University of Cape Town
Faculty of the Humanities

Constituting grammar and its pedagogy: The reform of the South African English Home Language Intermediate Phase curriculum between 1997 and 2012

A minor dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Education

Colleen Moore (MRXCOL006)
2014

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature:_____ Date:_____

Abstract

Post-apartheid curriculum reform in South Africa has impacted the constitution and organisation of English language knowledge, including grammatical knowledge and its pedagogy. Additionally, changes in theoretical viewpoints on grammar instruction and early literacy instruction have influenced the conceptualisation and teaching of English grammar. This study aims to determine how grammar and its pedagogy have been constituted and explicated in the South African Intermediate Phase (IP) English Home Language (HL) curricula through curriculum reforms after 1997. It also seeks to explore how the constitution of grammar within Curriculum 2005 (C2005), the Revised National Curriculum Statements (RNCS), and the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) have been influenced by changing grammar and early literacy instruction theories and language teaching methodologies.

The study analyses and compares the organisation and structure of grammatical knowledge and its suggested pedagogy in the three curriculum documents using Bernstein's concepts of classification and framing. Grammar instruction theories and conceptualisations of grammar types as prescriptive, descriptive and rhetorical (drawn from a variety of grammar instruction commentators including Lefstein, Thornbury and Hudson & Walmsley) are identified in teacher guides and other supporting literature accompanying the three curricula. These documents are also analysed to identify the predominant early literacy instruction theories – skills/phonics-based, whole language, and balanced language approaches – underpinning curriculum development.

The analysis shows that through the curriculum reforms, grammatical knowledge has been more strongly classified and framed resulting in a more explicit constitution of grammar as a skill to be acquired by learners for the development of an English meta-language. The CAPS English HL IP syllabus has returned to a contents- or knowledge-based curriculum. This clearer constitution of grammatical knowledge mirrors the re-emergence of explicit grammar instruction internationally, most notably in the UK. The analysis also shows that indistinct progression requirements, pertaining to the acquisition of specific grammatical knowledge, with an arbitrary basis between grades are a consistent concern in all three curricula. It also finds that conceptual ambiguity, regarding early literacy instruction approaches in curricula and accompanying guides, present since the inception of the RNCS and continuing in the CAPS, makes the task of curriculum interpretation difficult. The study concludes with some possible implications the areas of concern may have for teacher training and suggestions on grammatical knowledge organisation for clearer curriculum interpretation and implementation.

Acknowledgements

The presentation of this thesis is the culmination of an enjoyable year of learning more deeply about education and literacy, and time afforded to self-reflection and growth – both professionally as a teacher and personally.

For creating a valuable learning experience, I thank the following people: Dr. Ursula Hoadley for the sharing of her expertise, efficient supervision and thought-provoking coursework, and my other coursework lecturers at UCT who provided a good theoretical foundation for my research topic and other valuable knowledge, namely Dr. Carolyn McKinney, Prof. Mastin Prinsloo, and Dr. Heather Jacklin.

For giving me the motivation to pursue this opportunity, I acknowledge the staff and pupils of Pinehurst Primary school who prompted my many questions and pursuit of answers regarding education.

For enabling me to pursue this learning opportunity, I thank the trustees of the Mary Dorina Spilman scholarship, and for allowing me to maximise it, I thank Rose Jooste for her constant care and practical provision.

And for encouraging, challenging, and giving me renewed perspectives, I thank Jonathan Bergh.

You are all much appreciated.

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Rationale and purpose of study

This study aims to determine how grammar and its pedagogy have been constituted and explicated at a curriculum level in the South African Intermediate Phase (IP) (Grades 4 to 6) English Home Language (HL) curriculum documents, and how these have been influenced by changing grammar and early literacy instruction theories and language teaching methodologies underpinning three curriculum reform moments. The study examines how the different curricula have constructed knowledge of English grammar in order for learners to develop a meta-language to describe their literacy practice.

Curriculum reform in South Africa has been informed by changing ideologies. Theories of constructivism, movements towards integrated curricula and learner-centredness contributed towards changes in the constitution of knowledge and approaches to teaching language in the first reform process after apartheid. Post-apartheid movements from a traditional content/skills-based curriculum rooted in Christian National Education to a radically progressive, outcomes-based approach in Curriculum 2005 (C2005) (1997), and subsequently to the Revised National Curriculum Statements (RNCS) (2002) and Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) (2011), resulted in noteworthy changes in the explication of grammar in the curriculum content of English HL. This study aims to investigate what and how curriculum and early literacy instruction theories informed the formulation of the content and pedagogy at curriculum level of English grammar teaching in primary school (grades 4 to 6) from 1997, when outcomes based education was adopted as the underlying educational philosophy in South Africa, to the introduction of the CAPS in 2012.

In my own experience as a grade 6, English HL teacher, I constantly considered the importance and relevance of explicit grammar instruction and struggled to understand what the RNCS required learners to acquire within the "Language structures, conventions and/or uses" learning outcome. I also grappled to understand the theories informing the recommended approaches to literacy instruction which were promoted within the curriculum documents and training given by the South African Department of Education (SADoE) during curriculum change. It was my impression that the curriculum and the approaches promoted in the training tended to background grammar instruction and foreground literature and reading, thereby suggesting an invisible pedagogy of grammar at curriculum level. I therefore had concerns about learners' abilities to acquire a meta-language to

describe the subject of English and be prepared for the demands of the Further Education and Training (FET) phase.

With the publication of the CAPS documents in 2011 for public comment, concerns regarding the teaching of grammar became clear especially with regard to the component of grammar for assessment in examinations for grades 10 to 12. Venter's (2011) and Gosher's (2011) sharp criticism of the seeming exclusion of grammar instruction in the CAPS FET documents brought to the fore the opinions of many English teachers regarding the importance they placed on this aspect of the curriculum. Responding to the discussion around this, the DoE's position was clarified in a media report entitled, "Basic education says grammar will be taught" (2011):

> There is no intention to remove the teaching of grammar from the school syllabus, a spokesperson for the minister of basic education said on Friday. "We have not removed grammar from the syllabus, only the separate assessment of grammar in the exam," spokesperson Granville Whittle said. He said that this was part of an international move away from teaching grammar as a "stand alone", and that most teachers were comfortable with this. He said that the integration of grammar into the writing and reading components would allow grammar to be taught "in context". "... Some teachers feel you still need to teach grammar separately and we will look at this," Whittle said.

The above comments allude to an adoption of theories operating at an international level regarding grammar instruction and literacy. I therefore seek, through this study, to investigate how the knowledge and instruction of English grammar has been constructed at a curriculum level by the DoE and the influences on this construction which may determine the degree to which learners acquire a meta-language for English HL in the IP.

1.2 Research questions

The study makes an empirical contribution to how grammar teaching is being conceptualised in South Africa at a curriculum level by exploring the influential educational theories being propagated by curriculum developers at various curriculum reform moments.

The question I therefore ask is:

How have grammar and its pedagogy in SA English HL curriculum documents in the Intermediate Phase been constituted and explicated through three curriculum reform moments between 1997 and 2012?

Sub-questions which inform the above answer are therefore:

i. *How has grammatical knowledge been structured and organised in the three English HL IP curricula?*

ii. *What theories and trends of grammar instruction have underpinned each English HL IP curriculum?*

iii. *What early literacy instruction theories have underpinned and influenced each English HL IP curriculum change?*

1.3 A brief overview of South African curriculum reform

In this section I identify and give context to the three curricula examined in this study by reviewing a small portion of literature on South African curriculum reform. This will show how changing curriculum reform theory has an impact on the constitution of knowledge – in this study, grammatical knowledge – in various curricula. Hoadley (2011: 139) outlines three major curriculum reform moments in South Africa and their relation to the conceptualisation of knowledge: firstly, the birth of the first post-apartheid curriculum, C2005 in 1997 and its implementation in grade 1 in 1998; secondly the review of C2005 and consequent publication of the RNCS for grades R to 9 in 2002; and thirdly the review of the RNCS in 2009 and the publication of the CAPS in 2011. I mainly draw from Hoadley (2011) as it is one of the most recent commentaries on South African curriculum reform detailing the changes the CAPS intended to implement.

