

学習の学習

Learning Learning

JALT Learner Development N-SIG Forum vol.3. no.1. April 1996

This issue features articles on "Learner Development with Younger Learners," complementing the recent formation of the JALT Teaching Children N-SIG (whom we compliment, also!) and the upcoming IATEFL Learner Independence SIG Conference on Teaching Young Learners in School Situations and Encouraging Learner Independence (see Learning Learning 2/4 for details). Learner development has often been (and may still tend to be) considered appropriate mainly, or exclusively, in adult education or tertiary contexts; however, recent curricular reforms in a number of European countries seem to indicate that development of autonomous learning is becoming an increasingly "mainstream" goal with younger language learners. Stephen Brivati begins this feature issue with the argument that involvement of younger (kindergarten to junior high) learners in autonomous learning activities has proved to be both possible and desirable in his own teaching context in Japan, while Barry Mateer demonstrates similar convictions in describing an emergent "reader response" approach to oral communication classes which appears well-suited to encouragement of the independent learning, critical thinking and language awareness of his own Japanese junior high students. Concluding this feature, Renee Gauthier presents an entertaining and instructive account of the way in which control and initiative were shifted jointly by her and her own young learners, towards the learners themselves, in a language school context. On the basis of their own experience, the writers of these three articles together provide strong indications that learner development is both a desirable goal and a process which is achievable with pre-school and school children in Japan.

Naoko Aoki and Richard Smith

この号は、JALT Teaching Children N-SIGの誕生を祝うとともに、IATEFL Learner Independence SIGの「学校における子どもの教育と学習者としての自立の奨励」コンフェランス（詳細は「学習の学習」2/4）を記念して、子どものための学習者ディベロップメントを特集しました。学習者ディベロップメントは従来、主に成人教育や高等教育の話題であると考えられてきましたが、ヨーロッパ各国のカリキュラム改革を見ると、子どもの言語学習者における自律学習の育成が主流の目標になってきたように思えます。この号ではスティーブン・ブリヴァティが、幼稚園から中学までの子どもたちを自律的学習活動に導くことの可能性と妥当性を、日本での教育経験に基づいて主張しています。またバリー・マティアは、オーラル・コミュニケーションの授業へのリーダー・リスボンズ理論的アプローチを紹介し、この方法が中学生の自立的学習と批判的思考力とランゲージ・アウェアネスを育てるのに適していると述べています。最後にルネ・ゴージェが、英語塾の生徒と協力して授業の主導権を教師から生徒に譲りわたした楽しいエピソードを語っています。三人の著者の経験では、学齢期前から学齢期の日本の子どもたちにも、学習者ディベロップメントは望ましい目標であり、実現可能なプロセスだといえます。

リチャード・スミス、青木直子

Feature : Learner Development for Young Learners

特集 : 子どものための学習者ディベロプメント

Pedagogy and andragogy - a false dichotomy?

Stephen Brivati

Language teachers working with school age learners in a formal education context are quite likely to concede that the development of autonomy is "a good thing," but this worthy sentiment seldom appears to be realized in classroom practice. This is hardly surprising given the workload of a typical day, but there are other problems, too. One of these may be that most discussion of learner development tends to be specifically related to tertiary level or adult learners. Indeed, teacher training literature often appears to set arbitrary limits on when learner autonomy can be implemented :

"...Learner training is most effective at lower intermediate level..." (Ellis and Sinclair 1989, p. 9)

"Developing student autonomy may be taken to refer to people who accept more and more responsibility for their own learning, for setting goals and objectives, for finding resources, and for evaluating the outcomes of their learning activities. Such an approach is predicated on the notion that these are competencies which are called for in advanced graduate studies." (Candy, 1981, p.59)

This article will suggest that the above distinctions (relating to the possibility or desirability of developing autonomy) between "more advanced" or "older" learners and "less proficient" or "younger" learners have their origins in the history of education and can usefully be considered from such a perspective. After situating the terms "pedagogy" and "andragogy" in their historical context, we shall then move on to argue from experience of teaching Japanese kindergarten, elementary and junior high students that learner development *is* both possible and desirable with younger, less "advanced" learners.

