

https://dspace.org/

Perspectives in Education: Journal of the Faculty of Education of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, and the Johannesburg College of Education 4(1)

Wally Morrow; Penny Enslin; James Moulder; Christopher Orpen; John Povey ...

1980-08
University of the Witwatersrand
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/28998
Morrow, W. (Ed.) (1980, August). Perspectives in Education: Journal of the Faculty of Education of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, and the Johannesburg College of Education, 4(1).

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION



VOL 4 NO 1
August 1980

Journal of the Faculty of Education of the University of the Witwatersrand and the Johannesburg College of Education

©Faculty of Education
University of the Witwatersrand
1 Jan Smuts Avenue
Johannesburg 2001
South Africa

See the back cover for Table of Contents

CONTENTS

DISCUSSION

1 Do we need Professional Associations or Unions for teachers? — Penny Enslin

ARTICLES

4 The Education of Adults — James Moulder

15 Can Students Judge Lecturer Performance Accurately? — Christopher Orpen

INTERCHANGE

21 Language Policy and Bilingualism — John Povey

38 Doing the Right Thing for the Right Reason — Victor Rodseth

42 The Problem of 'Subtractive Bilingualism' — Norman Blight

47 The Neglected Question — Graham Walker

NOTICES

49

DISCUSSION

DO WE NEED *PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS* OR *UNIONS* FOR TEACHERS?

Penny Enslin

With the deepening of the current crisis in education in South Africa this question becomes all the more pertinent. And there is good reason to argue that a different type of organization, and an approach different from that pursued by the current professional associations, is needed to meet the situation. Indeed it has been reported that there is support in the leadership of the TO for the view that teachers need a union, while the TTA has consulted its membership on attitudes to possible forms of strike action.

The white professional associations have, it could be said, shown considerable restraint thus far in reaction to the continued failure on the part of the government to pay teachers salaries which compare realistically with those in other professions and in comparable positions in the private sector. One of the arguments put forward in favour of such restraint is that more militant action would be 'unprofessional'. This raises two crucial issues:

First, what constitutes 'unprofessional behaviour'? There are good grounds for the view that, centrally, behaviour which harms the pupil should be classified as 'unprofessional'. Clearly there are degrees of 'harm'; certain types of go-slow action like refusal to handle official correspondence or to supervise extra-mural activities for a certain period are likely to be less 'harmful' than a general strike by teachers for a period of time.

The decision to take one of these forms of action would surely, being the product of professional judgment, be taken as a result of calculating that such action would, in the longer term, be to the benefit of both teachers and pupils. It seems strange to argue that action taken with a view to ensuring improved conditions for teachers and thereby improved schooling for pupils is, of necessity, 'unprofessional' action. Such an argument, it seems, is repeatedly used and exploited by the authorities to dissuade teachers from taking action, while doing little to improve their lot.

This leads us to a second crucial issue: can teachers realistically be described in the present situation as having professional status at all? A difficult issue, but nonetheless it does seem inconsistent to demand 'professional conduct' of teachers while at the same time refusing to treat them as professional people. Whatever the problems involved in defining the nature of a 'profession', it is plain that a considerable degree of professional autonomy must be a central characteristic. A glance at the Code of Conduct of the South African Teachers Council for Whites - what could sound less professional than this very name which smacks of the pettiness of segregationist signs on park benches and public toilets - leaves little doubt of the scant recognition accorded to this principle of professional autonomy. For, while the Code does make mention of the teacher's 'professional independence', the import of the Code as a whole is that the teacher is responsible to a variety of other parties - most notably it seems to his employer.

Thus we find in theory and in actual practice that the supposedly professional teacher is responsible not to himself or to his peers but to an army of bureaucrats. And in the teaching 'profession', to a far greater extent than in any other genuine profession, the practitioner is at the mercy of this bureaucratic control. This very factor is often correctly cited as the most influential cause of the increasing exodus of teachers from this so-called profession.

If we accept as the distinctive feature of unions that they aim in the first instance to protect the interests of their members, while the role of professional associations is to define and protect standards of professionalism, it seems that the present circumstances cry out more urgently for the former than the latter. For without protection of the autonomy and interests of teachers, protection of professional standards becomes all but meaningless.

But we should not for a moment pretend that the crisis in education in South Africa is solely or even primarily one of unsatisfactory salaries and working conditions for white teachers. The wide variety of problems in education in South Africa as a whole need the urgent attention of experts on education. While a variety of outside bodies may claim to be experts on the problems of education in South Africa, we have lost sight of the obvious truth that the genuine experts must surely be found in the teaching 'profession'. Teachers unions would surely be the best channel for such expertise. The current form of representation of teachers lacks the assertiveness necessary to enable teachers to act appropriately, as experts, in the face of the current crisis.

ARTICLES

THE EDUCATION OF ADULTS

James Moulder

Education often seems to be regarded as something which only children need. But if we accept Glen Langford's suggestion that 'to become educated is to become a person', then everyone always needs to be educated (1). I therefore want to raise and explore three questions about adult education: What is adult education? Why should adults be educated? How should adults be educated? But the answers which I want to advocate are not as important as the questions themselves. They are, in fact, nothing more than an attempt to focus on some problems and to convince you that at least these three questions must receive serious consideration from any person or institution engaged in the education of adults.

What is adult education?

There are, broadly speaking, two kinds of answer to this question. The one kind tends to equate education with going to school or with going to university. More generally, it tends to equate education with the acquisition of knowledge or some professional skill or other. If this equation is made, then adult education programmes will tend to be regarded as attempts to enable adults who have not already done so to obtain various secondary or tertiary educational qualifications; to obtain, for example, a matriculation certificate or a BA degree.

At the same time, on this view, adult education will not be regarded as something which is urgently needed in South Africa or, for that matter, in other technologically

developed parts of the world. Every adult South African, after all, has been to school for at least ten years; the majority have been for longer; and a great many have received some form of tertiary education (2).

Furthermore, various correspondence colleges and UNISA enable adults to obtain secondary or tertiary educational qualification like matriculation or a degree. How can it be claimed, therefore, that adult education programmes are badly needed or urgently required? If education is equated with going to school or with going to university, then this question must be answered in the negative. In fact, on this view of the matter it is not at all obvious why it is even necessary to discuss distinctive educational programmes for adults.

On the other hand, the less education is identified with going to school or with going to university, the more obvious it will seem that every society needs to make a serious attempt to involve as many adults as possible in educational programmes. On this view, education leads to understanding; it does not have a 'practical' aim like the acquisition of knowledge or of some professional skill. It does not have as its object the 'production' of Calvinists, Catholics, Communists, citizens, students, scholars, workers or businessmen. It is interested in the development of human beings through the development of their minds and of their emotions. Its aim is well expressed by Comenius in The Great Didactic.

> He gave no bad definition who said that man was a 'teachable animal'. And indeed it is only by a proper education that he can become a man ... The education I propose includes all that is proper for a man, and is one in which all men who are born into this world should share ...
>
> Our first wish is that all men should be educated fully to full humanity; not any one individual, nor a few nor even many, but all men together and singly, young and old, rich and poor, of high and lowly birth, men and women - in a word all whose fate it is to be born human beings; ...

Comenius' wish that all men should be educated fully to full humanity is, of course, more inspiring than it is clear.

In fact, it is not so much an answer to the question, What is adult education? It simply enables us to focus sharply on that question and to raise a host of others. In particular, it raises two fundamental questions which any person or institution that wishes to engage in adult education should ask. One of these questions is, Why should adults be educated? The other is, How should they be educated? I want to tackle these two questions in the light of Comenius' convictions.

Why should adults be educated?

A straightforward answer in the spirit of Comenius is this: adults are not entirely incapable of being educatd; and if they are not educated, then they will not be fully human. This answer, however, is somewhat stark. It also has some rivals. I, therefore, want to provide a more substantial version of this straightforward answer. And I want to do so in the process of considering three rival but, in my opinion, inadequate convictions about what the aim of an adult education programme should be.

I.

One broad view of why adults should be educated is that men and women should be helped to acquire the knowledge they missed in their youth. A central thrust under this view of the matter has often been the effort to make men and women literate. But in societies with a high literacy rate the emphasis has been to provide adults with various forms of secondary and tertiary education which, for some reason or other, they did not receive when they were at the usual age for it. Adult education programmes which have this aim concentrate, therefore, on the provision of night schools, evening colleges and university extension centres. One of the most recent and most interesting developments along these lines is the Open University.

What, if anything, is wrong with adult education conceived of as a means by which men and women may be helped to acquire the knowledge they missed in youth? I think there are at least two objections which can be raised to this view of the matter. The one has already been mentioned; namely, that the more we equate education with schooling or with university training the less obvious it becomes that there is any real need for distinctive adult education programmes. The second objection to this view of the aim of adult education is that it fails to distinguish education either from schooling or from training. What counts as education is, of course, a controversial question. And I,

for one, do not have an uncontroversial and short answer. But Robert M. Hutchins is close to the heart of the matter when he maintains that

> The mind is not a receptacle; information is not education. Education is what remains after the information that has been taught has been forgotten. Ideas, methods, and habits of mind are the radio-active deposit left by education (3).

This warning reminds us that education leads to understanding. And understanding must not be confused with the acquisition either of knowledge or of various professional skills. There are, in any case, sufficient agencies within our society to enable adults to acquire any knowledge or skills which they may have missed in their youth. And although a great deal more has to be said about what education is and how we should set about providing it, the hints we have received from Hutchins and from Comenius are enough for the moment. And if they have any validity, then an adult education programme should aim to provide mature men and women with something more distinctive than they can obtain from any programme which offers them a second chance to go to school or to university.

II.

A second broad view of why adults should be educated is that education is a means of remedying social and economic inequalities. In opposition to this view I want to argue that an adult educationprogramme which is motivated by this aim is neither effective nor completely harmless.

