Bilingual teaching methods, principles and indicators

Wen Wu, Pan Liu, Yuhuan Xia, Xiaoyan Zhang, Daiheng Li, Shuang Li

School of Economics and Management, Beijing Jiaotong University, China

125757491@qq.com

Abstract

This study integrates the main teaching methods in bilingual teaching, and summarizes the main principles. Moreover, we advance the indicators for evaluation of bilingual teaching.

Keywords

Bilingual teaching, Principles, Methods, Indicators.

1. Introduction

Practitioners and researchers in the whole English courses need to think carefully and answer some critical questions: Should all English courses be optional or compulsory? What are requirements for the instructor? Is there a minimum requirement for English proficiency? What are the course objectives of the whole English courses? What problems were encountered during the implementation? Is subject knowledge and professional English a double gains or a double loss? What factors affect learning outcomes? How to manage foreign students and domestic students, study together or separate? What are the advantages and disadvantages of the whole English course compared with the Chinese course? And so on. Using the mother tongue to learn can achieve the best learning results, and the primary problem facing all English courses is how well students use a foreign language to learn professional contents. If its validity cannot be fully proved, we are rational to doubt the efficiency of all-English class. Existing researches have not given sufficient answers to this question, so it is the main issue of this paper. As a special course, all-English course has its unique course goal, and the course goal is the foundation and premise of course evaluation. Therefore, this paper will first discuss the course goal of whole English courses. This paper also focuses on the teaching process of the whole English course in order to explore the teaching factors that affect the learning results. Specifically, this paper will limit the scope of study to the undergraduates from four "double-top" universities in Shanghai, and mainly answer three questions listed below. First, what are the course objectives of whole English courses? Second, what is the learning result of the whole English courses? Last but not least, what are the factors that affect the learning results?

2. Research significance

First, our research discussed the concepts and objectives of whole English courses. Nowadays, the international academic community doesn't have a universal definition of whole English courses. However, there is a misunderstanding of "bilingual courses/teaching" and "all-english courses/teaching" in domestic literature. Therefore，how to define the whole English courses become a theoretical challenge for domestic and foreign scholars. About whole English courses goals, some scholars believed that learning content is its primary goal. Other scholars focus on evaluating its effectiveness in English learning. It is clear that there is no consensus on the curriculum objectives of the whole English courses. Combined with Chinese context, this paper tries to define the whole English courses and summarizes the aim of these courses to provide a theoretical basis for the evaluation of outcomes by theoretical research, analysis of universities' policy and surveys of relevant

teachers. Then this article would evaluate the outcomes of the whole English courses. Although as mentioned above, the outcomes of the English-teaching curriculum have become a common concern of the intellectual community, there are still few related studies. Most of the existing studies have only evaluated the subject knowledge or English level separately and little comprehensively.

Based on discussing of the concepts and objectives of the whole English courses, this paper conducts a questionnaire survey among undergraduates in four "double-top" universities to explore the whole English courses' learning outcomes and influencing factors. Our results will deepen understanding of people who related to the courses, give advice for university administrators, provide feedback for teachers, help undergraduates to select lessons, and provide data support for improving the quality of English teaching. It also helps to expand the field of higher education research. In recent years, whole English courses has become a hot research field of applied linguistics all around the world. In other words, most relevant research is conducted from the perspective of linguistics. Whole English courses research is urgently needed by educators (especially experts in curriculum and teaching theory). Studies from the perspective of pedagogy will make up for the shortcomings of existing research and enhance the overall understanding of this kind of courses. Domestic higher education research pays less attention to university courses and teaching and lacks sensitivity to the whole English course. In this sense, applied linguistics has a strong disciplinary inspiration for higher education research in China (and even the whole world). The intersection of applied linguistics and higher education will broaden the research field of higher education.

3. Whole English Course

Regarding English teaching courses, the internationally used concepts include English-medium instruction or English as a medium of instruction (EMI), teaching in English (TIE), English-medium education in multilingual university settings (EMEMUS), content and language integrated learning (CLIL), integrating content and language in higher education (ICLHE), et al.

In China, there are Whole English Language courses, Whole English courses, Whole English Language teaching courses and Whole English Teaching courses. This article uses a full English course and EMI. As mentioned earlier, the international intelligentsia has not reached a broad consensus on the definition of a Whole English Language courses.

Currently, the definition of Dearden is more influential, she regarded EMI as the activities using English for subject teaching in most non-English speaking countries or regions.

Madhavan Brochier defined it as: in most people who do not speak English, the subject curriculum is taught in English without obvious language learning purposes. However, some scholars don't agree to confine Whole English Language courses to non-English speaking countries.