Pedagogy versus andragogy

Prior to the emergence of "formal education," the great educators of history (Socrates, Lao-Tsu, etc.) worked with adults in group exploration of problems using techniques such as the parable. This changed dramatically in seventh century Europe with the introduction of formal education whose purpose was preparation of young boys for the priesthood. The monastic school's primary role was to indoctrinate young people in the beliefs and rituals of the Church. From this system there evolved a model of education that has persisted to the present day.

The word "pedagogy", describing dominant practice in this educational model, is derived from the Greek "paid" meaning child and "agog" meaning "leader of." The term "andragogy" was coined by a German grammar school teacher in 1833, as a descriptor of the style of education that Plato used with adults. Although the term is not yet widely recognized in the EFL profession, it does have a significant place in the literature specifically concerned with adult education (cf. Brookfield, 1986 : 90-122). Indeed, The University of Amsterdam has had a doctorate in andragogy since 1966.

What then, are the differences between these two models of education? Pedagogy might be characterized by the following assumptions:

1. Learners only need to know and learn what the teacher teaches.
 2. The learner is conceived of as dependent (and so the learner becomes dependent!).
 3. The learner's experience is not a resource for learning. The experience of the teacher and materials writer is paramount in the classroom.
 4. Learners are ready to learn what they are told to learn.
 5. Learners require subject matter content.
 6. Learners operate according to extrinsic motivation.
- (adapted from Knowles, 1990, pp. 55-61)

By contrast, andragogy implies the following assumptions:

1. Adults need to know why they are learning something. (Adults almost invariably invest time weighing the pros and cons of a course of action in real life).
2. Adults need to feel in control of their lives. They have a strong sense of self-concept. Although adults may take on dependent learner roles relating to their prior learning experience, this does not mean we can assume there is no resistance on a subconscious level.
3. Adults have a far wider range of experiences than younger people. This creates a need for experiential techniques, such as group discussion, simulation exercises, and problem solving activities.
4. An adult is ready to learn what she needs to know in order to move from one developmental stage to the next only if she is ready for that new developmental stage.
5. Adults have a life-centered orientation to learning. (adapted from Knowles, *ibid.*)

Implicit in the above characterization of the differences between pedagogy and andragogy is an important underlying assumption: there is a relationship between the maturation of the individual (from infancy to pre-adolescence, adolescence and adulthood) and the form that education should assume; i.e. encouragement of the skills required for self-direction must match the individual student's increasing need for these skills as she matures.

The problem is that the teaching profession has not assumed a model of education allowing variation on a case by case basis (as Knowles (1980:43) himself seems to propose), but a dichotomy: younger learners are to be taught pedagogically, and adults from an andragogic perspective (maybe!). It might be argued that one of the main reasons why this has occurred is that, given its historical role in the development of formal education, pedagogy has been invested with the status of an ideology, whereas andragogy is a product of more recent trends and demands (thus, Knowles (1990) defines the latter as a system of "alternative" assumptions). The outcome of this is that while adult education will take the form of a pedagogic approach if required and possibly move towards andragogic criteria in response to students' needs, the reverse scenario is rarely considered: pedagogy may not admit the tenets of andragogy into its practice.

Is andragogy really "for adults only"?

According to Knowles, the kind of situation in which initial pedagogy is required is one in which "(learners have) no prior experience with a content area, they do not understand the relevance of a content area to their life, they do not need the knowledge to accomplish a performance and their motivation is extrinsic." (*ibid.* p. 64)

Superficially, this sounds remarkably like what those of us teaching younger learners in formal education contexts encounter on a daily basis! However, it would be an error to use this as a justification for preserving the "pedagogic status quo" in such situations. On the contrary, language learning may be a special case with regard to prior knowledge. Indeed, Knowles' "conditions for pedagogy" above provide extremely helpful criteria in guiding teaching practice with younger learners. These criteria and their implications for classroom practice are considered below:

Do younger language learners have no prior knowledge?

