ENGLISH ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT IN MULTILINGUAL SINGAPORE

Rita Elaine Silver, Lubna Alsagoff & Christine C. M. Goh

OVERVIEW

English acquisition has been studied extensively in environments where English is the dominant language (e.g. the United States and the United Kingdom). However, studies of English language acquisition in other environments are less plentiful despite the fact that much English language learning is undertaken outside of traditionally English-dominant environments. In addition, few collections of empirical studies consider later development as well as initial acquisition, in home and school contexts. This volume brings together studies of English language learning in Singapore – an example of a multilingual, multi-ethnic context which encourages English language acquisition and development. Each study in this collection investigates a specific area of learning (e.g. grammatical development, literacy skills, pedagogical options for Asian classrooms) while taking into account the bi- and multilingual nature of the Singapore context. School-based learning is featured heavily as it plays a crucial part in English learning in Singapore and in other contexts of English learning internationally.

In order to establish the context for English learning in Singapore, some of the ways in which it is unique and some of the ways in which it is similar to other contexts of learning internationally, this chapter overviews key features of the policy background, historical development of study of English in Singapore (including issues of English as an International Language and World Englishes) and use of English within the educational system. First, it is important that we define the terms 'acquisition' and 'development' as used in this volume

and explain why we look at both, especially when considering international contexts of learning.

The term <u>language acquisition</u> refers to the initial cognitive and social processes in language learning. In first language acquisition, this normally takes place between birth and the age of four or five. A child who has acquired his or her first language is one who has achieved sufficient command of its form, vocabulary and 'rules' of use to engage in meaningful interactions with others. Bilingual acquisition might be simultaneous or successive to first language acquisition. Importantly for multilingual contexts, children acquiring two or more languages simultaneously from early in life might learn both (or all) as 'first languages' (Meisel, 1989, 1990). In these cases, the languages involved are considered to be acquired following the natural path of acquisition for each language, in the same way that a monolingual child acquires a single language. In contrast, second language acquisition and successive bilingual acquisition refer to the learning of a language by an individual who already has some degree of control over another language system. In all of these cases – first, second and bilingual – 'acquisition' is used to refer to the initial stages of learning.

The term <u>language development</u> is used to refer to an individual's progressive mastery of specific linguistic features, such as pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, and any sequences that occur throughout the process of acquisition. Discussions of language development take into account learner language, with features that may be part of the normal path of development but not part of the stable, adult variety, as well as development of linguistic skills for specific areas of use (e.g. academic English). We use <u>language learning</u> as a term which covers the trajectory from early acquisition through later development and ultimate proficiency.[1] Broadly speaking, language learning is seen as a cognitive skill that is developed and honed through interaction with other users in a specific learning environment.

Thus, articles in this collection address both cognitive and interactionist aspects of language learning.

Because the purpose of the book is to examine language learning in one socio-political, geographic context – that of Singapore – there is an emphasis on the role of the environment, both social and linguistic. We use <u>social environment</u> to refer to the circumstances in which the learner is brought up and develops conceptual knowledge. This includes environmental factors which influence the way language is used in broader social contexts (e.g. outside the home). <u>Linguistic environment</u> refers to the learner's opportunities to receive input; to produce meaningful, appropriate output; and to get explicit and implicit feedback on language use via linguistic interaction (cf. Long, 1996).

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON ENGLISH ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT

Singapore is of linguistic interest for many reasons, not least of which is the seemingly overwhelming success of a national language policy linking economic development, education and multilingualism (Silver, 2005). A crucial piece of these interlocking policies has been the adoption of English as one of four official languages (Chinese [Mandarin], Malay, Tamil are the others) and an emphasis on English language learning in schools from preschool onward. In this, Singapore is but one of the countries influenced by and participating in the global spread of English. Because of the emphasis on English in educational, social and economic settings, Singapore also exemplifies language shift and the development of localized variations. Thus, to understand English acquisition and development in Singapore, we must consider the language learning environment not in comparison with traditional English-dominant environments but in the context of English as an International Language (EIL) and the development of World Englishes.[2]

English is used for specific purposes in many international, intercultural contexts. In these contexts, users might include so-called 'native English speakers' from western, Anglo-Saxon nations (e.g. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, UK, US) in communication with 'second language learners' from other nations; however, users are just as likely to be bilinguals with varying degrees of proficiency and different standards of use, none of whom fit the stereotypical view of a 'native English speaker'. In these cases, English is used as a lingua franca.[3] Different, localized varieties of English – World Englishes – are also used in many international, intercultural contexts.