According to Nykiel-Herbert (2004:251), C2005 attempted to "change the authoritarian, racist curriculum of 'fundamental pedagogics' into one that embraced – politically and philosophically – democratic, progressive, constructivist principles of teaching and learning." It was based on the premise of transformational, outcomes-based education (OBE) which "presented a strong political argument for a curriculum for rapid social transformation" (Hoadley, 2011:145) and "espoused a radical view of learner-centredness" (Nykiel-Herbert, 2004:252). C2005 can be described in Bernsteinian terms as an integrated curriculum code. It was characterised by "a shift away from strong disciplinary boundaries to a horizontal integration of traditional curriculum subjects. Learning areas, which were clusters of subjects, were introduced to support integration… Learning outcomes were generic, and most of the subject-specific content from the curriculum was removed" (Hoadley, 2011:146-147). This was in sharp contrast to the curriculum produced under apartheid-driven, Christian National Education, which was "content-driven with very stringent prescriptions for the sequencing and scope of contents" (Hoadley, 2011:144). There was in the latter, according to Hoadley (2011:145), "strong control exerted over knowing, knowledge and knowers, informed by an autocratic theory of pedagogy and clear content selection along white, Christian nationalist lines," while C2005 assumed that "learning disciplinary content knowledge (the what) could be replaced by learning the procedures and methods of discipline (the how)… silencing knowledge with a strident theory of knowing" (Hoadley, 2011: 147-148).

One of the key criticisms of C2005 that emerged during its review process in 2000 was the lack of definition of what constituted knowledge as a result of the integrated code of the curriculum. As a result, and "drawing implicitly on Bernstein's theory of knowledge then, the authors of the *Curriculum 2005 Review Report* took a realist view of knowledge, and of school knowledge as having an objective conceptual structure (especially in terms of the selection and sequence of knowledge). The major design flaw of Curriculum 2005 was identified as its having no conceptual sequence and hence no learning progression path" (Hoadley, 2011:150). According to the Report of the Review Committee on C2005 (SADoE, 2000:51&52): "The C2005 design structure is strong on integration and weak on conceptual coherence – it is over-designed but under-specified" and "the range statements, performance indicators and expected levels of performance are intended to provide the progression features of C2005. However, these have proved unnecessarily cumbersome and have, by and large, *failed to act as mechanisms which promote sequence, progression and pace*. This is largely because curriculum designers have attempted to *avoid prescribing content*". [italics mine]

According to Fiske & Ladd (2005:167), the Review Committee of C2005 "reaffirmed the value of outcomes-based education as an educational philosophy, and stressed that, for all the problems with implementation, there was strong continuing support for OBE among South African educators". So while the committee recommended a curriculum that would reduce integration and clearly specify content (Hoadley, 2011:150); allocate more time for mathematics and language instruction; use revised terminology to make documents clear and accessible; pay attention to teacher orientation, training, and support; use more learning support materials, especially textbooks; and call for better co-ordination of national, provincial, and district-level support services (Fiske & Ladd, 2005:168); the revised curriculum was still designed around outcomes. Thereby it unsuccessfully addressed the review committee's own critique "around knowledge and the need for greater conceptual coherence and progression, knowledge stipulation and attention to disciplinary structure" (Hoadley, 2011: 150).

The RNCS was approved by Cabinet in 2002 and the implementation thereof started in 2002 for grades R to 9 and in 2006 for grades 10 to 12, with the first school-leaving certificate examinations based on the new curriculum being written in 2008. According to Hoadley (2011:151), the compromises and contradictions of the Report of the Review Committee on C2005 (SADoE, 2000) resulted in a "compromise curriculum which could be read in a number of ways, and which would be underpinned by conceptual unease". In 2009, due to public criticism of outcomes-based education

and South African learners' poor performance in national and international standardised tests, a review of the RNCS was undertaken. According to Hoadley (2001:152-153), the report of the task team for the review of the implementation of the NCS (2009) argued for a knowledge-based curriculum and challenged pedagogical approaches based on OBE: "What the *NCS Review Report* deliberately attempts to do is define curriculum in terms of specification of 'the what' of knowledge… In particular, the Report argues that outcomes inhibit a clear specification of what is to be learnt, suggesting that outcomes be replaced with 'clear content, concept, and skill standards and clear and concise assessment requirements' (SADoE, 2009:45)."

In 2011, CAPS was published based on recommendations of the afore-mentioned review report, and implemented in 2012 in grades R to 3 with further roll-out in the IP in 2013. The curriculum's design intention according to Hoadley (2011:153) was a "'structuring and organisation of knowledge (Moore 2004)'" and references to learning outcomes were to be removed. Recommendations made in the C2005 review report were echoed in the RNCS review report and implemented with the advent of CAPS namely: a reduction of learning areas in the IP, an increased allocation of teaching time for a Home Language, Mathematics and Natural Science as a result of more teaching time and the prescribed use of textbooks for every subject. According to the Minister of Basic Education, Angie Motshekga, CAPS "builds on the previous curriculum but also updates it and aims to provide clearer specification of what is to be taught and learnt on a term-by-term basis" (SA DoE, 2011: Foreword). CAPS then clearly signifies an incremental shift towards more of what Bernstein (1975) terms as a "collection type curriculum", which prioritises the definition of knowledge, more strongly bounded subjects and clear specification of content selection, sequencing, pacing and evaluation.

1.4 Overview of research report

In the next chapter of this study, literature pertaining to the contexts and theories of early literacy instruction, language acquisition and grammar instruction are reviewed and discussed. This chapter concentrates on outlining the literature which informed the conceptual framework of this study. Chapter Three briefly outlines Basil Bernstein's socio-linguistic code theory and its relevance to the analysis of educational knowledge. It describes how this theory was used to create descriptors which are used to compare the three English Language curricula and analyse the data. Definitions of terminology used in the study relating to grammar and early literacy instruction theories are also briefly clarified. Chapter Four shows the analysis of the curriculum documents, and the findings and predominant themes are presented. The relevance of these findings to current curriculum design and English language pedagogy is discussed in the final chapter.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This study is positioned within the context of curriculum reform in South Africa and the overarching approaches to curriculum which influenced such reform, as discussed in Chapter One. Added to this, influences of grammar instruction, early literacy instruction and language acquisition theories are referenced to locate the various suggested teaching methodologies within the three, English HL IP curriculum documents and the type of grammar being constituted at curriculum level. Bernstein's concepts of framing and classification, which are explained and detailed in Chapter Three of this study, are used to describe and compare how grammatical knowledge has been structured and organised within the curricula.

This chapter therefore concentrates on highlighting and discussing literature which uses concepts and theories which assist in answering my two other sub-questions namely "What theories and trends of grammar instruction have underpinned each English HL IP curriculum?" and "What early literacy instruction theories have underpinned and influenced each English HL IP curriculum change?". The emphasis of this literature review is therefore to create conceptual clarity around what I mean when referring to grammar instruction and early literacy theory, as well as the influence of language acquisition theory on the conceptualisation of grammar and its teaching. No studies similar to mine, showing the constitution of grammar at a curriculum level in the South African context, were found in the literature reviewed. Studies referred to in this chapter are therefore mainly from UK or US sources, and discuss mainly the value of grammar within language teaching as opposed to its constitution.

2.1 English Language as a subject

In order to locate the development of grammar instruction theories, I reference Christie and Macken-Horarik (2007), who argue that the pedagogy of English as a school subject has become increasingly invisible in the UK and therefore explicit teaching of language and its structures is absent. This literature helps to answer my sub-question concerning trends and theories affecting grammar instruction. According to Christie and Macken-Horarik (2007:156-157), although the importance of the English language curriculum has become increasingly significant due to the educational and social mobility the language enables, the nature of the subject and students' mastery thereof has become more intangible. Say Christie and Macken-Horarik (2007:157) of English instruction: "A powerful invisible pedagogy often applies, such that what is evaluated as success is tacitly understood, rather than clearly articulated". These authors continue to sketch a brief history of the main theories informing English instruction, naming (in somewhat of a chronological order) the theoretical categories of: Basic Skills, Cultural Heritage, Functional Language Studies, Personal

Growth, Cultural Studies and New Literacy Studies. They argue that due to the segmented nature of subject English's history there has been a tendency "to diminish the status of overt teaching of knowledge about language, while promoting various valued subject positions, though the tools for their expression have become increasingly invisible" (Christie & Macken-Horarik, 2007:179). What is optimal for English instruction is, according to the authors, clearer explication of requirements of the subject to learners. They say Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), arising from the historical category of Functional Language Studies, can be used to achieve this. Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007:179) argue that by making the features of texts visible though the SF meta-language, subject English is made more visible:

> English teachers have access to a meta-language through which to articulate requirements, and hence to make it more accessible to a greater number of students…The meta-language of SFL can be used to highlight commonalities and differences across the specialized languages and methodologies of English, and we suggest it can be used to outline a scope and sequence for progressing learning in English at both primary and secondary levels.

