出國報告(出國類別：出席國際會議)

出席國際應用語言學學會(AILA)
2014 年世界應用語言學第十七屆會議

服務機關：國立嘉義大學
姓名職稱：蘇 復 興教授
派赴國家：澳洲
出國期間：103 年 8 月 9 至 103 年 8 月 18 日
報告日期：103 年 11 月 14 日

摘要

本會議乃是世界最重要的應用語言學研討會，每三年舉辦一次，會眾規模龐大。的主辦地點選在澳洲布利斯本。筆者今年參與此項學術會議的最主要目的是發表和主題相關的學術論文，闡述來自臺灣的觀點，藉此與各國學者交換經驗，讓他們對於臺灣語言學界、應用語言學界的現況更加瞭解。此外，筆者透過這項會議觀察各國學者以及研究人員所關注的學術領域和次領域為何，並觀察主辦單位在綜理大型國際學術會議時，運籌帷幄的實況。本報告的結尾並陳述筆者參加此次會議的心得和建議。

關鍵詞：英語元音、發音、華語人士

目次

一、目的

　　世界應用語言學會議(World Congress of Applied Linguistics)是國際應用語言學學會(AILA)主辦的最重要的研討會。本會議每三年舉辦一次，是世界應用語言學界的一大盛事，成員與會眾規模龐大。今年第十七屆國際應用語言學學會研討會自 8 月 10 日至 8 月 15 日於澳洲布利斯班舉行。此次會議以「一個世界，多種語言」為主題，之下分為五大次主題：語言習得及語言處理、語言教學與學習、語言在專業職場上的應用、語言與社會、口語及書面語的言談分析。

　　筆者這次參與此項學術會議的最主要目的，是為了與各國語言學家、應用語言學家乃至語言教師分享個人研究的成果，以促進跨國性的學術交流，並讓這些人士明瞭當前台灣應用語言學研究的大致情況。此外，筆者也期盼透過這項會議觀察各國學者以及研究人員所關注的學術領域和次領域為何，以作為自己日後從事實證性研究和指導研究生論文寫作的參考。筆者關注的領域大致上包含了語音學、音韻學、心理語言學、社會語言學、語言測驗、和口筆譯等各方面，具體的研究課題則大致上圍繞發音、音韻發展、言語感知、音韻結構、言語與認知、言語失常、語言與資訊處理、語言政策與規劃、性別與語言、多語現象、多文化主義、語言技能評量、標準化語言測驗、多重語言評量、文本翻譯、文體與譯文、口譯實務、及對外華語教學等。個人期盼透過對於這些研究議題和動態的掌握，能夠提醒自己和國內學術同儕，緊跟全世界先驅研究的腳步，不至於落伍。

　　另一項目的則是就近觀察主辦國和主辦城市在綜理大型國際學術會議時，如何運籌帷幄，有效調配人力、物力、資源、和經費的運用。本人服務的學校將於 2015 年 5 月辦理國際研討會，此次與會的經驗有助於個人更加明瞭場地、議程、論文發表、交通接待、食宿安排、活動宣傳等各面向的細節，以便有效進行分工合作。

二、過程

　　筆者按照原定的行程規劃，於八月九日出發，隔天中午之前抵達澳洲布里斯班，隨即前往會議場地完成註冊程序並參與當天晚上的開幕式和第一場專題演講。八月十一日至八月十五日之間，筆者全程參與會議，充分把握聽講以及和各國學界人士互動交流的機會。八月十六日會議結束隔天，筆者在布里斯本附近稍作停留，並於八月十七日搭機返國，順利完成此次出國開會的旅程。

　　本人及國立高雄第一科技大學黃俐絲教授所發表的論文和語音學相關。該研究的背景是因為先前研究曾提到英語元音在不同語音環境裡會呈現不同的質量特性，但是其探索的焦點大多侷限於長短元音或鬆緊元音的觀察。至於我們的研究則改弦更張，設計包括四種緊元音[i], [e], [u], [o]和三個雙元音[aɪ], [aʊ], [ɔɪ]在不同語境裡的特徵。這項研究的重要性是讓我們得以發現華語受試者已經建立的英語語音庫藏以及檢視其第一語言的影響痕跡。畢竟，華語並未根據元音的長短或鬆緊來產生意義的區辨，其語音系統和英語的語音系統有所差別。此外，這項研究也讓我們得以觀察受試者在每一個目標音的發音上產生何種偏離情況。

