

Basic Principles and Modularity of College English Teaching

Lichang Xiao, Education School, THE PHILIPPINE WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY And Its Affiliate Schools for Men & Women, Taft Avenue, Manila, Philippines, 2021t1154@pwu.edu.ph.

Key words: Ministry of Education, English teaching, English major, Teaching reform

Abstract:

The “University English Curriculum Teaching Requirements” promulgated by the Ministry of Education in January 2004 is a win-win document that has been democratically discussed many times. This article aims to clarify that the new “Teaching Requirements” embodies contemporary advanced concepts from philosophy, linguistics, literary criticism, psychology, pedagogy and other disciplines, such as individualization, collaboration, modularization and hypertextualization. It will have a profound impact on my country's college English teaching, English major teaching and English teaching in primary and middle schools, and promote the reform of foreign language teaching in our country.

1.Introduction

The Higher Education Department of the Ministry of Education issued the “University English Course Teaching Requirements” (hereinafter referred to as the “Teaching Requirements” notice [1] in 2021. According to the spirit of the “Teaching Requirements”, the Ministry of Education officially approved the Higher Education Press and Tsinghua University the College English network textbooks published by the Publishing House, Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, and Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press were experimented in 180 universities across the country. Soon, Peking University Press also published a series of three-dimensional networked textbooks of “College English”. The attention of colleagues and college English teachers.

In order to formulate the new “Teaching Requirements”, the leaders of the Ministry of Education and the experts of the College English Teaching Steering Committee and the English Majors Teaching Steering Committee, before and after the meeting, the meeting was really busy for a while, and there were many repeated studies and understandings. Many times, of affirmation and negation, interaction and communication, the result is that everyone is happy. Because “Teaching Requirements” embodies the collective wisdom from leaders to teachers, it is a document that everyone can accept so far. It should be said that the formulation process of “Teaching Requirements” embodies a democratic “dialogue” spirit, which is a successful case in which “dialogue” is stronger than “monophonic” [2].

2.Personalization

“Teaching Requirements” mentioned many times that the curriculum should “fully reflect individuality”, “consider students from different starting points”, and the teaching mode should “develop the main body status of “should enable students to independently choose materials that suit their needs for learning”. As for “process evaluation” and “summary evaluation”, it also

includes learners' self-examination. The central idea of these formulations is “individualized learning.”

On this basis, psychologist Kelly put forward the idea of “personal construction”. Kelly emphasized that each person uses different personal construction methods when dealing with learning tasks. “Different people use different methods to construct the universe. Therefore, a person understands his world through an infinite series of successful approximations.” The characteristics of the learner's worldview are one the continuous process of testing hypotheses and improving theories to make the world around him meaningful [3]. When this worldview requires little or no adjustment to the underlying assumptions, learning will have no major difficulties; when substantial changes are needed, learning will be difficult and even painful (Little 1991). As far as language learning is concerned, learners need to have a clear understanding of their own personal structure and even their own learning process. An important result of the implementation of this learning method is that it is necessary to create a learning environment and learning materials that are meaningful to individuals, and learners should build their own learning space [4].

Therefore, it is not difficult to see that the personalized learning advocated by “Teaching Requirements”, including autonomous learning, heuristic learning and fun learning, embodies advanced constructivist theory to varying degrees [5].

3.Hypertextualization

“Teaching Requirements” puts forward in the curriculum setting and teaching mode that “advanced information technology should be used extensively to promote English teaching based on computers and networks”; “all institutions of higher learning should make full use of multimedia and network technology, and adopt new teaching models to improve the original A single classroom teaching model based on teacher lectures.” From here, we can see that college English teaching in the new century will gradually transition from computer-assisted teaching to hypertext-led multimedia teaching and online course teaching [6].

The term “hypertext” was first used by Ted in a report of the National Computer Association in 1965. It includes three aspects: (1) a form of electronic text; (2) a brand-new information technology; (3) a form of publishing. Later, it was defined as “a series of text blocks connected by link points to provide readers with different paths” (Nel-son 1981: 2; Whitehead 1996) [7].

4.Collaboration

“Teaching Requirements” mentioned that “the enthusiasm of both teachers and students should be fully mobilized” and “the role of teacher face-to-face guidance should be emphasized.” This

shows that personalized learning does not exclude teachers guide and help. Secondly, there is an expression of “especially listening and speaking ability” in the teaching objectives. This means that learners have to learn to listen to others and speak to others. All these reflect that language learning is inseparable from the mutual cooperation between people. Psychologists and educators call this teaching method “cooperative learning”, and its main spirit is that students divide into groups to complete a common learning goal (Gokhale 1995). This depends on the nature of language. The conceptual meta-function and interpersonal meta-function of linguist Halliday [8] can show that we use language not only to express our thoughts, but also to establish interpersonal relationships.