What makes Christie & Macken-Horarik's (2007) arguments relevant to this study is that they show how different treatments of subject English have and will affect the explicit teaching of grammar and learners' development of a meta-language. These English language theoretical categories do not describe the chronological progression of the teaching of subject English but rather how English has been and still is viewed and taught differently at various times, and how the categories have informed different methods of grammar instruction as discussed in the following section.

2.2 Grammar instruction theory

The literature reviewed in this section discusses how grammar has been defined and viewed by linguists and teachers. It outlines the different types of grammar that have been conceptualised over the last fifty years and draws mainly from UK literature. This is because very little literature was found which highlighted grammar as a concern in English HL education in South Africa. The recent focus of educational research in language and literacy instruction in South Africa has focussed on the challenges of multi-lingualism and language policy. One older South African article found which looks at the role of grammar in teaching English is by J. Keith Chick (1992). He (1992:38), in examining the role of English in the formation of a post-apartheid educational language policy, argues for the importance of grammar to be recognised in ensuring that "English becomes the medium of communication rather than miscommunication". He suggests that knowledge of grammar enables effective communication especially in a multi-cultural context such as South Africa where contextual backgrounds in understanding language vary greatly. Subsequent to this commentary, significant enquiry into grammar teaching was not pursued. However, the debate around the teaching and value of grammar teaching has recently intensified in the UK. A re-introduction of national,

standardised grammar tests for 11 year olds in 2013 (2013 Key Stage 2 tests: English grammar, punctuation and spelling test, 2013) and planned teacher training in grammar instruction ready for a new English curriculum in 2014 (Clark, 2012) are evidence of grammar instruction being prioritised as part of the UK national education curriculum.

2.2.1 Defining grammar

With the dissemination by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) of the National Literacy Strategies (NLS) in 2001 in the UK, formal grammar teaching, according to Hudson and Barton (2001), was back on the education agenda after its disappearance from classrooms since the 1970s. Its disappearance, say Hudson and Barton (2001), was due to the dominant ideas of grammar having to be taught in context, which Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007) express in their English subject teaching traditions of Cultural Heritage, Personal Growth and Cultural Studies.

Hudson and Walmsley (2005) sketch a detailed history of grammar instruction in the UK from the late 1800s to the early 21st century. They argue that the recent reconceptualisation of grammar in the UK national curriculum has been influenced by the increasing amount of research done in linguistics since the 1960s and that there should be more links between the latter and what appears in school language curricula. Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007:163) concur with this, crediting Michael Halliday's SFL work for reinstating the value of teaching knowledge about language (KAL) and its use in text analysis in schools.

What is evident from this history, and according to other researchers including Burgess (1998), Watson (2013) and Lefstein (2009), is that the confusion regarding the definition of grammar and its use in language development contributes to the ambiguity of its conceptualisation at a school curriculum level and as a pedagogy. Says Burgess (1998:105 – 106):

> A necessary background is to recognise that versions of 'what grammar is' and 'what grammar is for' vary widely. At the risk of stating the familiar, in public discussion of grammar, the distinction is rarely kept between a) a metalanguage, b) a level in the language, c) capacities and knowledge in pupils' heads and d) a course of instruction.

What emerges from the literature are the diverse descriptions and terminology used by different researchers to describe their views, trends and conceptualisations of grammar. Added to this, the debates surrounding the value of grammar instruction have come from corners with conflicting interests. The interests include viewing the value of grammar instruction for the preservation of a standard English, the improvement of learners' writing, the improvement of communicative competence, or the acquisition of a second language.

Thornbury (1999:13) defines grammar in the context of educational purposes for the learning of a language as: "a description of the rules for forming sentences, including an account of the meaning that these forms convey… Grammar adds meanings that are not easily inferable from the immediate context." He notes that most traditional grammar is an observation of the written form of a language, while there is a distinctive grammar for the spoken language which is perhaps not traditionally studied or taught. He (1999: 11-12) continues to explain that the way in which grammar rules are formulated determine the type of grammar which is taught, namely a prescriptive (rules dictating accuracy of use), descriptive (rules describing what language users actually do) or pedagogic grammar (rules which guide learners to use language meaningfully without being prescriptive), and whether these types focus on form (how configurations and conjugations are made by changing letters or words) or on use (how configurations and conjugations are used according to the communicative context). The terms descriptive and prescriptive grammars and their foci are also used differently and more elaborately by other commentators on grammar and will be discussed and defined for the purposes of this study in Chapter Three.

2.2.2 Dominant trends in grammar instruction in the U.K.

What is clear from the literature that is discussed below is that there are methods of teaching or types of grammar which have emerged over time. These methods and types have developed chronologically but have also overlapped, and have been and still are used by curriculum developers and teachers depending on their own view of the value of teaching grammar.

2.2.2.1 Rules-based/prescriptive grammar

According to Hudson and Walmsley (2005:600), the issue of grammar instruction has been an historical problem for those with interest in English. "The English Association identified the teaching of grammar as a 'vexed question' in 1923 (English Association 1923:3) and… remained a problem until the last quarter of the twentieth century". According to these researchers, little grammar was expected to be taught by elementary school teachers in the 1920s, and secondary school teachers concentrated on parsing and analytical styled, decontextualised exercises which lacked purpose or relevance to the rest of the language. Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007) describe this type of English language instruction as the pre-1950s, Basic Skills tradition which concentrated on the acquisition of abstract skills leading to decontextualised, rote-practice of spelling rules, the alphabet and the use of basal readers.

The authors of the Newbolt report in 1921 (titled *"The Teaching of English in England"*) – progressive for its time – recommended that "the child's developing grammar as reflected in his or her writing skills should be fostered through the dual practice of reading literature and writing composition whereas 'grammar as science' should be taught as explicit language study". Although this report

marked, says Hudson and Walmsley (2005:601), the beginning of the focus of grammar teaching from strictly form to function/meaning, it still propagated the teaching of a pure grammar – one which was rules-based and prescriptive. This type and teaching of grammar, according to much of the literature, can still be found in classrooms today.

2.2.2.2 An absent grammar

Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007) and Hudson and Walmsley (2005) both describe an approach to English language teaching which basically saw grammar's absence in favour of studying English literature. Chrisite & Macken-Horarik (2007) describe this as the Cultural Heritage tradition of English language teaching which propagated the idea of learning values and acquiring culture through the reading of great literary texts thereby focussing on literature study and very often unrelated grammatical skills practice. Say Hudson and Walmsley (2005:604) on this tradition: "Since the chief aim of schooling in the early part of the century was to ensure literacy, and grammar could offer no empirical proof that it helped to improve skills in composition, it was taken to be of no practical value. (The fact that there was no empirical evidence to prove that the study of English literature promoted literacy either, was apparently not an issue)."