And it is not effective for the same reason that primary and secondary education programmes which are organised with the same end in view are not effective. In general terms, this reason is that no educational system can escape from the society in which it operates; it must reflect what the society wants it to reflect. More specifically, education has to contend with the environment in which it is given: with the family, the community, the media of mass communications, advertising, propaganda: in short, with the culture. Education, therefore, is hardly in a position to remedy the handicaps of and the injustices to socially and economically underprivileged people. It is simply naive to expect an educational system, adult or otherwise, to develop intelligent human beings if all the forces of the culture are directed, for example, to developing producers and

and consumers. There simply is no reason to believe, therefore, that an educational programme is an effective means of remedying social and economic inequalities.

Furthermore, it is not at all clear that it is completely harmless to believe that an education programme, adult or otherwise, is an answer to social questions. Someone who proclaims the salvation of society through education runs the risk of failing to do something about the social and economic ills of his society. Those who talk of education as the means of solving the race problem, for example, often seem as though they have no great interest in inconveniencing themselves about a solution to the problem.

Is adult education, therefore, of no relevance to society? Should it aim to be of no earthly use? Not at all. And especially not if the aim of an adult educational programme is that all men should be educated to full humanity. The central thrust under this view of the matter is to enable mature men and women to understand what it means to be human. And because we live in a particular society at a particular period of its development, it is impossible to understand what it means to be human without understanding the nature, the limitations and the possibilities of our society.

An essential aim of an adult education programme, therefore, should be to provide people with the ideas, methods and habits of mind which would enable them to evaluate their society; to appreciate everything which makes their lives and the lives of others worth living; and to reject anything which dehumanises them and the other members of their society. Such an understanding of one's society is, of course, no substitute for an involvement in the means which it provides for its improvement and change. But it is a necessary condition for an intelligent involvement in this area of one's existence.

III.

A third broad view of why adults should be educated is that education is a means towards economic prosperity. Some advocates of this view declare that the economic prosperity which adult education is supposed to improve is that of the individual being educated. More commonly, it is maintained that adult education, like all other education, is a means towards national prosperity; and, therefore, towards international power and prestige.

This conviction underlies a great deal of talk about 'investment in man' and 'the knowledge industry'. Both these phrases are useful clues to what motivated most educational establishments and programmes during the 1960s. During this decade many people were convinced that the greater a person's knowledge or professional skill, the better off he would be; and the larger the proportion of educated people a country had, the stronger and richer it would become. John F Kennedy stated the prevailing view in a message to Congress in 1963:

> This nation is committed to greater advancement in economic growth, and recent research has shown that one of the most beneficial of all such investments is education, accounting for some forty per cent of the nation's growth and productivity in recent years. In the new age of science and space, improved education is essentail to give meaning to our national purpose and power.

In 1965 and in a similar vein, Lyndon B Johnson urged businessmen to support expenditures for education on the ground that they were a good investment. He claimed that a college graduate would earn, on average, $300,000 more in his lifetime than a man who had stopped at the eighth grade. And, he concluded, prosperous citizens mean a prosperous country. These convictions are still held. And they are particularly common in developing countries like South Africa. This, perhaps more than anything else, is the reason why some maintain that the aim of an adult education programme should be either to help mature men and women acquire the knowledge or professional skills they missed in their youth; or to remedy social and economic inequalities.

There is, of course, some connection between education conceived of as the acquisition of knowledge or professional skills and the economic prosperity of either an individual or of a nation. On the other hand, it is becoming increasingly clear that people who claim that education is an adequate means of promoting the economic objectives either of an individual or of a nation are guilty, as Kennedy and Johnson were, of a gross oversimplification. The plain truth is that nobody has yet managed to disentangle what is cause and what is effect when it comes to the interaction of education and of economic growth. Although a country's gross national product and its educational level tend to grow together, this is not necessarily so. Brazil,

for example, has one of the fastest growing economies in the world. But its educational level is lower, in proportion to the population, than it was before its economic expansion began. And Japan was on its way to becoming an industrial world power before the introduction of vocational training in the schools in 1894. Before that such training was given in industry, and much of it continued to be given there afterwards. It is not at all clear, therefore, whether it was vocational training that built Japanese industry or industry which built its vocational training.

There is, however, a more serious objection to the view that adults should be educated as a means to their own or their nation's economic prosperity. This view is not only over simple; it is also out of date. And it is out of date because automated and cybernated industries no longer require a large number of highly knowledgeable or highly skilled people. In fact, apart from a minority of scientists, engineers and skilled repairmen, workers in automated industry hardly require any education for their work. For their work, they do not even need to know how to read, to write, or to do simple arithmetical calculations. The ordinary worker in a highly automated or cybernated industry only needs to be able to see, say, whether a right light is on or to hear whether a whistle is blowing.

Illiterate Spanish migrants, for example, are supervising automatic bakeries in West Germany. They ride back and forth on bicycles in front of the ovens. When the warning signal goes on, they report to a repairman. Since they cannot speak German, they do so by pressing a button. Industry, therefore, needs hardly any knowledgeable or skilled people. And, consequently, adult education programmes lose their point if they are conceived of as a means to improve economic prosperity. In fact, those who participate in programmes which promise such improvement will soon discover, as more and more matriculants and university graduates are discovering, that their schooling or professional training does not even guarantee them employment, let alone the type of employment their educational experiences promised or led them to expect.

IV.

In opposition to these three views of why adults should be educated there stands the stark, straightforward one inspired by Comenius. On this view adults should be educated because if they are not, then they will not be fully human. Unlike the three rival views which I have considered, this view of the matter does not aim adult education

programmes at a particular section of a society; at, for example, those who neglected, or never had, the opportunity to go to school or to university; or at those who are economically underprivileged; or at those who want to improve their economic position. It recognises that "all whose fate it is to be born human beings" should have an opportunity to "be educated fully to full humanity".

Comenius' view, however, distinguishes itself from its rivals by more than its universality. His view does not rest on a dubious declaration that adult education is a means to some other end. It does not promise adults who are concerned about their education that they will be able to make up for what they missed in their youth; or that they will have justice done to them; or that they will be able to obtain more interesting or more lucrative forms of employment. On the contrary, it warns that there is nothing to be gained from education except some better understanding of what is involved in having been born a human being.

Comenius' view also makes it possible to regard adult education as something distinct and different from going to school or to university. This is because his view of the matter equates education with understanding. On the other hand, the three rival views tend to equate education with the acquisition of knowledge or of professional skills. On these views, therefore, we are forced to think of adult education programmes merely as school or university programmes with a difference. And often the only obvious difference will be that most adults are older than school children and university students.

The main attraction of Comenius' view, however, is that anyone who adopts it as his reason for being involved with adult education cannot escape two questions which are all too often ignored by educators and by educational institutions. These two questions are: What is education? And, what is it to be human? In fact, if we were able to answer these two questions satisfactorily, then we would have a better idea of how adults should be educated. Although I am not able to answer these questions to my own satisfaction, I want to conclude with some reflections which may include the ingredients for a more adequate answer.

How should adults be educate?

I want to offer you a quotation, a distinction and an observation. And I want to maintaim that these are the ingredients from which we may be able to discover what education is; what it is to be human; and, therefore, how adults should be educated.

adults should be educated.

The quotation comes from Michael Oakeshott's superb discussion of the point of trying to understand one's society.

> As civilized human beings, we are the inheritors, neither of an inquiry about ourselves and the world, nor of an accumulating body of information, but of a conversation, begun in the primeval forests and extended and made more articulate in the course of centuries. It is a conversation which goes on both in public and within each of ourselves. Of course there is argument and inquiry and information, but wherever these are profitable they are to be recognized as passages in this conversation, and perhaps they are not the most captivating of the passages ... Conversation is not an enterprise designed to yield an extrinsic profit, a contest where a winner gets a prize, nor is it an activity of exegesis; it is an unrehearsed intellectual adventure ... Education, properly speaking, is an initiation into the skill and partnership of this conversation in which we learn to recognize the voices, to distinguish the proper occasions of utterance, and in which we acquire the intellectual and moral habits appropriate to conversation. And it is this conversation which, in the end, gives place and character to every human activity and utterance (4).

A recent example of what Oakeshott had in mind was the conversation on and by Die Sestigers which the University of Cape Town's Department of Extra-Mural Studies arranged for its 1973 Summer School. By all accounts, this conversation was not an enterprise designed to yield an extrinsic profit. It was an unrehearsed intellectual adventure which contributed as much to the education of the authors engaged in conversation amongst themselves and with their audiences as it did to those who merely listened or read some of the newspaper reports. Conversation, then, is an essential part of what education is; of what it is to be human; and, therefore, of how adults should be educated.

The distinction which must be included in any adequate view of how adults should be educated is the distinction between two kinds of question to which an adult or any other educational programme can introduce us. On the one hand, there are questions which can be answered by acquiring further information or a certain expertise. For convenience, let us call questions of this kind 'problems'. Problems are very common. In fact, a great deal of ordinary schooling and university training is concerned with enabling people to acquire the information or expertise which they need to deal with problems of various kinds.

Problems, however, are not the only kind of questions one may ask. There are also what I will call 'puzzles'. Puzzles are not like problems because a puzzle is a question which we are intelligent enough to ask but neither clever nor wise enough to answer. All we can do, therefore, about our puzzles is to engage oursleves and other people in a conversation about them. But instead of trying to describe or define a puzzle let me say that puzzles concern such things as our beliefs about and attitude towards ourselves; towards our personal and formal relationships with other people; towards politics, economics and our society in general. For example, one of the most puzzling questions anyone can ask is 'What does it mean to be fully human?' And as soon as one begins to wrestle for an answer one discovers that this question has some peculiar features.