The English-speaking countries represented by England, America and Australia have absorbed an absolute majority of international students. English is not usually their first language, and the courses they have taken are also in full English.

Classroom teaching is the central part of the teaching process, other links are around classroom teaching, and the language of classroom teaching is, of course, oral language. From the above definition, Northwest Polytechnic University and Huazhong University of Science and Technology put coursing and teaching at the top of all teaching links. The use of Whole English Courses can better reflect the central position of curriculum teaching. In addition, from the perspective of inheritance, bilingual teaching should be transferred to Whole English language teaching instead of Whole English teaching". Finally, the Course in Whole English Course. Ornstein and Hunkins summarize four different definitions of a course: the first view is that a course is a plan to achieve certain specific goals, represented by Taylor; the second view is that the course is the experience of learners, represented by progressives; the third view regards the course as a research field; the fourth view regards the course as a view of course as subject matter.

This paper tends to take the first position, and the Whole English course in Colleges and universities is designed to achieve certain specific goals. But the Whole English course is different from the college English course or the specialized English course. The latter aims at learning English while the former uses English as a medium to acquire professional knowledge. English is only a tool for learning English content in the whole English course, not the course itself. The definition of Whole English Teaching course in Shanghai Jiaotong University shows its non-linguistic characteristics, and non-linguistic teaching course in English is adopted.

To sum up, the operational definition of the Whole English course in this paper is that non-linguistic English courses are used in teaching materials, teaching process and teaching evaluation, while English is usually a foreign language of teachers or students.

4. Expected Learning Results

Teachers' teaching logic is usually goal-teaching-evaluation, while students' learning logic is evaluation-learning-result.

Curriculum objectives guide teachers' teaching behavior and curriculum evaluation, while curriculum evaluation, in turn, forces students' learning behavior and influences their learning results. Results evaluation is the end of teachers' teaching, but it is the starting point for students to learn. At present, the concept of international education is changing from teacher-centered to student-centered, and more and more attention is focused on the Intended learning outcomes of students.

Expected learning outcomes are the core concepts in John Biggs' constructive alignment theory, which refers to the behavioral competence that students should possess after teaching, that is, the traditional curriculum objectives. Biggs's abandonment of curriculum objectives and the introduction of expected learning outcomes also reflects the transformation of teaching theory from teacher-centered to student-centered. The construct in Constructivist learning theory from constructivist learning theory is that teaching is not to instill knowledge into students, but to let students actively learn, based on their existing knowledge to construct new knowledge; consistent is that curriculum evaluation is consistent with expected learning results.

Under the theory of building consensus, teachers' tasks are:

1. Determining expected learning results

2. Selection of teaching activities based on expected learning outcomes

3. To assess the extent to which students' performance has reached the expected learning results.

The theory of construction consistency is the inheritance and development of the Taylor principle. The latter is the four basic questions raised by Ralph Taylor in 1949 concerning curriculum development and teaching planning:

1. What educational goals should schools strive to achieve?

2. What kind of educational experience do you need to provide to students to achieve these educational goals?

3. How to effectively organize these educational experiences?

4. How can we be sure that these educational goals are being realized?

5. Principles of Task-based Language Teaching

Task-based language teaching often leads to misunderstanding such as not teaching grammar and neglecting the accuracy of language. In fact, if we can fully understand the principles of TBLT, we can avoid this misunderstanding. There is no uniform authority on the principles of task-based language teaching. Nunan (1991, 2004), Willis (1996), Skehan (1998) and Ellis (2003) have put forward different opinions.

To sum up, there are mainly the following principles.

Form meaning principle

Skehan (1998) argues that for the systematic development of potential inter-language and effective communicative behavior, learners should pay attention to the form of language while doing tasks in the sense of language. Zhang Wei (2008) found that some students rely heavily on a single vocabulary rather than using appropriate expression structures during task completion. Therefore, in order to prevent this from happening, teachers should supplement the task by directing their attention to the relationship between form and meaning.

Recycling principle

Nunan (2004) points out that the principle of recycling is based on the discovery of language acquisition that learning is a gradual process and is unstable. The mastery of language structure will not develop from zero to localization in a linear way. Language cycle maximizes learning opportunities and activates the "organic" learning principle. In other words, learners are unlikely to master a particular language structure for the first time. They need to repeat this structure over a period of time. In fact, recycling does not only mean simple and boring repetition of language structure. Instead, learners have more opportunities to encounter the target language structure in a series of different contexts and see the function of this particular structure in different content areas.

Task related principles

Nunan (1999, 2004) suggests task dependency as another principle of TBLT.