Hudson and Walmsley (2005:605) expound that the growing progressive movement in education and the notion of literature specialists that "grammar could only be tolerated if it could empirically demonstrate that its teaching had a beneficial effect on pupils' language skills" culminated in the 1970s "expulsion of grammar-teaching" which "ushered in a period in which an informed understanding of language and an appropriate meta-language to discuss it in were systematically eradicated from the state school system". This period was enforced by conflicting research results reporting that grammar did not contribute to children's writing and some that grammar was too hard for children to learn. Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007) describe this tradition as the Personal Growth tradition which viewed the teaching of English as a means for children to self-express and develop. "The skills of spelling, grammar, sentence construction and reading foregrounded in the Basic Skills tradition were greatly reduced in significance. Grammar was to be taught 'at the point of need' rather than formally introduced." (Christie & Macken-Horarik, 2007:162)

2.2.2.3 A descriptive grammar

A descriptive grammar emerged as a result of many educationalists disagreeing with the expulsion of grammar and trying to re-introduce it into English language teaching, but in a contextualised manner. According to Lefstein (2009:381), the rejection of grammar teaching in schools, was not universally accepted. As literacy achievement declined, opponents of the progressive movement, called for "back to basics" in pedagogy including back to traditional grammar teaching. Citing

Cameron and Bourne (1989), Lefstein (2009:381) says: "'Traditional grammar' is a politically potent symbol, signifying a nostalgic time, when the English language, national identity and social order seemed more secure and certain than they do in the current period of gloabalisation and 'post-modern' doubt". Hence the issue of proper or standard English – and grammar teaching's influence on that – incrementally surfaced on the UK's political landscape.

Citing Hudson and Walmsley (2005), Paterson (2010:475) points out however that contrary to what was happening to grammar teaching in schools, Halliday's SFL work in the 1960s foregrounded grammar as a concern for linguists at an academic level. Paterson (2010) uses this historical split in grammar actualisation between academia and classroom practice to support her argument that in the UK, teachers lack grammatical knowledge to deliver the grammar instruction demands of the 2011 primary school curriculum due to the lack of grammar instruction in their own schooling. According to Hudson and Walmsley (2005:610), Halliday's greatest contribution to re-instating grammar as an educational concern was through his large-scale Schools Council project from 1964 to 1971 which studied literacy in primary schools and knowledge about language (KAL) in middle and secondary schools. Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007:164) agree saying: "*Functional Language Studies* has greatly increased the visibility of language in the curriculum, while it has also pointed directions for pedagogic practice". They argue that this approach puts language as the object of study while establishing the relationship between text, context and grammatical resources. Say, Hudson and Walmsley (2005:610) about Halliday's contribution:

> Perhaps the most general idea about grammar which has survived from the project is that grammar is a resource, not a limitation, and that the aim of teaching should be to expand that resource rather than to teach children to avoid errors. In short, *grammar-teaching should be informed by descriptive rather than prescriptive grammar*. This idea is now taken for granted by most UK educators. [italics mine]

The ideal of grammar as descriptive, and not prescriptive, continued in reports commissioned by the UK government into English teaching. Starting with the Bullock report in 1975, the Kingman report in 1988 and the Cox report in 1989, explicit grammar teaching was recommended, but they agreed "that the teaching should be different from the traditional grammar teaching that had died out by 1960" (Hudson & Walmsley, 2005:610). Continue the latter commentators:

> Moreover, it was to be a description of speech as well as writing, and applicable to 'language in use' i.e. sufficiently sophisticated to help children to understand how to use language like the experts – a far cry from the parsing and analysis exercises of the defunct grammar tradition.

An emphasis on instilling language awareness including pronunciation, foreign languages, social and regional variations, communication etc. also arose from grammar being defined by UK governmental reports as descriptive rather than prescriptive.

Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007) describe the descriptive approach as part of the English language teaching Cultural Studies and New Literacy Studies traditions. They (2007:165) criticise the Cultural Studies tradition for making the linguistic skills students need to succeed in English invisible, by not paying attention to the language of texts. They also criticise the New Literacy Studies tradition (2007:167) for burying the study of language itself by being "preoccupied with the immediate literacy practice, such that relatively little interest attaches to any sense of the linguistic system with which one engages in order to construct that practice".

2.2.2.4 Rhetorical grammar

The rhetorical approach to grammar instruction developed out of calls to return to the explicit teaching of language structures, but not to use irrelevant, decontextualised methods characteristic of the traditional, prescriptive grammar. Curriculum developers also wanted to make the pedagogy of descriptive grammar more visible. In 1988 the UK implemented its first national curriculum for all primary and secondary schools, and the English curriculum was based on the afore-mentioned government-commissioned reports. Hudson and Walmsley (2005) and Lefstein (2009) point out that what resulted was a type of grammar teaching which was free from prescriptivism; acknowledged heterogeneous non-standard usages of English; should be integrated in other communicative contexts and not taught separately, inculcated linguistic tolerance for understanding how power and values are communicated through language, and was seen as interesting enough to warrant its study in schools. It was not a return to rules-based, prescriptive grammar but had more in common with what Lefstein (2009: 381) defined as a rhetorical grammar although he was careful to point out that the curriculum grammar differed from rhetorical grammar in that its emphasis was on understanding language and thus society rather than improving learners' writing.

Lefstein (2009:380) defines rhetorical grammar as a grammar which:

> …treats grammatical conventions as resources to be exploited, rather than rules to be followed. So, whereas rule-based grammar divides language into two absolute categories – correct and incorrect – rhetorical grammar treats grammatical choice as, well, precisely that: a *choice* from among possibilities. These possibilities are judged as more or less effective, depending upon factors such as audience, purpose and context.

This grammar will be more defined in Chapter Three of this study.

According to Lefstein (2009:382), conservative politicians did not agree with the KAL or "new grammar" recommended in reports and actioned through the curriculum, and called for a formal

approach to grammar teaching which did not condone inaccuracy but rather corrected ungrammatical work. Shortly after a Labour government was instituted in the UK, the National Literacy Strategy (NLS) was implemented in 1999 for all primary schools which outlined frameworks, teaching strategies and a government-sponsored glossary of meta-language (which was subsequently updated by linguists). The most striking feature of the NLS, according to Hudson and Walmsley (2005:614), is the prominence it gives to the "explicit teaching about language structure", giving intense detail of what should be taught at word, sentence and text levels. The approach to teaching grammar of the NLS, according to Clark (2010) was back to a more traditional approach to grammar teaching, which was a prescriptive grammar taught decontextually.

2.2.3 The problematic of grammar instruction

Clark (2010), unlike Hudson and Barton (2002) who favourably viewed the NLS' emphasis of grammar teaching on "rapid-pace, whole-class learning with a systematic underpinning framework of grammatical and other knowledge" predominantly realised in learners' writing, is critical of how grammar teaching has been constituted in UK national curricula. She argues for a curriculum for grammar which "aims to meet the demands of the various different kinds of texts and literacy practices, both spoken and written, that make up a curriculum for English. It would provide pupils with a critical awareness of language and the means to assess particular standards and values over others…" (Clark, 2010:198). This, she says, is in contrast to the constitution of grammar by the NLS documentation which isolates grammar instruction away from the other activities of the English curriculum, and still makes use of separate, decontextualised, textbook-based exercises. Clark herself (2010:193) describes her approach to the constitution of grammar and its instruction as "holistic and developmental" and seems to draw on the New Literacies tradition of literacy. She acknowledges the difficulty of her approach, and questions how her constitution of grammar would translate into classroom practice and teaching materials effectively.

Lefstein (2009:382) disagrees with Clark in that he says the NLS promotes a rhetorical grammar and has distanced itself from traditional grammar. Referring to an extract from a primary school teacher's guide on grammar, "*Grammar for writing"*, released by the Great Britain Department of Education and Employment (DfEE, 2000), Lefstein says: "The final sentence aligns the NLS with rhetorical grammar teaching: the point of grammar study is to enable students to make choices from among a range of linguistic resources, and to be aware of the effects of the different choices on the rhetorical power of their writing". He, however, acknowledges that the enactment of the rhetorical grammar of the curriculum is problematic due to broader issues such as teacher knowledge about language and related support, other curriculum constraints of the NLS, expectations on teachers to

show evidence of pupils' learning, and the perceived concept of grammar in schools held by teachers.