Kachru (1982, 1992) considered Singapore to be within the Outer Circle of his model of English language expansion internationally. Within this Outer Circle are 'countries where English has a long history of institutionalized functions and standing as a language of wide and important roles …' (Kachru & Nelson, 1996: 78). This situates Singapore as a context for examination of English as an International Language (EIL) and issues of language acquisition and development related to EIL.

Historically, English learning was encouraged in Singapore following an EIL rationale – the pragmatic use of English for international business and trading. This continues today as current education policy states, 'At the end of their primary and secondary education, pupils will be able to communicate effectively in English … [to] speak, write and make presentations in internationally acceptable English…' (Curriculum Planning and Development Division, 2001: 3; emphasis added). In addition, historically as well as currently, English is promoted as an inter-ethnic language within Singapore, to foster communication across Chinese, Malay, Indian and other ethnic groups with individuals who might not share a common language. Thus, Singapore is an example of adoption of English for both international and local use (e.g. de Souza, 1980; Ho & Alsagoff, 1998; Platt &

Weber, 1980; Silver, 2005), and English in Singapore exemplifies both language spread and language change.

Education has been central to English acquisition and development in Singapore and elsewhere. Some of the policy rationales for adopting English as one of the official languages of Singapore are similar to justifications voiced globally. Nunan (2003), for example, reports that language education policies in seven countries in Asia (China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Taiwan and Vietnam) emphasize the importance of English as a global language, connecting English knowledge to international relations and international trade. Likewise, English-knowing bi- and multilingualism has spread throughout Europe, again largely justified by arguments related to economic opportunity (Hoffman, 2000). In Switzerland, for example, already known for a long-standing policy of multiple national languages, English is gaining importance as a foreign language. In some cases English acquisition is considered to be more important than learning a second national language[4] for increased opportunities in the labor market (local and international) (Grin & Korth, 2005).

In Singapore, as English has become more important economically and politically, it has also become more important socially. With the increased importance of English for 'getting ahead' (in terms of educational advancement, higher education and employment opportunities), English has also gained ground as a home language (or one of the home languages) among the upwardly mobile (Pakir, 1997). In Singapore and internationally, use of English at home by those who are not native speakers increases the opportunity for growth of new varieties of English, as discussed above. Since discussion of the localized variety, its development and study, is central to an understanding of England acquisition and development in Singapore, an overview is given below.

AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF ENGLISH IN SINGAPORE

The first articulated framework proposed for the study of Singapore English in its own right, known as the 'Lectal Continuum', was developed by Platt and his associates (Ho & Platt, 1993; Platt & Weber, 1980). Theoretically grounded in creole studies, the Lectal Continuum characterizes Singapore English as a post-creole continuum, in which there is movement from a creoloid form towards a more prestigious and exonormatively defined Standard English. Prior to this, English in Singapore was viewed more as a poorly learnt version of Standard English (Tay, 1982; Tongue, 1974). The older view was in keeping with monolingual, colonialist, behaviorist views of language acquisition. The Lectal Continuum definitively changed the older, predominantly prescriptive approach to the study of English in Singapore. Through the newer, descriptive framework, Platt and Weber set out to study variation in Singapore English. This newer view was in line with emerging sociolinguistic approaches to language use and language learning. Within this framework variation is described along a cline defined by proficiency, education and socio-economic status (Platt & Weber, 1980: 108-135). At one end, the acrolectal variety – identified as the Standard Variety of English – is associated with social groups having higher levels of (English) education, as well as higher socio-economic status, as determined primarily by occupation. At the other end of this cline, the basilectal variety – identified as Singapore English – is associated with low education, and low socio-economic status, and possibly lower English proficiency. This variety is most commonly referred to as 'Singlish'.