The fact that the learner - at whatever age - does not begin second language study as a tabula rasa is well established in the second language acquisition literature. Although a discussion of innate language universals is beyond the scope of this article it is worth noting that the beginning language learner already possesses both the "knowledge that" language is organized systematically utilizing a limited number of universal components and the "knowledge how" any language can be manipulated to achieve a communicative purpose, even with the scarcest of resources. The systemic organization of the target language may initially have to be brought to students' consciousness in a pedagogic manner, but it is possible to begin moving towards more autonomous activities (for example, involving pair or group work) the moment the students have control of a handful of nouns and a concrete verb such as "take". Indeed, I have found that Japanese junior high school students, for example, are very active in demanding new words the moment they understand that this practice is encouraged.

Is content of instruction irrelevant to the younger learner's real life?

A great deal has been written on this particular topic

and what the communicative language teacher should be doing about it. Opinions and options vary from Widdowson's (1978) arguments that the classroom is the student's real life to the kind of full scale project work involving use of resources outside the educational institution advocated by Legutke and Thomas (1991). I have no hesitation in muddying the waters even further by suggesting that the real life of children is profoundly governed by stories (this is true of adults too, of course, but the relationship with "real life" is more complex). Stories can therefore be exploited in the classroom to good effect. For example, I use all manner of folk tales and fables to teach grammar indirectly in precisely the sequence advocated by the rigid yet eccentric demands of Japanese junior high school textbooks (have you noticed that "Goldilocks and the Three Bears" is based around comparative and superlative adjectives?) The students listen actively and become very involved in any related activities, especially seeming to enjoy the creation of their own part of the text.

Do younger learners need knowledge but not need to accomplish a performance?

The answer to this is fairly self-evident : young learners love to perform and evaluate one other's performance if the atmosphere is non-threatening. I know some teachers will argue that to require a student to perform in front of a class is cruel and destructive and I would tend to agree with them. This does not however, invalidate the argument that younger learners are often very willing to perform in front of others, especially if this is prepared for gradually through pair and group work. With the right kind of preparation and support, drama can be central to teaching young learners. I think it is extremely rare to find a situation in which performance itself lies at the heart of distressing students.

Of course, Knowles is using the word "performance" in a much broader sense, but this issue can be addressed, too. If the young learner is working in a situation where her group is responsible for one part of a whole class product then the student will tend to collaborate with her colleagues in actively seeking knowledge, as a social response. This approach, in which performance is linked to social responsibility, is one of the most powerful tools at the teacher's disposal, at least in my experience with young learners in Japan.

Do younger learners only have extrinsic motivation?

I do not think it is so terribly important for teachers to be concerned with the extrinsic/intrinsic distinction. However, they can ensure that learners leave the classroom having experienced the following to varying degrees :

1. They have found something out for themselves.
2. They have created something or used their imagination.
3. They have had fun doing it.
4. They feel that they have made progress.

My experience with Japanese kindergarten, elementary and junior high students has shown me that these factors can be united in the younger learner's creation and performance of her own texts. Very often we tend to underestimate the young student's ability to produce a simple text and illustrate it.

Conclusion

Implicit in the last section has been the argument that choice of classroom activities may itself be the determining factor in whether younger learners are ready or "made ready" for andragogy. Activities such as I have described which result in the creation of texts by students themselves have been among those that I have found to be useful in effecting the transition from pedagogy to "andragogy" in a Japanese junior high school. I hope that these limited suggestions will help to begin dispelling the myth that pedagogy and andragogy are "worlds apart", with the former being regarded as the only pragmatic approach in formal education, and the latter as the "trendy" and somewhat irrelevant theory of someone obviously out of touch with the schoolroom chalk face. I always try and teach according to the tenet of a card hanging above my desk inscribed with the words "anything we do that a child could have done deprives that child of a step towards independence."

References

- Boud, D (Ed). 1981. *Developing Student Autonomy in Learning*. London: Kogan Page
- Brookfield, S. 1986. *Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Candy, P. 1981. "On the attainment of subject matter autonomy," in Boud, D. (Ed.) (1981).

Ellis, G. and B. Sinclair. 1989. *Learning to Learn English*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Knowles, M. 1980. *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy*. (2nd edition). New York: Cambridge Books.

Knowles, M. 1990. *The Adult Learner - A Neglected Species*. (4th edition). Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company.

Legutke, M. and P. Thomas. 1991. *Process and Experience in the Language Classroom*. Harlow : Longman.