Hudson and Walmsley (2005:615) concur with Lefstein (2009), saying that concerning grammar instruction in recent UK curricula: "Prescription is dead – non-standard varieties are tolerated, as are informal registers; variety is accepted, but different varieties are suited to different occasions so the focus is now on the matching of variety to context… The reality in classrooms, of course, is different." According to these researchers, some of the problems in seeing this new, rhetorical grammar realised in classrooms are: the presupposition of some of the curricula's principles that teachers have a solid knowledge base of English grammar and have the ability to address the diverse contextual examples arising in demographically diverse learning environments, both orally and in writing. Due to the "grammar-free" history of English language teaching in the UK, this is even more problematic as older teachers know how to teach a prescriptive grammar, and younger teachers did not receive grammar instruction themselves, hence leaving them suspicious of explicit instruction and lacking content knowledge.

Watson (2013) echoes the problematic of teachers' knowledge and attitudes towards grammar instruction by foregrounding teachers as implementers of the curriculum. She highlights the disparity between the espoused type of grammar in the UK curriculum and accompanying guides with the enacted type of grammar teaching happening in classrooms. She (2013: 2) concludes that "while teachers' initial conceptualisations of 'grammar teaching' tend to reflect a prescriptive and traditional model of grammar, their beliefs about how it may be of value tend to evoke a rhetorical model". Her study – using participant teachers implementing the revised Framework for English issued in 1998 by UK authorities for years 7 to 9 – found that the majority of teachers did not have a confident explicit understanding of different models of 'grammar teaching'. Says Watson (2013: 11-12):

> There is, therefore, a pressing need for more precision and consistency in professional, policy, and research documents in the use of the term 'grammar' as it relates to the teaching of English. More nuance and clarity in how the phrase 'grammar teaching' is used, along with more consistency in the model of grammar advanced in curricular documents may help teachers to develop a more secure, multi-dimensional understanding of what 'grammar teaching' can mean, and this may assuage negative feelings or resistance to the inclusion of grammar in the curriculum.

Watson's (2013) latest research supports Paterson's (2010) earlier examination of the UK 2011 Primary English curriculum and 2008 Secondary curriculum (further policy updates from the NLS). Paterson (2010:482) criticises the lack of specificity of grammar in the curricula and concludes that "the National Curriculum for English does not define what pupils are meant to learn about grammar

in any clear and comprehensive way" and "practically guarantees that no two teachers will teach grammar in the same way". She reiterates that the uncertainty regarding grammar instruction acknowledged by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) in 1998, in its large scale survey of teachers' views on grammar teaching and subsequent report, "*The grammar papers: Perspectives on the teaching of grammar in the national curriculum"*, has not been assisted by the multiple versions of the English Order. The QCA's report, according to Watson (2013: 4), had prior to the implementation of the NLS, acknowledged teachers' discomfort, lack of knowledge and speculation of the value of grammar teaching. Citing page 28 of the QCA report, Watson (2013) says the report found that: "There was a strong association of explicit grammar teaching with prescriptivism and old-fashioned teaching methods such as decontextualised 'exercises' and 'drilling', along with a general lack of confidence in defining grammar, particularly in understanding 'the relationship between implicit and explicit knowledge of language'". With this foreknowledge, researchers comment that the subsequent curricula and guides should have aided teachers in conceptualising grammar teaching. However, as Paterson (2004:482) points out, the curricula have not succeeded to do this, and "this is significant because in order for pupils to gain metalinguistic knowledge effectively, teachers must be provided with a clear framework". Cajkler's (2004:1) analyses of how grammar is described in documents for the NLS and Key Stage 3 National Strategy (for years 7 to 9) concurs with Paterson and Watson, saying that these two strategies' documents "do not consistently follow a recognised approach to grammatical description, and there are numerous 'grammatical' errors, inconsistencies and inappropriate examples. As a result, teachers using NLS and KS3 materials may be contributing to uncertainty about grammar".

Interestingly, Chick (1992:38-39) in the context of commenting on the requirements of establishing English as the language of learning and teaching in a post-apartheid South Africa, calls for the incorporation of explicit English grammar study to be incorporated in teacher training. This, according to him, will ensure teachers are able to teach a grammar which enables learners to make accurate grammatical choices for their communicative contexts and not via traditional, prescriptive grammar teaching methods.

2.2.4 Grammar instruction in other international contexts

Interest in grammar instruction has also emerged in recent years in other international English-speaking contexts. According to Watson, (2013:1-2) citing Locke (2010), the re-introduction of grammar in first language English teaching has not only taken place in the UK, but also in Australia

and the US. Similarly to the UK with the introduction of the NLS, there has been an emergence of government-led, centralised strategies to improve literacy standards in the latter countries.

Hudson and Barton (2002) acknowledge the historical trend of grammar instruction's disappearance from schooling in the seventies in other Anglophone countries, similar to that of the UK. While in "eastern and southern Europe (Russia, Bulgaria, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal) and South America…there is no pressure to abandon grammar teaching as too academic, too irrelevant or too boring". Clark (2010:192) makes special mention of Australia's embrace of Halliday's SFL as a pedagogical grammar and refers to this as having "much to offer an integrated curriculum for English". However, a lack of teacher training in SFL is named as a challenge to effective implementation in the UK.

The reviewed literature in this section has suggested, that there have been and still are, various approaches to teaching grammar and different types of grammar that are taught. Four different approaches to grammar instruction have been highlighted: a traditional, prescriptive grammar; an absent grammar; a descriptive grammar, and a rhetorical grammar which arguably has characteristics of the other approaches. I will define these terms for the purposes of this study in Chapter Three, and will use these definitions to describe how grammar has been constituted in the three SA curricula.

2.3 English language instruction, early literacy instruction and language acquisition theories

Additionally to grammar instruction theories underpinning each of the three SA curriculum reform moments, there have been theories regarding early literacy instruction which have contributed to the pedagogies suggested, and the organisation of grammatical knowledge in the curricula. I seek to explore what theories of early literacy instruction are suggested through English HL IP curriculum documentation and their influence on the constitution of grammar instruction. In this section then, I review studies from international contexts which define and discuss three early literacy theories dominating the conceptualisation of literacy best practice in education, and hence the approaches to teaching reading, writing and grammatical knowledge.

2.3.1 Early literacy instruction – a skills/phonics-based approach

Simultaneous to the traditions of English language instruction that emerged, overlapped and evolved (suggested by Christie & Macken-Horarik (2007)), are the theoretical approaches to early childhood literacy and more specifically reading instruction approaches. These too would have an influential impact on the way in which grammar instruction could be constituted in a curriculum. Pearson (2004) outlines the emergence and practice of three main approaches to early literacy instruction

which were at the centre of intense American political debate: a skills/phonics-based, traditional approach; a Whole Language Approach (WLA) and a Balanced Language Approach (BLA). The first approach has its roots in Christie & Macken-Horarik's (2007) Basic Skills tradition. Dating back to the early part of the 20th century, this reading approach taught reading from basal readers – books designed to teach reading – which developed learners' decoding skills and phonemic awareness. Rote-learning of sight words, drills and whole class teaching were characteristic of this approach. According to Jannuzi (1997), the phonics approach to early literacy is "a way of teaching reading and spelling that stresses symbol-sound relationships, used especially in beginning instruction (Harris & Hodges, 1995, p. 186)". What is evident in this approach is that the view of language informing it, sees language as a set of symbols or structures which can be separated and analysed in order to understand or acquire its meaning i.e. a structuralist theoretical understanding.

More recently in the US, according to Pearson (2004), the skills/phonics-based approach has become known as the approach based on scientifically-based reading research (SBRR). This term is indicative of the findings of the US's National Reading Panel (NRP) in 2000 (in response to the highly politicised debates around early literacy instruction). The NRP used results from scientific, replicable (more inclined to quantitative methods) research methodology as opposed to more qualitative, ethnographic research methodology employed by proponents of the WLA to substantiate its support of the phonics approach. The NRP, according to Moats (2007:7), named five essential elements of a SBBR programme which would ensure a child's reading success namely: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Moats (2007:11), a strong advocate of the SBBR/phonics approach to reading instruction, argues that a phonics approach is based on "thirty-plus years of scientifically based reading research (SBBR)" and that "in order to read, students have to master a progression of skills, beginning with awareness of speech sounds and letters and continuing through comprehension."