Firstly, this question cannot be answered simply by obtaining further information. In fact, as soon as one begins to gather information about what is involved in being human one encounters a bewildering variety of opinions. Secondly, because this question cannot be answered simply by obtaining further information, there are no experts you can go to for an answer. And there are no experts because every human being is interestingly different from every other; therefore, one's way of being human is not necessarily someone else's way. Thirdly, if an answer is to silence our questions about what it means to be human then it must satisfy, not only our reason, but also our feelings and emotions.

I have by no means exhausted this distinction; nor can I. But it seems to me obvious that if an adult education programme is thought of as a conversation, then those who participate in it will be presented with puzzles rather than with problems. In other words, adult education should be essentially concerned, not with those questions which some teacher or other can answer, but with those far more interesting questions that neither teachers nor pupils are either clever or wise enough to answer definitively. And

if someone objects that to concentrate on questions that seem to defy an adequate answer is very frustrating, then the point must be granted. All that one can say in reply is that there is also something comforting about our relative stupidity. Can you imagine how depressing it would be if we were wiser than we are and still managed to complicate things as much as we do?

The observation which must be included in any adequate view of how adults should be educated is that our development as human beings has become dangerously one-sided. For example, although we have managed to put some of our fellow human beings on the moon, our understanding, as distinct from our knowledge and our technological expertise, is so limited that we do not understand what it is that we have managed to put there - except, of course, that they were Americans! Adults, therefore, should be educated. And any education programme which is provided for us should be such that this balance is corrected. In a word, it is about time that someone who wants to be educated should find it possible to be educated fully to full humanity.

Notes

(1) G Langford "The Concept of Education", pgs 3-32 in G Langford & DJ O'Conner (eds) New Essays in the Philosophy of Education London: RKP, 1973.

(2) Adult black South Africans have discovered that they have little to gain from old-fashioned liberals like myself speaking about their problems. I welcome their discovery and respect their request to refrain from speaking about what they need. The adult South Africans whom I have in mind, therefore, are the white ones.

(3) RM Hutchins The Learning Society London: Pelican Books, 1970 pg 44. Anyone who reads Hutchins's book will discover how much my paper owes to him.

(4) M Oakeshott Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays, New York & London, 1962, pgs 198-199.

CAN STUDENTS JUDGE LECTURER PERFORMANCE ACCURATELY?

Christopher Orpen

Introduction

Student evaluations of lecturers are being used by an increasing number of universities and colleges, especially in the United States (1). On the assumption that they provide an accurate index of instructional quality, many of these universities and colleges base important decisions regarding the salary, promotion, and tenure of lecturers on the evaluations which the lecturers receive from their students (2). However, despite the fact that they are widely employed for this purpose, there is still considerable debate over the usefulness of student evaluations of lecturer performance. On the one hand, there are those who contend that students, as consumers of instruction, are not only best qualified to judge the product being offered, but will do so accurately under appropriate conditions (eg 3 + 4). On the other, there are those who argue that student judgments of lecturers reflect popularity and other factors unrelated to teaching excellence (eg 5 + 6). In order to decide between these protagonists, it is first necessary to establish just how valid are student evaluation of lecturer performance.

Despite the importance of this question and several relevant studies (eg 7, 8 + 9), there is little or no agreement regarding the extent to which student evaluations provide a valid measure of teaching effectiveness. This is principally because there have been so few appropriate studies, that have compared student evaluations with proper criteria of teaching effectiveness or quality of instruction; as has been made clear by the major reviews of Costin et al (1) and Trent & Cohen (10). There appear to be four main reasons for this state of affairs. First, although there is general agreement that the proper criteria must be student performance on course examinations, it is very difficult in practice to compare student evaluations with their examination performance in such a way as to rule out the 'grade satisfaction' hypothesis. This refers to the tendency for students to give more favourable lecturer evaluations, not because of a higher quality of instruction, but because they have done well on the relevant examinations; ie, because of their satisfaction with their obtained course grades. Second, although it is generally recognized that it

requires a large multisection course to be able to test the validity of student evaluation properly, it is difficult to find such courses, even in big universities and colleges. Third, even when such courses can be used it is not easy to ensure that the students taking the different sections possess the same initial aptitude for the course. Hence, in most cases, the possibility cannot be discounted that differences in student evaluations may reflect differences in initial aptitude, which tend to result in unlike attitudes to the course and lecturer, rather than to differences in the quality of instruction. Finally, the validity of student evaluations cannot be assessed in the usual fashion by correlating the individual evaluations with the individual performance of students taking a single course, because of the tendencies of excellent lecturers to give special attention to the poorer students and of mediocre lecturers to pay attention only to the better students (cf 11).

The present study, which was designed to overcome those difficulties, satisfies the main requirements for an investigation of the validity of student evaluation of lecturers, in as much as (i) each of the students attends the same large multisection course, (ii) the different sections of the course are taught by different lecturers, but cover the same content, (iii) all the sections are tested with a common examination, which is equally appropriate for each section and which serves as the performance criterion. In addition the study was designed in such a way that (iv) the grade satisfaction hypothesis, and (v) initial aptitude differences, can be ruled out as alternative explanations. Under those five conditions, it can be argued that a positive correlation between the average evaluation and the average performance of students in the various sections indicates that the student evaluations of these lecturers are valid; ie, are accurate indicators of the quality of instruction.

Method

The subjects were 128 students drawn from five British comprehensive schools who completed an introductory course in University Mathematics, given by graduate students from the local university. The course lasted six weeks and consisted of 30 formal lectures plus a series of ten tutorials at which the students worked through examples under the personal guidance of their particular instructor. Those were between ten and twelve students enrolled in each section. Each section was the same in terms of content, textbook, assignments and final examination. The only

difference between the sections was that they were taught by different instructors. The final examination was marked by the course director, who was responsible for the administration of the course but did no teaching, helped by three specially-trained graduate assistants.

To examine the 'differential aptitude' hypothesis, prior to enrolling in the different sections, the students each completed a pretest, designed to predict final examination performance, consisting of a short form of the Scholastic Aptitude Test - Quantitive, specially developed for university entrants by the New York College Entrance Examination Board (12). To examine the 'grade satisfaction' hypothesis, just prior to taking the final examination the students each completed a single-item rating scale, which required them to indicate 'how well they thought they would do on the class examination', with a range from 'very well' to 'very poorly'. At the same time, the students also completed a 21-item version of the Teaching Rating Form developed by Pambookian (13) from the original form of McKeachie et al (1971). This version consists of a series of three-item subscales chosen because of prior high loadings on the following seven teaching dimensions: skill, achievement, interaction, overload, structure, rapport, and feedback. For each item, subjects indicated on a five-point scale the degree to which the item statement was descriptive of the particular lecturer, from 'very descriptive' to 'not at all'. The subjects' responses to the various items were summed to yield scores for each of the subscales, as well as for the total scale.

Results and Discussion

To establish the validity of the student evaluation, product-moment correlations were computed between the average student performance (on the final examination) and the average student evaluation (of the lecturer) in each of the ten sections of the course. The average student performance in a section was given by the mean of the scores obtained by the students taking the section. The average student evaluations were given by the means of the total scores of the students taking the section on the Teaching Rating Form and its subscales.

Of the eight validity coefficients computed in this way, four were statistically significant at the .05 level and two at the .01 level, with only two just failing to reach significance ($p > .05$). The actual correlations obtained for each dimension were: skill, $r = .61$ ($p < .05$); achievement, $r = .73$ ($p < .01$); interaction, $r = .74$ ($p < .01$);

overload, r = .58 (p .05); structure, r = .10 (p .05); r = .65 (p .05); feedback, r = .21 (p .05); and, total scores, r = .52 (p .05). The six correlations that were significant were used to compute the best or highest multiple correlation coefficient between the evaluation subscales and the performance criterion (examination scores). The multiple correlation (R = .75) obtained in this way was highly significant (p .01). From those results it appears as if the student evaluations were a highly accurate indication of the relative quality of instruction provided by the various lecturers.

It is also important to note that the significant validity coefficients obtained in the present study cannot be explained away in terms of either (i) differences in initial aptitude, or (ii) differences in expected grades among students taking the various sections. For instance, the results from the aptitude pretest indicated that the differences between the mean scores of students taking the ten sections were insignificant, F (9, 118) = 1.16, p .05. In addition, the analysis of the grades the students expected to obtain prior to the final examination revealed that the differences between the mean grades expected by students taking the ten sections were insignificant, F (9,118) = 1.25, p .05.

The present findings are consistent with the position of Hildebrand et al (3) and McKeachie (4), that student evaluations offer a useful means of assessing the quality of instruction, at least under the circumstances of the current investigation. The importance of this conclusion derives mainly from the fact that the objections raised by the opponents of student evaluation against previous validity studies cannot be invoked against the present study. This is because the validity coefficients were determined in the present study using a multisection course with common content and the same examination, in which both the 'differential attitude' and 'grade satisfaction' explanations can be ruled out. As a final point, although the present findings indicate clearly that students evaluations <u>can</u> provide accurate data about teaching effectiveness, whether they will or not is another matter. Research is now needed to establish the appropriate conditions of administration which will result in the potential validity of these kinds of evaluations being realized.

Notes

(1) F Costin, W Greenough & R Menges "Student ratings of college teaching; Reliability, validity and usefulness" in Review of Educational Research, 41 (1973) pgs 511-535.

(2) R Kohlan "A comparison of faculty evaluations early and late in the course" in Journal of Higher Education, 44 (1973) pgs 587-595.

(3) M Hildebrand, R Wilson & E Drenst "Evaluating University Teaching" Berkeley, Calif: Centre for Research in Higher Education (1971).

(4) WJ McKeachie "Student ratings of faculty" in American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 55 (1969) pgs 439-444.

