

ILEJ

INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION JOURNAL

Volume 3

1987

語文教育學院學報

第三期

一九八七年



Institute of Language in Education 語文教育學院

香港教育署

語文教育學院
學報

INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE IN
EDUCATION JOURNAL

Education Department, Hong Kong

第三期 一九八七年

Volume 3 1987

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors would like to thank the Journal Advisors and all those members of the staff of the I.L.E. who helped in the preparation of this issue of the ILEJ.

致謝

本期學報得到校外學者出任顧問，及院內同事協助編輯工作，謹致謝意。

INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION JOURNAL

Volume 3 1987

Editors

Vernon ANLEY
(English Language)

CHAN Wai-leung
(Chinese Language)

for the Institute of Language in Education

Editorial Advisory Panel

Verner BICKLEY
Harley BROOKES
CHIU Ling-yeong

Institute of Language in Education
British Council, Hong Kong
University of Hong Kong

Secretary to the Advisory Panel

Madeleine LAU

Institute of Language in Education

語文教育學院學報

一九八七年

第三期

編輯

顏偉能
(英文)

陳煒良
(中文)

編輯顧問委員會

白敬理
布洛士
趙令揚

語文教育學院
香港英國文化協會
香港大學中文系

編輯顧問委員會秘書

劉梁鴻麗

語文教育學院

FOREWORD

This third issue of the ILEJ contains articles on language acquisition (Graham Bowtell, Therese Leung, and Michael Webster); on the views of examiners and teachers of Hong Kong's Use of English Examination (Gillian B. Workman); on corporal punishment (Yu Nai-Wing); and on the role and responsibilities of language teachers (Desmond Allison, Zhang Shou-Kang, Tin Sia-Lam, and Cheah Chak-Mun). There are also two articles relating to the teaching and learning of Putonghua (Cheung Yat-Shing and Miao Chin-An).

前言

本期刊載的文章，內容包括語文能力的掌握方法(柏維爾、梁兆珩、魏士德)；香港主理考試的人員及教師對運用英語科考試的意見(白芝蓮)；從古文字看傳統教育對待體罰的問題(余迺永)；語文教師的職責和所扮演的角色(艾理崇、張壽康、田小琳、謝澤文)。此外，還有兩篇文章討論關於普通話的教與學問題(張日昇、繆錦安)。

CONTENTS 目錄

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| Desmond ALLISON | Distinguishing "Language" and "Content" in English-Medium Education | 7 |
| Graham BOWTELL | Ethnocentrism: A Barrier to Second Language Acquisition and Cross-Cultural Communication? | 16 |
| 謝澤文 | 華文課程的修訂與教師的在職訓練 | 27 |
| 張日昇 | 普通話學習動機與實際使用的調查研究 | 35 |
| Therese LEUNG | Experimental Teaching: the Nucleus of a Refresher Programme | 44 |
| 繆錦安 | 普通話教學的幾項原則 | 50 |
| 田小琳 | 中文教師語言教學能力的再提高 | 55 |
| Michael A. WEBSTER, Alan WARD & Kenneth CRAIG | Language Errors due to First Language In- terference (Cantonese) produced by Hong Kong Students of English | 63 |
| Gillian B. WORKMAN | Cohesion or Conflict? An analysis of the Views of Examiners and Teachers of Hong Kong's Use of English Examination, with the Aim of Contributing towards Improvements in the Learning Outcomes of Hong Kong Students from their Form Six and Seven English Course | 82 |
| 余迺永 | 從古文字看傳統教育對待體罰的問題 | 103 |
| 張壽康 | 中國語文教師延續教育的必然性和必要性 | 105 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Chapter I: The English Language in Hong Kong | 2 |
| 3 | Chapter II: The English Language in the Curriculum | 3 |
| 4 | Chapter III: The English Language in the Classroom | 4 |
| 5 | Chapter IV: The English Language in the Community | 5 |
| 6 | Chapter V: The English Language in the Future | 6 |
| 7 | Chapter VI: The English Language in the Curriculum | 7 |
| 8 | Chapter VII: The English Language in the Classroom | 8 |
| 9 | Chapter VIII: The English Language in the Community | 9 |
| 10 | Chapter IX: The English Language in the Future | 10 |
| 11 | Chapter X: The English Language in the Curriculum | 11 |
| 12 | Chapter XI: The English Language in the Classroom | 12 |
| 13 | Chapter XII: The English Language in the Community | 13 |
| 14 | Chapter XIII: The English Language in the Future | 14 |
| 15 | Chapter XIV: The English Language in the Curriculum | 15 |
| 16 | Chapter XV: The English Language in the Classroom | 16 |
| 17 | Chapter XVI: The English Language in the Community | 17 |
| 18 | Chapter XVII: The English Language in the Future | 18 |
| 19 | Chapter XVIII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 19 |
| 20 | Chapter XIX: The English Language in the Classroom | 20 |
| 21 | Chapter XX: The English Language in the Community | 21 |
| 22 | Chapter XXI: The English Language in the Future | 22 |
| 23 | Chapter XXII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 23 |
| 24 | Chapter XXIII: The English Language in the Classroom | 24 |
| 25 | Chapter XXIV: The English Language in the Community | 25 |
| 26 | Chapter XXV: The English Language in the Future | 26 |
| 27 | Chapter XXVI: The English Language in the Curriculum | 27 |
| 28 | Chapter XXVII: The English Language in the Classroom | 28 |
| 29 | Chapter XXVIII: The English Language in the Community | 29 |
| 30 | Chapter XXIX: The English Language in the Future | 30 |
| 31 | Chapter XXX: The English Language in the Curriculum | 31 |
| 32 | Chapter XXXI: The English Language in the Classroom | 32 |
| 33 | Chapter XXXII: The English Language in the Community | 33 |
| 34 | Chapter XXXIII: The English Language in the Future | 34 |
| 35 | Chapter XXXIV: The English Language in the Curriculum | 35 |
| 36 | Chapter XXXV: The English Language in the Classroom | 36 |
| 37 | Chapter XXXVI: The English Language in the Community | 37 |
| 38 | Chapter XXXVII: The English Language in the Future | 38 |
| 39 | Chapter XXXVIII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 39 |
| 40 | Chapter XXXIX: The English Language in the Classroom | 40 |
| 41 | Chapter XL: The English Language in the Community | 41 |
| 42 | Chapter XLI: The English Language in the Future | 42 |
| 43 | Chapter XLII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 43 |
| 44 | Chapter XLIII: The English Language in the Classroom | 44 |
| 45 | Chapter XLIV: The English Language in the Community | 45 |
| 46 | Chapter XLV: The English Language in the Future | 46 |
| 47 | Chapter XLVI: The English Language in the Curriculum | 47 |
| 48 | Chapter XLVII: The English Language in the Classroom | 48 |
| 49 | Chapter XLVIII: The English Language in the Community | 49 |
| 50 | Chapter XLIX: The English Language in the Future | 50 |
| 51 | Chapter L: The English Language in the Curriculum | 51 |
| 52 | Chapter LI: The English Language in the Classroom | 52 |
| 53 | Chapter LII: The English Language in the Community | 53 |
| 54 | Chapter LIII: The English Language in the Future | 54 |
| 55 | Chapter LIV: The English Language in the Curriculum | 55 |
| 56 | Chapter LV: The English Language in the Classroom | 56 |
| 57 | Chapter LVI: The English Language in the Community | 57 |
| 58 | Chapter LVII: The English Language in the Future | 58 |
| 59 | Chapter LVIII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 59 |
| 60 | Chapter LIX: The English Language in the Classroom | 60 |
| 61 | Chapter LX: The English Language in the Community | 61 |
| 62 | Chapter LXI: The English Language in the Future | 62 |
| 63 | Chapter LXII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 63 |
| 64 | Chapter LXIII: The English Language in the Classroom | 64 |
| 65 | Chapter LXIV: The English Language in the Community | 65 |
| 66 | Chapter LXV: The English Language in the Future | 66 |
| 67 | Chapter LXVI: The English Language in the Curriculum | 67 |
| 68 | Chapter LXVII: The English Language in the Classroom | 68 |
| 69 | Chapter LXVIII: The English Language in the Community | 69 |
| 70 | Chapter LXIX: The English Language in the Future | 70 |
| 71 | Chapter LXX: The English Language in the Curriculum | 71 |
| 72 | Chapter LXXI: The English Language in the Classroom | 72 |
| 73 | Chapter LXXII: The English Language in the Community | 73 |
| 74 | Chapter LXXIII: The English Language in the Future | 74 |
| 75 | Chapter LXXIV: The English Language in the Curriculum | 75 |
| 76 | Chapter LXXV: The English Language in the Classroom | 76 |
| 77 | Chapter LXXVI: The English Language in the Community | 77 |
| 78 | Chapter LXXVII: The English Language in the Future | 78 |
| 79 | Chapter LXXVIII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 79 |
| 80 | Chapter LXXIX: The English Language in the Classroom | 80 |
| 81 | Chapter LXXX: The English Language in the Community | 81 |
| 82 | Chapter LXXXI: The English Language in the Future | 82 |
| 83 | Chapter LXXXII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 83 |
| 84 | Chapter LXXXIII: The English Language in the Classroom | 84 |
| 85 | Chapter LXXXIV: The English Language in the Community | 85 |
| 86 | Chapter LXXXV: The English Language in the Future | 86 |
| 87 | Chapter LXXXVI: The English Language in the Curriculum | 87 |
| 88 | Chapter LXXXVII: The English Language in the Classroom | 88 |
| 89 | Chapter LXXXVIII: The English Language in the Community | 89 |
| 90 | Chapter LXXXIX: The English Language in the Future | 90 |
| 91 | Chapter LXXXX: The English Language in the Curriculum | 91 |
| 92 | Chapter LXXXXI: The English Language in the Classroom | 92 |
| 93 | Chapter LXXXXII: The English Language in the Community | 93 |
| 94 | Chapter LXXXXIII: The English Language in the Future | 94 |
| 95 | Chapter LXXXXIV: The English Language in the Curriculum | 95 |
| 96 | Chapter LXXXXV: The English Language in the Classroom | 96 |
| 97 | Chapter LXXXXVI: The English Language in the Community | 97 |
| 98 | Chapter LXXXXVII: The English Language in the Future | 98 |
| 99 | Chapter LXXXXVIII: The English Language in the Curriculum | 99 |
| 100 | Chapter LXXXXIX: The English Language in the Classroom | 100 |