The skills/phonics-based approach therefore regards the separate and explicit instruction of components of literacy to be valuable. According to Moats (2007:18), elements of a SBBR approach are for example: structured verbal and written practice of new vocabulary led by the teacher; structures of narrative and expository texts taught directly and comprehension strategies modelled and taught overtly; and grammar, handwriting, spelling and punctuation taught systematically and within structured writing opportunities. Explicit allocation of teaching time and a systematic approach to grammar instruction are therefore characteristic of a skills/phonics-based approach.

2.3.2 Early literacy instruction - Whole Language Approach (WLA)

According to Pearson (2004:221), the WLA to literacy instruction accepts "the premise that skills are better caught in the act of reading and writing genuine texts for authentic purposes than taught directly and explicitly by teachers… These entities may be worthy of learning, but are unworthy of teaching". Moats (2007:11) adds: "Whole language proponents… argued that children learned to read naturally, largely through 'literacy experiences' and exposure to books. They rejected structured, explicit, published reading programs, preferring what they termed 'real literature', whether students actually could read what was on the pages or not." Pearson (2004:218) suggests that the WLA gained momentum in the 1980s with the influence of socio-linguistics, critical literacy and constructivist pedagogy, and challenged the use of basals and vocabulary control. By the early 1990s, "phonics, along with other skills, was backgrounded and literature moved to center stage." A WLA to reading foregrounded the context and human interaction of literacy learning. "There were four casualties" caused by the WLA according to Pearson (2004: 221): "skills instruction, strategy instruction, an emphasis on text structure, and reading in the content areas." Critics also questioned the non-inclusion of "instructional" texts written specifically to practise skills outlined in the curriculum while 'authentic' texts were promoted. Moats (2007:12) specifically points out that the WLA disadvantages children who perform poorly in literacy assessments. She says: "no studies show that whole-language programs are as successful as SBBR programs in teaching children in the at-risk groups to read".

Kenneth Goodman, a main proponent of the WLA in the eighties, emphasised the meaning-making aspect of reading, saying that: "It is this search for meaning which preoccupies the reader and unifies the uses of the strategies and cycles that the process requires. Meaning is both input and output in this process. That is why aspects of the process and how it works cannot be isolated from the construction of meaning that is the ultimate goal" (Goodman, 1984:111-112). This latter objection to the separation of aspects of the reading process is why the WLA rejects the separate instruction of phonics and language skills. Jannuzi (1997) says, citing Harris and Hodges (1995:280): "Because whole language teachers believe that all language systems are interwoven, they avoid the segmentation of language into component parts for specific skill instruction".

According to Moats (2007:18), approaches to early literacy instruction which are Whole Language derivatives show elements such as: non-directive discussion and reading aloud by the teacher (new vocabulary important to the meaning of the text is pre-taught, explained during reading and practised after reading); teachers are instructed to use choral, shared and guided reading to practise

comprehension strategies and teacher modelling (thinking aloud) is the primary instructional strategy; and there is a writer's workshop approach to writing emphasising the process and self-expression of writing rather than the mastery of componential skills such as grammar, handwriting, spelling and punctuation. There is a rejection of systematic decoding, spelling and grammar instruction according to Moats (2007:20): "Teachers may, or may not, correct poor grammar, sentence structure, or word choice. There is no planned development of component language skills within a composition program". A lack of or no allocation of teaching time and an integrated approach to grammar instruction are therefore characteristic of a WLA.

2.3.3 Early literacy instruction - Balanced Language Approach (BLA)

By 2003 in the US, there had been a clear rejection of the WLA. A return to an approach more reflective of a skills/phonics-based reading instructional approach was evident – largely due to questions surrounding the credibility of qualitative research on which the WLA had been based. The educational debate became a highly politicised one with a skills/phonics-based approach being propagated by the traditional right-wing, claiming scientific research as the basis for its approach, and a WLA being representative of the liberal left-wing. A Balanced Language approach (BLA) therefore arose in 1999/2000 with research done by various educationalists, most notably Marilyn Adams and Connie Juel. It was also endorsed by reports released by the US National Reading Panel (NRP). They concluded that children could and should learn through a combination of explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, letter-sound correspondence, inventive and conventional spelling in writing and opportunity to read connect texts (Pearson, 2004:226).

Pearson, himself, (2004:244-245) argues for the BLA to reading instruction based on his acceptance of many types of research on which the skills/phonics-based and WLAs are based, and that exceptional teachers have shown to naturally use a "balanced repertoire of instructional strategies". According to Pearson (2004:244), a BLA to literacy instruction has more in common philosophically with a WLA than with the skills/phonics-based approach. This is because the role of the teacher is both facilitator and instructor and adopts a constructivist view of the reading process. Learners, as in the WLA, are seen as active meaning makers as they learn to read while the teacher uses explicit instruction to help them acquire the skills to reach the next step in the learning-to-read process. "A balanced approach will privilege authentic texts and tasks, a heavy emphasis on writing, literature, response, and comprehension, but it will also call for an ambitious program of explicit instruction for phonics, word identification comprehension, spelling and writing," says Pearson (2004:243).

While the BLA has been widely accepted and implemented, Moats (2007:8) warns that many reading programmes and curricula using the term "balanced literacy" continue to teach using a WLA. This

hints at terms and approaches being conflated by various users. She (2007: 13) cites an example of a US-based school which adopted a BLA to reading instruction but did not teach phonological skills, phonics, or reading fluency. “Proponents of guided reading and balanced literacy sometimes talk the talk of SBBR, but they do not walk the walk. At other times they voice overt hostility to SBBR programs, as when they criticize ‘scripted programs’, ‘skill and drill’, ‘one size fits all’, ‘mechanistic methods’, and other straw men they lump together in opposition to SBBR,” argues Moats (2007:19). Institutions, curricula and other spokespeople promoting the BLA often engender the following obscurities surrounding literacy instruction, explains Moats (2007: 19 – 21): Using teacher modelling such as reading aloud and requiring learners to repeat words instead of direct instruction of language structure; teaching learners to use contextual guessing, picture clues and patterns to recognise words instead of direct and systematic teaching of the alphabetic code; rejecting the teaching of decoding, spelling and grammar instruction in a systematic way in favour of word walls and teaching one sound per alphabetic letter; teaching phonemic awareness such as rhyming and alliteration instead of phonics which focuses on individual speech sounds and how they are represented in writing; using process writing where the teacher models and motivates writing and corrects language structure such as grammar and spelling only in the editing phase rather than explicit instruction of writing skills; an over-reliance on levelled books which increase in difficulty with each level but do not teach phonics patterns and words in a systematic order; and a lack of overt teaching of comprehension strategies due to not wanting to spoil learners’ enjoyment of the reading experience – reading aloud and undirected classroom discussions are activities characteristic of a balanced approach to fostering comprehension. Therefore while a BLA in theory promotes, as Pearson notes (2004:243), the explicit instruction of grammar and other components of language structure, in practice many BLAs use the methodologies of a WLA which lacks systematic and explicit instruction of the former.

The literature in this section has shown that there are three predominant approaches to early literacy instruction: a skills/phonics-based approach; a Whole Language approach (WLA) and a Balanced Language approach (BLA). Each approach views the value and hence teaching of grammar differently. Where a skills/phonics-based approach is used to inform literacy development, grammar is taught, separately, explicitly and systematically. In a WLA, grammar is taught from engagement with authentic texts in an integrated manner with other language skills. And where a BLA is used, an equal emphasis is placed on writing and comprehension and separate skills instruction which would include grammar instruction. However, the literature suggests that there has been confusion surrounding the term “BLA” and many labelled BLA programmes actually adopt a WLA which rejects

the explicit instruction of grammar. In Chapter Three I will define how I use these terms in order to identify the early literacy instruction theories underpinning the three curricula studied.

2.4 Language Acquisition theory - Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Parallel and mirroring the early literacy instruction approaches, are theories relating to the acquisition of language. In this section of the literature review, I give a highly simplified account of theoretical approaches to language acquisition. This is because I am more interested in showing how first language and second language acquisition theory has informed language teaching methodologies which are recommended for teachers to use in the curricula studied. These methodologies also construct a way in which grammar is incorporated and taught. By looking at acquisition theory, a better understanding is realised of the way in which language, and hence grammar instruction, may be constituted.

