提高學生的語文程度，要減少方言環境中種種不利因素，我們就得要增加學生在書面語方面的接觸和運用機會(6)。站在教學的立場，加強課內聽、說、讀、寫、思考的訓練，是提高語文程度的有效辦法；重視課外閱讀，着重推廣課外閱讀的風氣，更是可行而又收效的好辦法。

(5) 唐海濤在《國語應推行，方言不可廢》中說：「在國語發展成長的過程中，其實早已吸納了許多方言的菁華，以詞彙一端為例，國語中就採入了許多吳語成分……這些都增加了國語的表達力，使它更生動而形象化，」(見《明報月刊》第二卷第四期，1985年4月明報有限公司，頁84。)

(6) 莊澤義在《提高學生的中文寫作水準》中說：「中國有許多方言區，那裏人們使用的方言各有一套獨特詞彙和表達習慣。但是，沒有任何一處方言區（包括講閩南話的台灣在內）的學生作文，其受方言干擾的程度，像香港這麼普遍，這麼嚴重，……原因很可能是多方面的，但是最重要的原因，怕是香港學生對標準語接觸的機會太少。……要提高學生的中文寫作水準，必須向他們提供接觸標準語的機會和環境。」(見《明報》，1986年9月19日明報有限公司。)最理想的標準語接觸和運用，當然最好包括口頭語和書面語兩方面，如果兩者要分影響的大小，我認為書面標準語的接觸和運用，對一個人寫作水準的影響，應該遠遠大於口頭標準語的影響。而且，在香港，教師要向學生提供接觸標準語的機會和環境，書面語的提供，實易於口頭語的提供。

時至今日，學生在語文學習的過程中，可說有所得也有所失。他們的口齒伶俐了，反應敏捷了，見聞增多了，勇於表達了，是他們的所「得」，這得拜社會發展、生活改變、科技進步、資訊發達之賜。然而他們在書面語方面的表現，包括閱讀、寫作，的確不如理想，是他們的所「失」，這也得拜社會發展、生活改變、科技進步、資訊發達之賜。因為現時視聽的設備，如電視、收音機、錄音機、錄影機等等，已用影像、聲音，取代了部分書刊的功能。現時於學生再不能像過往的學生那樣，經常面對書刊的字詞、語句、段落、篇章，作必須的停頓、推敲、思考，於是現時學生的邏輯推理能力，往往缺乏應有的訓練⁽⁷⁾。針對他們的所「失」，加強書面語的接觸與訓練，鼓勵課外閱讀和寫作，不但有利於方言環境中的語文教學與學習，也有利於任何環境中的語文教學與學習。

我國古代的語文學習，口頭語是一套，書面語是一套，「我手」並不「寫我口」，但他們的書面語，卻很少出現方言干擾的問題，現在我們在方言環境中學習語文，尤其是學習書面語，「手」、「口」分離的情況，正好與古人相類似。古人學習語文成功的經驗、心得，是不是可供我們參考、借鏡？古人的語文學習，主要在先熟讀他人的文章、多接觸他人的文章和多模仿他人的文章，然後再放手寫自己的文章。古今時代不同，社會不同、生活情況不同，古人的經驗、心得，不一定百分之百適用於今日，但他們多接觸、多模仿書面語的做法，對我們仍然有參考的價值和啟發的作用。

(7) 參閱林欣《中文水平下降四大原因》，《明報》，1986年10月28日明報有限公司。

漢語方言區語文教育的方言干擾問題

劉叔新

中國天津南開大學

(一)

新中國成立以來，教育事業有了很大的發展。語文教育一如其他學科的教育一樣，從內容的擴展、深化和普及面的擴大來看，都取得很大進展。但是，語文教育的成效並不令人滿意，大中學生以及社會上一般知識分子的語文水平普遍比以前有所下降。原因是多方面的。政治的、文化的及一般教育制度的制約因素，可暫不討論，這裡能夠論定而且須要提出來深省的一個原因，是方言的干擾。

由于漢族人民散布在國土的廣闊地域，而且越來有越多人從富庶的東都、南部沿海地帶和中原地區轉到北部和西北部地區進行開發，又由于漢語歷史上形成了複雜的方言分歧，中國大部分地方都是漢語方言區。其中包括除首都北京以外的幾乎所有大中城市⁽¹⁾。由于北京話的語音就是漢民族共同語——普通話的標準音，因此除了少量比較土的詞語以外，北京話大體上是同普通話相吻合的。當然，離北京市區較遠的幾個郊區縣的土話，就沒有北京話的這種天然優越的地位。