DISTINGUISHING "LANGUAGE" AND "CONTENT" IN ENGLISH-MEDIUM EDUCATION

DESMOND ALLISON

In this article, I examine two views of the role and responsibility of the (English) language teacher, and indicate some of the difficulties that arise in seeking to distinguish questions of "language" from matters of "content", especially when a language is being used as medium of instruction. In treating these issues, I shall attempt to suggest lines of inquiry rather than to prescribe solutions. The article nonetheless refers to some classroom observations and research findings, and it offers some tentative implications for English teaching in English-medium secondary schools.

The role of the language teacher

In this paper, we shall consider how far the role of the language teacher should extend into questions of "language use", with special reference to the teaching of other subjects. More exactly, we shall be concerned with the role of "language teaching", whether this is undertaken by language teachers, subject teachers, or in a combined approach by both language and subject teachers.

The actual functions of language teachers, and of other subject teachers, are governed by many factors. These include training, experience, type of class taught, workload, the expectations of pupils, parents, principals and peers, and the interests and personality of an individual teacher. In principle, nonetheless, any language teacher operates upon certain assumptions or ideas about what language teaching sets out to achieve, and about where a language teacher's responsibility should lie (c.f. Stern 1983: 23-24). It can be useful to make possible assumptions explicit, to examine their rationale and to compare them with other viewpoints.

Two viewpoints

Let us now examine two views of the relationship that may hold between "language" and "content", or "subject-matter", in situations where (English as) a second language is used as a medium of instruction. The restriction to English reflects the present writer's experience: comments may well be applicable to other languages when used as medium of instruction. Moreover, the focus upon use of a second language does not exclude the possibility that similar problems will arise in first-language educational contexts.

For convenience, I shall use the terms "minimal" and "maximal" to designate two contrasting views of the relation between language and content in education, and consequently of the role of the language teacher.

1. A "minimal" view of the language teacher's role

In discussing the importance of questioning as a skill for teachers, Cripwell and Geddes (1982) offer the following remarks:

"In subjects other than foreign languages, the teacher and his or her pupils are normally all native speakers of the language in question. For them the language is taken for granted and it is the content of the lesson that is important But for foreign language learners it is the language itself that is at issue. If they and the teacher are able to communicate through middle or higher order questions and appropriate answers in the foreign language, there should be no need for further lessons in that language".

(Cripwell and Geddes 1982:232)

We may remark that Cripwell and Geddes here pay no attention to the common situation in which a non-native language serves as a medium of instruction, whether for certain individuals in a multi-lingual classroom or for both teacher and learners in a second-language context. The authors do not comment on the possible roles of language lessons in a first-language situation. Their view of the (foreign) language teacher's role can be called "minimal", as they suggest that language learners who are able to ask suitable questions and understand the answers do not require further language teaching. An implication is that such learners will be adequately equipped to negotiate meanings directly with other users of the language; such users might in some circumstances include teachers of other school subjects. The focus of such negotiation, and of subject teaching in particular, would then be upon "content", with language being "taken for granted".

Comments on the "minimal" view

The position adopted by Cripwell and Geddes is by no means unattractive. On short language courses for prospective students, for example, a focus on asking questions and understanding answers could equip learners with vital skills for future situations. The target linguistic command that is implied by such a course objective is already considerable, so that what I am calling the "minimal" role of language teaching is not a trivial or negligible one. Where teaching and learning time are limited, attention to asking questions and understanding answers in a language will often merit high priority.

There are, however, difficulties with the view that, in principle, no further language teaching will be required after these objectives have been attained:

- (1) Continuing language support classes can often help learners by moving into the areas of "communication skills" and "study skills". These include, but are obviously not confined to, the abilities needed to ask questions and interpret answers. While the value of such teaching needs to be critically assessed, one may observe that such skills are widely taught to native speakers. This suggests that

many educators find that one cannot simply "take the language for granted" or assume that adequate linguistic proficiency will ensure effective communication in study (or other) contexts (1).

- (2) Learners may still encounter specifically linguistic problems. However, such problems may not always be recognised, either by the learners or by their subject teachers. In such cases, the required renegotiation of meanings will often not take place, so that misunderstandings persist and may impede further learning.

Example of a persistent language problem

An illustration of a language problem arising in academic work in another subject may be helpful at this stage. The example, which comes from the writer's teaching experience, is taken from work on a preparatory science course for selected form five school leavers entering the University of Botswana (2).

Students had been asked by their chemistry lecturers to write a summary of a school textbook passage on atomic structure (from a chapter by Thyne and Woolcock, 1978). English teaching staff agreed to mark and comment on the summaries.

Several students introduced a paragraph on electrons as follows:

(a) "An atom consists of electrons".

or (b) "An atom consist of electrons".

One error in (b), omission of the morpheme for third person singular, is clearly linguistic, and students generally recognised this as a concern of the English teacher.

The error also found in sentence (a), however, is of more interest in the present connection. Sentence (a) is grammatically acceptable, but it contains an apparent "content" error, since an atom does not in fact consist solely of electrons (3). Many students maintained that the error in (a) was one of content and not of language.

However, some of the students who had written sentence (a) or sentence (b) later wrote sentences such as:

(c) An atom also consists of protons and neutrons.

In such cases, the textual evidence showed that the apparent "content" error in (a) and (b) was in fact an error of language. The learners were aware of the names of the principal sub-atomic particles. They had, however, failed to appreciate that the verb "consists of" should be followed by an indication, in the verb phrase, of all the "constituents". The lexical item CONSIST OF differs in this regard from other related items, such as INCLUDE (4).

Such linguistic misunderstandings are likely to persist even among learners with an otherwise good command of English. Problems of this nature suggest the need for continuing language teaching. In a context of English-medium schooling, there appears to be scope for increased co-operation between English teachers and subject teachers, so that difficulties in the use of English as medium of instruction can be better recognised and addressed in teaching (c.f. Allison 1986).

2. A "maximal" view of the language teacher's role

Recent years have seen much emphasis, in language teaching circles, upon the importance of teaching learners not only the forms of a language, but also how the language is put to use. (An increased awareness of language functions is prominent in the latest Hong Kong syllabus for primary and secondary schools). A related point has been that language in use, whether in spoken interaction, spoken monologue or written text, goes beyond the boundaries of single sentences. The negotiation of meanings between language users, and the linguistic signals that may influence interpretation, have been studied under the heading of "discourse analysis". These developments have had considerable influence on the views of language teaching and learning that are expressed, or implied, in contemporary books, articles, syllabuses and materials in language teaching.