First language acquisition and the development of one's first language throughout childhood has been the study of linguists for centuries. The three main theoretical positions of the last fifty years regarding this development have been, according to Lightbrown & Spada (2006:10), the behaviourist, innatist and interactional/developmental perspectives. Briefly described, the behaviorist perspective views imitation and practice as the most important processes in language development with children attempting to reproduce what they hear. Innatists (Noam Chomsky being the most influential in this field) view language as a biologically programmed function that all children are born with and that the environment makes a contribution to its development. The term Universal Grammar (UG) was coined to describe this innate common ability of children to acquire the principles of any language. Lastly, the developmental perspective, born somewhat out of cognitive and developmental psychology, emphasises the role of social interaction in language development. Developmentalists recognise the roles of both the innate, cognitive abilities of children and the interactions with language to which they are exposed in language development. Child development theorists, Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky, lent towards this way of thinking about language development. "Piaget saw language as a symbol system that could be used to express knowledge acquired through interaction with the physical world. For Vygotsky, thought was essentially internalized speech, and speech emerged in social interaction" (Lightbrown & Spada, 2006: 20).

These three positions on language development have given rise to various perspectives on optimal ways in which to teach a language especially to those whom have yet to acquire the target language i.e. second language acquisition (SLA) applications. Many methods for second language or foreign language pedagogy have been conceptualised from these theoretical outlooks and disciplines e.g.

the Reading approach, Total Physical Response approach, Functional Notional approach etc. (Kerper Mora, 2013). Certain approaches gained more momentum and development than others such as the Audiolingual method from the behaviourist perspective which saw mimicry and memorisation as key learning processes and the Grammar-translation method. The Grammar-translation method relied on the concept that if one's target language was similar to one's first language, acquisition would be easier than if one's first language was very different to the target language. Rules and translation of grammar were at the heart of this method. Methods flowing from an innatist perspective were the Direct method which foregrounded immersion in the target language, and Stephen Krashen's Natural method which propagated Krashen's belief that a language is acquired, not learnt, and that "acquisition occurs…when the learner is exposed to the right input in a stress-free environment so that innate learning capacities are triggered" (Thornbury, 1999:19). According to Lightbrown and Spada (2006:38), Krashen's ideas were influential on second language teaching at a time when the emphasis of methods moved from "learning rules or memorizing dialogues" to "using language with a focus on meaning". According to Thornbury (1999:19) central to Krashen's Natural method which gained popularity in the seventies, was the rejection of the formal study of grammar.

Building on the latter model, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), became a predominantly popular approach to SLA from the seventies onwards. Dovetailing with the acceptance of the WLA approach in the eighties, the approach avoided the compartmentalisation of language teaching and highlighted the development of the overall communicative competence of learners. According to Savignon (2002:1):

> The central theoretical concept in communicative language teaching is ''communicative competence,'' a term introduced into discussions of language use and second or foreign language learning in the early 1970s (Habermas 1970; Hymes 1971; Jakobovits 1970; Savignon 1971). Competence is defined in terms of the *expression, interpretation,* and *negotiation* of meaning and looks to both psycholinguistic and sociocultural perspectives in second language acquisition (SLA) research to account for its development (Savignon 1972, 1997). Identification of learners' communicative needs provides a basis for curriculum design (Van Ek 1975).

A continuum of the implementation of CLT emerged, says Thornbury (1999:18 & 22). At one end the view was "you learn a language to use it" (also labelled as shallow-end CLT) and on the other, "you use a language in order to learn it" (deep-end CLT). Proponents of deep-end CLT argue that by engaging in real-life communicative practice, the grammar of a language will be acquired virtually unconsciously and therefore studying the rules of grammar is "simply a waste of time". However CLT users of shallow-end CLT did not reject grammar teaching and did not think the explicit teaching of grammar rules was "incompatible with communicative practice". Grammar teaching was therefore

presented in CLT courses through functional settings e.g. asking directions and introducing oneself. Overall though, Savignon (2002: 6-7) suggests CLT was perceived to view grammar as unimportant but really the methodology embraces building grammatical competence within communicative competence rather than grammatical drilling. He (2002:4) adds that "central to CLT is the understanding of language learning as both an educational and a political issue. Language teaching is inextricably linked with language policy. Viewed from a multicultural intranational as well as international perspective, diverse socio-political contexts mandate not only a diverse set of language-learning goals but a diverse set of teaching strategies." It is not surprising then with this insight that CLT was encouraged as the predominant approach to language learning in South African language curricula and teacher guides post-1994. Shallow-end CLT, as described by Thornbury (1999), has a common philosophy with the early literacy instruction theory of the BLA, in that they both in theory put equal emphasis on the authentic context and meaning-making of language learning and the explicit instruction of language structures. However, it should be noted that CLT has its roots in a SLA theoretical basis where communicative competence is the end goal, while a BLA's end goal is a literate learner. Commenting on CLT, Lightbrown and Spada (2006:38), note the following: "Classroom research has confirmed that students can make a great deal of progress through exposure to comprehensible input without direct instruction. Studies have also shown, however, that students may reach a point from which they fail to make further progress on some features of the second language unless they also have access to guided instruction."

Using the literature reviewed in this section, I have outlined briefly how language acquisition theory has given rise to many different language pedagogies. Innatist theory, popular in the seventies, spurred on the development of second language teaching methodologies which emphasised learners' inherent abilities to acquire a language, and therefore focused on meaning-making as opposed to skills instruction. The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method was born from this thinking and this methodology's end-goal was communicative competence. Grammar instruction was therefore minimised in this pedagogy. While within CLT the degree to which grammar instruction is prioritised varies; the literature suggests that CLT concerns itself with the socio-political impact of communicative competence rather than the development of grammatical knowledge. The degree to which CLT is recommended at curriculum level therefore may impact how grammar is constituted in the three curricula examined.

2.5 Summary of Literature Review

What the reviewed literature has shown is that the constitution of grammar in curricula has been problematic in many contexts – especially in the UK – due to different perspectives on what grammar is, the value and purpose of teaching it, and differing views on its pedagogy. The pedagogy of English language, and hence grammar, have at different times been conceptualised at different degrees of visibility within curricula – resulting in different types of grammar being taught namely a prescriptive, absent, descriptive or rhetorical grammar. These influences and types of grammar will therefore be evident in the South African curricula being analysed in this study. Added to these trends in language teaching methodologies, the influence of language acquisition and early literacy development theories have also influenced the explication of grammar. The skills/phonics-based, Whole Language (WLA) and Balanced language (BLA) approaches have wielded much influence over the way in which literacy and language teaching have been delivered to learners, so much so that they have become symbolic of political agendas in the US. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), a language teaching methodology drawing on second language acquisition theory, has also exerted its influence on English language curricula. All these influences contribute to the way in which grammar is constituted, and I will use these influences outlined by the literature to answer my research sub-questions as stated in Chapter One.

Chapter Three: Theoretical framework and methodology for analysis

In this chapter, I give a detailed explanation of the theoretical frameworks used to inform my research methodology which aims to answer my three research sub-questions namely:

- How has grammatical knowledge been structured and organised in the three English HL IP curricula?
- What theories and trends of grammar instruction have underpinned these curricula? and
- What early literacy instruction theories have underpinned and influenced each English HL IP curriculum change?

Firstly, I explain the use of Bernstein's concepts of classification and framing to describe how grammatical knowledge is organised in the three curricula. Secondly I clarify the types of grammar discussed in Chapter Two in order to show how I use the terminology to describe the grammars prevalent in the three curricula. Thirdly, I very briefly revise the early literacy instruction theory terminology to show how I define it in this study. In this chapter, I also include a description of how I use this theoretical framework to analyse the data collected.

3.1 Bernstein's concepts of classification and framing

The focus of this section is to explain the terminology used by Bernstein to describe educational concepts such as classification and framing which I have used to analyse the data collected from the three curricula in this study. It is noted that other studies have used Bernstein's concepts of classification and framing to analyse textbooks, students' written work and pedagogic modalities. However, the focus of this study is the use of Bernstein's *intra-disciplinary classification and framing of knowledge within English HL curriculum documents*. Studies that were located such as Hoadley & Ensor (2009), Morais, Neves & Pires (2004) and Wilmot (2008) concentrate on using classification and framing to analyse pedagogic practice rather than curricula. Koustourakis & Zacharos (2011) use indicators of framing to analyse Mathematics textbooks for students and teachers, and students' exercise books produced during two different curricula in Greek elementary education. Parker (2006) briefly uses the concept of intra-disciplinary classification to investigate integration in the SA NCS Mathematics FET curriculum, but does not operationalise the concepts of classification and framing to analyse the curricula as in this study.