Platt's model, developed in the 1970s, accurately portrayed a linguistic community where English was a newly emerging inter-ethnic lingua franca, but where education in English was not widespread and English proficiency often guaranteed a good job. Despite its obviously descriptive stance, as well as its historical appropriateness, the Lectal Continuum has nonetheless been criticized as inadvertently promoting inequality between speakers of local

varieties and of Western oriented varieties of English. It labels Singlish as 'undesirable', since it implies that the use of Singlish is borne out of lack of education, not choice, and because it is associated with low socio-economic status. In contrast, Standard English is held up as the desired variety, associated with a good education and high socio-economic status (Alsagoff, 2007).

Gupta (1992, 1994) proposed that diglossia (following Ferguson, 1959) might be more appropriate than Platt and Weber's Lectal Continuum to serve as the framework for describing and understanding the variation and use of English in Singapore. The Diglossic Model has been subsequently adopted by a significant number of local and international researchers and is incontrovertibly the dominant model in any literature citing Singapore English (Alsagoff & Ho, 1998). The diglossic model sees Singlish as an L-form, existing side-by-side with Standard Singapore English, its H-form counterpart. Each of these varieties has a specific set of functions – the colloquial variety or L-form functions in social contexts that orientate towards friendliness, rapport and solidarity (Gupta, 1994, 1998). The H-form, on the other hand, is used in formal and literary domains. The change of perspective comes about primarily from a consideration of the historical development of English use in Singapore: from one where most of its citizens clearly acquired English through education as a second language to one where many acquire English as a home language. In addition, as Pakir points out, 'Platt and Weber's (1980) static depiction of the acrolect, mesolect and basilect speakers of Singapore English obscures the fact that speakers switch back and forth all the time' (1991: 174).

The Diglossic Model addresses this switching between varieties and recasts Singlish as a colloquial form of Singapore English spoken by educated Singapore English speakers to indicate informality or solidarity. Singlish thus becomes a variety with a sociolinguistic purpose and design, rather than one borne out of a lack of competence to command the

Standard variety. Thus, while standard English still remains the target variety in education and formal domains, it is increasingly clear in Singapore that a range of more informal varieties exist in other domains.

An interesting issue that arises in a discussion of the nativeness of Singapore English comes from a closer reading of Gupta (1994), who distinguishes two groups of speakers – one where only Singapore Colloquial English is the acquired variety of English, and the other where both SCE and the Standard Variety are acquired. This means that the linguistic landscape in Singapore is far from homogenous, and that a consideration of English as L1 or L2 must be accompanied by questions as to which variety of English is being acquired. Pakir has sought to develop an approach which is partially meant to address this variation: the 'Expanding Triangles of English Expression' (1991). The 'Expanding Triangles' model attempts to combine the descriptions offered by the Lectal Continuum as well as the Diglossic model. This model places the variation of English in Singapore along two clines – a proficiency cline and a formality cline. The model is presented through a series of expanding triangles which represent the differing ranges of repertoires of English speaking Singaporeans – with education and corresponding proficiency in English offering speakers an increasing range of choice. Thus, in her model, educated advanced speakers are able to command a range of styles from Standard Singapore English (SSE) to the colloquial variety (SCE). They are capable of using English in a broad range of functional contexts as well as having command of the formal style. A speaker with only rudimentary proficiency, on the other hand, will have only a limited range of styles and may not be able to participate successfully in a context that requires a high degree of linguistic formality. In all of these models, education has an important part to play.

CURRENT SITUATION OF ENGLISH IN SINGAPORE

Education was initially the primary means of promoting English acquisition in Singapore. However, a trend toward increasing home language use has been continuing for several decades. In the latest census, done in 2000, 23% of the population claimed English as one of the home languages (up from 18.8% in 1990) (Singapore Department of Statistics, 2000). The Ministry of Education has found that as much as 50% of the ethnically Chinese, first grade cohort reports using English as a home language (Goh, 2004).

As of 1990, English has been referred to as the 'first language' of school by the Ministry of Education, regardless of home language use (Curriculum Planning Division, 1991). For students who do not use English at home, learning all subjects in English (apart from Mother Tongue[5]) acts as a sort of immersion program – although content courses are usually not designed as language learning environments in Singapore. Throughout the school system, there is an emphasis on textbook-based learning and preparation for high-stakes examinations at primary, secondary and pre-university levels. In this, Singapore is similar to other countries with examination-based pedagogies (e.g. Korea, Japan).