在如此廣闊的方言區裡，語文教育在各種程度上遇到教育對象方言習慣的障礙，自然產生了特定的困難和問題。所謂語文教育，主要是要讓學習者正確掌握、運用祖國的語言文字⁽²⁾，在漢語方言區來說，是要正確掌握、運用漢民族共同語和漢字。而學生從小講的是父母或年長者教給的方言；出了學校，回到家裡，走到社會上，講的、聽的也大多是方言。這樣，語文教育是在兩個語種互相矛盾、互相作用的背景下進行的。一方面，根深蒂固的本地方言習慣，對普通話的學習和使用，頑強地抗拒、排斥；另一方面，在學生學習語文和學着使用普通話時，本地方言習慣又以種種方式輸進學生在口頭和書寫上對普通話的運用之中，給它按上本地方言特點的明顯烙印，使它蕪雜不純，很不完善。這兩方面，都是漢語方言對民族共同語語文教育的干擾。

(1) 這裡例外的大城市，或許可以提出哈爾濱。哈爾濱話的語音和北京音基本上一致，土的詞語也不多。

(2) 參考呂叔湘先生在《關於語文教學的兩點基本認識》一文裡的注文：“‘語文’有兩個意義：一、‘語言’和‘文字’，二、‘語言文字’和‘文學’……一般說到‘語文教學’的時候總是用的‘語文’的第一義。”（《文字改革》1963年第4期1頁）。

一般在實行雙重語言制或流行多種語文的地區，進行其中任何一種對學習者來說並非母語的語言的教育，都會不同程度地受到其他語言的干擾。漢語方言區雖然一般並沒有嚴格意義的雙重或多重語言制（某些居住着少數民族的地區例外），但是本地方言和普通話的並立和互相作用，在某種程度上，尤其是在普通話得到推行的城鎮裡，也可以說是一種“雙語”現象，只不過這裡的“語言”不指某種民族語言，而指一定的語言符號系統罷了。漢語方言區的語文教育受到當地方言的干擾，乃是規律的、必然發生的現象。不過，普通話同每個地方的漢語方言之間，存在着特殊的關係，其關聯的特點與一般並用于同一地區的兩種（民族）語言的關係有別。首先，在每個地方，漢語方言比普通話常用和活躍，地位牢固得多。對於地方上的絕大多數居民來說，當地方言是母語或所謂“母方言”⁽³⁾，是社會習慣的一個重要部分，它必然對要學習、掌握另一個語種起巨大的影響。其次，普通話是在北方方言基礎上形成的，與北方方言及其他漢語方言存在親近程度不等的同源關係，彼此在許多材料成分上相接近。這給方言區的學生和一般本地人以母方言代替普通話，或有意無意把普通話的說法說成母方言的或相似于母方言的說法，提供了條件。再次，普通話同漢語方言之間存在漢字的特殊紐帶。漢字的超方言性質，雖然可以使方言區的學生和其他本地人在不掌握普通話讀音的情況下大體學懂普通話的書面語，從而有利于民族共同語的統一，但是同時也強化了方言的牢固地位，使方言區學生意識不到學習普通話的必要性，也使他們習慣于以方言語音來讀漢文，從而大大增加了方言干擾的渠道和機會。最後，又應該說，普通話對漢語方言起着主導作用。普通話用于書面文字、廣播、電視、電影、隆重集會上的演說和其他重大的交際場合，居于較高的、權威性的地位，它以全民族標準語言模式的身份而使地方上的方言服從于它。漢語方言對語文教育的干擾不能不存在某種限度和一定的範圍。所有這些關聯的特殊性，就使得漢語方言對於語文教育的干擾具有一些特點，和一般雙語或多語區語文教育所受到的語言干擾有所不同。這些特點，概括來說，表現為三個方面：一，干擾十分容易產生，因而是極為普遍地、幾乎自然而然地出現的。這使它具有頑強性和持久性，形成一種不易對付的社會性的抗力。不過它也遇到大力推廣使用民族共同語的一定抑制。二，干擾的渠道多。除了方言習慣直接在普通話的說和寫上起作用的渠道之外，還有漢字讀音和書刊閱讀的以及社會觀念影響的（如認為在家鄉中說普通話而不操本鄉話，是打官腔，和鄉人不親近或脫離群眾）渠道。三，干擾有多種多樣