我們的受試者為四十五名台灣大學主修英語的學生，他們學習目標語言已經多年，經驗豐富，因此在英語的音韻習得上已經達到穩定狀態，這些受試者在電腦教室錄製一項發音測驗，該測驗包括四十二個單音節的詞彙，平均出現在三種 語音情境之中：(1)結尾為元音的開放性音節、(2)結尾為濁輔音的閉合性音節、(3) 結尾為清輔音的閉合性音節。經由量化統計分析的程序，我們發現受試者對於第二種語音環境的測驗詞表現最佳，其次是第三種，最差的是第一種。雖然其平均分數有所不同，但是其差異並未達到顯著水準。其次，關於發音常見的偏離形式方面，受試者最常見的錯誤是未能有效區分長短元音和鬆緊元音在形式上的差別，乃至於將雙元音簡化成單元音等現象。這些發現顯示了華語成年人無法有效區隔元音所在的語音環境之不同，依此製造不同特性的變體，反而是固著在某一種發音形式之上，而且其主要的發音偏誤也和元音長度有關。這種傾向或許可以歸咎於他們先前在第一語言上的發音慣性使然，也可能是因為他們先前所接受的英語教學一直強調元音長短的區別，未能留意到元音的鬆緊的緣故。有鑑於此，我們建議在英語教學上應該培養學生對於不同元音的敏感性。

筆者親身聆聽的單篇論文、專題演講、工作坊、研討會相當眾多。礙於篇幅起見，筆者以下僅針對參與各項主題演講的心得加以略述。

筆者在第一天聆聽了澳洲國立大學教授 Nicholas Evans 的主題演講，獲得許多啟發。Evans 的演講標題為「聆聽內心：澳洲語言的意義景觀」，他比較澳洲原住民語言和世界其他各語言在語意系統上的深層差異，而這樣的差異其實是文化差異的表徵，這些表徵呈現在親屬稱謂、生態關聯、語言感知、思想、信仰和記憶等各方面的用語之上。Evans 主張，如果我們要充分欣賞原住民語言的文化遺產，首要之務便是聆聽內心，而現有語言保存和振復的課程也不應該過度強調口說，以致忽略了聆聽和理解的重要性。

第二場主題演講由美國喬治城大學的 Lourdes Ortega 教授擔任，主題是語言經驗和延遲性雙語教育的成果。Ortega 要探討的主題是成人在欠缺年齡優勢的前提之下，如何進行第二語言學習、如何獲得成功、成功的水準為何。她強調，在現今第二語言習得的領域裡，不管是社會文化、社會認知或用法本位等觀點，都把經驗視為核心觀念。究之事實，學習者的學習成效不能脫離語言經驗來評斷，而語言學習所要關注的三個問題包括：(1)語言使用的經驗如何對多種語言學習的成果提供貢獻；(2)我們如何得知對於雙語或多語學習的知識為何；(3)當前關於語言經驗的主流觀點如何界定語言學習的成果。

在第三天裡，筆者聆聽了西雪梨大學教授 Ann Cutler 的演講，主題為本土語言在聽力上的優勢。Cutler 的論點很直接，即是母語對於日後所學習的各種語言能提供益處，其中又以聽力技能最是居功厥偉。當然，聽力情境會因為說話者的存在與否、說話者的熟識與否、語言變體熟悉的程度乃至言語的語域、言語速度、背景噪音以及其他諸多因素而造成不同難度，而實證性及經驗性的研究也指出，那些影響第一語言聽力的因素也正是同樣會影響第二語言聽力成效的因素。Cutler 的說法為口語辨識及口語表達等各面向提供了一個有趣的觀察角度。

筆者在第四天參加了以色列學者 Elaine Shohamy 的演講，這是一場生動有趣的演講。Shohamy 探討的是語言景觀(linguistic landscape)的主題，主要的概念 ej0 關係到各種符號系統在公共領域、空間裡的陳列狀況，以及不同的陳列方式所反映出來的實情，包括各國政府、政治實體對於語言政策的重視程度，語言正義和語言權力的維護等相關問題。

三、心得及建議事項

　　此次參加會議，筆者的心得大致如下。

1.筆者親身見識到大洋洲地區乃至歐洲各國對於遺產語言(heritage language)的重視，而該地的學者也透過語言政策制定和規劃來保護這些原住民的母語或少數民族瀕危的語言，並將學術研究的成果分享給有識之士，期望提醒社會大眾的注意。這種作為誠屬難能可貴，值得台灣政府及民間在推行母語教育及少數語言振復時作為參考。

2.澳洲本地乃至歐美各國的大學碩、博士生參與本次會議並發表論文的人數相當可觀，另外，發表者當中也不乏來自未開發國家乃至第三世界的青年學子。反觀來自台灣的與人士絕大多數仍以教授或學者為主，這種現象值得國內高等教育人士引以警惕，積極鼓勵研究生與國際接軌，勇於出國參加學術會議，分享研究成果，以免未來國內出現學術命脈青黃不接的現象。