5. Bruner

It is pointed out that collaborative learning methods can promote learners' problem-solving ability, because the environment faced by students can have various explanations. The peer support system makes it possible for learners to simultaneously internalize external knowledge (like the knowledge of their partners) and critical thinking skills (such as evaluating the various understandings of their peers), and convert these knowledge and skills into intelligence.[9]

Little also reported, “The developmental learning experienced by barrier-free children occurs in the interaction with parents, siblings, grandparents, family friends, neighbors, etc. Education, whether institutionalized or not, is also interactive. Social process. For most of us, we must remember the important learning experience, at least part of it must be explained by our relationship with others or more people, or our relationship with the teacher.” It can be seen that Vygotsky's method emphasizes A collaborative learning environment is necessary. Under this environment, learners can interact and support each other in language learning, and establish a public space characterized by interaction and structure [10].

“Teaching Requirements” stipulates in the nature and goals of teaching to “train students' comprehensive English application ability, especially listening and speaking ability”. At the same time, the teaching requirements are divided into “general requirements, higher requirements and higher requirements” according to the status quo of teaching in universities in our country. These multi-level requirements are difficult to achieve by opening a course or writing a textbook. This requires us to implement modular teaching.

According to this understanding, in the compilation of college English textbooks, you can first arrange two large modules, college English textbooks and listening and speaking textbooks, and then divide them into several modules according to the degree of difficulty, such as the

“University English Course” by Peking University Press. 2 volumes, 3~4 volumes and 5~6 volumes respectively to achieve general requirements, higher requirements and higher requirements, the guiding ideology is relatively clear. In some qualified schools, course modules taught in English have been opened for all students to choose from. For example, Peking University and Tsinghua University have opened “Australian Society and Culture”, “English-speaking Country Profile”, “Selected Readings of American Culture”, “British and American Profile”, “Business English”, “Technical English”, Spoken Language, Advanced Spoken Language, Writing, Advanced Writing, etc. [11]. As far as each textbook is concerned, it can be divided into sub-modules according to the unit. The theme of the text is the core of the sub-module learning. The materials for listening, speaking, reading, writing and translation are coordinated by the same theme, and the theme vocabulary and language expressions are repeated and looped. Confirmation, strengthens the memory and retention of language learning, and promotes long-term memory, so as to cultivate students' comprehensive ability in listening, speaking, reading, writing and translation. In each unit, we can divide three sub-modules according to the requirements of skills, context and language production to unify the knowledge of language skills, the real situation and the practical language ability.

Concluding remarks

Inspired by Schwienhorst's (1998) integration of learners, teachers, syllabus and technical relationships, I integrated the above-mentioned individualized, collaborative, modular and hypertextualized relationships in Teaching Requirements into the following schematic diagram.

References:

- [1] Wang Shouren, Wang Haixiao. Investigation of the status quo of college English teaching in my country's colleges and universities and the reform and development direction of college English teaching[J]. Foreign Languages in China, 2011, 8(5): 4-11+17. DOI: 10.13564/j.cnki .issn.1672-9382.2011.5.11.
- [2]Wang Wenyu. Ideas, Strategies and English Vocabulary Memory[J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 1998(1): 49-54+80.
- [3] Cai Jigang. Thoughts on Some Problems in College English Teaching[J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 2005(2): 83-91+160.
- [4] Cai Jigang. Research on the Characteristics and Countermeasures of College English Teaching in my country in the Transition Period [J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 2007(1): 27-32+80-81.
- [5] Cai Jigang. Thoughts on Some Problems in College English Teaching[J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 2005(2): 83-91+160.

- [6] Dong Yafen. English teaching in my country should always be based on reading and writing[J]. Foreign Languages Circle, 2003(1): 2-6.
- [7] Li Sen. Important measures to improve the teaching of English writing: process teaching method[J]. Foreign Languages World, 2000(1): 19-23.
- [8]Xiang Maoying. The Influence of Affective Factors on College English Teaching——Theoretical and Empirical Research [J]. Foreign Languages and Foreign Language Teaching, 2003(3): 23-26.
- [9] Wang Shouren. Interpretation of the main points of “University English Teaching Guide” [J]. Foreign Languages World, 2016(3): 2-10.
- [10] Wen Qiufang. The application of output-driven hypothesis in college English teaching: reflections and suggestions[J]. Foreign Languages World, 2013(6): 14-22.
- [11] Zhou Xing, Zhou Yun. Investigation and Analysis of Teacher Talk in College English Classes[J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 2002(1):59-68.