One difference in the Singapore educational system is the implementation of bilingual education along ethnic lines with all four official languages. All schools offer all four languages but each student usually studies only two of these: English plus a 'Mother Tongue'. Ultimately, this system promotes English-knowing bilingualism (Kachru, 1992; Pakir, 1991). Mother Tongue is determined by the child's ethnicity (Chinese study Mandarin, etc.). The policy goal is for all children to be effectively bilingual; however, English seems to be the first among equals since all subjects other than Mother Tongue are taught in English.

The social context of schooling in Singapore supports a system of examination-based pedagogy as parents pre-teach materials from the textbooks, send their children for extra 'tuition', and worry whether teachers are adequately preparing children for examinations. Pakir (1997) refers to the 'invisible language planning' that goes on at the individual and family level as individuals emphasize English learning and switch to English as the home language in order to give their children a head start in school. Despite concerns by scholars that English spread leads to language loss and cultural dislocation (e.g. Canagarajah, 1999; Phillipson, 1992), families and individuals in Singapore often emphasize the practical aspects of English learning (educational and economic advancement) and the potential advantages of entrance into the broader English-speaking community worldwide (Chew, 1995, 2007).

English, for the most part, is viewed positively with strong parental concern about children learning English and some resultant language shift, as noted above. Since English is considered to be necessary for economic advancement and the government persistently claims that only 'Standard English' can fulfill this role, parents are often worried about the learning and use of 'Singlish'. The perception that the localized, colloquial variety of English is somehow 'substandard' is in conflict with the view of trained linguists' and the models of Singapore English they advocate (see discussion above).

Bearing all of this in mind, we can see that there are several key factors that language learning in Singapore shares with other international contexts for English acquisition and development. First, language learning in Singapore takes place within a bi- or multilingual context rather than a largely monolingual, English–dominant one. Learners may be exposed to multiple languages in a variety of contexts. Second, teaching and learning of English is by and large intentional with policies establishing teaching and use of English in schools, parents often making choices about schools based on language learning goals, and families sometimes making explicit decisions about home language use based on perceptions about

which language will be most useful for the child outside the home. Third, school-based learning is central to English acquisition and development, sometimes as the starting point for acquisition but also as both purpose and place for development. In Singapore, 'school-based' does not indicate only primary or secondary education; it also includes nursery school, kindergarten and private lessons of all sorts for extensive and intensive learning. Finally, learning English in these contexts often entails English-knowing bilingualism as objective and outcome rather than English monolingualism, though the range and depth of proficiency varies greatly across users.

OVERVIEW OF THE ARTICLES

The empirical studies in this volume investigate learners of different ages (pre-school through secondary), in different settings (at home, in school, and 'lab like'), and with different methodological and theoretical orientations. They also cover a broad range of topics. Taken together, the articles showcase the variety of issues and interests for studies of language acquisition and development in 'New English' contexts such as Singapore and indicate why investigation of English learning in these contexts is important for a better understanding of language acquisition and development. In the first article, Cruz-Ferreira directly addresses the issue of standards and targets for New Englishes using examples of phonological variation in child language learning. She provides examples of phonotactic processes as well as phonemic and prosodic systems in Singapore English that differ from 'Old English' models and points out (following Foley, 1998) that idealized norms, based on models which do not take the local variety into account, provide a deficit model which disadvantages Singaporean children.

Subsequent articles are loosely grouped around the age of the learners in each study. Goh and Ho look at use of decontextualized oral language skills of three Singaporean pre-school (age 6) children. Using two oral language elicitation tasks (picture description and narrative production) they compare the children's ability to make information linguistically explicitly, to establish cohesion and coherence in their production, and to use appropriate vocabulary. They found that while all three children had developed a 'fairly large vocabulary' which they could use in their oral tasks, their language overall was 'limited to the literal level' and there were many examples of 'non-standard features' of the type commonly considered to be Singapore Colloquial English (p. TBA). However, the researchers go beyond merely describing the children's output by also investigating mother-child interactions during story reading. Their results show that differences in the production of the three children did not necessarily align with differences found in the mother-child interactions, unlike in prior research on decontextualized oral language (e.g. De Temple, 2000; De Temple & Beals, 1991). Here the role of the socio-cultural environment comes into play. As Goh and Ho note, 'In Singapore, children's main caregivers and conversational partners during the day are often not mothers, but grandparents, siblings, foreign domestic helpers or child minders in day care centres.' (p. TBA). Thus, the relative importance of 'home language use' must be reconsidered not as a locale or even as caregiver-child interactions, but in terms of the variety of interlocutors who might be caregivers and the types of languages they might use with the child on a daily basis.