3.完善的會議場所及妥適的人力分工確實是辦理大型國際會議成功的不二法門。當然，學術專業組織乃至非營利人士的經費挹注也扮演重要的角色。此次會議場所選定在布里斯本國際會議及展覽中心，交通便利，地點合宜，設備先進，在在令人刮目相看。而澳洲應用語言協會乃至各大學通力合作，摒棄成見，更是此次會議成功的重要關鍵，值得國內學界日後舉辦大型學術會議時加以效法。

四、附錄

筆者所發表論文之大綱

The Production of English Vowels by Chinese Speakers
Fu-hsing Su (fhsu@mail.ncyu.edu.tw)
National Chiayi University, Taiwan)
Li-szu Agnes Huang (lshuang@nkfust.ncyu.edu.tw)
National Kaohsiung First University of Science and Technology, Taiwan)

1. Introduction
1.1 Research background
--Previous works have highlighted the different quantity or quality of English vowels in different phonetic contexts (Cebrian, 2006; de Jong, 2004; Flege & Port, 1981; Wang & Wu, 2001).

--We followed the wait of previous investigators and chose different target vowels for observation.

--Purposefully, we observed how Chinese speakers produced four monophthongs /i/, /e/, /u/, /o/ and three diphthongs /aɪ/, /aʊ/, /ɔɪ/ in different contexts.

1.2 Significant of the study
--The current study enables us to find out whether the English sound repertoire the participants have acquired consists of the sounds transferred from their L1, which maintains no vowel duration contrast.

--It also allows us to realize the sound deviations the participants generate for each target vowel.

1.3 Research questions
Q1. Is there a significant difference in the participants' correct production of the target vowels placed in three phonetic contexts?

Q2. What are the common speech sound deviations the participants generate for each target vowel?

2. Related literature
2.1 The distinction of tense versus lax vowels in English
--A conventional classification of tense and lax vowels in English (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2011)

Examples: beat, bit; [eɪ, ɛ] as in *bait, bet*; [u, ʊ] as in *boot, foot* of tense/lax vowels: [i, ɪ] as

in *beat, bit*; [eɪ, ɛ] as in *bait, bet*; [u, ʊ] as in *boot, foot*.

--A lax vowel is shorter and slightly more centralized while a tense vowel is pronounced with more effort and involve some tongue movement.

--Spectral and durational characteristics: Tense vowels are longer than lax vowels and are more peripheral in the acoustic vowel space. They have lower F1 and higher F2 and F3 values relative to lax vowels (Kondaurova & Francis, 2008).

--Hillenbrand, Clark, and Houde (2000): Native speakers of North American English rely mostly on spectral cues in discriminating the two vowel types.

--Tenseness plays a minor role in the vowel inventories of Chinese. The Chinese equivalents to the English vowels seem to be shorter and slightly more centralized.

2.2 Context and English vowel production

--Phonologically, tense and lax vowels occur in different kinds of syllables

--Vowel length as an index: Denes (1955) and Peterson and Lehiste (1960) first identified vowel length as an index to the perceptual distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants.

--Brown (1990): None of the basic vowel series /ɪ, ɛ, æ, ɒ, ʊ, ʌ, ə/ can appear in a stressed monosyllable that is not closed by a consonant.

--Flege (1988): Native Chinese speakers produced a relatively small vocalic duration contrast between English vowels preceding /-p/ and /-b/ than native English speakers.

--Chang (1994) observed how 35 Taiwanese college students and a native speaker of English produced vowels. The subjects read test stimuli from a production experiment with 32 English words of C(C)VC type, which end in voiced and voiceless stops, and 8 words of CVC type, which end in voiced and voiceless fricatives.

--Findings from Chang (1994): (1) The Chinese subjects produced the vowels preceding word-final voiced obstruents significantly longer than the vowels preceding word-final voiceless obstruents. (2) However, they did not lengthen the vowel before voiced obstruents in any way as long as what native speakers would do.

--Hsieh and Kuo (1999) examined how English learners in Taiwan used preceding vowel duration as a cue to the voicing of word-final consonants.

--Findings from Hsieh and Kuo (1999): the learners did not produce enough vowel duration contrast preceding word-final voiceless and voiced consonants.

--Wang and Wu (2001) administered two experiments to examine the effect of vowel length on the perception of postvocalic voicing of consonant and the correlations between vowel perception and production. Their subjects included two groups of Taiwanese English learners with intermediate- and advanced-level proficiency and a group of native English speakers, twenty in each.

--In the Perceptual Experiment, the subjects had to differentiate the length of vowels in nine pairs: *beet-bead, bat-bad, pot-pod, cut-cud, boot-booed, leaf-leave, calf-calve,*

duff-dove, and *proof-prove*.

--In the Production Experiment, they had to read a short article in normal speed and clear pronunciation.