(5) K Doyle & S Whiteley "Student ratings as criteria for effective teaching" in American Educational Research Journal, 11 (1974) pgs 259-274.

(6) DS Holmes "Effects of grade and disconfirmed grade expectations on student evaluations of their instructor" in Journal of Educational Psychology, 63 (1972) pgs 130-133.

(7) SA Cohen & WG Berger "Dimension of student ratings of instructors" in Proceedings of the 78th Anual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 5 (1970) pgs 605-606.

(8) PW Frey "Student ratings of teaching; Validity of several rating forms" in Science, 182 (1973) pgs 83-85.

(9) J Kulik & C Kulik "Student ratings of instruction" in Teaching of Psychology, 1 (1974) pgs 51-57.

(10) J Trent & A Cohen "Research on teaching in higher education" in R Travers (ed) Second handbook of research on teaching Chicago, Ill; Rand McNally (1973).

(11) J Brophy & T Good Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences New York; Holt Rhinehart & Winston (1974).

(12) WH Angoff "The College Board Admisions Testing Programme: The Development of the Scholastic Aptitude and Achievement Tests" New York, College

Entrance Examination Board (1971).

(13) H Pambookian "Initial level of student evaluation of instruction as a source of influence on instructor change after feedback" in Journal of Educational Psychology, 66 (1974) pgs 52.57.

Author's Note

This article is based on research conducted by the author during sabbatical leave in Britain during 1978.

LANGUAGE POLICY AND BILINGUALISM

John Povey

Last year I attended the annual meeting of the Linquistic Society of America, a series of the panels were given over to questions of language use and language policy in Africa. Among the many papers presented relating to the current linguistic situation in Africa, one theme became apparent through repetition. This was the demand for mother-tongue education. This is an understandable off-shoot of the increasingly vigorous demand for Africanization at all levels of African education and indeed in general social policy. The African intellectuals present, argued, with a fresh intensity and passion, albeit in English, that African self-awareness and identity could only be achieved when the local mother-tongue was the normal and natural vehicle of self-expression and the common vehicle of education.

The arguments for this opinion might be advanced with the usual pros and cons of any intellectual debate, although that was not the dispassionate tone on the occasion! Certainly, it can readily be agreed, that it is highly desirable that a child receive his first education in the familiar medium of his mother-tongue. There are also, in Africa, some tempting economies deriving from the fact that elementary teachers, following this policy, need less training and can become employed in the classroom without the necessity of an extended period of training to achieve competence in an unfamiliar foreign language.

On the other side, more convincing are the arguments for the utility of a European language as a language of wider

communication appropriate to the fragmented linguistic diversity found in most African countries. International languages not only become the very essence of national cohension, but the medium through which economic modernization must occur.

If this conclusion is accepted, then debate on the question of the timing when the necessary transition from mother-tongue to the acquisition of the European language becomes crucial. Educational statistics from independent Africa demonstrate not only the proportionally limited initial educational opportunities but a savage and dramatic drop-out rate of those who do begin schooling. For them, the timing of the introduction of the European language determines forever their likely prospect of entering the contemporary commercial job market. Those who do not achieve a minimal competence in English are relegated to a proletariat, either agricultural or urban, their status determined primarily by their specific linguistic deficiency.

These thoughts, though somewhat crudely expressed outlive fundamental questions of language choice in Africa, and the results for those passing through this system by regional decisions. Such relative rationality is not always encountered in the African situation. At conferences, passion takes the place of rational argument, and there are blatant rhetorical demands for using African languages in the African situation, no matter how demonstrably disastrous this view might be for any economic advance. Cultural liberation is argued to be more vital than commerical advantage. Mother-tongue education and regional usage is vigoroulsy, indeed agressively, demanded in the name of liberation from neo-colonialism and its attendant crimes.

At this LSA meeting, I felt provoked to mention that the linguistic policy which was being so urgently advocated was in fact the declared educational policy of at least one African country. There was interest and enthusiasm until I indicated that this policy of mother-tongue education was advocated under the notorious Bantu Education Act of South Africa. At that discovery, the policy was most rigorously and abusively condemned, although it differed so little from what had been urgently advocated for other parts of the continent. I wryly recalled a line from TS Eliot's Murder in the Cathedral that it was very possible 'to do the right thing, for the wrong reason'.

While reviewing some of the more demonstrably dubious elements in the demands made on behalf of African language education, I reconsidered the recent history of American education and

the amazing changes of language policy that had taken place during the last decade in the United States. It seems on this occasion that it might be useful to record the changes of attitudes and policies found in America, in the hope that the concepts presented might suggest to you possible enlightening comparisons with the present situation in South Africa, as that country seeks to develop a new educational policy for its own complex social and linguistic situation. It would be inappropriate for me to make specific recommendatons in the company of acknowledged South African experts. My presentation will describe the curious zig-zags that have recently marked American domestic language policy. It may allow those more familiar than myself with the local language situation, to discern if there are some comparable elements which might illuminate the present controversy.

I have a sense that, for good or ill, American ideas and American policies exert the major influence on the cultures of much of the contemporary world. It is American music, American clothes, American films, American eating habits, American organization of road building and factory productivity which have become the measure of our century. Yet there is a distressing sense that the world learns from America too late. In colonial days, the habits and preferences of the occupying power were generally the fashion in a colony at a point where they were already outdated back home; so it is with this neo-colonial domination of American culture. Britain introduces race quotas in schools after America has learned of the conflict they generate; America begins to sense the dangers of anti-elitist education just as other countries are following the questioned American democratic practice of levelling down. Countries measure economic achievement by car ownership and road building, when America has at last become aware that only extended public transportation systems make sense. Many similar analogies will occur to you all. I have digressed in this way because I would not wish the period of linguistic disintegration, through which America is now passing, to be presented as if it were an ideal for emulation. The educational decisions being introduced under severe political pressures must be most vigorously tested in other situations, in order to determine whether they have any value for another society either as models, or as possible warnings of potential disasters. I cannot determine if there are ways in which recent American language policy might illuminate the vigorous debate in this multi-lingual country. My necessarily brief and superficial survey of American legal policy and social attitudes may cast some marginal light on the South Africa dilemma. It will point

out the dangers when social theories, on the surface so full of reason and benevolence, are carried, by headstrong intellectuals, to their extremes. Then they cease to be effective and fail to exhibit that crucial ingredient of policy - common sense.

The most important, and perhaps unexpected, statement with which to begin this analysis is that America is no longer a monolingual country. To draw upon the old metaphor, 'the melting pot' has ceased to melt. The idea of a single homogenous and monolingual American society is no longer applicable to the present situation. This reality is equally obvious outside the specific issue of language use. The idea of 'minorities' now has popular sway, even if there are now so many minorities defined that they reduce to an absolute minority those whom it was once normal to accept as the American majority. Unhappy indications are that race has now been re-introduced on application forms as a racist way of achieving non-racism. Moreover, in this indexing, the majority American has to mark his cross in the square defined as 'other', since 'Native American' is a definition reserved for Eskimos and Indians!

The social chaos which has derived from this reintroduction of racial affiliations is too large a subject for this present paper. The newspapers daily report the problems of quotas, of bussing, of affirmative action, of white backlash, of court cases, the demands and counter-demands that follow when the old dream of Americanization is held hostage by a bigoted bureaucracy. I will review only what is happening in the field of language usage and educational policy in response to these divisive political and social pressures.

It is commonly assumed that America has always been a monolingual country, with English as the language required for citzenship. Historically this was not as total as is generally believed. In the 19th century there were acceptions particularly in favour of German, as evidenced in German medium schools permitted in Ohio by the law of 1839. Later in the 19th century, this tolerant attitude began to change. The reason for this is unclear. Increasing chauvinism in the face of dramatically increased immigration played a part, especially since these new arrivals were often of unskilled peasant origin from Eastern and Southern Europe regions, which had neither social, nor linguistic prestige.

This changing antagonistic attitude to the new immigrants was reflected in the increased determination to insist that Americanization became the measure of acceptance. The

major evidence of this adaptability was competence in English usage. By 1914, 34 states had passed legislation declaring that English was to be the exclusive medium of instruction in all schools, a number undiminished in 1973! Seven states went further and passed restrictive laws which required educational authorities to revoke the certification of any teachers who used any language other than English in their classroom.

The problems resulting from this language policy by fiat, may be imagined from evidence of the linguistic situation, when New Mexico entered the Union in 1874. A survey at that time found that 69% of the population were monolingual Spanish speaking. (It will be remembered that New Mexico was formed out of territory acquired from Mexico). 26% admitted to being bilingual in Spanish and English. That left only 5% who could be identified as mother-tongue speakers of American English. These statistics made no challenge to the calm assumption expressed in the state constitution. All education in New Mexico was to be conducted in English. Such policy can be duplicated in other proclamations. In particular it was the declared policy of the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs that all schools run by the Federal Government on the Indian reservations would use only English in the classroom.

Oddly enough, for all the obvious harshness and injustice of this system, in a world where people were less able or less willing to stand upon their 'rights', the policy, in its own crude way, seemed to work. Immigrants recognised that their future achievement and that of their children was related to their ability to function in the English language. If this elevation was unlikely to be achieved by the immigrant parents, the policy provided the children the chance for assimilation and upward mobility, which they eagerly south. It was this world, which was amusingly, if cruelly, depicted by Leo Rosten, in his famous stories of the linguistic incompetence of Hyman Kaplan. Its effect on general education, was to place emphasis on Americanization. The old world was to be rejected, as the values of America were willingly embraced.

In passing, it is interesting to observe that one explanation for American schools being judged to lack the academic standards of Europe, was that so much more attention was given to acculturation, which at this period was more socially significant than specific book learning. Even more by the way, this school emphasis on social training is also said to account for the apparent bad behaviour of American children, since it engendered a child-centred world.