In Gu, Hu and Zhang's study on listening strategies, children in Primary 4 - Primary 6 (ages 10-12) met with researchers outside of their regular class in the school setting. Using pre-recorded narrative passages ('easy' and 'difficult') and think-aloud protocols, the researchers compared the listening strategies of students at different grade levels and of high and low proficiency learners. There were few differences due to grade level, although the P6 students

were significantly more likely to try to link the information in the listening passage to their own experience and to ask for help, as compared with students in Primary 4 and Primary 5. In terms of proficiency groups, Gu et al. found that high and low proficiency learners used inferencing, prediction and reconstruction of the stories to facilitate comprehension. Learners in both groups also asked for help and attempted to monitor their own progress. However, there were also differences between the groups. Notably, the high proficiency group used more strategies to go beyond literal comprehension and to integrate the new information into existing knowledge, while the low proficiency learners were less able to orchestrate strategy use effectively and were more likely to pretend to comprehend even if they did not. Although differences between the two groups were not statistically different, the researchers are able to report a number of qualitative differences in learners' use of top-down and bottom-up listening strategies. When considering these findings in light of prior research, they conclude, first, that the specific socio-political-education context of Singapore was not a crucial factor in the strategy use of individual learners. Further, they state that 'research on L2 learner strategies has come of age and has discovered enough compelling patterns to deserve more classroom attention' (p. TBA).

Vaish and Shegar investigate teacher-student interaction in the English language classroom. They do an in-depth analysis of pupil-teacher classroom exchanges in a Primary 5 English language unit. Using cluster analysis to select the unit from a large corpus of classroom data (Luke, et al., 2005) and comparing the features of the unit with findings from other Primary 5 English language lessons (Luke & Abdul Rahim, 2006; Sam, Shegar & Teng, 2005), they conclude that the transcribed unit is typical of P5 English lessons. They then consider the types of scaffolding that are and are not provided to children during teacher-pupil interactions of the IRE (Initiation-Reply-Evaluation) type, and compare the types of scaffolding found with research reported from 'Centre-based' classroom contexts (Gibbons,

13

1998, 2002, 2003). Their analysis shows how teacher prompts are restricted to elaboration and procedural prompt types (following Ge & Land, 2004) and almost no room for children to deviate from the teacher's planned script. They also suggest that though this type of sequence is limited, it can assist in comprehension for children of mixed abilities and varied home-language backgrounds.

While Vaish and Shegar suggest that there are specific discourses attributable to the Singaporean context, Doyle investigates this more directly. Doyle draws from a large corpus of annotated classroom data – the Singapore Corpus of Research in Education (SCoRE) – to try to understand what a 'school variety' is in the Singaporean context. By using a corpus-based approach, Doyle is able to examine a large body of data to look for patterns in the language at school, specifically in Primary 5 and Secondary 3 classes. He compares the classroom data with data from the International Corpus of English (ICE), including the ICE-Singapore (Pakir, 2000). The detailed findings indicate frequent use of SCE in pedagogical contexts, by teacher as well as students. They also suggest that SCE is not used for affective purposes (e.g. building solidarity) (cf. Kwek, 2005), but also for instructional, content-oriented talk. The analysis also shows that teachers maintain control over their lessons through use of frequent IREs, supporting the findings on classroom discourse in Primary 5 English lessons (Vaish & Shegar, this volume), and crucially that 'pupils and teachers share the same variety of English, but differ in terms of how much of this variety they get to contribute in the construction of the typical classroom discourse' (p. TBA).

In a second study using SCoRE data, Guo and Hong provide a cross-sectional analysis of the development of metamorphization in writing. They also examine the linguistic realizations of grammatical metaphor in compositions (or 'essays') written during English Language (EL) lessons by students in Primary 5 and Secondary 3. Specifically, they looked at two stages of ideational metaphor development: protometaphor and metaphor (cf. Derewianka, 2003;

Halliday, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999). They first present an in-depth analysis of two sample essays (one at Primary 5, one at Secondary 3) and show how both writers focus on events and actions in their compositions and both use similar organizational features appropriate to the recount text type; however, the Secondary 3 learner shows a greater ability to make use of grammatical metaphor. Subsequently, the researchers refer to the findings of an analysis of 33 essays (21 for Primary 5 and 12 for Secondary 3) to determine whether there are patterned differences in use of grammatical metaphor between the two groups. They find a number of differences between the groups, all of which indicate that secondary school 'is the time when metaphorical and protometaphorical modes of meaning making begin to take hold' (p. TBA). This supports research from contexts in which English is the dominant language.

