

摘要

本研究基于 Spolsky 提出的语言政策模型（2004、2009、2019），从语言实践、语言意识、语言管理三方面，对聋校手语政策进行民族志的描述、解释与反思。

首先，本文分别从教师的“授课”和“批评”两种语言实践类型切入，描写了“汉语思维”主导下手语作为教学媒介语的边缘化现状，以及手口共用中双语结构与视听模态不对称的特点，讨论了该课堂语言选用对教学效果的影响。其次，本文考察了师生语言意识的异同对双方语言实践及语言管理的影响，发现听师聋生在对手语语言属性及语言功能的认同、教学媒介语及语言能力发展的价值判断方面存在明显反差，而该张力与双方对聋人的人群语言文化态度密切相关。继而，本文发现学校域内师生个体层面的语言管理作用突出，域外影响十分有限，手语教育缺失，现有语言管理难以以为师生语言实践及手语意识的发展提供积极指导。最后，本文讨论了我国手语政策规划发展趋势，提出在融合而非全纳的特殊教育理念洪流中，聋校需要成为保护手语和聋人文化的坚实堡垒。

关键词：聋人；手语；聋校；语言政策；民族志

Abstract

Based on the language policy model proposed by Spolsky (2004; 2009; 2019), this study attempts to present an ethnographic description, analysis, and reflection of sign language policy at schools for the deaf, from perspectives of language practice, language ideology, and language management respectively.

Firstly, starting from two language practice types of "teaching" and "criticism", this paper describes the marginalization of sign language under the dominance of "thinking-in-spoken-language" to varying degrees and the asymmetric continuum of sign language and spoken language when they are simultaneously produced, as well as their influence on teaching effects. Secondly, how the language ideologies of hearing teachers and deaf students may influence their language practices and management is examined. It is found that they differ dramatically in the recognition of sign language as a language, valuation of the medium of instruction, and development of individual linguistic repertoire, which is closely related to their different linguistic-cultural attitudes towards deaf people. Then, it is discovered that language management at the individual level of teachers and students within the school domain has a prominent role, while that of other domains seems very limited, and that little guidance on language practice and sign language ideologies can be received due to the lack of sign language education as a method of language management. Finally, this study discusses the current issues of sign language policy and planning in China and proposes that deaf schools should become a fortress to protect sign language and deaf culture in the flood of integration rather than inclusion.

Keywords: D/deaf; sign language; deaf school; language policy; ethnography