Nunan (2004) believes that in a class, a task should be developed on the basis of the previous task, so that a class or a series of tasks in a unit form a teaching ladder, each of which represents a ladder on the ladder. Nunan (2004) points out that on the ladder, learners can achieve higher and higher communicative competence. Thus, the principle of task dependence is to form a series of tasks in the teaching sequence, learners step up the ladder until the highest point to complete the last task will also complete the entire task.

Principle of doing middle school

Nunan (2004) pointed out that learning by doing has a further meaning, that is, the shift from simple copy language to creative use of language. Magdalena Kubanyiova (2016) and Graham Crookes (2016) discovered that task-based language teaching is a learning-by-doing process, mainly to encourage the development of learner language meaning systems. In other words, learners learn better when they have more chances to use the target language in class, so it is learners, not teachers, who need to do most of the work in class.

Cooperative learning principles

Cooperative learning is a very successful teaching strategy in group teaching. Each group member has a different level of competence. Each group member improves their understanding of the target task through various activities. Each group member not only needs to learn the knowledge taught, but also helps other members of the group. This will create one To create an atmosphere of achievement is to form a shared honor and a common learning atmosphere.

6. The definition and connotation of CLIL

CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), is a teaching model which combines language and professional content. CLIL first appeared in European literature. This model was first proposed by Professor David Marsh, a Finnish foreign language expert. CLIL is based on linguistic communicative competence theory (D. Hymes) and functional linguistics theory (M. A. K. Halliday). Professor Marsh believes that CLIL means learning subjects through a second language or a foreign language and is based on subjects. The content is to learn a second language or a foreign language.

Unlike the Present-Practice-Produce principle of traditional teaching, Coyle proposed the 4Cs principle of CLIL classroom teaching based on the experience of the University of Nottingham School

of Education in training CLIL teachers: Content, Communication, Cognition and Culture, which complement each other. It constitutes the CLIL classroom context.

In terms of content, CLIL greatly improves the "quality" and "quantity" of language input. Teachers and students should consciously use professional academic English as much as possible in the process of discussion, so that students can obtain the knowledge of subject content in a subtle way. Communication is the core of the 4Cs framework. When teachers discuss with students, English should be used as a communication tool. In terms of cognition, teachers try their best to break the cognitive structure of students' existing linguistic knowledge and professional knowledge, and promote the improvement of students' linguistic competence and professional knowledge. In terms of culture, CLIL aims not only to cultivate students' intercultural communicative competence, but also to cultivate students' identification with the culture of the target language country.

Compared with other bilingual teaching modes, CLIL teaching mode has its own advantages in improving teachers' and students' motivation level and learners' benefit. CLIL teaching allows teachers to break the limitations of teaching materials, out of the boundaries of the faculty, through collaboration with other colleagues across the curriculum, participate in teaching discussions, enrich professional knowledge, strengthen teaching practice, to obtain the sense of accomplishment of course professors. On the contrary, these motivated teachers can also affect students' learning motivation and enhance learners' learning expectations.

CLIL teaching enables students to be exposed to the real learning environment, in a large number of contacts with the target language environment, so that learners' language skills and professional skills continue to improve. At the same time, this kind of creative and challenging learning stimulates students' enthusiasm for learning and improves the learning effect imperceptibly.

The CIPP evaluation model is also called the decision-oriented or improved-oriented evaluation model.(D.L. Stufflebeam) first proposed that its evaluation elements mainly include the following four aspects: (1) context evaluation; (2) input evaluation; (3) process evaluation;(4) Product evaluation. The basic idea of the CIPP evaluation model is to evaluate the most important items. Not proof, but improving. Background evaluation is to assess its needs, problems, resources and machines in a specific environment. "Needs" mainly includes those things that are necessary and necessary to achieve the purpose; "problems" mean when the needs are met. Obstacles that must be overcome; "resources" refer to experts and services available locally; "opportunities" mainly mean satisfaction. The time to ask and resolve related issues. Input evaluation is based on the background evaluation, the conditions required to achieve the goal. The evaluation of the resources and the relative merits of each selected program are essentially the judgment of the feasibility and utility of the program. Process evaluation is the continuous monitoring, inspection and feedback during the implementation of the program. Result evaluation is the target. Assessment of the degree of achievement, including: measuring, judging, explaining the achievements of the program, and confirming the process of people's needs degree and so on.