Widdowson, H. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Contact :

Stephen Brivati
Ogasa Gakuyoo Junior High School
5430 Shimohirakawa
Ogasa-cho, Ogasa-gun
Shizuoka-ken 437-15

Tel.(h) 0537-73-7422
Fax (w) 0537-73-2401



ペダゴジーとアンドラゴジー： 子ども向け、大人向けの教授法？

スティーヴン・ブリヴァティ

正規の教育の場で学齢期の学習者たちに関わっている語学教師たちは、自律の発達を「いいこと」だと認めはするだろうが、この貴重な考えが教室で実際に実行されることは稀のようである。日々教師にのしかかっている負担を考えれば驚くことではないが、しかし問題はほかにもあるのだ。そのひとつは、学習者ディベロップメントに関する議論の多くが、高等教育の中の学習者や成人学習者に偏りがちだということかも知れない。実際、教師トレーニングを扱った文献では、学習者の自律が実行できる時期に対し、しばしば恣意的な制限が設けられているように見受けられる。例えば：

「…学習者トレーニングは、中級の下レベルで最も効果を発揮する…」 (Ellis and Sinclair, 1989: 9)

「生徒の自律を発達させるということは、人々が、自分自身の学習に対して、つまり、最終到達目標と短期到達目標の設定、リソース探し、自己の学習活動の結果の評価などに対して次第に責任をとれるようにすることを指すと考えられよう。このようなアプローチは、これらが大学員レベルの学習で必要とされる能力であるという考えに基づいている」 (Candy, 1981: 59)

本稿では、「より上級の」あるいは「年長の」学習者と、「より能力の低い」あるいは「年少の」学習者との間に見られる、上記のような（自律性の発達の可能性あるいは望ましさに関する）相違点の源が教育史の中にあること、こうした差異の問題をそのような視点から考えることの必要性を述べる。まず「ペダゴジー」と「アンドラゴジー」という用語をその歴史的コンテクストに位置づけた後、日本の幼稚園児や小・中学生への教授経験を基に、学習者ディベロップメントが、年少の、「上級」でない学習者にとって可能なものであり、望ましいものでもあるということ論じていく。

ペダゴジーとアンドラゴジー

教育が学校のような正式の形態をとって行われるようになる以前、歴史上の偉大な教育者たち（ソクラテス、老子、等々）は、寓話などの手法を用いて、問題をグループで探求しながら成人を対象とした教育を行っていた。こういった形態は、7世紀のヨーロッパで、幼い少年たちに聖職に就く準備をさせることを目的とした正規の教育が導入されたことにより、劇的に変化する。修道院学校の第一の役割は、幼い子供たちにキリスト教の教義や儀式を教え込むことにあった。このシステムから、今日まで続いてきた教育のモデルが発展した。

この教育モデルにおける支配的な実践方法を表す「ペダゴジー（教授法）」ということばは、ギリシャ語で「子ども」を意味する"paid"と「～の主導者」を意味する"agog"から来ている。「アンドラゴジー」という用語は、プラトンが成人に対して用いた教育スタイルを表すことばとして、1833年にドイツのグラマー・スクール教師が造ったものである。この用語は、英語教育の分野ではまだ広く知られてはいないが、成人教育を専門に扱った文献では重要な位置を占めている (cf. Brookfield, 1986: 90-122)。実際、アムステルダム大学では1966年から、アンドラゴジーに関する博士号を出している。

それでは、この2つの教育モデルの違いというのは何なのだろうか？ペダゴジーは、恐らく以下の仮定によって特徴づけられるだろう：

1. 学習者は、教師が教えることだけを知り、学習すればよい。

2. 学習者は依存的であると見なされている。(だから学習者は依存的になるのだ！)
3. 学習者の経験は学習のためのリソースにはならない。教室で重要なのは、教師や教材執筆者の経験である。
4. 学習者は学習するように言われたことはすぐに学習できる。
5. 学習者には教科の内容が必要である。
6. 学習者は、外的動機づけによって行動する。

(Knowles, 1990: 55-61を改編)