(3) “母方言”這一術語，見皮特·科德(S. Pit Corder)《應用語言學導論》(Introducing Applied Linguistics)，漢譯本44頁，1983年，上海外語教育出版社。

的表現方式，分別爲外部的和內部的兩大類型。“外”和“內”，是從普通話語文的教和學的自身角度來說的。關於這一點，容下文再作具體闡述。

(二)

漢語方言區內依方言的不同而形成的各個地域或地方，語文教育所受到的方言干擾會千差萬別，至少也不盡相同。目前，要把每個地方的特殊干擾都確定下來，還做不到。但是大片區域共同表現的基本情況，可以看得出來。而爲了現階段方言區的語文教育能夠逐步制定有針對性的克服干擾的措施，明確不同區域基本干擾情況的不同所在，是必要的。

整個漢語方言區，就流行的方言同普通話的接近、親近程度來看，可分爲兩大區域。華北，東北，西北，西南除西藏、桂南、桂東之外的部分，江淮地區和山東，都流行着官話——北方方言。這一大片區域，傳統上稱之爲官話區或北方方言區。東南浙、贛、湘、閩、粵、台、海南諸省及蘇南地區，流行的是同普通話距離較遠的吳方言、贛方言、湘方言、閩北方言、閩南方言、客家方言和粵方言，傳統上把這片東南區域稱爲南方方言區。南、北兩大方言區，語文教育的方言干擾情況，有較大的差異。

北方方言區的語文教育，一般而論，學生的語言障礙較小，因爲他們的母方言同課本和教學所用的語言差別較小。北方方言和普通話的差別，大多只在聲調上比較顯著，而除去山西一部分、江淮地區一部分及河南北部個別的縣之外，整個北方方言區的方言聲調和普通話一樣，都沒有入聲，差別只在舒聲的調值及部分調類上。因此北方方言區的學生要學會普通話，一般沒有什麼困難，尤其是在學習和掌握書面語上更少詞語、語法差別的障礙，在從家鄉話轉到普通話來的換碼過程中幾乎只是轉換語音形式的局部成分。他們能夠不費多大力氣就熟練流暢地說普通話，在口頭上帶家鄉話的口音一般不重，有的甚至很輕；書面運用上很少會出現家鄉話的特殊詞語、語法痕迹。這就是說，家鄉話對於普通話語文本身的掌握所施加的干擾比較小，影響到所學習、掌握的語文內部的程度比較輕微。例如，天津的學生說普通話時，會說得幾乎像北京人說的那樣純正；遠離北京的武漢、南京、瀋陽、成都等地的學生，講起普通話來一般口音也不重。這些北方方言區城市的學生寫成的書面文字，很容易或往往很自然地符合于共同語的規範。但是，北方方言同普通話的相當接近，却給北方方言區的語文教育以較嚴重的外部干擾。表現爲學生走出了課堂，一般就把普通話置于一邊，只使用家鄉話。于是，語文課中所獲得的語言知識，特別是字和詞的正音、文學語言中許多非來自家鄉話口語的詞語、句式及其使用方式等，難以得到鞏固。之所以離開了課堂就使用母方言，很重要的一個原因，在于周圍的人們都聽得懂，不論在說普通話的環境，還是北京話的

或其他北方方言的環境，自己說的母方言都可以被交際的對方所接受。沒有交際困難的壓力，一般就不想改變自小使用母方言的習慣，何況一改腔還可能討厭或被嘲笑。

就整個北方方言區語文教育的總體來說，方言給予的外部干擾是比較突出的。學生在學期間，平時不說普通話，離校進入社會工作後就依樣不愛說甚至更加疏遠普通話；如果不是從事語文或人文科學的工作，他們離校後的語文知識素養就還有可能日益降低。可以看出，方言的外部干擾所產生的不良影響相當大。它不僅削弱語文教育的效果，而且也成了普通話不易在北方方言區較快推廣的一個基本原因。

南方方言區的語文教育，受到方言的內部干擾比較突出。一般而論，在受過幾年語文教育之後，這個區域的高小學生和中學生不僅能大體上說普通話，而且在須用的時候，在與操北方方言或普通話的人交際的場合，都自覺地說普通話。在北方方言區的城鎮里，從南方方言區來的學生和學生出身的人，如果用母方言同當地周圍的人說話，必然會讓對方聽不懂，因而他們都開腔說普通話，雖然說得並不純正和流暢。可見，必須操用或有必要學會普通話的壓力，使南方方言的外部干擾沒有北方方言那麼嚴重。但是相對之下，內部干擾的不良影響卻比較大，比較明顯。表現在，南方方言區學生說的普通話一般帶有濃厚的口音，無論在口頭上還是書面上都有方言詞語的輸入或印迹，有的甚至摻上方言的語法結構。