An emphasis upon language use is not entirely incompatible with the "minimal" view of the language teacher's role that we saw earlier (5). Nevertheless, a concern for the many different uses of language will clearly tend to expand our conception of the role and responsibilities of language teaching. A "maximal" view of the language teacher's task would be that all the relevant uses of a target language will need to be taught (6).

When a second language also serves, or will serve at a later educational stage, as medium of instruction, relevant uses of that language will include communication that takes place in other "subject" classes and assignments. Even when the target language is a foreign language (and not a medium of schooling), the case for using other subject materials as the basis for language courses in schools has been strongly argued by Widdowson (1978: 15-18, 53-54). According to Widdowson, such materials could help learners to draw upon their experience of language use in the mother tongue when attempting to communicate in the foreign language. Although the learners' own experience of language use is acknowledged, the argument persists that learners in a school situation will be unlikely to put target language forms to use unless they have guidance in doing so. Learning another language, in this view, requires that one should obtain an adequate command both of linguistic forms and of language use, for which suitable language teaching will be helpful.

Comments on the "maximal" view

Calls for greater recognition of the complexities of language learning and use, and for an increased role for language teaching, have had a mixed reception in the language teaching profession. Such ideas may have been widely welcomed in the public domain of conferences and papers, but the new demands they imply can prove unsettling to practising teachers. It is therefore important to ensure that any such demands offer a legitimate goal for professional development, and that they are not simply a product of uncritical delight in new ideas (7).

Two dangers of the "maximal" view of the language teacher's role, as I have outlined it here, are that:

- (1) language teachers might seek (or might feel obliged) to advance too far into the concerns of subject teachers, in the name of an interest in language use;
- (2) teachers might devote time and effort to teaching aspects of language use that do not, in fact, constitute problems for learners.

There is an increasing recognition, among language teaching professionals, that we need evidence to show whether or not particular uses of language, or features of discourse organisation, cause difficulties for learners and thus require teaching. (For references, see Allison, forthcoming).

It therefore appears important that English language teachers should try to determine what problems of language use are actually experienced by learners in other subjects in an English-medium situation. We should assume neither that language use other than asking questions and understanding replies can take care of itself (the "minimal" view in this paper), nor that all uses of language will need to be identified and taught (the "maximal" view). Instead, we need to find out what the language problems of learners in particular English-medium situations really are, and to work out with subject teachers effective ways of tackling identified problems.

Example of a problem involving language use

The broad issue of whether learners experience genuine problems with language use should therefore give rise to more specific questions that can be directly explored. Answers are likely to differ from one language function or from one discourse relation to another, with some uses of language proving obvious while others cause problems. For the same use of language, answers are also likely to vary between problems of comprehension and those of language production.

I propose now to exemplify a problem of language comprehension, involving language use in written discourse rather than command of syntactic or lexical forms, that appeared in an academic subject area. (Fuller discussion appears in Allison, forthcoming). The example is drawn from personal observation and research at the University of Botswana (from 1982 to 1985). It may serve to illustrate how problems of language use in other subjects can differ from those arising in self-contained language classes.

The problem was the widespread failure of learners to recognise certain contrasts in written texts, despite the presence of clear linguistic signals. Difficulties of this nature appeared frequently in language production when the learners wrote summaries of the "atomic structure" passage that we briefly considered earlier in this paper.

The passage in question includes a number of contrasts between Dalton's ideas about atoms (formulated in the early nineteenth century) and our contemporary understanding of atomic structure. Dalton imagined

atoms as minute, solid and indivisible particles, with all atoms of a given element being identical. Later discoveries, however, showed that atoms consist mostly of empty space (i.e. are not solid); that they include electrons, protons and neutrons as constituent particles (i.e. are not indivisible; c.f. note 3 for greater precision); that atoms of the same element may differ in mass (i.e. not all are identical). Thus, there appears to be a clear contrast between Dalton's earlier ideas and our subsequent understanding of atomic structure.

Such contrasts are quite common in academic writing, including school texts (8). It appears, however, that readers (at least in a second language) often fail to identify these contrasts. (The problem, for learners in Botswana, was not confined to writing tasks, but was also found in responses to "True-Not Known-False" reading test items). A common response was to take reported ideas, such as Dalton's views of the atom, as constituting "facts" (e.g. "Atoms are minute, solid particles"; "Atoms are indivisible"). This occurred despite clear textual signals that such statements were only what Dalton believed to be the case, and that these ideas later "had to be abandoned". In the written summaries, learners produced statements that were mutually incompatible (e.g. that all atoms of a given element are identical, yet that atoms of the same element can differ in mass).

Among the various possible explanations for such performance, we will note four:

- (i) a tendency for learners to "grab facts" when reading and ignore other features of discourse. (This was mentioned by students in informal feedback reports);
- (ii) a tendency to infer that what someone says is true (c.f. Spiro, 1980:254). Such a strategy will sometimes be appropriate, but can clearly cause problems if it is over-generalised;
- (iii) a tendency to ignore textual information that is not consistent with the reader's own understanding of subject-matter;
- (iv) lack of sensitivity to lexical signals. Thus, "non-factive" words (such as "believed", "considered", "suggested" or "maintained") might not be clearly differentiated from "factive" items (such as "proved", "showed", "established" or "demonstrated"). This could affect nouns (c.f. "idea" and "fact") as well as verbs.

We may observe that "comprehension" exercises and tests in the language class might not focus on all these possibilities. In particular, previous understanding of subject-matter (point iii) is often kept to a minimum, in order to ensure that learners focus on what they can discover from a text, rather than what they may already know. Such exercises thus differ from most genuine reading tasks. (This is not of course true of all comprehension exercises, but of many).

A series of research studies was carried out at the University of Botswana, by the present writer, in order to answer two questions:

- (1) were the problems explicable as lexical difficulties or were they more widespread than one would expect on the basis of learners' lexical knowledge?
- (2) were problems influenced by textual features, or were they the same under different textual conditions? (The conditions examined were explicitness of contrast signalling; sequence of information; choice between repetition or synonymous variation when signalling factivity or non-factivity).

A brief summary of the research findings is that:

- problems in identifying this kind of contrast in written discourse were more widespread than learners' (few) difficulties in responding correctly to items that tested knowledge of lexis;
- of the textual conditions examined, one (only) had a significant effect on readers' responses to test items. Problems were significantly fewer when the contrasts were made explicit in the texts (9).

The problem, therefore, was indeed one that arose during response to discourse. It seems likely that previous understanding of subject matter (including erroneous or oversimplified beliefs) heavily influenced the learners' ability to perceive contrast relations. However, responses were affected by the presence of explicit linguistic signals of contrast.

Professor J. Mc. H. Sinclair (Birmingham University) has commented on a tendency he had observed for Chinese students in an English-medium context to avoid, in written work, any overt signalling to show that juxtaposed points of view were in contrast rather than in continuity. The reasons for this phenomenon are likely to be complex (and may include a reluctance to make explicit what might be left to inference); however, when readers or writers are also dealing with new "subject" material, there would appear to be a need for clear signalling of contrast relations, since these will often not prove to be obvious.

Suggested Implications for English Teaching

1. More research is needed in order to determine which uses of English as medium of instruction will give rise to problems for learners. Such research, which includes careful observation of class work by teachers, can help to establish truly relevant objectives and priorities for English language teaching. (Similar arguments will presumably apply to the teaching of any language, where it serves as medium of instruction).
2. There is room for increased liaison between English teachers and teachers of other subjects, in order to discover more about the use of English in other classes (including reading texts and types of written assignment) as well as in public examinations. This can assist teachers both in identifying problems (point 1) and possibly in the joint setting and marking of suitable activities, with subject teacher and language teacher each contributing relevant expertise.
3. There are many constraints in schools (including available time and existing perceptions of roles) that can make it difficult for language

teachers and subject teachers to work together. Attention to these issues could therefore be of value during teacher education courses, perhaps particularly on in-service courses. The language needs of pupils in English-medium secondary schools might also be a possible focus for individual research projects during such courses.