Immigrant parents recognised that it was the children who were being taught to understand the manners and customs of their new land and so accepted the children's judgement, even in behaviour which they would otherwise have challenged for presumption. For the children, a consequence of the Americanization policy was the rejection of family, out of shame for their eccentric customs, inadequate English, curious habits of foreign food and dress. The result was their defiant assertion of Americanisation. Hamburgers were enjoyed not spaghetti and knishes. For this generation, achievement was measured by the distance of the escape from the familiar ethnic regions to which their parents had naturally gravitated.

Although seeming today gratuitously arrogant, this policy had a measure of success. Italians, Russians, Poles and Swedes were incorporated into the general society of America within a generation, albeit that certain prejudices remained against minorities still identified by European surnames. There was a pecking order based on national origin, but the assimilation pattern continued. Its success might be argued to derive from the volunteer nature of immigration itself. The decision to come to America and relinquish previous nationality presumed a readiness to welcome American ways and the American manners acquired. Immigration demonstrated the intention, even preference, to take on new nationality. In a new country nationality would come from behaviour rather than origin. Language being the next obvious feature of social behaviour, was the most ready measure of successful assimilation.

On the surface, this policy of human modification worked well enough to conceal the large segments of the American population for whom it was not working at all. These encompassed several different groups, but they could be linked by the connection that they were all non-immigrants. They were either indigenous groups, in regions incorporated by American territorial expansion, or indentured labour. They were primarily Mexicans, American Indians and Asians, largely Chinese and Japanese. Another analogous group, though speaking another dialect rather than a different language, were black ex-slaves. These people all had physically recognizable features which distinguished them from the 'white' Americans of European origin. Even with an effort at linguistic acculturation they would never physically assimilate into the American system. Usually they remained isolated in specific areas, either by custom engendered by prejudice, or sometimes by deliberate government policy such as the Reservation system for Indians.

Their problems were not likely to concern general social policy, since they were all to differing degrees considered 'inferior' to the mainstream American. Given their lowly political non-voting status, their problems could be conveniently ignored. Generally there was the closest connection between their economic restrictions and their competence in English, for the ability to use Engilsh was an exact measure of social status and economic opportunity. As Troike put the issue in 1971.

> The older educational idea that only English should be used as a medium of instruction in the US has left thousands of children illiterate in their native language and has fostered low achievement in English itself. (1)

The quotas of immigration during the inter-war period were based upon the preference for maintaining the existing ethnic proportions of the population. In practice this meant that there were more places allocated to British immigrants than required, while there were few slots for non-European immigrants, who had no proportional ethnic group they could join. After 1945 this policy was modified. Professional competence rather than national origin was weighed when allocating immigrant visas. Non-European immigration increased vastly, consisting of those visually distinguishable from the WASP's (White Anglo-Saxon Protestants). On the West coast there were Samoans, Philipinos, Koreans and later Vietnamese. On the East coast there was an enormous influx of Cubans escaping the Castro regime, who settled primarily in the Miami area. Puerto Ricans moved into New York in thousands, being allowed free entry because of the special status of that island as a 'Commonwealth'.

All these groups, by preference, accident, and occasionally restrictive housing practice, clustered in specific areas of American cities. Their forgathering created urban areas where the new arrivals were substantially isolated from the mainstream of American society. Increasingly they developed their own local enterprises living as if they had simply imported segments of their own original society. Whether these people preferred separation, as had earlier European immigrants or were driven to this exclusiveness in self-protection against prejudiced rejection, is debatable. The results would have been the same. By 1975 it was estimated that 7 million students, a full 16% of the entire US school-going population were non-native speaking. Such enormous figures presented a problem to the education authorities

which would not be wished away by assumptions of casual and automatic assimilation into the predominant society.

Unfortunately, the schools responded in the old way - which is to say that they did not respond at all. They went on teaching in English even in classes where there was a majority of non-native speakers sharing a home language. It is significant that changes came through complaints concerning students' civil rights, rather than their educational requirements. In 1971 the Civil Rights Commission examined the school system in Texas. It found that in spite of the high proportion of mother-tongue Spanish speakers, 66% of Texas schools specifically forbade Spanish to be used in the classroom. 33% added the same prohibition of that language to include the playground during recess. Some schools even had specific detention rooms to house those students who persisted in using their mother-tongue rather than English. This was not an isolated discovery. A few years ago I spent some time working in the schools on the Indian reservations conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. There was the same vigorous prohibition of the use of mother-tongue. Indian languages were not taught and were even forbidden as a means of individual communication.

It was obvious that substantial changes were needed, but as commonly happens, changes, when they did come, resulted from political pressure. This is further evidence that linguistic policy is a political decision, much as linguists would prefer more idealistic motivation for educational reform. In America this pressure came from the Civil Rights Movement which, beginning in 1957, demonstrated for a range of social ameliorations for minority conditions. The initial force came from Black Americans and so it did not focus upon linguistic questions, although there was a period when radical Black educationalists demanded school reading texts be published in Black English dialect. Instead, the movement demonstrated the power of minority activism to effect social change through public pressure. Following this example militant Spanish-speaking Mexican-Americans of the South West, taking the name Chicani, formed a redical movement called La Raza. Their demands for social change were specifically linked to demands fro linguistic change. Civil rights in their context necessarily related to language rights; the use of mother-tongue.

American public opinion responded to this pressure with a mixture of antagonism and generosity. There was the reluctant belated recognition that America has become, in fact, a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society; a revolutionary admission granted historical attitudes.

The significance of the Mexican-American victory was apparent to smaller minority groups who also demanded the same gains achieved by the more influential and vehement groups. The full implications of their demands became clear in the longer term with dramatic educational and social consequences.

The immediate educational response was modest and reasonable. There was appropriate recognition of the necessity for English Second Language programmes in the schools. This was a logical reaction. Generally these programmes assumed that mother-tongue should be employed in the early classes for all educational purposes. This policy had demonstrable advantages. It allowed the younger students to keep up with the content of their class work, rather than let them fall behind in those academic skills while they grappled with the acquisition of the second language. Students could more readily learn the complicated process of encoding and decoding for reading and writing in their mother-tongue. In spite of instinctive expectations that this would require a double effort when subsequently transferred to a second language, it has been conclusively demonstrated that this sequence accelerates literacy.

The policy would also prevent the horrible use of the mentally retarded classes as parking places for students who were unable to cope with their studies solely owing to their inadequacy in English. Too often teachers, out of ignorance or indifference, equated linguistic incompetence with intellectual stupidity. It is indicative that in 1970, two years after the Bilingual Education Act was passed, 40% of the pupils in the mentally retarded classes of California were Mexican. Implicit in these policies was the assumption that English would subsequently be the medium throughout the school. Educational theorists would review the most appropriate time and methodolgy for transfer from mother-tongue to the language of wider communication.

These became the educational ideas underlying the important Bilingual Education Act, Title VII, which was made law on Jan 2nd 1968. It represented a generous step forward, considering previous American policies. It is important to recognize, however, that it was permissive rather than mandatory. It <u>permitted</u> state school authorities to allow and encourage ESL classes, it did not <u>require</u> that they should do so as a matter of Federal law. The preamble of this Act declared its purpose: 'to recongnize the special educational needs of a great many students whose mother-tongue is other than English.'

A Commission was appointed to support such ESL programmes

but in spite of its title this Act in no measure envisaged America becoming a bilingual society. It was a programme of remedial linguistic assistance. Funding began at $7.5 million and eventually reached nearly $100 million annually. Under the Act programmes were supported in Spanish, French, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, Italian, Chamorro, thirteen Indian languages, Greek and Amish. Revealingly the Spanish programmes were ten times as extensive as all others combined.

It became clear the emphasis of the programmes as they were developed by the recipient school systems, remained highly biased towards class remedial work, rather than towards truly bilingual offerings. Figures published by the Civil Rights Commission analysing funded programmes in the American South West (the region with heaviest non-native speaking concentration) demonstrated that only 6.5% of schools had developed bilingual programmes; 19.7% had specific ESL programmes: while 58.2% had chosen to use the Federal allocation to provide remedial classes, particularly in basic reading skills.

This Act demonstrated an intended benevolence and reasonable, if rather hazy, aims. But ESL has sensitive aspects. It must be provided with considerable cultural awareness.

Drake observed:

> It is important that ESL be taught in a way that fosters respect for the linguistic and cultural diversity and that it provides children with English language skills that are experienced as a valuable addition to, rather than a substitute for, fluency in the Spanish language (2).

In passing, I would observe the obvious applicability of that remark to the South African situation.

The Act provided significant educational advance but Chicanos, in particular, found it highly inadequate to meet their overall social aims. Gonzalez for example takes the more militant line and points out why the simple ESL approach is unacceptable from the Chicano viewpoint, especially

> When we hear the philosophy and intent of bilingual education described as a <u>transition</u> ... to allow the limited English speaker to become English ...(3)

With equal vigour he rejects,

> the continuing assertion that bilingual education is remedial ... (aiming) to compensate people for supposed deficiencies (4).

It would be easy to continue quoting examples of this increasing disaffection with the conventional assumptions of ESL education. Two comments from a paper written by Arciniega will indicate the increasing militancy with which this criticism is being propounded:

> The majority of schools with ethnic minority representation are attempting to improve the educational opportunities of these children. Regrettably it is often for the wrong reasons and in the wrong direction. The 'bilingual problem' is viewed by school personnel as a handicap to be overcome. As a member of a sub-culture the children are considered 'culturally disadvantaged' (5).