普通話在各地說者的使用中，特別在口頭使用上，很自然地會受到各自母方言習慣的強烈影響，摻進母方言的不少成分，尤其是語音的成分。這樣，形成了普通話的種種地域性變異⁽⁴⁾，就是形形色色的“藍青官話”⁽⁵⁾。而南方方言區的“藍青官話”帶有的方言影響相當重，方言印迹很多、很顯著，與普通話規範的差距比北方方言區的藍青官話大得多。湖南、福建、廣東、海南等省區及江西中南部、浙江南部等地的學生，所說的普通話一般相當差勁；教他們語文課的本地老師們，情形也好不了多少。這樣的藍青官話，實在只能勉強地列進普通話的範圍（或者說，處于普通話範圍的邊緣）；從用語習慣轉變的角度來看，像有的學者說的，只是一種“過渡話”⁽⁶⁾。而對於普通話口頭上掌握的水平如此之低，會大大影響書面語的學習；書面語的教學不能在口語教學良好效果的基礎上進行，也無法事半功倍地取得成效⁽⁷⁾。因此，同普通話標準相去甚遠的藍青官話的產生和存在，表明了南方方言直接地嚴重干擾普通話語文的教和學。

(4) 參見陳原《社會語言學》，218頁，1983年，學林出版社。

(5) 藍青官話指種種不地道的、走樣兒的官話。性質上大致就是布龍菲爾德 (L. Bloomfield) 所提的次標準語 (sub-standard language)（見其所著 *Language*，485頁，1935年英國版）。

(6) 陳建民《文化語言學說略》，見《語文導報》1987年第6期，45頁。

(7) 參見呂叔湘《漢語研究工作者的當前任務》，《中國語文》1961年4月號5頁。

具體一些說，語音方面的明顯干擾主要表現在聲母、韻母上。普通話的四個聲調，南方方言區的學生都能大體把調值唸準確。但是方言中某些不同于普通話的聲母、韻母發音，却移到普通話相應的或接近的聲母、韻母上。例如，湖南長沙的學生把“湖、狐、灰、昏、荒、橫、宦”等的x聲母唸成f，把“犁、旅、雷、賴、藍、鸞、卵、爛、連、淋、烈”等的l聲母唸成n，把“娘、槍、創、亮、燈、能、鄧、蒸、升、冷、更、清、京、聲”等的ŋ韻尾唸成n。福建廈門的學生往往把“麻、埋、眉、蠻、忙、密、木”等的m聲母唸成b，把“人、任、然、燃、染、柔、汝、熱、日”等的ʃ聲母唸成l，把“三、占、金、臨、山、前、銀、根、星、燈、曾”等帶鼻輔音韻尾的韻母唸成無韻尾的鼻化韻。廣州的學生用半元音j來唸普通話的ʃ聲母，給“岸、熬、傲、我、餓、臥、牙、涯”等零聲母字添上ŋ聲母，把“這、者、折、蔗、遮、奢、賒、捨、涉、社、射、攝、設”等的ə韻母唸成iɛ，把“哥、科、棵、窠、珂、可、河、何、賀”等的ɤ韻母唸成ɔ。粵方言、客家方言、閩南方言的齒音聲母只有一套ts、ts'、s（粵、客個別地方話另有ʃ），這些方言地區的學生就唸不出捲舌音聲母，無意識地用ts、ts'、s或某種舌面前、中的塞音、塞擦音、擦音分別替代它們。粵方言的ts、ts'、s其實有點舌面化而近于tʃ、tʃ'、ʃ，因而粵方言區的學生唸普通話的ts、ts'、s聲母和tʃ、tʃ'、ʃ聲母，也走了樣兒。