Notes

- (1) For relations between communication skills courses for native speakers and second/foreign language teaching, see Williams, Swales and Kirkman (eds.) 1984.
- (2) Botswana (formerly known as Bechuanaland) is a country in southern Africa. The University of Botswana offers four-year degree programmes (five years for law). On entering the university, most students have completed twelve years' schooling.
- (3) Any atom contains at least one proton, and has the same number of electrons; most atoms also contain neutrons (uncharged particles). There are other sub-atomic particles, but these are not usually mentioned in introductory texts.
- (4) This example is likely to be typical, as Flood and West (1953) have indicated that the lexeme CONSIST OF often gives rise to persistent problems.
- (5) Cripwell and Geddes (loc. cit.) are already concerned with the use of language for asking and answering questions, as opposed to a purely formal objective such as mastery of interrogative syntactic patterns.
- (6) The current primary and secondary syllabuses for Hong Kong observes generally that:
"of recent years, language teaching specialists have become increasingly convinced that the ability to use the target language successfully . . . has to be taught" (1981:21; 1983:14).
One may note that this belief applies both to receptive and to productive use of language.
- (7) It is clearly not the intention of prominent authorities (such as Widdowson, Wilkins or Brumfit) to create new dogma, but to stimulate independent professional inquiry among those concerned with language teaching.
- (8) Contrasts between the reported views of other writers and the viewpoint that prevails in a discourse have been termed "Hypothetical-Real" contrasts by E. O. Winter (see Hoey 1983:128-129). Instances found in first-year science texts at the University of Botswana included alternative theories of heat ("caloric" and "energy"), and the contrast between pre-evolutionary and evolutionary theories of biological species. The "atomic structure" example comes from a school textbook.
- (9) Explicit signals showed either that the earlier ideas were "rejected", "abandoned" or otherwise refuted, or simply that later theories "contrasted with" or were "opposed to" the earlier position.

References

- Allison, D. M. 1986. "Training Learners to Prepare Short Written Answers". In *ELT Journal*, 40/1, pp. 27-32.
- , forthcoming, "The 'Hypothetical-Real' Contrast Relation: a problem of lexis or discourse for readers of English as a second language?" Paper presented at the Second International Seminar, Institute of Language in Education, Hong Kong, December 1986.
- Cripwell, K. and M. Geddes. 1982. "The Development of Organizational Skills through Micro-Teaching." In *ELT Journal*, 36/4, pp. 232-236.
- Flood, W. E. and M. West. 1953. "Supplementary Scientific and Technical Vocabulary". In West, M., *A General Service List of English Words*, Longman.
- Hoey, M. 1983. *On The Surface of Discourse*. Geo. Allen @ Unwin.
- Sinclair, J. McH. 1986. Personal communication (oral).
- Spiro, R. J. 1980. "Constructive Processes in Prose Comprehension and Recall". In *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension* (ed. Spiro, R. J., Bruce, B. C. and W. F. Brewer), Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Syllabus for English (Primary). 1981. Curriculum Development Committee, Education Department, Hong Kong.
- Syllabus for English (Secondary). 1983. Curriculum Development Committee, Education Department, Hong Kong.
- Thyne, M. and W. Woolcock. 1978. "Atomic Structure and Bonding". In *Revised Nuffield Chemistry* (ed. Coulson, E. H. and R. Ingle), Longman.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, R. C., Swales, J. M. and J. Kirkman (eds). 1984. *Common Ground: Shared Interests in ESP and Communication Studies* (ELT Documents 117). Pergamon (in association with the British Council).

Dr. Desmond Allison is Senior Lecturer (English) in the Institute of Language in Education, Hong Kong.

ETHNOCENTRISM: A BARRIER TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION?

GRAHAM BOWTELL

The totality of discourse is the sum of many more parts than just the choice of words and structures employed, no matter how appropriate they may be to the circumstances. Lexis and syntax in themselves fall far short of representing the body of linguistic knowledge required for effective communication, despite the assumption implicit in many a text-book that a knowledge of vocabulary and grammar is more or less sufficient to generate appropriate discourse. Real language is not a sterile world of lexical items and syntactic structures, and the monumental failure of much language learning is predicated on this false assumption. We must also recognise that what is *unsaid*, what is *implied* and what is to be *inferred* are major elements in real-world communication. "It's not what you said but how you said it!" The impact of an utterance on a listener is clearly more than just the surface forms might lead us to believe.

Given such over-riding factors in authentic discourse, we should now be looking to other, perhaps more nebulous, elements of language to determine why miscommunication occurs. In a timely and apposite article touching on some of the critical misunderstandings that can arise in international negotiations, Verner Bickley has again drawn our attention to the need for further investigation into the causes of communication breakdowns, and the necessity to isolate some of the factors contributing to negative encounters between individuals. (1) He refers to "a classic dilemma—the problem of maintaining good nation-to-nation relations based on reciprocity and equality when different sets of national and regional interests have to be reconciled."

It is in the breakdown of such high-level international (and intercultural) negotiations that we can see the extent of the difficulty, for it is at this level that our cultural chauvinism, our ethnocentrism, is at its most intransigent. In international agreements, the least acceptable course appears to be to compromise the more deeply held values of the various parties. What has this to do with language teaching and learning? The words and structures of English, for example, have been studied in depth, and methods for teaching and learning them have been reasonably successful, but what of those areas where real cultural variations occur?

A missing "-s" on an English plural form would rarely cause the misunderstandings that can arise when, for example, a falling intonation is produced where a rising tone is expected, or where a staccato delivery replaces the usual rhythms of standard English speech, or where politeness

strategies vary from the native-speaker norms. Even the very topic, the content of the message, can pose real problems for successful interethnic communication. There is a wide range of linguistic skills which, while crucial in interactions, are hardly ever taught with any degree of consciousness or sensitivity and are rarely learned in the formal language education environment.

A revealing study undertaken by Jean Brick in Australia (2) looked at the question of topic selection in initial informal encounters between strangers. The study contrasts Australian and Vietnamese values and attitudes when first meeting someone new, and demonstrated that a considerable communicative gulf exists from the outset between Australian and Vietnamese participants in casual conversation.

"Australian cultural assumptions contrast strongly with Vietnamese ones. Rather than stressing high social distance and high power differentials, Australian society stresses solidarity and low power Rather than silence, talkativity is valued as it is only through communication that solidarity and the mutual ratification of wants, desires and interests can be negotiated."

Brick found that all her Vietnamese informants felt that an initial silence was an appropriate first response on meeting a stranger, and that conversation would be short and reserved. Australians, by contrast, felt that "ignoring" a stranger was rude and silence, failure to ask questions and restricted responses were signs of hostility or disinterest. In terms of topic selection, Australians were strongly oriented toward affective considerations. The Vietnamese were concerned with the establishment of social and power differentials and this was reflected in the choice of topic in first meetings. Their initial concern is to establish common links through family or friends, thereby determining the societal membership of both participants. Given these concerns, first meetings are inherently face-threatening as social identity must be established, while silence and reticence can serve to preserve independence. This strategy is particularly evident among Vietnamese women who express great reluctance to initiate conversation with a stranger.

It is not only in the interests of enhanced social contact that interethnic communication be successful. Such deeply-held and conflicting values between a minority group and the dominant culture of the so-called "gatekeepers" (employers, government officials, landlords, bank managers, etc) are highly likely to result in misunderstandings, mutual antagonism and discrimination. If effective encounters between these parties are genuinely sought, the role of the teacher in identifying potential difficulties and raising the learners' awareness of areas of conflicting values must not be undervalued. This task requires not only cultural sensitivity but also real data.

We all seek to some degree the comfort and familiarity to be found among those who share our own values and our own deep understandings of what constitutes cultural propriety, of what is the right way to behave

and to speak in varying situations. Another language, and all that its use entails, can be a major threat to these notions of cultural correctness. This does not of course mean the words and grammar of another language, as it is these aspects of language that the student will have neither intellectual nor emotional qualms about learning.

A Challenge to Personal Schemata

Students of English whose social or professional development is to a large extent dependent on their ability to function effectively in this language are generally highly motivated to learn. I would suggest, however, that a commitment to learn another language must be made at two quite different psychological levels if the endeavour is to be at all successful. The primary level of commitment comes with the *intellectual* decision to master the language—the syntax, vocabulary and phonology—insofar as it suits the needs of the learner.

Language is a highly emotive phenomenon so closely tied to one's cultural being that what we say and how we speak reveal a great deal about our self-image. Through language we project our worldview, our values, our beliefs. It could be that the intellectual decision to learn another language for cross-cultural communication may not be matched by a deeper *emotional* commitment to learning how to *relate* in that language across cultural lines.