Alsagoff, Yap and Yip use data from compositions done by students in both Primary and Secondary, in this case to test the Aspect Hypothesis (e.g., Salaberry & Shirai, 2002; Andersen & Shirai, 1996). They note that variation in use of past tense markers is a well-known feature of Singapore English and this cannot be attributed solely to phonological contexts (cf. Platt & Weber, 1980) or syllable structure (cf. Randall, 2003). The Aspect Hypothesis suggests a development pattern for use of past tense related to telicity. As the researchers explain, telic verbs related to achievements and accomplishments while atelic verbs related to states and activities. The Aspect Hypothesis predicts that past tense morphology will be used appropriately in the former before the latter. Their analysis focuses on learner errors in the production of past tense in compositions. While noting the potential problems with an analysis of development based on learner errors (see Ellis, 1994), the authors also demonstrate that verb telicity is a reliable predictor of learner errors. The findings suggest further that the impact of telicity is stronger for the secondary students than for primary students. Alsagoff et al. hypothesize that for primary school students, 'meaning is

not the only determinant of past tense marking' (p. TBA), and suggest that further work in this area be undertaken.

Turning from written skills and grammatical development to oral development, Stinson and Freebody report on a study of pedagogical intervention in Singapore secondary schools. In their study, trained drama teachers worked with students in the 'lower proficiency' EL classes to teach the dramatic art form using Process Drama, a dramatic art form that focuses on engaging in an extended collaborative experience in role. Since drama is generally thought to contribute to oral language skills, gains in oral language proficiency were assessed in a pre-test, post-test design. In brief, the researchers found that use of Process Drama with these students was highly engaging, kept student focused during the lessons, and encouraged collaboration. In addition, it led to significant gains in oral competence as measured by a simulation of the oral proficiency test used in Singapore secondary schools. The authors note that the students gained not only in oral proficiency but also in self-confidence. In addition, the use of this type of drama learning can shift the type of teacher-dominant interactional patterns that are evident in the studies reported by Vaish and Shegar, Doyle, and Bokhorst-Heng and Wolf (all this volume).

In the final article, Bokhorst-Heng and Wolf present a case study of one bilingual girl. They turn our attention to language-literacy links and looking across both school and home settings. Based on classroom observations, interviews, and a self-report diary kept by the student, the researchers describe the different types of literacy events and literacy practices that the girl engages in at school and at home as well as the different languages used to participate in those literacy events and practices. Three points are of particular interest for consideration of language and literacy learning in New English contexts, which are by their nature. First is the way that school literacy practices are intended to support student keeping a reading log, while the student in this case study perceives them to interfere with her

individual reading purposes. Second are the student's comments on exams as well as her exam results which indicate that she is only 'average' in her reading comprehension at school, in contrast to the rich data showing that she is an avid, active, independent reader at home. Third is the way her bilinguality and biliteracy intersect in myriad ways with Chinese as the language most spoken at home, English the dominant language at school, and frequent codeswitching in conversation and differing linguistic preferences for various media (Chinese for TV and pop music but English for reading and writing – except magazines on Chinese pop idols in Chinese). As Bokhorst-Heng and Wolf point out, the notion of 'third space' (Moje, et al, 2004) helps us better understand this adolescent girl's bilingualism and bilinguality. The article also returns us to discussion of crucial issues around language learning in New English contexts: issues of home-school language learning links and perceptions of what it means to 'know' a language at home and at school.

In the final chapter, Courtney B. Cazden provides an afterword which traces links across the different chapters and helps to place this research in a broader, global perspective.