各種南方方言都沒有普通話的兒化韻，絕大多數也沒有普通話合成詞中的輕聲，因此南方方言區的學生以及學校出身的人通常唸不出兒化韻，把合成詞的輕聲音節都加以重讀並拖長。“冰棍兒”piŋ⁵⁵kuɿ⁵¹說成“冰棍”piŋ⁵⁵kuɿⁿ⁵¹，“鴨子兒”ia⁵¹tslɿ²¹⁴說成“鴨子”ia⁵¹tsl²¹⁴；“火燒”xuo²¹⁴.shao³（燒餅）說成xuo²¹⁴shau⁵⁵，“東西”tuŋ⁵⁵.ɕi²（事物）說成tuŋ⁵⁵ɕi⁵⁵。大量口語詞帶兒化韻，大量合成詞中有輕聲詞素，都是普通話口語的重要特點；南方方言區的學生在家鄉話的語音干擾下，說不出而且歪曲表現這樣的特點，說的普通話固然“生硬”難聽，有時甚至會鬧出笑話或引起誤解。與此同時，對掌握兒化韻和輕聲的干擾還起了抑制學生學習普通話口語詞語的消極作用。這牽連到並助長了詞彙方面的干擾。

南方方言詞彙和普通話詞彙的差別較大。普通話中相當一部分來自北方方言的口語詞語，由于語音形式對於南方方言區的人來說比較特殊、陌生而難學，或者由于詞語的含義或所指的事物對象比較陌生，為南方方言區的學生所疏遠甚至排斥，他們很自然地用自己習慣的家鄉話相應詞語或普通話中別的說法來取代這些口語詞語。比如，“腦瓜子”“嘴皮子”“逗趣兒”“窩囊”“拉倒”“裝蒜”“瞎扯”“臉紅脖子粗”之類，他們不說也極少能說；要

表示類似的意思，他們大多分別說成“頭”“嘴”“引人發笑”“不中用”“算了”“裝假”“亂講”“滿面漲紅”。這是普通話在南方方言區的學生和知識分子口中，一般說得文縐縐而刻板不活的一個重要原因。口頭上如此，書面寫作上自然也一樣。南方方言區的學生雖然在課本和課外閱讀中接觸了不少現代文學作品，但是一般不會把作品中生動的口語詞語吸收到自己的寫作中。他們的行文因而並非偶然地比較死板、干巴，遠不如北方方言區學生寫得自然、活潑。無疑，在他們的寫作上，語文教育得不到應有的成效。

詞彙的內部干擾，還表現為另一種情形。南方方言獨特的詞語比較多，學生們往往有意無意間把自己用慣的這類獨特詞語帶進普通話裡，尤其在書面文字中更顯突出。粵方言區的學生表現得最甚，諸如“靚（漂亮）”“叻（能幹）”“架勢（了不起）”“嘈（鬧）”“揸頸（受氣，受制）”“搵笨（討便宜）”“撞板（碰壁）”“屋企（家裡）”“鋪頭（商店）”“事頭（店主）”“伯爺公（老頭兒）”“恤衫（襯衣）”“士担（郵票）”“士的（拐杖）”之類，常可見于他們的文字習作。這一來不符合普通話的詞語規範，顯得怪誕不經，二來也自然不可能掌握好普通話詞語，難以使個人的普通話語彙豐富起來。至于畢業後到社會上工作，在書寫的事務文字或發表的文章、報道中繼續表現出這種愛用方言詞語的習慣，那就更產生不利于共同語規範化的社會影響。

語法的內部干擾，在某些地區也是存在的。例如廣州的學生在講話和寫作中，都常會出現副詞“先”置于謂語動詞之後以及間接賓語置于直接賓語之後的說法，這不是普通話的句法結構，而是廣州方言的句法結構套用到普通話的詞語組合上來。母方言某些特殊的語法習慣，使廣州學生掌握不好普通話的句法，至少不能很快正確、熟練地掌握。不過廣州話以及其他南方方言，在語法方面和普通話畢竟相同之處較多，也較為主要，南方方言區的語文教育受到語法的內部干擾比較輕，而且有局部性而不普通。

總起來看，南方方言給語文教育的內部干擾是明顯地大量發生的現象。其後果，不僅學生口頭上學不好普通話，只能說一口“不像樣兒”的藍青官話，而且影響更大的還在于削弱了書面語的學習成效。這是不容忽視的。

（三）

漢語方言的干擾，雖然為一些客觀因素所決定而不可避免，但是只要認清事實，採取治本的辦法，完全能抑制其產生或大大降低其程度，盡量縮小其破壞作用。

不同類型的干擾，對付的辦法、措施應有所不同。

要抑制或減少方言的外部干擾，首先須憑靠正確的語言政策和社會規範的約束力量。中國政府三十多年前制定並隨即在社會上推行的大力推廣