Reading statements like these, one can sympathize with the indignation of the writer, yet, at the same time, retain the opinion that unhappily it is true that these pupils are and will continue to be handicapped and disadvantaged if they can function only inadequately in the dominant economic language of society. This is as true in America as in most countries in Africa. Such restrictions will not be eliminated by the indignant rhetoric which has increasingly appeared in American educational debate. Says Arciniega:

> The real problem is our society today ... and therefore the real problem in education today ... is not the Mexican-American problem, nor the Puerto-Rican problem, nor the Cuban problem, it is the Anglo point-of-view problem. (6).

This accusation provides a typical example of the new attitude which blames the system. If liberal feelings find this evidence of oppression, a sadly simple counter would be the retort that it is the minorities who have the problem since they, after all, are the ones unemployed, under-educated and lacking economic potential. Those deficiencies provide problems for them, rather than for those largely free of such linguistically imposed difficulties.

The consequence of this increasing antagonism to ESL principles, has been the revealing emphasis that bilingualism in education 'ceases to be a process and becomes a target.' It is determined to be desirable in itself. Disastrously, this resentment of Anglo arrogance has sometimes been signalled by indifference in schools to English competence. In one school I visited there were exciting and imaginative classroom presentations but none of them were in English. I was told by the happy teacher, 'Bilingualism means we can speak Spanish now.' That definition was never the intention of governmental policy, but it has become reluctantly accepted by the community at large, out of apathy, and the irrational submission to damaging group demands which are occuring in many other areas of American life.

Many urgent social changes in modern America are not being made by the elected government, itself unable to control the fragmentation of society on which its re-election increasingly depends. Rather it is in the hands of the independent Federal courts whose judges, since the earliest Civil Rights cases, have made fresh law, doubtless with honorable liberal intentions, rather than interpret the existing constitution. The Supreme Court has seemed unresistantly responsive to minority challenges appealing to constitutional rights. In language policy the courts have made the rulings which demand government intervention.

Several cases have been submitted to assert the civil rights of the non-English speaking children to receive different and special education. Serra versus Portales Municiple Schools in 1972 was a significant ruling early on. It notably indicated the rejection of the 'remedial' principle of linguistic amelioration for those without English as mother-tongue. The key case in this intense national debate was submitted in California, listed as Lau versus Nichols. It was filed in San Fransisco in 1970, on behalf of a young Chinese-speaking minor and implicity on behalf of 2850 Chinese speaking students of that city. After a series of appeals the case reached the US Supreme Court in 1974. Most of these crucial cases of social policy are appealed to the highest court of the land, since parties to the issue are seeking to establish unanswerably and finally, the legal principle at stake. A recent example of this was the decision of the University of California to appeal to the highest court in the Baakke case, to settle the legality of minority quotas in University entrance policies.

The arguments underlying the Lau/Nichols case extended far beyond the intentions of the original Bilingual Education Act which aimed at inculcating English mastery while

employing the students' mother-tongue as a temporary educational assistance. The Lau/Nichols case took a far stronger stance about school district obligations, but it is revealing to review the flip-flop of legal interpretatons as the case was appealed through the higher courts.

The basis of theplaintiff's complaint rested on the constitution. Section 2 of their attack argued that:

> the plaintiffs were discriminated against by being provided unequal educational opportunities which violated their rights to equal protection (the 14th Amendment) (7).

Section 3 reversed the direction of the insult by arguing that

> the defendants, by providing unequal educational opportunities, deprived the plaintiffs of equal educational opportunity (8).

Judge Burke of the District Court ruled in favour of the school district, arguing soundly that individual needs were not necessarily constitutional rights. Judge Burke argued:

> These Chinese-speaking students, by receiving the same education made available, on the same terms and conditions, to the other tens of thousands of students ... are legally receiving all their rights to an education and to equal educational opportunities. Their special needs, however acute, do not accord them social rights above those granted other students (9).

More bluntly and uncharitably, this general opinion, that education was not discriminatory when it was the same for all. was upheld by Judge Trask of the Superior Court, who ruled that from examination of the school policy,

> There was no evidence of invidious discrimination caused by some form of state or government action (10).

The corollary of this was the unkind opinion that 'the classification claimed invidious by the plaintiffs was the result of deficiences created by the students themselves in

failing to learn the English language.' (11)

The judges of the Supreme Court overruled all the lower courts and found for the plaintiffs. In their ruling they made the following somewhat circular argument:

> Basic English skills are at the very core of what these public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement that, before a child can effectively participate in the educational programme, he must already have acquired these basic skills, is to make a mockery of public education(12).

The court went on to make specific policy and utilized that famous phrase that has been the bane of American social policy in the last decade: 'affirmative action'.

> Where inability to understand the English language excludes national origin-minority group children ... the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional programme to those students (13).

The full effects of this decision are not yet clear; school districts flounder, struggling to introduce programmes to meet contradictory mandates of Federal programmes in order to maintain receipt of Federal funds, which are threatened by withholding for non-compliance with bureaucratic edicts. Some districts are clearly hoping the nasty problem will go away. The State of California has thrown its resources into local level intervention, wholeheartedly requiring special language programmes in any class where there are more than FIVE students who share a mother-tongue other than English. There are neither the trained personnel or the resources to carry out such a grandiose policy, but no court challenges against school districts attempting to handle this thorny problem have, as yet, come to trail.

The overall educational position remains hazy. Three crude generalizations can be made about the present situation. Like all generalizations, they are gross and oversimplified. That lack of subtlety may only emphasize the disturbing results likely as these policies are pushed to the extreme and affect wider groups of students.

1 English in certain areas of the United States is no longer automatically essential. Within certain limits you

can function without it. The English surrender is seen in Spanish street signs, Chinese voting ballots and in the Asian zones of the major cities: Little Korea, China Town, etc.

To quote Drake again:

> It may not be as inconceivable as many claim for some Chinese or Mexican American or Native Americans to opt to go to school and gain skills only in their mother-tongue if they have a viable ethnic community in which to assume adult roles (14).

That 'if' is a big question, as is the definition of 'viable'. Obviously there is no hierachy of languages per se, but there is very often a hierachy of prestige or utility within a single society. In America, English remains the language of upward-mobility. Economic advance without English is highly restricted, a fact well recognized by parents who often protest bitterly and ineffectively against the bilingual policies of the educational bureaucrats and intellectuals. A Hopi Indian could function in Hopi, in his own society. That society would be on an Indian reservation. There is vigorous rejection of the reservation/homelands restrictions of Washington's national Indian policy. In America today you can be non-English speaking, but, in consequence, you are likely to be economically disadvantaged; part of a proletariat defined by language. The response to the recognition of this fact seems to be further demands. Business may be forced to employ an appropriate quota of non-English speaking personnel, just as they are already forced into meeting racial and sexual ratios.

2 American schools are under great Federal pressure to integrate the schools racially. This is not the time to review some of the absurdities initiated by this policy; extended suburban bussing to counter white urban evacuation, redirection of teachers to balance racial ratios on school staffs, etc. On the present topic, it is obvious that integration policies assume the advantage of the integrative melting pot. The courts have rejected all elements of the old doctrine of separate but equal. Bilingual/bicultural education is antagonistic to integration as an aim, for that intention condemns the cultural specificity which results from the demand for minority cultural identification. In Los Angeles, for example, the Mexican-Americans do not support the Afro-American demand for social integration. The government, so far, has established integration as the

first priority, even if it results in conflict with their own edicts concerning bilingualism. The courts have ruled that 'bilingualism is not a substitute for desegregation.'

3 The new demands for bilingualism or biculturalism have twisted full circle all previous attitudes towards ethnic minorities. If bilingualism cannot be criticisized as being a disadvantage then as a corollary, monolingualism must be seen as a deprivation, rather than the fortunate avoidance of a serious linguistic problem.

As Swensen remarks:

> If Anglo-American children do not have equal educational opportunities (to learn about other cultures) are they not the unculturally deprived? (15)

That assertion raises highly complex social issues, though it would be received in many intellectual circles in America today, as a purely rhetorical question. UCLA has made arrangements with a local school for an experimental programme to have young English speakers 'immersed' into Spanish speaking classrooms, thus reciprocating the problem of the Spanish speaker attending Anglo-classes. At present it is voluntary and attracts primarily the children of UCLA liberal academics, but this may be a forerunner of a new policy. Certainly under these conditions the children seem to cope extraordinarily well with the acquisition of the second language. Given the dismal failure of American High Schools to provide competent teaching of any foreign language, there may be virtue in early immersion, but then the motive would be a good deal more practical than the plans for changing American social patterns envisaged by proponants of bilingual/bicultural programmes.

Many issues remain unclear or unresolved. America has usually progressed by massive pendulum swings of policy. Radical change is followed by years of inertia. Social retrenchment, rather than dramatic government intervention, seems increasingly the present National emotion. But discussion of future policies is important, particularly if, as I argued too simplistically earlier, American policies are likely to be exported to other countries. Classes in Urdu are being provided in British schools ...

There may seem little direct connection between the fluctuations of American policy and the tense and complex South Africa situation. But this review provides a warning, by indicating the disarray that occurs when social engineering

supersedes accurate educational analysis. It may remind administrators, planners and teachers in this present organization, to be sharply aware of the dangerous interaction between linguistics and politics, between language policy and social planning. In this country, change may come, without the violence we all fear, if options are open to all members of this culturally diverse community. A vital unifying factor, will be the effective use of English. The participants at this conference will be in the vanguard of decision-making which will do much to assist in the provision of a solution to the present South African dilemma.

Notes

This paper was presented at the English Association of Southern Africa, Johannesburg, 1979.

(1) MR Saville & RC Troike A Handbook of Bilingual Education Washington DC 1971 pg 2.

(2) GF Drake "Integrity, promise of language planning" in Language Learning Vol 25 No 2 pg 275.

(3) AG Gonzales "Bilingual-bicultural education: a survival imperative" in M Swemsen (ed) Bilingual Education: The National Perspective New York 1974 pg 86.