--Findings from Wang and Wu (2001): (1) As expected, native English speakers had the highest reading scores, followed by advanced English learners and intermediate English learners, respectively. (2) As for the Perceptual Experiment, native English speakers achieved the highest reading scores, followed, respectively, by advanced learners and intermediate-level learners.

3. Instrument and method

3.1 Participants

--We selected 45 Chinese speakers in Taiwan as the participants, who were college students majoring in English language.

--Theoretically, they were individuals who had enough linguistic experience (Flege, 1991; Cebrian, 2006)to reach a stable state in the acquisition of English phonology.

3.2. Instrument and procedures

--The participants were randomly assigned to separate recording sessions for an experiment of English vowel production.

--The instrument was a word list of 42 monosyllabic items that featured the contrast of four monophthongs /i/, /e/, /u/, /o/ and three diphthongs /aɪ/, /aʊ/, /ɔɪ/. (PPT)

--Each target vowel was arranged in 6 test items placed in three phonetic contexts or environments: (1) an open syllable without a word-final coda; (2) a closed syllable ending with a voiced consonant; (3) a closed syllable ending with a voiceless consonant.

--The software MP3 Recorder was installed to facilitate the recording and transformation of speech signals into MP 3 files.

--The recording was carried out at a room of the Computation Center of the university where the participants studied.

--Prior to the experiment, the participants were explained the purposes and procedures of the experiment.

--A computer technician was arranged for each group to help with trouble-shooting, whenever it was necessary.

3.3. Data collection and analysis

--The participants' pronunciation responses were transcribed using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) symbols.

--Two transcribers were in charge of the transcription work. They agreed on more than 96% of agreement. Disagreements were solved through discussion.

--The scoring of each response (perfect score = 42)

(1) 1 point: a response that matches the intended pronunciation of the test item.

(2) 0.5 point: a response that involves the substitution of a target vowel with another alternative vowel

(3) 0 point: a response that involves the substitution of a target vowel with a consonant, or one that shows the addition or reduction of a vowel beside the target vowel.

--Quantitative paradigms of descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA were first observed, followed by qualitative analyses that intended to identify the common speech deviations in the participants' responses.

4. Results

Q1. Was there a significant difference in the participants' correct production of the target vowels placed in three phonetic contexts?

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of the participants' production of target vowels in three contexts (n =44)

Phonetic context of test items	N	M	SD	SE
1. an open syllable	44	5.99	1.04	0.16
2. a closed syllable ending with a voiced consonant	44	6.49	1.47	0.22
3. a closed syllable ending with a voiceless consonant	44	6.31	0.94	0.14
Total	132	6.26	1.18	0.10

Table 2 Summary of one-way ANOVA of the participants' vowel production (n =44)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.636	2	2.818	2.053	.133
Within Groups	177.097	129	1.373		
Total	182.733	131			

Q2. What were the common speech sound deviations the participants generated for each target vowel?

Some of the common deviations we observed, which maintains a frequency of occurrence of 3 or bigger.

--Responses to the target vowel /i/: ɪ (26), iː (7) for *plea*, iː (33), ɪ (3) for *plead*, and iː (33), ɪ (3) for *bleach*.

--Responses to the target vowel /u/: ʊ (35) for *crew*, uː (33), ʊ (4) for *cruise*, and uː (39), ʊ (9) for *Bruce*.

--Responses to the target diphthong /aɪ/: aɪ̆ (31), aɪː for *sign,* aɪ̆ (30), aɪː (6), aːɪ̆ (4) for *sign*, and aɪ̆ (38) for *sight*(" ˘ " over a vowel represents an extra short duration).

Certainly there are deviations pertaining to other vocalic properties such as height or backness, or even the addition or reduction of elements. Examples are the lowering of /e/ into /ɛ/ as shown in the responses

--Responses to the target diphthong /aʊ/: ɑ (6), o (4), ɔː (3) for *cow* and ɑː (17), ɔː (4) for *clout*

5. Conclusion and Discussion

--Our quantitative analyses revealed no significant difference in the participants' production of the seven target vowels arranged in different conditions.

--This result may suggest Chinese speakers' inability to accurately produce the various variants of a specific English vowel in accordance with the phonetic environments it is situated.

--The deviant phonetic realizations the participants created were mainly length-based, suggesting their tendency to use durational cue as a key factor to differentiate the seven tense vowels.

--The participants' failure to differentiate vowel variations in different phonetic contexts is probably due to their habitual tendency in processing Chinese vowels, which predominantly occur in an open syllable.

--The participants' predominant use of durational cue could be attributed to a possible effect of an instructional bias towards a temporal interpretation of the English vowel contrasts (Cebrian, 2006).

--We therefore suggest that Chinese speakers learning English have to be trained to become "linguistically sensitized" to spectral differences of English vowels.