In recognition of these problems, attention is beginning to turn to a number of other aspects of language: politeness strategies, elements of voice quality like pitch, rhythm, stress and intonation, timing, turn-taking, back-channeling, explicitness and implicitness of information, appropriacy of openings and closings, repairs. The work of John Gumperz and his associates might be cited as examples of this new direction in linguistic research. To this list we might add what could be described as "discoursal democracy" in casual conversation; i.e., the right to initiate new directions in a dialogue, to claim a fair share of talking time, to both ask and answer questions, to expect appropriate feedback, etc.

It is in these areas that cultural mismatch is most likely to occur, and most particularly where the ethnocentrism of the participants—the "cultural blinkers" that we all wear to a greater or lesser extent—is profound. Might it be that cultural conservatism on the part of the learner is of itself a major barrier to progress? Indeed, might not ethnocentrism on the part of the teacher represent a formidable obstacle to effective teaching? Being culture-bound, on either side of the teaching-learning process, must be a major stumbling block in cross-cultural encounters. Such "road blocks" as he calls them form the basis for the recent proposal by R. J. Owens (3) that a special component in Hong Kong language teacher education courses be devoted to them.

To provide a firmer basis for these suggestions we might turn first to some aspects of cognitive theory. What do we know about the acquisition of knowledge that might help us to enhance the learning process? What

lo we know about language that might provide insights into how and what to teach? One attempt to explain the underlying mechanisms of knowledge acquisition is a learning model known as *schema theory*. This theory is based on the idea that prior knowledge directly influences both the *content* and *form* of new knowledge. It has derived from the work of social psychologists and linguists and has applications not only in cognitive psychology but also underlies recent work in artificial intelligence. (4)

Schema theory provides a framework for explaining and even predicting how information is *organised* by individual learners, how it is the *meaning* rather than the surface form that is likely to be remembered, and how *context* and *prior knowledge* effect cognition, i.e. *how much* and *what* is learned.

It has been clearly established (5) that new meanings are acquired by the interaction of new knowledge with previously learned concepts or propositions. Two factors are involved in this acquisition: the learner must adopt a meaningful learning set (i.e. an intention to relate new information to existing cognitive structures) *and* the new material must be potentially meaningful (i.e. relatable to those cognitive structures). In short, the meaningfulness of new information is dependent on how well it meshes with a learner's prior knowledge. Errors in reconstruction indicate where new material is contradictory in some part with existing cognitive structures. The conclusion to be drawn here is that the learner must utilise pre-existing knowledge which will be re-organised or updated by new information. The theory also predicts that the memory preserves real-world rather than linguistic information; that is, the meaning rather than the form.

The importance that general world knowledge plays in understanding language has been dramatically pointed up in attempts at computer simulation of human understanding. Schallert (p. 20) notes that:

"Early failures in modelling language processing, such as the language-to-language translation machines, can largely be blamed on theories of word meanings that proved too simple. Word meanings do not derive from a combination of a limited set of linguistic primitives as Katz and Fodor proposed (1963). Sentence, and much less, paragraph meanings are not the result of a simple concatenation of word meanings taken from a mental dictionary. If a computer is to 'understand' a linguistic input—that is, have the ability to answer questions, make inferences, or perhaps, produce a paraphrase in essentially indistinguishable form from human responses—it must be programmed with detailed knowledge about even the most mundane of fact, object or event."

Schemata might be defined as abstract structures that represent what one holds to be generally true about the world. They are dynamic, changing from moment to moment in response to comprehension process demands. The inference is that the acquisition of new knowledge therefore reflects the level of sophistication of existing cognitive structures so that the more an individual knows about a concept, the better that knowledge is organised and the more further input will be processed in an orderly and systematic manner, enhancing the learning process.

Widdowson acknowledges the concept of schemata as fundamental to the learning process. For him, they constitute what he calls "communicative competence" and, combined with "linguistic competence" (i.e. knowledge of the language systems), they represent the learner's prior knowledge upon which new information can be overlaid. He defines communicative competence as "having to do not with the structure of sentences but with the organization of utterances, as a set of expectations derived from previous experience which are projected on to instances of actual language behaviour." (6) To lend weight to this view of the importance of schemata in the learning process, Widdowson cites research into other aspects of human behaviour, particularly some accepted principles of visual perception. The work of Neisser in this area (7) is concerned with "anticipatory schemata" which prepare the perceiver for accepting new information and determining just what is perceived.

It is the fundamentally negotiative nature of the application of schemata to instances of actual language use which is involved in meaningful communication, and incidentally in the modification of schemata. Widdowson notes the implications of this in a cross-cultural context:

"All communication depends on the alignment and adjustment of each interlocutor's schemata so that they are brought into sufficient correspondence for the interlocutors to feel satisfied that they have reached an understanding. The more remote the schematic worlds of the interlocutors, the more procedural work will need to be done to achieve communicative rapport." (8)

Two types of schemata are distinguished; ideational or propositional schemata which are involved in conceptual organisation, and interpersonal or illocutionary schemata which are related to the establishment and maintenance of relationships. Communication involves both the exchanging of propositions and, if it is not to break down, an understanding and respect for each interlocutor's values and sense of propriety. Schema theory goes a considerable way towards explaining how we provide a meaningful framework and organisation to the ideas being discussed. The relevance of a contribution to a conversation is checked against ideational schemata, and if such relevance cannot be established, the conversation will break down. The flow of a conversation is maintained by drawing on language from interpersonal schemata.

Schemata, comprehension and effective communication

The importance of schemata to the comprehension of language input has been tested in a number of ways but has received particular attention in relation to enhancing reading comprehension. The psychologist F. C. Bartlett (9) proposed the idea of story schemata (i.e. schematic structure or rhetorical organisation in narratives) as early as 1932 and showed how different ways of organising narrative prose affect the way that prose is understood and recalled by native speakers. Bartlett tested English-speaking students on their reproduction of an Amerindian narrative which

expressed beliefs and adhered to a schematic structure which was unfamiliar to the students. He found that adjustments were made to make the original material correspond more closely to their own world-views; "they interpreted the content by fitting it into their own frames of reference, their own schemata."

Several studies have been carried out which show the effects on ESL reading comprehension of cultural differences in the rhetorical organisation of expository texts. One of these compared Japanese and English readers, reading in their own languages, on texts with a typical Japanese schematic structure. It was found that not only was it generally more difficult for the English readers, but particular aspects of the organisation were extraordinarily problematic, especially in delayed recall. The traditional pattern known as *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* is difficult for English readers who lack the appropriate formal schema against which to process the Japanese pattern. (10)

Another study by Carrell shows the effects of four different English rhetorical patterns on the reading recall of ESL readers of various language backgrounds. That study showed that the more tightly organised patterns which she labelled "comparison", "causation", and "problem/solution" are generally more facilitative of recall of specific ideas from a text than is the more loosely organised pattern she called "collection of descriptions". Within that finding she also noted significant and interesting differences among the LI groups: Arabic, Spanish, and "Oriental" (predominantly Korean and some Chinese). She goes on to suggest that we might facilitate reading comprehension by teaching about text structure and working on schema availability, schema activation and metacognitive training (e.g. inference awareness, analogy) among other things.

Turning to another aspect of language, that of conversation, John Gumperz (11) suggests that we draw on a number of areas of knowledge when we make inferences from what is said during a conversation. Grammatical and lexical knowledge are supplemented by knowledge of the physical setting, personal background knowledge, attitudes of the participants, socio-cultural assumptions about role and status relationships, and social values associated with the message. Usual descriptions of language, based on context-free rules, do not provide the kind of information required for an understanding of how language is employed. Gumperz is adamant that new types of data are needed.

"Conversational analysis over the last few years has demonstrated beyond question that not only formally distinct speech events but all kinds of casual talk are rule governed. It is through talking that one establishes the conditions that make an intended interpretation possible. Thus to end a conversation, one must prepare the ground for an ending; otherwise, the ending is likely to be misunderstood. Or to interpret an answer, one must be able to identify the question to which that answer is related. To understand a pun, one must be able to retrieve, re-examine and reinterpret sequences that occurred earlier in an interaction." (12)

Gumperz makes the important point that even when a speaker appears to have near-native command of English, misunderstandings can still arise in interethnic communications not so much due to deficiencies in the lexico-grammatical side of language but more likely as a result of other prosodic features. Elements such as intonation or politeness strategies can be heavily influenced by the speaker's own cultural milieu.