7. Evaluation indicators for the curriculum

Principles for the construction of the indicator system

(1) Scientific principles

The principle of scientific means that the construction of the indicator system should be based on scientific research methods and the actual situation.Set the evaluation indicators. The evaluation system of the whole UK curriculum must be based on science, because the evaluation system of the whole British curriculum.The more scientific, the more effective the curriculum construction will be. Therefore, the evaluation index system of the whole UK curriculum follows scientific research.The method has a certain theoretical basis, and it must conform to the actual situation of the teaching of the whole British curriculum. Evaluation of building a UK curriculum.In the indicator system, we should

avoid personal subjective prejudice, solicit more opinions from experts, and make the construction of indicators more scientific, objective and reasonable.

(2) Systematic principles

The systemic principle refers to the indicator system as a system, which should fully reflect its own feature characteristics and maintain its Integrity. First of all, the systemic evaluation index system of the whole UK is embodied in the integrity of the indicator system itself, that is,It is said that the indicator system can grasp the key indicators that reflect the essential characteristics of the evaluation object, systematically and comprehensively reflect the whole English curriculum.The overall attributes. Second, the systemic nature of the indicator system is reflected in the integrity of the indicator system level. It has certain.The hierarchical structure, the overall goal can be decomposed into several first-level indicators, and the first-level indicators can be decomposed into several secondary indicators. There are inherent logic and connections between the levels. The same is true for the evaluation index system of the whole UK curriculum, which must guarantee its own.Systematic, but also to grasp the integrity of the indicators at all levels.

(3) Guiding principle

Educational evaluation has value orientation and evaluation purpose. The value orientation and evaluation purpose of education evaluation are mainly reflected in the evaluation. Estimated in the indicator system. Through the evaluation of education, the evaluation target is developed in the direction of basic requirements. Evaluation indicators for the UK curriculum. The system should also convey the correct guiding information to the evaluated subject, and build the index system for evaluation purposes.

It is to guide the university to scientifically and rationally carry out the curriculum construction of the whole UK, and to promote the realization of the effect of the whole British curriculum system and the goal to make.

(4) Principle of operability

Operationality refers to the observability and evaluability of indicators. National Science and Technology Terminology Committee will "feasibility of the original. "Defined as: the time, manpower, material resources and financial resources required for any evaluation plan shall be the objective environmental terms of the assessor.It is allowed, and it is required that when the evaluation plan is formulated, the plan should be rationally designed according to the evaluation target, and the evaluation plan should be. Feasibility analysis and argumentation. In order to make the evaluation work smoothly, the evaluation index system of the whole British curriculum is constructed. At the time, it is necessary to take into account the selectability and operability of the evaluation indicators, and to make the overall goal concrete and detailed through layer-by-layer decomposition. The details of Curriculum Evaluation Index System are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Preliminary Framework of the Undergraduate Curriculum Evaluation Index System

Primary indicator	Secondary indicators
course background	A1.Course concept
	A2.Course objectives
Curriculum	B1.Course teacher
	B2.Course resources
	B3.Course management
Course implementation	C1.Course content
	C2.Course teaching
	C3.Evaluation mechanism
Course effect	D1.Course goal achievement
	D2.Course satisfaction

References

[1] Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

[2] Lapkin S, Hart D, Swain M. Early and Middle French Immersion Programs: French Language Outcomes.[J]. Canadian Modern Language Review, 1991, 48(1):11-40.

[3] Jaiwon Jung. English immersion program in Korea: students progress after four months.[D]. 2001.29-34.

[4] Cummins J. Language Proficiency, Biliteracy and French Immersion.[J]. Canadian Journal of Education, 1983, 8(2):117-138.

[5]Jaiwon Jung. English immersion program in Korea: students progress after four months.[D]. 2001.29-34.

[6] Baker, C. (2006). Foreword. In A.W. Feng (Ed.) Bilingual education in China: Practice, politics and concepts (vii-viii). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

[7] Baker, C. (2011). Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (5th edition). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Maters.

[8] Ball, P. and Lindsay, D. (2013). Language Demands and Support for English-Medium Instruction in Tertiary Education. Learning from a Specific Context. In Aintzane Doiz, David Lasagabaster and Juan Manuel Sierra (eds.), English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges, 44-61. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

[9] Barkley, E.F. and Major, C.H. (2016) Learning Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[10] Baetens Beardsmore. The European School Experience in Multilingual Education [M], 1995:21-68.

[11] Baker C. Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism [M]. Multilingual Matters, 1993:1-35.

[12] Barwell R. Integrating language and content: Issues from the mathematics classroom[J]. Linguistics & Education, 2005, 16(2):205-218.

[13] Carloni G. Content and language integrated learning: A blended model in higher education[J]. International Journal of Technology Knowledge & Society, 2013(4):61-71.

[14] Coyle D, Baetens Beardsmore H. Research on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)[J]. International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism, 2007, 10(5):541-542.