Although the articles in this volume address a variety of topics and employ many different methodologies for their investigations, the centrality of language learning in and for school is a focus in each. Most of the studies used data collected in classrooms (e.g. Alsagoff, et al.; Doyle; Guo & Hong; Stinson & Freebody; Vaish & Shegar), in schools and related to classroom learning (Gu, et al.), linking home and school learning (Bokhorst-Heng & Wolf; Goh & Ho) or by considering what school expectations of norms and standards means for assessment of learner development (Cruz-Ferreira). Each chapter also addresses some implications for language learning and education, implications that will no doubt be worth considering for language learning both New English and 'Old' English contexts.

REFERENCES

Alsagoff, L. (2007). Singlish: Negotiating capital, culture and identity. In V. Vaish, S. Gopinathan, & Y. Liu (Eds) *Language, capital and culture* (pp. 25–46). Rotter- dam: Sense Publishers.

Alsagoff, L., & Ho, C. L. (1998). The grammar of Singapore English. In J. Foley, S. Kandiah, Z. Bao, A. Gupta, L. Alsagoff, C. L. Ho, L. Wee, I. S. Talib, & W. Bokhorst-Heng (Eds), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 127–151). Singapore: Singapore Institute of Management & Oxford University Press.

Anderson, R. W., & Shirai, Y. (1996). The primacy of aspect in first and second language acquisition: The pidgin-creole connection. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 527–570). California: Academic Press.

Bolton, K. (2004). World Englishes. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds), *The handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 369–396). Oxford: Blackwell.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Chew, P. G. L. (1995). Lectal power in Singapore English. *World Englishes 14*(2), 163–180.

Chew, P. G. L. (2007). Remaking Singapore: Language, culture and identity in a globalised world. In A. B. M Tsui & J. W. Tollefson (Eds) *Language Policy, Culture, and Identity in Asian Contexts* (pp. 73–94). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Curriculum Planning and Development Division. (2001). *English language syllabus, 2001: For primary and secondary schools.* Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Curriculum Planning Division. (1991). *English language syllabus (Primary).* Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Derewianka, B. (2003). Grammatical metaphor in the transition to adolescence. In A. Simon-Vandenbergen, M. Taverniers, & L. Ravelli (Eds), *Grammatical metaphor: Views from systemic functional linguistics* (pp. 185–219). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

de Souza, D. (1980). The politics of language: Language planning in Singapore. In E. Afendras & E. Kuo (Eds), *Language and society in Singapore* (pp. 203–232). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

De Temple, J. (2001). Parents and children reading books together. In D. Dickinson & P. Tabors (Eds), *Beginning literacy with language* (pp. 31–51). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

De Temple, J. M., & Beals, D. E. (1991). Family talk: Sources of support for the development of decontextualized language skills. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 6*(1), 11–19.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. (1959). Diglossia. *Word, 15,* 325–340.

Foley, J. A. (1998). The New Englishes: Language in the home. In J. A. Foley, T. Kandiah, Z. Bao, A. F. Gupta, L. Alsagoff, C. L. Ho, L. Wee, I. S. Talib, & W. Bokhorst-Heng (Eds), *English in new cultural contexts: Reflections from Singapore* (pp. 218–243). Singapore: Singapore Institute of Management/Oxford University Press.

Ge, X., & Land, S. M. (2004). A conceptual framework for scaffolding ill-structured problem-solving processes using question prompts and peer interactions. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 52*(2), 5–22.

Gibbons, P. (1998). Classroom talk and the learning of new registers in a second language. *Language and Education, 12*(2), 99–118.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth: Heineman.

Gibbons, P. (2003). Mediating language learning: Teacher interactions with ESL students in a content-based classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(2), 247–273.

Goh, C. T. (2004, March 21). *Speech at the Chinese High School's 85th anniversary and Hwa Chong Junior College's 30th anniversary dinner.* Retrieved 26 April 2004, from http://www.moe.gov.sg/speeches/ 2004/sp20040321.htm

Grin, F., & Korth, B. (2005). On the reciprocal influence of language politics and language education: The case of English in Switzerland. *Language Policy, 4,* 67–85

Gupta, A. (1992). Contact features of Singapore colloquial English. In K. Bolton & H. Kwok (Eds), *Sociolinguistics today: International perspectives* (pp. 323–345). London: Routledge.

Gupta, A. (1994). *The step-tongue: Children's English in Singapore.* Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Gupta, A. (1998). A framework for the analysis of Singapore English. In S. Gopinathan, A. Pakir, W. K. Ho & V. Saravanan (Eds), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (2nd edn, pp. 63–84). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd edn). London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1999). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition*. London: Cassell.