All this leads inevitably to the conclusion that a learner with entrenched cultural values whose experience and knowledge (schemata) are as yet quite unmodified in terms of the culture of the target language community carries a heavier learning burden during second language acquisition. The teacher who doesn't understand or appreciate this ethnocentrism for what it is cannot expect rapid progress from the learner, struggling in what might not be a sympathetic environment, to modify deeply implanted schemata, particularly of the interpersonal variety. Procedures to deal effectively with learners must not only account for their present levels of knowledge of vocabulary and grammar but must also begin to ascertain and appropriately modify those other areas of language likely to alienate or confuse native-speakers. This is not to advocate changing behaviour patterns to mimic native speakers completely, but rather to point up where cultural differences might serve to abort the very communication sought.

New concerns for course designers

Teaching the words and phrases that a learner might use as models during conversational exchanges has been the major focus of most of the teaching in this skill area. While this has been difficult enough in itself, it represents a somewhat easier task than is entailed in a shift of emphasis (or at least a diversification of foci) toward those other verbal and non-verbal elements crucial in successful cross-cultural encounters. There seems to be so much requiring attention that one hardly knows where to start.

The insights to be gained from studies such as Brick's or the work of Gumperz and his associates are only just beginning to address some of the specific issues. A similar concern to that addressed by Brick, again relating to initial encounters between Southeast Asians and Australians, might serve to illustrate the complexity of the task that lies ahead. I would like to look briefly at two aspects of *non-verbal* behaviour in Indonesian learners which may at first seem trivial but can assume quite significant proportions if reactions in interethnic encounters prove negative.

The behavioural idiosyncracies in question are naturally perfectly acceptable in the subjects' "home" cultural setting. I will term these non-verbal actions the "giggle" and the "bob" and both are frequently observed in the way Indonesians, and particularly Javanese, behave in initial encounters with strangers. If these terms seem derogatory, then it is by design as they reflect the values placed on such behaviour by the host culture.

The subjects of my observations were students, both male and female, who were well known to me before leaving Indonesia and who went

to Australia to undertake post-graduate studies. All were high-status members of their own society, being university or government employees, and enjoyed professional recognition in having been selected for long-term study abroad. Having observed a number of initial encounters with people such as university supervisors, landlords, telecom employees, fellow students and older members of the community (such as my own parents), I was distressed to find that reactions were more often than not unfavourable towards them. This is not to imply that Australians were in any way antagonistic but rather that they felt uncomfortable and often judged the Indonesian students as perhaps a little immature or backward. Most surprising of all was the attempt on the part of some Australians to "pidginise" their English in the belief that this would make them more easily understood. What, aside from a few errors in structure and pronunciation, were the most significant features of the Indonesians' manner and language that might have resulted in these reactions?"

One aspect of Australian society that causes considerable difficulty to members of a nation which still describes itself (if only unofficially) as "feudal" is the concept of social egalitarianism. As Brick has stated with regard to Vietnamese society, so also is Indonesia's social network based on relative status, power and, to a lesser extent, sex. The ultimate manifestation of this are the languages of Java and Bali themselves which all require that many common lexical items be varied on the basis of the relative status of the speakers. Many common nouns, verbs and grammatical morphemes have three quite different surface forms and a careful speaker can vary the selection of these forms to distinguish up to nine different status relationships with various addressees.

To give a brief example of this phenomenon from Javanese:

"I'm reading a Javanese book"

When speaking to a social inferior or informally to a peer=

"Aku lagi moco buku Jowo"

When speaking to a social superior=

"Kulo saweg maos buku Jawi"

With social relations so overtly stamped on the culture it is not surprising that clashes of values occur in an Australian context which professes equality and eagerly seeks to "cut down the tall poppies". In order for communication to proceed across such a cultural gulf, some modification is clearly required.

In Australia, the "giggle" is generally associated with the less mature members of that society, and particularly with schoolgirls. Such type-casting, whether legitimate or not, is bound to have adverse effects if associated with adults who are supposed to demonstrate more mature behaviour. What is the outcome, then, when a Javanese continually concludes each utterance in an initial encounter with a kind of nervous giggle? To the Indonesian this represents a certain apprehension in the process of establishing a social relationship and signifies an attempt at deference. A great social virtue in a Javanese female is to be "demure" (*malu*) so that a

confident, self-assured approach is most definitely inappropriate. For a successful professional, to exhibit such inappropriate behaviour in Australia is bound to create the wrong impression.

Niels Mulder wrote in his classic analysis of the Javanese character: (13)

"In the Javanese world view individual autonomy and social self-expression, and an active relationship to the world of matter are negatively valued. Javanese thinking does not attribute positive meaning to individual autonomy, or to a direct confrontation with the world of things

Among the Javanese themselves, there are standard means of communicating personal emotions as in the extreme circumspection with which people approach their subject, in the show of embarrassment itself, or in the excessive demonstrations of modesty. These emotions generally arise from the difficulty that an individual feels in approaching another person to whom he is not intimately related, which include most people beyond the mother and other immediate kin Towards strangers and those with higher status, a person feels shame, anxiety, fear, and insecurity that are demonstrated by language, inaction, mannerisms such as excessive smiling, shying away, and giggling. These are shows of 'stage-fright' in dealing with other persons"

One of Mulder's personal experiences might serve to illustrate the extent to which this is basic to even slightly threatening confrontations:

"A person with whom I was fairly well acquainted wanted to convey an important message. He entered my room, giggling and smiling. I invited him to sit, and he accepted the ritual tea that is served soon after a guest arrives. He kept giggling and talking about the weather and other topics that were obviously irrelevant to his message. He excused himself for intruding upon me, and continued to talk about trivial things, yet his excessive smiling and giggling demonstrated that he had more on his mind, and that he was under stress—he was obviously trying to overcome the intimidating barrier that separates man from man in Java. Smiling and giggling, he finally came to his point—'my father has died'—and immediately he made his excuses and wanted to leave. He had overcome the barrier and apologised for having done so. He was embarrassed, and so was I, because his father had died."

A purely physical form of deference, demanded throughout Java, is the "bob", a dropping of the right hand and shoulder whenever passing in front of or between people of any status. Unlike, for example, the Japanese bow, this action may not emerge during an initial meeting but will be commonly observed in any confined space in which there are a number of people present. Most gatherings are likely to produce many examples of this dragging of the right hand almost at floor level when people have no option but to pass before someone of status. It is symbolic of a lowering of the body, and particularly the head, before a respected personage and is an utterly automatic gesture. One finds oneself attempting this very gesture even while squeezing along a row of tightly packed and occupied theatre seats.

Again, in a society such as Australia's where equality is presumed and appropriate behaviour demanded, such shows of deference are calculated to destroy personal relationships. There one must learn to tread a fine line between deference and arrogance if successful communication is to be nurtured. The impression that "you wouldn't say boo to a goose" or that your own self-image is one of humility and lack of confidence will most likely result in your abilities going unrecognised.

For such reasons, these seemingly trivial actions can represent a kind of "fatal flaw" in the way in which competent Indonesian professionals present themselves in initial encounters in any Western society. As teachers of communication skills, rather than just "English", we must attempt to develop strategies in our learners such that they can represent themselves in a fairer light, with confidence but not arrogance. There must be a real benefit to be gained from learning an enhanced repertoire of, for example, appropriate conversational openings and closings which stresses not only the words and phrases but also the entire gamut of verbal and non-verbal features of effective communication.

To establish themselves as intelligent professionals, the initial impressions arising from any newcomer's first encounters with university staff, fellow students, landlords, government representatives and the like are extremely important. If the aim in going abroad for further education or other professional purposes is to be fulfilled, then on such meetings rests to a large extent the outcome of the entire exercise.

If, among the host of other things to be learned, the suppression of inappropriate non-verbal behaviour can add immeasurably to the success of interaction across cultural barriers, then such behaviour should be identified, the interpersonal schemata modified, and procedures developed as an integral part of the establishment of communicative capacity. Perhaps the greatest difficulty, as was suggested at the beginning of this paper, is the degree to which an individual learner is "culture-bound", and the failure of the teacher to acknowledge this ethnocentrism and deal with it in a sensitive yet positive manner.