これと対照的に、アンドラゴジーには、以下のような暗黙の前提がある：

1. 大人は、自分がなぜ学ぶのか知る必要がある。(大人が時間を投資する場合は大抵、実生活の行動と照らし合せて、やった方がいいかどうかを判断している)
2. 大人は、自分の生活をコントロールしているのは自分自身であると感じる必要がある。大人は強い自己イメージを持っている。大人の場合でも、過去の学習経験と関連して依存的な学習者の役割を演じることが有り得るが、だからと言って、無意識のレベルで抵抗感を感じていないと考えてよいわけではない
3. 大人は子供よりも遥かに幅広い経験を有しているので、グループ・ディスカッションやシミュレーション、問題解決活動といったような、体験的手法が必要となってくる。
4. 大人の場合、発達の現段階から次の発達段階へ移る準備ができて初めて、次の段階に移るのに必要なことを学習することができる
5. 大人は、生活中心に学習の方向づけをおこなう。

(前掲書)

上に述べたベダゴジーとアンドラゴジーの相違点の特徴の基底には「個人の(幼児期から前青年期、青年期、成人期への)成熟と教育がとるべき形態とは関連がある」という重要な仮定が暗示されている。すなわち、自律に必要なスキルは、個々の生徒が成熟するに従ってこれらのスキルの必要性が増していくのに合わせた形で、奨励していかなければならない、ということになる。

問題は、教師たちが、Knowles自身が提案しようとしていると思われるケース・バイ・ケースでの多様性を考慮した教育モデル(Knowles, 1980: 43)ではなしに、「年少の学習者はベダゴジーで、大人は(恐らく!) アンドラゴジー的の見地で教えなければならない」という2項対立の考えに従っているということである。このようなことが起きている理由は、一つには、ベダゴジーが、正規の教育の発展において果たした歴史的役割から、イデオロギーとして支持されてきたのに対し、アンドラゴジーが、ごく最近の傾向や需要の産物であるということにあるかも知れない(だからKnowles(1990

)は、アンドラゴジーを「代替的」仮定の体系と定義したのだろう)。この結果、成人教育の場合には、必要ならベダゴジー的アプローチを採り、生徒のニーズに合わせてアンドラゴジー的アプローチへと移行していくのに、その逆のシナリオが考えられることはほとんどない。つまり、年少者の教育において、アンドラゴジーの理論が取り入れられることはないのである。

アンドラゴジーは本当に大人専用の教授法なのか？

Knowlesによれば、初期にベダゴジーが必要とされるような状況は、「(学習者が)学習内容について先行経験がなく、学習内容と自分の生活との関連性を理解しておらず、パフォーマンスを達成するのにその知識を必要とせず、さらに動機が外的なものである状況」である(前掲書: 64)。表面的には、これは、我々のように正規の教育の場で年少の学習者を教える者が日々遭遇する状況に瓜二つである! しかしながら、そのような状況で「教育の現状維持」のための弁明としてこれを利用することは誤りだろう。それどころか、先行知識に関して言えば、言語学習は特殊な例なのかも知れないのだ。実際、上に述べたKnowlesの「ベダゴジーの諸条件」は、年少の学習者への指導実践を導く上で、非常に有益な基準を提供してくれている。これらの基準と、そこから得られる教室実践への示唆は、以下のようなものと考えられる。

年少の学習者は先行知識を持たないのか？

学習者は、何才であれ、第2言語学習を白紙の状態では始めるのではないという事実は、第二言語習得の研究者には広く受け入れられている。人が生まれながらにして普遍的言語能力をもっているかどうかに関する議論は本稿の扱う範囲を越えているが、初期段階の言語学習者が、言語に限られた普遍的構成要素を用いて体系的に構成されているという「事実についての」知識と、「どのようにすれば」リソースが極少の場合にでさえ、言語を操作して伝達目的を達成することができるかという知識の両方を持っているということは、注目に価する。目標言語の体系が生徒に認識されるためには、始めはベダゴジーを用いなければならないかも知れないが、生徒が名詞をいくらかと"take"のような具象動詞を一つ使えるようになったら、(例えばペア・ワークやグループ・ワークを取り入れるなどして)より自律的な活動へ移行し始めることは可能である。実際、私の経験では、例えば日本の中学生は、こういった練習が奨励されていると理解すると、新しい単語を積極的に求めるようになる。

指導内容は生徒の実生活に関連がないのか？

このトピックや、このトピックに関してコミュニケーションな語学教師が何をすべきかということについては、多くのこと