(4) Gonzales op cit pg 89.

(5) J Arciniega in Swensen (ed) op cit pg 199.

(6) J Arciniega loc cit pg 200.

(7-13) These quotations from the court register are reproduced from a report by Bruce Beezer published in The Educational Forum May 1971 pgs 538-9.

(14) Drake loc sit pg 276.

(15) Swensen op cit pg 85.

DOING THE RIGHT THING FOR THE RIGHT REASON

Victor Rodseth

Prof Povey's informative paper on language policies in America does provide 'enlightening comparisons with the present situation in South Africa' and does help to 'illuminate the present controversy'. His warnings about the lack of common sense in much educational policy decision making, especially when political considerations dominate, should be taken. We are challenged by the paper to find a 'more idealistic motivation for educational reform'.

The 'present controversy' in South Africa alluded to centres on the question of medium of instruction for black (African) pupils. Views on what is best vary from 'go straight for English in Grade I (Sub A) as they do in Zimbabwe', through 'transfer to English medium from vernacular medium in Standard 1/3/5/6/8,' to 'use vernacular medium throughout'. The latter view is, strangely, possibly more prevalent among a certain section of whites than it is among blacks at this stage, though what changes in the black community would come about should a black government come into power is difficult to predict.

There are three particular local factors which make it difficult to debate the language-medium issue sensibly:

One, there is a strongly-held view among blacks (especially those who enjoyed English-medium missionary education) that vernacular medium of instruction was introduced by 'Bantu Education' to 'keep the native in his place'. Official department views (and other views) on the advantages of vernacular medium education are regarded with suspicion by many.

Two, when the question of medium of instruction and educational standards is discussed, many other variables are overlooked. For example, the missionary-educated elite tend to overlook the vast differences between the educational realities which pertained to this group and the realities of the present mass-education system. A further example: When certain homelands lowered the stage of medium-transfer from Standard 5 to Standard 3 the resultant drop in standards was attributed by some solely to this change. Other factors like the deteriorating teacher-pupil

ratio and the inadequacies of college and in-service training were not properly considered.

Three, a vernacular medium system of education has inevitable political overtones in the sense of a separate development political philosophy. Vernacular medium leads to 'ethnic grouping', seen by many as a manifestation of a 'divide and rule' policy. Political opponents of separate development are not particularly sympathetic to discussions of the educational advantages of vernacular medium.

It would be a lot easier in South Africa to formulate sensible educational language policies were we to have equality of educational financing as a starting point. How soon to introduce English medium would be an easier question to answer were we able to presume substantial financing for college and in-service re-training, and improvements in teacher salaries resulting in improvements in the calibre of the teaching force. That America, relatively free from financial and constitutional restraints, has still found it so difficult to solve language-in-education problems, is a salutary reminder of the enormous difficulties we are faced with.

There is a danger in attempting to formulate policy based on the status quo. What is needed is policy formulated according to sound educational principles and not the inadequacies of the present black education systems. The following policy suggestions are based on considerations of what is educationally most desirable. The suggestions do seem to find endorsement in Prof Povey's paper:

1 Pupils should learn to read and write in the mother tongue. South African black pupils do 'more readily learn the complicated process of encoding and decoding for reading and writing in the mother tongue.' Prof Povey states that the advantages of enliteration in the mother tongue followed by a bridging process to the second language have 'been conclusively demonstrated.' He is no doubt referring (amongst other evidence) to the research findings written up in Early Childhood Education, John and Horner, 1971. The research and development project undertaken by the Institute for the Study of English (in which I am still involved) is certainly an endorsement of this view. The project has sought to improve early literacy by developing better standards in mother tongue literacy and building English literacy on this foundation. The project (which

has received Prof Povey's strong approval) has demonstrated 'that this sequence accelerates literacy'.

The South African vernaculars are tailor-made for teaching children to read and write. Not only are they regularly spelled, but they have the added benefit of being syllabic in structure. Pupils are soon able to generalise and use this learning strategy in acquiring reading and writing skills very quickly and effectively. Should there be a movement away from ethnic schooling it would still be possible to exploit the great advantages the vernaculars offer by having vernacular literacy classes in mixed schools, as they do in America.

2 'It is highly desirable that a child receive his first education in the familiar medium of his mother tongue'. The present arrangement, a consequence of pressure from the majority of black educationists in the Republic and the Homelands, seems to be a sensible one - pupils study through vernacular medium until the end of Standard Two. During this period they study English as a subject - orally in Sub A / Grade I with reading and writing added from Sub B / Grade II onward.

3 Exposure to English as subject from Sub A, to the end of Standard II should be increased so that a deliberate programme of preparation for English medium in Standard III is made more feasible. Delaying the introduction of the third language (Afrikaans) until Standard III should be part of the strategy. The language confusion caused by the too-early introduction of the third language is considerable.

4 English should be the medium of instruction in black education - and Standard III would seem to be about the right stage for the transition. English has already taken its place 'as a language of wider communication appropriate to the fragmented linguistic diversity found in' South Africa, and it has 'become the very essence of national cohesion' and 'the medium through which economic modernisation must occur.'

There is no doubt that the extra exposure to

English provided by English - medium content - subject study does a great deal to improve the standard of English.

It seems unlikely 'that African self-awareness and identity (can) only be achieved when the local mother tongue (is) the normal and natural vehicle of self-expression and the common vehicle of education.' These qualities can surely be achieved in a system offering mother tongue as an on-going subject and English medium instruction. The present black consciousness movement does not appear to be linked to an emphasis on the vernacular; in fact it would seem that it is the black consciousness radicals who are most opposed to any form of vernacular medium instruction.

5 Two birds could be killed with one stone by propagating the importance of the mother tongue (as subject). There is no doubt that the mother tongue has suffered considerable neglect. Improvements in the standards of mother tongue instruction would both encourage 'self awareness' and a sense of 'identity' and facilitate better transference of language skills. That there can be improvements in language skills transfer through improving vernacular teaching is a well-demonstrated fact.

Prof Povey's article is a useful contribution to a debate which could result (to paraphrase Eliot) in our 'doing the right thing for the right reason.'

THE PROBLEM OF 'SUBTRACTIVE BILINGUALISM'

Norman Blight

> In Lambert's (1) terms, educationally successful forms of bilingualism tend to be 'additive' in that the individual adds an L2 (a second language) at no cost to L1 (first language) proficiency. The bilingualism of minority language groups is termed 'subtractive' in that the child's L1 skills are replace or 'subtracted' in the process of acquiring L2(2).

African vernacular languages have minority language status in South Africa, and most of their speakers have subtractive bilingualism. Cummins notes that minority language groups have ambivalent attitudes to the majority language. Immigrant Finns in Sweden repeatedly express aversion towards the Swedish language, and many are ashamed of their Finnish language. Predictably Finnish children born in Sweden perform extremely poorly at school, as do so many minority language group children in American schools irrespective of their attitudes to the majority language. Language attitudes in South Africa would seem to encourage success in English at mother-tongue expense.

> Black pupils lack motivation in studying the mother-tongue and this is a major contributory cause of poor achievement. Both the pupil and the teacher seem to adopt the attitude that the mother-tongue is not important because it does not pay off in terms of economic viability, as do English or Afrikaans(3).

Research and experience suggest, however, that subtractive bilingualism usually does debilitate academic and cognitive functioning irrespective of positive attitudes to the L2 medium of instruction.

There are at least two approaches to the problem of subtractive bilingualism in South Africa. The long-term view is the question of whether Blacks will follow the trend noted by Professor Povey, where intellectuals from Africa are making increasing demands for mother-tongue education. I am not in a position to predict thinking on this score,

but hope that this debate will elicit thoughts from Blacks.

Povey accepts 'that linguistic policy is a political decision, much as linguists would prefer more idealistic motivation for educational reform.' Language policy reforms were demanded by pressure groups in America to ameliorate minority conditions. Cummins finds that, 'in general, transitional programs in the United States appear to have met with only limited success.' He then asks important questions about this problem.

> However, it is not possible to say to what extent this apparent limited success is a function of invalid theoretical assumptions, poorly implemented programs or poorly designed evaluations(4).

The second approach to subtractive bilingualism in South Africa, at once both more practical because linguists can try to do something about it, and therefore more idealistic in Povey's terms, is to set about coping with the linguistic consequences of this political choice. Povey hopes (against the experience of the past) that we might avoid the errors of America's language policy swings. It must be our hope that more successful teaching methods will enable policies to succeed (or prove to be failures) for valid reasons. EL2 as medium requires continuing linguistic awareness and suitable methods and materials. There is, for example, the growing awareness of the opportunities for the teaching of English as communication, in which there is a fundamental shift from treating language as raw materials to the teaching of discourse.

The discussion of a linguistic exercise based on the idea of gradual approximation will illustrate the attention which can now be given to the linguistic problems of learning English as a second language (EL2) using English as medium. It is possible that more English will be learnt in the other subject lessons that in the English lesson, especially if the other subject teachers are linguistically aware.

In suggesting this form of exercise, Widdowson (5) draws upon and relates two kinds of knowledge to teach language functions in English: the learner's (imperfect) knowledge of English and his knowledge in other subject areas. The learner thus learns to discuss / read / write in English what he already knows in terms of his L1. This is not usually possible where the L2 is medium; nevertheless the linguistic awareness of the method is valuable, and the process can perhaps be adapted. It might work as follows,

teaching a piece of discourse.

The teacher must anticipate the linguistic difficulties of the learner and decompose (the) passage into a set of 'constituent propositions.' Widdowson decomposes a piece of scientific discourse (6). Discourse contains both propositional content and grammatico-semantic relationships which the second language student might not perceive accurately. The propostional sentences would therefore be emended to make clear the grammatico-semantic relationships, and to make explicit what was implied. Finally the teacher might decompose these sentences / propositions into Noun Phrases (NP) and Verb Phrases (VP). Now he is ready to tackle the linguistic difficulties of his students' learning procedures.