Notes

- (1) Bickley, V. (1986). p. 13.
- (2) Brick, J. (1984). Unpublished essay, but see also:
Brick, J. & Louie, G. (1984).
- (3) Owens, R. J. (1986). p. 103.
- (4) See Schallert, D. L. (1982). p. 19, who notes:
"Recent developments in artificial intelligence are in fact so compatible to schema theoretic notions that it seems a misrepresentation to classify them as antecedents. They are more properly seen as realisations, coming from a different methodological tradition, of the same general theory of knowledge."
- (5) See Schallert, p. 14ff for a summary of the evidence.
- (6) Widdowson, H. G. (1983).

- (7) Cited in Widdowson, p. 65.
- (8) Widdowson, p. 40.
- (9) Cited in Widdowson, p. 54.
- (10) Carrell, P. L. (1984). p. 11.
- (11) Gumperz, J. (1982). p. 153.
- (12) Gumperz, p. 155.
- (13) Mulder, N. (1983). p. 65f.

Bibliography

- Bickley, V., "Problem: Education and the Cross-Cultural Encounter", *New Horizons*, no. 27, Hong Kong Teachers' Association, Nov 1986.
- Brick, J and Louie, G., *Language and Culture: Vietnam*, Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, 1984.
- Carrell, P. L., "Facilitating Reading Comprehension by Teaching Text Structure: What the Research Shows", paper presented at 18th TESOL Convention, Houston, 1984.
- Gumperz, J., Jupp, T. and Roberts, C., *Crosstalk: a study of cross-cultural communication*, NCILT, 1979.
- Gumperz, J., *Discourse Strategies*, CUP, 1982.
- Gumperz, J., *Language and Social Identity*, CUP, 1982.
- Gumperz, J., *Developing Awareness Skills for Interethnic Communication*, Occ. Paper 12, RELC, 1980.
- Mulder, N., *Mysticism and Everyday Life in Contemporary Java*, 3rd ed., Singapore UP, 1983.
- Owens, R. J., "Cross-Cultural Problems in Language Teaching and Learning", *Institute of Language in Education Journal*, Vol. 2, Education Department, Hong Kong, 1986.
- Schallert, D. L., "The Significance of Knowledge: A Synthesis of Research Related to Schema Theory", in Otto, W. and White, S., eds., *Reading Expository Material*, Academic Press, 1982.
- Widdowson, H. G., *Learning Purpose and Language Use*, OUP, 1983.

Mr. Graham Bowtell is Lecturer (English) at the Baptist College, Hong Kong.

華文課程的修訂與教師的在職訓練

謝澤文

星加坡教育部

背景

1. 新加坡是一個多元種族、多元文化的社會，在約二百五十五萬的人口
中，華人佔76%，馬來人佔15%，印度人佔6%，其他族人佔
4%。這裏的官方語文是馬來語(巫語)、華語(普通話)、淡米爾語和
英語。國語是馬來語，主要的行政語言是英語。在華人的社會裏，方
言的使用很普遍，主要的方言有福建話、潮州話、廣東話、客家話、
海南話等。由於“推廣華語運動”已收到了一定的效果，華語的使用
日漸普遍。
2. 新加坡原本有華文、英文、馬來文和淡米爾文四種不同源流的學校。
在1956年之前，雖然非英校都自動教導英語作為第二語文，但英校
之中，只有少數教導華文。在當時的英校裏，華語被稱為土語
(vernacular language)，沒有什麼地位。1956年，《各政黨委員會報
告書》發表，其中的一項建議是小學應教導第二語文。到了
1962年，政府宣佈：英校學生參加小學離校文憑考試(PSLE)的時
候，可以選考華文作為第二語文。1965年，就是新加坡宣佈獨立
的那一年，華文第二語文成為小學離校文憑考試的必考科目。
1966年，政府規定英校中學一年級的學生必須修讀第二語文。到了
1969年，華文第二語文成為了劍橋普通教育證書(普通水準)考試(即
中學會考)的必考科目。
3. 由於英校畢業生在升學和就業方面都比其他語文學校的畢業生佔優
勢，所以越來越多家長把孩子送進英校。到了1984年，選擇進入英
文小學一年級的新生人數竟達全部報名人數的99%以上。政府經過
詳細考慮後，決定分階段統一四種語文源流的學校，從1987年開
始，中小學一律以英語作為第一語文，學生的母語作為第二語文。不
過在四間特選的小學裏，學生可以修讀英文和華文作為第一語文。那
些在小學離校考試中屬於最優秀的10%及格學生，可以選擇進入九
間特選中學，修讀英文和華文作為第一語文。華文的授課時間如下：

| 科 目 | 節 數 | | 備 註 |
|----------|-----|----|-------------|
| | 小學 | 中學 | |
| 華文(第一語文) | 10 | 8 | 每節 30—35 分鐘 |
| 華文(第二語文) | 8 | 6 | 每節 35—40 分鐘 |

課程綱要的修訂

4. 近二十多年來，華文課程綱要經過三次的修訂。目前的小學和中學綱要是分別在 1980 年和 1983 年公佈的。新綱要的實施，對華文教學產生的影響有以下幾項：

- 4.1 在舊的綱要裏，教學目標訂得很籠統，既不分年級，也不分主目標和副目標；而且語文訓練的目標只佔一半，另一半是有關道德教育和知識灌輸方面的。修訂後的綱要以語文訓練為主目標，道德教育等為副目標；而且每項語文訓練的目標都訂得比較明確。這表示華文教學雖然不能忽略正確價值觀念的灌輸，不過它的主要任務還是語文技能的訓練。
- 4.2 加強說話和閱讀的教學，但並不忽略書寫方面的教學。小學生從四級開始學習漢語拼音，教師必須有系統地教導，以確保他們在小學畢業前掌握這套拼音工具。
- 4.3 中小學的綱要都附有字表。在小學階段，以華文第一語文的學生學 2 000 個漢字；以華文作為第二語文的，學 1 800 個漢字。在中學階段，以華文作為第一語文的，多學 1 500 字，共 3 500 字；以華文作為第二語文的，多學 1 200 字，共 3 000 字。字表的公佈，使教材所用的字滙有更好的控制，增加了字滙，詞滙重複出現的機會，目的是減輕學生學習華文的負擔，並增強他們的學習信心。
- 4.4 以單元的方式組織教材。在小學階段，每個單元包括了聽、說、讀、寫的教材和語文練習作業。在中學階段，更突破了傳統篇章教學的局限，每個單元包括了不同性質不同教學目標的教材，如說話教材、實用文(包括報章)、文章選讀等，目的是使學生能均衡地學習不同性質的教材，獲得較全面的語文技能訓練。
- 4.5 課堂教學的活動更多樣化，教師通過分組教學、遊戲、角色扮演、討論等活動，使學生有更多使用華語的機會。教師也要使用更多的視聽教具，以引起學生學習興趣，提高教學效果。

新的要求和挑戰

5. 新課程的實施，使華文教師面對了新的挑戰。他們有必要進一步提高自己的專業水平，以應付課程和教材方面的改變。例如修訂課程主張加強說話教學，使學生能說更流利更正確的華語。要達到這個目標，就先要有適當的師資。我們的非大學畢業華文教師全部畢業自舊制的華文學校；大學畢業的教師多數是南洋大學和新加坡國立大學（以前稱新加坡大學）的中文系畢業生，一部分是畢業於台灣，甚至中國（年紀較大的）的大學。他們在讀和寫方面的能力沒有問題。在口語方面，他們雖然都能說“流利”的華語，但由於他們都是南方人，又生長在一個方言很普遍的社會，加上他們在求學時期沒有獲得適當的語音訓練，所以在發音方面難免受到方言的影響而不夠準確。如果要有效地實施修訂課程綱要，提高學生的語音水平，老師本身就得先接受訓練。
6. 新加坡教育部在一九七四年成立了“小學華文教材組”，編寫實驗性的小學華文教材。這套教材獲得學校的好評，而且調查結果證明新教材在訓練學生聽、說、讀、寫基本語文能力方面很有效。1980年修訂公佈後，小學華文教材組對新教材作了進一步的修訂，使它成為一套全國學校採用的教材。新教材着重字匯的適當控制，課文力求生動有趣而且實用。整套教材包括：學生讀本、習字本子、作業簿、圖片、字卡、錄音帶、錄像帶、遊戲用具、補充讀物和教師手冊。教材引導教師有系統地訓練學生聽、說、讀、寫方面的能力，並培養他們對學習華文的興趣和信心。1983年中學華文修訂課程綱要公佈，教育部的課程發展署接着成立了“中學華文教材編寫組”，負責編寫新教材，稱為《中學華文教材》。整套教材包括：課本、評鑒與練習、視聽教材、輔助讀本和教師手冊。教材以單元的方式組織，每個單元包括了會話教材、實用文和文章選讀。練習方面包括了有系統的語文活動，如字形結構、構詞、組合句子、病句、句型、簡單語法、中英對比等。另外還有隨機性的語文活動，如聽會話、聽新聞、聽廣播、聽座談、對話、討論、看幻燈片、膠片寫新聞、學習採訪新聞等，目的是訓練學生的聽力和交際能力。傳統的課文大多是“文選”，教師的教學活動主要是講解和分析，至於學生的語文習練，不外是問答、解釋、造句、作文。教具方面，通常只用到黑板和粉筆。一向習慣於傳統教學法的老師，開始的時候不容易適應這套新教材和新教學法。
7. 這幾年來，在教育方面我們的口號是“鼓勵創新，提高素質”。在華文方面，我們要求改進教學法，使課堂教學更靈活，更有趣，而且更有效。這無形中給予教師一種“壓力”，他們需要不斷進修，以充實自己應付新的需求。