Ho, C. L., & Alsagoff, L. (1998). English as the common language in multicultural Singapore. In J. Foley, T. Kandiah, Z. Bao, A. Gupta, L. Alsagoff, C. L. Ho, L. Wee, I. S. Talib, & W. Bokhorst-Heng (Eds), *English in new cultural contexts: Reflections from Singapore* (pp. 127–151). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ho, M. L., & Platt, J. (1993). *Dynamics of a contact continuum: Singaporean English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hoffman, C. (2000). The spread of English and the growth of multilingualism. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language* (pp. 1–21). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40,* 157–181.

Kachru, Braj B. (1982) Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed), *The other tongue: English across cultures*, 2nd edn (pp. 48–74). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd edn). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B., & Nelson, C. (1996). World Englishes. In S. McKay & N. Hornberger (Eds), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 71–102). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Kwek, M. (2005). *English teachers using Singapore Colloquial English: An examination of two secondary teachers' lessons*. Unpublished academic exercise, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego: Academic Press.

Luke, A., & Abdul Rahim, R. (2006, April). *Holding a mirror up to the profession: Using classroom coding data to mobilize large scale pedagogy reform.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, USA.

Luke, A., Freebody, P., Lau, S., & Gopinathan, S. (2005). Towards research- based innovation and reform: Singapore schooling in transition. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 25*(1), 5–29.

Meisel, J. M. (1989). Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children. In K. Hyltenstam & L. Obler (Eds), *Bilingualism across the lifespan* (pp. 13–40). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Meisel, J. M. (1990). *Two first languages: Early grammatical development in bilingual children.* Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *39*(1), 38–70.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly, 37,* 589–613.

Pakir, A. (1991). The range and depth of English-knowing bilinguals in Singapore. *World Englishes, 10,* 167–179.

Pakir, A. (1997). Education and invisible language planning: The case of the English language in Singapore. In J. Tan, S. Gopinathan, & W. K. Ho (Eds), *Education in Singapore: A book of readings* (pp. 57–74). Singapore: Prentice Hall.

Pakir. A. (2000). *International corpus of Singapore English.* Singapore: National University of Singapore.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1980). *English in Singapore and Malaysia.* Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Oxford University Press.

Randall, M. (2003, August). Dictation errors and what they can tell us about lexical representations; pedagogical implications. Paper presentation, *3rd International Literacy Conference, Literacy: Bridging Past, Present and Future August 15–17*. Penang, Malaysia.

Salaberry, R., & Shirai, Y. (2002). *The L2 acquisition of tense-aspect morphology.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24,* 209–239.

Silver, R. E. (2005). The discourse of linguistic capital: Language and economic policy planning in Singapore. *Language Policy, 34,* 47–66.

Singapore Department of Statistics. (December, 2000). *Singapore Census of Population, Advance Data Release No. 3. Literacy and Language.* Retrieved 5 July 2005, from http://www.singstat.gov.sg/papers/c2000/adr-literacy.pdf

Tay, W. J. (1982) The uses, users and features of English in Singapore. In J. B. Pride (Ed.), *New Englishes* (pp. 51–70). Rowley, MA: Newbury House. Also in W. J. Tay (1993). *The English language in Singapore: Issues and development* (pp. 12–36). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Unipress.

Tongue, R. (1974). *The English of Singapore and Malaysia.* Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

NOTES

[1] We do not follow Krashen's (1985) acquisition/learning distinction.

[2] The lack of clarity and problematic usage of terms such as World Englishes (WE), English as an International Language (EIL), English as a Global Language, and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) is discussed in detail by, among others, Bolton (2004), Jenkins, (2006) and Seidlhofer (2004).

[3] We note here that Jenkins (2006) and others specifically exclude native speakers from their discussions of ELF. We do not refer to 'English as a Lingua Franca' in that sense for this article.

[4] The four national languages in Switzerland are: German, French, Italian and Romansch.

[5] Mother Tongue is a required subject for all students in the national schools. Choice is only for the official languages and each pupil is assigned a Mother Tongue based on the ethnicity of the father. Therefore, in all but exceptional cases, Chinese take Mandarin (called simply 'Chinese'), Malays take Malay and Indians take Tamil.