In the classroom / laboratory the student explores a process / an artefact / a diagram / a text, and matches the NP from a given column A with a VP from column B, so composing meaningful sentences on the basis of observations. He thus begins a series of gradual approximation exercises: having assembled these propositions, he then establishes the relations between them, ordering, conjoining and embedding, and so reconstituting discourse. By selection and ordering, various purposes can be served, constructing a variety of discourses. The process thus serves both to teach subject matter and to develop the use of English.

Having chosen English as medium of instruction we need to consider the consequences for learning. We must seek teaching strategies for leading the learners through both the observational procedures and the linguistic exploration and presentation of knowledge. Recent work at a London school with a high proportion of EL2 pupils followed Widdowson closely in establishing a language policy applicable across the curriculum. That research and development project established three crucial principles:

1 It was 'in-school based' - sensitive to that school's needs.

2 It was 'data-based', and the team did not believe that it could be reduplicated more quickly for other schools. Such a policy would need to be developed within each school.

3 The project required inter-departmental work, eg the discussion of 'definitions' in various subject (7).

These principles are sound, as such a policy for language and learning across the curriculum is concerned largely with teacher awareness, not merely with producing teaching materials to be applied by all teachers. The project began with an analysis of the language experiences of some children in a typical school day, through a school week, in all subjects. The research team analysed teaching styles, and although they did not necessarily set out to change these, teacher awareness was raised. Heads of Departments were most closely involved with the researchers, and they repeated the processes with their staff members.

Such a project needs to be implemented in one of our EL2 schools to explore a procedure for establishing a policy for language and learning across the curriculum, to cope with the needs of learners using English both as second language and as medium of instruction. If we do not achieve success through some such process we may hasten the day when Blacks in South Africa find the problems of subtractive bilingualism intolerable, and call for mother-tongue medium of education. That may be an extremely difficult alternative in a multi-lingual country hoping to take its place in the international community.

Notes

(1) WE Lambert "Culture and language as factors in learning and education" in A Wolfgang (ed) Education of Immigrant Students Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) 1975.

(2) J Cummins "The language and culture issue in the education of minority language children" OISE mimeo 1979 pg 17.

(3) LW Lanham & KP Prinsloo (eds) Language and Communication Studies in South Africa Oxford, OUP 1978 pg 217. The quotation is from R Gugushe.

(4) Cummins op cit pg 20.

(5) HG Widdowson Explorations in Applied Linguistics Oxford, OUP 1979.

(6) ibid pg 77.

(7) "Language across the curriculum - progress

report" Ealing College of Higher Education 1980.

THE NEGLECTED QUESTION

Graham Walker

On the assumption that what America is today, the rest of the world will be in five or ten years, Professor Povey is hopeful that his analysis of American social and educational policies will 'suggest to (us) enlightening comparisons with the present situation in South Africa'. I'm afraid he is wrong. Or, rather, wrong where it counts. His analysis, perfectly sound as far as it goes, lacks a dimension which is critical if it is to throw light on the South African situation: an elucidation of the relationship of class and language.

Says Professor Povey, 'Those who do not achieve a minimal competence in English are relegated to a proletariat, either agricultural or urban, their status determined by their specific language deficiency'. This is far too simplistic for application to South Africa. Agreed, not to speak English or Afrikaans is to be relegated to the bottom of the employment pile, to the most menial of jobs. But the question is not whether proficiency in one or other official language will permit a prole to advance to the middle class (as in the rest of Africa), but whether that prole will be a more or less productive prole. What Professor Povey terms 'factory productivity' is in the minds of most White South African industrialists the nub of the South African problem. Literacy in a lingua franca like English enhances that productivity. Hence the collaboration (the word is used advisedly) of the captains of industry with PW Botha and his minions who, in their turn, are trying to buy off incipient revolutionaries as part of some 'total strategy'.

So language is not inert. Besides this function, it serves another: it acts as an instrument of control. Speaking at Ruskin College, Oxford, on 5 May, 1972, Harold Rosen, now Professor of English at the London University Institute of Education, said:

> Much of the language which the (British) working class encounter in their daily lives is transmitted to them through a variety of agencies not under their control which deploy a language designed to mystify, to intimidate and to create a sense that the present arrangement of society is imm-mutable.

If this is true of a situation where a few varieties of one language are spoken, how much more true is it of South Africa where language coincide with colour, and where colour definitively marks possession of power and/or privilege.

To what extent is language policy predicated on these two functions which language in South Africa is forced to serve? That is the question. An even broader one was put by Professor Rosen to the History Workshop at Ruskin College:

> A thorough attempt to analyse the relationship between class and language would require us to examine the relationship of the dominant culture of our society to the culture of the dominated. This would inevitably involve an examination of the part played by language in the operation of this relationship. No-one so far as I know has attempted to do this.

That is also the question. Neither were attempted by Professor Povey. Hence his hope will remain largely unfulfilled.

If these questions were properly investigated, it is my belief that the language of the dominant group would be found to be hopelessly over-valued - at the expense of the dominated group whose language would be found to have been tragically undervalued.

NOTICES

EDITORIAL NOTE

This new journal is a combination of Symposium (Johannesburg College of Education) and Perspectives in Education (Faculty of Education, University of the Witwatersrand.) We intend it to reflect the virtues of both previous journals. It will be published three times a year, but, where it is appropriate, we intend to publish extra, occasional, issues devoted to particular topics or questions.

We are distributing this first issue of the new journal to all those listed on both the Symposium and the Perspectives in Education distribution lists. However, we would like to try to ensure that (a) our lists are correct, and (b) we distribute the journal only to those who are interested. We enclose two address slips with this issue. One is for you and one for you to hand to someone else who might be interested in receiving the journal. Please return these address slips as soon as you can. We shall use them to compile a new distribution list for the journal.

At present we are still able to distribute this journal free of charge and we will let you know in advance if we can no longer continue this practice.

CONFERENCE CALENDAR

Thursday 21/ 8/80 : Topic : Nursing Education (ASEESA)
Place : Johannesburg College of Education
27 St Andrews Road
Parktown
2192
phone: 28-1221
Contact person : Prof N Boyce

Saturday 13/ 9/80 : Topic : Language and learning across the curriculum (TATE and JCE)
Place : Johannesburg College of Education
27 St Andrews Road
Parktwon
2192
phone: 28-1221
Contact person : Mr M Rice

Friday 7/11/80 - Topic : Strategies for educational
Monday 10/11/80 development in South Africa
(English language Universities)
Place : Wilgerspruit Fellowship Centre
Contact person : Mr W Morrow
Department of Education
University of the Witwatersrand
Johannesburg
2001
phone: 39-4011

Wednesday 14/ 1/81 - Topic : Curriculum and Community (phase 2)
Friday 16/ 1/81 Place : University of Cape Town
Private Bag
Rondebosch
7700
phone: 69-8531
Contact person : Prof C Millar

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS Volume 4 Number 1 August 1980

Norman Blight	Department of English, Johannesburg College of Education
Penny Enslin	Department of Education, University of the Witwatersrand
James Moulder	Department of Philosophy, University of Natal, Durban
Christopher Orpen	School of Psychology, University of the Witwatersrand
John Povey	English Department, University of California, Los Angeles
Victor Rodseth	Honorary director of ELTTC (English Language Teaching Information Centre), and a Senior Research Officer of ISEA (Institute for the Study of English in Africa) Rhodes University
Graham Walker	Molteno Fellow, ISEA, Rhodes University

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The Editor will welcome contributions in the form of comments on local events or questions, original articles, discussion of articles published in previous issues, reviews, items for the 'Notices' Section, and so on.

Contributions should be sent to: Wally Morrow
Department of Education
University of the Witwatersrand
PO Box 1176
Johannesburg
2000

Contributions should not ordinarily exceed 3000 words in length, and should be typewritten on one side of A4 paper, double spaced, with ample margins. Two complete copies should be submitted. Proofs will not be sent to authors for correction unless this is explicitly requested.

There is to be no separate 'Bibiliography'. References should be kept to a minimum. All notes (which includes 'footnotes' and references) are to be numbered consecutively in the text (in Arabic numerals, in parentheses, on the line of the text), and should be listed at the end of the article, as 'Notes'. Titles of papers or chapters cited are to be enclosed in double uqotation marks; titles of books are to be underlined. Examples:

Notes

(1) Carole Pateman Participation and Democratic Theory, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

(2) PF Strawson "Freedom and Resentment" in Freedom and Resentment and Other Essays, London: Methuen, 1974, pgs 15-23.

(3) L Althusser "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in BJ Cosin (ed) Education, Structure and Society, Harmodsworth: Penguin, 1977, see pg 81.

Substantial quotations (more than about 3 lines) should be indented, shorter quotations should be enclosed in single quotation marks. Omissions from a quotation should be indicated by three dots.

DISTRIBUTION

This journal is distributed free to anyone who is interested. All enquiries about distribtuion should be addressed to:

Sheila Schlesinger
Johannesburg College of Education
27 St Andrew's Road
Parktown 2193

CONTENTS

DISCUSSION

1 Do we need Professional Associations or Unions for teachers? — Penny Enslin

ARTICLES

4 The Education of Adults — James Moulder

15 Can Students Judge Lecturer Performance Accurately? — Christopher Orpen

INTERCHANGE

21 Language Policy and Bilingualism — John Povey

38 Doing the Right Thing for the Right Reason — Victor Rodseth

42 The Problem of 'Subtractive Bilingualism' — Norman Blight

47 The Neglected Question — Graham Walker

NOTICES

49