提供訓練的單位

8. 目前，負責為教師策劃和提供進修課程的有下列幾個單位：

- 8.1 教育學院——該學院的職責主要是培訓師資。在新加坡，要成為合格教師，必須先進入教育學院，接受師資訓練，考取教育專業文憑。大學畢業生須接受一年的全職訓練，非大學畢業生，須接受兩年的訓練。學院也為教師和校長提供種種的在職訓練課程，包括教學法、教育行政以及語文課程等。
- 8.2 教育部——教育部設有“訓練組”，負責策劃組織和協調各項訓練課程。該組和教育學院、教育部視學組、課程發展署和區域語言中心等保持密切聯系，以確保所提供的訓練課程合乎教師和校長們的需要。教育部的視學組主要的職責是編訂課程綱要、督導有關科目的教學和鼓勵教師嘗試創新的教學法。該組也有責任根據教師的需要，向訓練組建議開辦何種課程。視學人員還通過校內座談會(School-based Workshop)、小組討論等活動，提高教師們的專業知識。
- 8.3 課程發展署——教育部屬下課程發展署的主要工作是編寫教材、製作視聽教具、和指導教師使用教材。課程發展署教材編寫組在全面推行新教材之前，通常會開辦短期的訓練課程，教導教師怎樣使用新教材和教具。教材編寫組的視導員過後還到學校去，幫助教師解決教學上碰到的困難。

訓練課程

9. 根據修訂課程和教材的需要，各單位為華文教師提供了以下的訓練課程：

9.1 華文教師語音訓練班

- 9.1.1 修訂的小學華文課程綱要規定學生從四年級開始需有系統地學習漢語拼音。中小學的課程綱要都主張加強口語教學，使學生說更流利更標準的華語。教育部經一番考慮後，決定開辦語音訓練班，重新訓練大部份的華文教師，使他們能夠掌握漢語拼音和基本的語音理論。我們認為教師如果能掌握漢語拼音和基本的發音理論，就算本身的語音不夠標準，也能相當有效地教導學生。理由是學生年紀輕，模仿力和領悟力強，他們學會了漢語拼音，就可以通過查字典、聽錄音和電視廣播等活動，自我糾正自己語音上的毛病，學到較標準的華語。

9.1.2 教育部特地成立了一個工作委員會，負責協調這個訓練計劃。在初期，我們還特地從台灣聘請了一位語音教授擔任顧問，協助策劃課程的內容和訓練語音班的指導員。在正式開辦課程之前，工作委員會進行了以下幾項準備工作：

甲、 擬定課程內容

| | |
|----------|------------|
| 學前測試 | 2小時 |
| 基本華語發音理論 | 12小時 |
| 漢語拼音講解 | 6小時 |
| 漢語拼音練習 | 16小時 |
| 方音對華語的影響 | 2小時 |
| 結業測試 | 2小時 |
| | <hr/> 40小時 |

乙、 訓練語音導師

本課程的特點之一是學員聽了有關漢語拼音的講解後，立刻進行分組練習；每組約十人，由一位語音導師負責示範和糾正學員所犯的錯誤。語音導師是從華文教師中挑選出來的。我們選出十九位語音比較標準的老師，讓他們接受海外顧問的指導。其中十位表現較優異而且有興趣當語音導師的，受邀擔任兼職導師。後來，我們把其中四位從學校調派出來，擔任全職的語音導師。

丙、 試教

根據所訂的綱要進行試教。接受試教的教師共80位，包括幼兒班、小學和中學的教師。

丁、 檢討

試教之後，工作委員會檢討了課程內容、訓練方法和時間安排等，並加以調整。海外顧問在語音導師的協助下，完成了一份有關華文教師常犯語音錯誤的報告，供語音導師和學員們參考。

9.1.3 試教的工作在一九八〇年十二月完成，正式的訓練課程從一九八一年一月開始。我們規定每班人數約四十人，每星期上課兩次，每次二小時，十個星期完成，上課地點是教育學院。教師利用課餘的時間進修，教上午班的老師下午來參加，教下午班的老師則上午來上課。我們上午開兩班，下午開兩班，四個語音班同時進行，一年大約訓練640位教師。

9.1.4 說音班着重分組練習，由語音導師進行個人指導。參加課程的教師必須勤學漢語拼音聲母、韻母的拼讀和拼寫，他們經常像小學生似的，進行聽音拼寫的練習。這種方法雖然在開始的階段使到一些教師覺得有點難堪，但效果却相當好。經過一番“苦練”之後，90%以上的教師都能掌握漢語拼音。他們完成課程後，表示有信心教導漢語拼音的超過85%。這個訓練計劃從一九八一年一月開始，到一九八五年十二月結束，前後進行了五年，共有2879位中小學華文教師完成了課程，佔全部華文教師65%左右。在安排教師參加這課程時，訓練組優先考慮年齡不超過四十五歲的教師，所以那些沒有參加訓練課程的大部分是年紀較大的教師；也有部分教師他們已經對教導漢語拼音有信心，所以沒有參加。近年來，我國漢語拼音的教學相當成功，學生的語音水平提高了不少，這說明了華文教師訓練班已產生良好的效果。

9.2 小學華文教材訓練課程

爲了使教師了解新教材的精神、特點和使用的方法，教育部課程發展署的小學華文教材組特別爲教師開辦了小學華文教材訓練課程，內容見表一。整個課程分爲七講，每星期兩講，一個月內完成。教材組的視導員過後還到學校去，了解教師在使用時所碰到的問題，並提出建議。如果發現某些教師教得特別好，他們將會把這些教學上的優點介紹給其他教師。教材組也通過討論會、小組討論等活動，經常和教師交換教學上的意見。目前幾乎所有小學華文教師都已參加過這訓練課程。

表一、 小學華文教材訓練課程內容

| 教材 | 教學內容／活動 | 時間 |
|-------|-------------------------------------|------|
| 低年級教材 | • 總論：討論教材的精神和特點。 | 2小時 |
| | • 教學法：有關說話、識字、寫字、分組活動、遊戲等教學法的講解和討論。 | 6小時 |
| | • 通過錄像帶示範小學華文教材的教學法。 | 40分鐘 |

| 教材 | 教學內容／活動 | 時間 |
|-------|----------------------------------|------|
| 中年級教材 | • 教學法：有關說話、識字、寫字、句式練習等教學法的講解和討論。 | 5小時 |
| | • 通過錄像帶示範教學法。 | 40分鐘 |
| 高年級教材 | • 教學法：有關說話、閱讀、句式練習、作文等教學法的講解和討論。 | 5小時 |
| | • 通過錄像帶示範教學法。 | 40分鐘 |

9.3 中學華文教材訓練課程

這個課程由課程發展署的中學華文教材組和教育學院的亞洲語文學系聯合主辦，目的是使教師掌握配合教材需要的教學法，內容包括：

- 動機教學和字滙教學
- 詞滙教學
- 寫作教學
- 閱讀教學
- 語法教學
- 語文活動教學
- 視聽教材的使用
- 會話教學
- 朗讀教學
- 字詞讀音訓練

整個課程共十講，每講兩個小時。教師利用課餘的時間上課，每星期兩次，每次兩小時，五周內完成。教學的活動包括講解、討論、示範、練習等。教材組的視導員過後會到學校去了解教學的情形，協助教師解決問題，並收集教師對新教材的意見。他們也為教師舉辦校內教學討論會，對實際教學上碰到的問題交換意見。目前這課程還繼續開辦。