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Background

Background elements of native instruction may be modified and manipulated to enhance noncircumstances, I hypothesize that instruction that has been modified to mimic the way in which a native substantial in number and highly abstract in pronunciation and meaning. To mitigate these inadequate by themselves for those involving Sino based languages. These methods, while perhaps applicable to some other world languages, are wholly Many approaches to this subject are not optimal in that they rely heavily on methods that are antiquated speakers, especially those with a western language of origin. Proficiency specifically so that they may be used with existing pedagogical methods for non

Purpose and Hypothesis

The explicit purpose of this research is to identify novel strategies to optimize Sino Japanese complex and simple sentences. From these sources they derived a qualitative assessment of the data.

Literature Review and Methodology

The authors examined the premise that “it is conventionally taken for granted that pinyin is always useful in professional or educational contexts for Chinese characters and should accompany characters in learning materials for beginner learners” (Lee & Kalyuga, 2010) but they later found that this was not so, that the use of pinyin was only helpful after a higher level of proficency had been established. Thus, it has revealed that it established two related processes and call it the Kanji learning process. First, the research revealed that even aids to comprehension must be used judiciously for them to be effective. In this instance it revealed that some methods of pinyin that actually hindered the learning process for novice students of mandarin, due to a phenomenon referred to as “cognitive overload” (Lee & Kalyuga, 2010). In their words “This conventional [belief] that pinyin should necessarily benefit the Chinese language may not always be correct. The reported study indicates that the effectiveness of pinyin as a means of instructional support may depend on the [learner’s] prior language proficiency and experience with pinyin” (Lee & Kalyuga, 2010). This is also relevant to Ishwita and Sekiguchi’s (2009) study which conveyed that native Japanese and, in most cases, native Chinese speakers will be superior users of Kanji. In such a way, Lee and Kalyuga’s (2010) research does imply limitation on the background of the student, notably that background does not abdicate the individual of using enhanced learning methods. This research does not, on the other hand, mention the use of furigana, a native Japanese construct used to teach native speakers the varied pronunciations of their own writing system. It will require further research to discover if any of the premises for pinyin remain true for furigana, as it would offer a greatly enhanced perspective of the process. Given the different natures of the two sorts of “training wheel” approaches (i.e., pinyin and furigana), I suspect there would be vastly different outcomes in their effectiveness, and they may reveal clues on how to enhance the usage of the other. This research may also reveal important implications on the JSL (Japanese language learning) of using pinyin in learning furigana as well. I speculate that part of the difficulty with using pinyin is that the students are not greatly exposed to Roman characters, and conversely, JSL students may find significant difficulty in their attempts to learn Kanji using furigana.

Less controversial is the conclusion drawn by Ishwita and Sekiguchi (2009) who discovered, as mentioned, that native speakers of Chinese and Japanese would, in most cases, almost always use Japanese characters with greater facility than their Western counterparts with the only exception being Chinese students who had not commenced Japanese education until University. As stated by the researchers, “The findings present important pedagogical implications. First, despite the different study backgrounds, the levels of learner proficiency were not as different as expected. The most notable difference was Kanji use, which was predicted, but this applied to a group of character-based language learners only” (Ishwita & Sekiguchi, 2009). This finding gives greater depth in several areas of the Kanji learning process. Again, it trumps the notion that being a native speaker is a free pass. Being able to be excelled to face as diverse as the teaching methods employed at the university level versus the individual’s school level, as well as possible demographic factors such as age and or gender that are inherently different in the university community. This study, while on the surface definitive, really gives interesting insights as to how the process may work. Specifically, it details that Chinese and Japanese students may not have enough in common to be taught with identical, or similar, even similar methods. This is a very intriguing thought, given their profoundly obvious linguistic and ideological relations. It is worth mentioning that Japanese and Chinese, while possessing highly similar writing systems, are fundamentally different in terms of grammar, orthography, and so on. As, it seems a likely conclusion that this research may lead to a constellation of approaches that need to be applied, given the background and objective of the individual student.

Methodology

The article by researchers Lee and Kalyuga (2010) which studied the effects of pinyin usage started by selecting participants randomly from “six classes of 20 year old students (115 females and 127 males, average age of 14.4 years, SD=0.8) from two Hong Kong subsidized secondary schools...” (Lee and Kalyuga 2010). “The experiment included a pretest phase, a learning phase, and a post-test phase” (Lee and Kalyuga 2010). The pretest phase screened candidates for background and prior competency in pinyin. The subjects were categorized into “low prior knowledge level” and “high prior knowledge level.” (Lee and Kalyuga 2010). The learning phase consisted of a lesson, with varied usage of pinyin, the three groups were “Full Pinyin Condition”, “Partial Pinyin Condition” and “No Pinyin Condition” (Lee and Kalyuga 2010). The post-test phase was a multiple-choice paper based on a and statistical analysis of the results were performed.

The second sources, from Ishwita and Sekiguchi (2009) featured research using a similar method, but were scrutinized for different results. Again, the subjects were screened, divided among various groups, B group (beginner), C group (post-beginner and post-secondary and character based background, N=5; Group B: post-secondary and character based background, N=5; Group C: post-secondary and non-character based background N=14) (Ishwita and Sekiguchi 2009). All other groups from the original number were excluded and from there, the remaining were required to write a composition of approximately 300-400 characters, or about one page. The papers were then judged and rated on structure, vocabulary, kanji words and characters, and categorization of Japanese complex and simple sentences. From these sources they derived a qualitative assessment of the data.