Bertram's (2006) analysis of two SA FET History curricula using classification is most similar to this study. Her study operationalises classification in order to examine the integration of historical knowledge with other subjects (inter-disciplinary classification), between historical topics (intra-disciplinary classification), and specialised historical knowledge and everyday knowledge (inter-discursive classification). She also used Bloom's revised taxonomy to analyse the forms of knowledge and cognitive demands evident in the curricula's learning outcomes or stipulated assessment tasks.

Framing was not operationalised and was used in a generic manner. “It was not used in a fine-grained way to analyse selection sequencing, pacing and evaluation in discrete ways” (Bertram, 2006:38). She found that in the NCS FET History curriculum document inter- and intra-disciplinary classification were stronger than in the Interim Core Syllabus for History Standards 8 to 10 (ICS) and there was a theory of pedagogy more focussed on the learner than teacher. The NCS also demanded high level knowledge and cognitive processes. Bertram (2006:48) suggests that History teachers will have to adapt their pedagogies to meet the requirements of the NCS curriculum document, and further exploration is needed into the effect of the structure of historical knowledge on the learning of history.

3.1.1 Explanation of Bernstein’s terminology

Bernstein (1975:77) describes educational knowledge as being realised through three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. He defines the first system as “what counts as valid knowledge”, the second system, pedagogy, as “what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge”; and the latter as what counts as a valid realisation by the taught of this knowledge. Bernstein’s distinctive contribution to understanding and describing school knowledge was, according to Young (2007:7), “to emphasise the key role of knowledge boundaries, both as a condition for the acquisition of knowledge and as embodying the power relations that are necessarily involved in pedagogy”.

Bernstein asserts that one can analyse educational knowledge in order to see how it is experienced by participants, by using the criteria of classification and framing and the relationship between these two variables. His definitions of classification and framing were designed to describe the knowledge and pedagogy of education transmission (Hoadley & Ensor, 2009:2). He (1975:80) defines classification as: “the degree of boundary maintenance between contents” and framing as: “the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship”. In simpler terms, classification refers to how subjects or learning areas are kept or presented separately within a curriculum; while framing refers to the freedom of choice a teacher or pupil has in deciding what may be taught or learnt.

However, the above basic definitions are limited because Bernstein (1996:6) says classification is used to “examine relations between categories, whether these categories are between agencies, between agents, between discourses, between practices.” Therefore, classification can refer to the degree to which school subjects are insulated from each other within a curriculum, and how

knowledge/discourses/ genres/skills within subjects can be presented separately or in an integrated manner. Framing then refers to the locus of control either held by the teacher or pupil in determining the sequencing, selection, pacing and evaluative criteria in the transmission of that. Therefore within a particular subject curriculum such as English, there can be degrees of classification of genres, discourses and skills which construct the knowledge to be acquired and will inform how the knowledge is demarcated. The stronger the classification, the more specialised and separately functioning the entities within the curriculum are.

Framing refers more to how meanings are constructed and made known within social relationships between the teacher and the taught and who decides these aspects within the pedagogy. According to Bernstein (1996:13), framing is made up of two sets of rules regulating two types of discourse: the instructional discourse which refers to the control of the selection, sequence, pacing and evaluative criteria of the knowledge taught: and the regulative discourse which refers to the hierarchical relations in the pedagogy and expectations surrounding conduct, character and manner. The curriculum can, to a degree, direct the instructional discourse of educational knowledge through its particular type of code defined by its strength of framing of content selection, sequencing, pacing and evaluation.

Bernstein's codes of curriculum are described as the integrated and collection codes. He (1975:82) explains that an organisation of educational knowledge which uses strong classification results in a collection code, while a reduction in strength of classification is an integrated code. Bernstein (1975:89) suggests that the key concept to the collection code is discipline – ensuring learners learn how to work within a received frame, moving from their everyday knowledge to more scientific knowledge i.e. strong framing where the teacher holds the balance of power within the instructional discourse. Conversely, an integrated code would be characteristic of weak classification and framing. Bernstein (1975) continues to explain the shift in the European education curriculum – especially in Britain – at the time from a collection code to a more integrated code. The two codes exist in an educational binary – each espousing different benefits, challenges and ideologies. This change can also be used to describe South African curriculum reform. In this study however, I use classification and framing to analyse and hence describe how the 'what' and 'how' of grammar has been constituted and the degree to which it has been explicated within three, different SA English HL IP curricula.

3.1.2 Application of terminology

Both classification and framing can be expressed as being strong or weak. With regard to classification I am interested in intra-disciplinary classification – the degree of separation or integration of topics (in particular grammar) *within* subject English. Where classification is viewed as strong, this means boundaries between grammatical knowledge and other language knowledge within an English curriculum are clear and defined. Grammar is expressed as a specialised and separate entity with specific terminology to be taught and within a demarcated time allocation. Where classification is weak, there is integration of grammatical knowledge with other language knowledge, and boundaries between grammatical knowledge and the rest of the subject English are absent or blurred. Grammar is not expressed as a separate entity and terminology and time allocations are not prescribed. In this study, whether grammar is stipulated to be assessed separately, or in relation to other learning outcomes of the English syllabi, is also considered in assessing the degree of classification.

Framing, as stated earlier, usually is observed within social relationships between the teacher and the taught and who decides the selection, sequencing, pacing and evaluative criteria of the pedagogic practice. In this study, framing is used to analyse the instructional discourse of the pedagogy envisioned by the curriculum through its structure and constitution. It is therefore used to describe the type of pedagogy recommended for teachers to teach grammar in their classrooms. Where framing is considered to be strong, this implies that there is a limited degree of options for teachers to select, sequence, pace and set evaluative criteria in their classrooms for the teaching of grammatical knowledge as stipulations in the curriculum are strict and explicit. Conversely, where framing is considered to be weak, teachers are presented with degrees of control in determining the selection, sequencing, pacing and setting of evaluative criteria for the transmission of grammatical knowledge as requirements are not stated overtly in the curriculum documents.

Selection refers to the choosing of what knowledge should be communicated to learners. Included in this description of selection are the decisions surrounding the degree of difficulty of content to be taught to different learners. The degree of difficulty of content indicates the clarity of progression evident in the curriculum for teachers to ascertain the expectations required of learners in concurrent grades. However, progression is also influenced by the degree to which sequencing is framed. In this study, where the framing of selection is considered to be strong, the curriculum has specified and named grammatical terminology which is to be taught for each grade of learners. There is a clear distinction between what grammatical knowledge should be acquired by the different grades of learners suggesting an increase in difficulty in knowledge as the grades increase.

It has also specified text types through which to teach the terminology and has included guidelines on how to select materials for grammar or language lessons. The teacher therefore has little control over what is selected for transmission. The framing of selection is considered to be weak where the curriculum has not identified specific terminology relating to grammar to be taught per grade. There are also no distinct differences or demarcations of grammatical knowledge differentiating the grades of learners, and the teacher is left to decide the degree of difficulty of grammatical knowledge needing to be acquired. Teachers are given the ability to choose what specific grammatical knowledge they will teach, as well as the text types and other means through which grammar will be taught.

If progression in the degree of difficulty of the knowledge to be acquired by different grade/ages of learners is expected to be shown in a curriculum, it then follows that information will be organised into a particular order which teachers are required to follow. Sequencing then refers to the rules which govern the order of progression. Where framing of sequencing is considered to be strong in this study, it means the curriculum stipulates an explicit order and moment in time (e.g. 2nd week of third term) in which grammatical terminology should be introduced and taught to learners. Framing of sequencing is said to be weak when the curriculum does not specify any order or time periods in which grammatical knowledge should be taught, and the teacher is left to determine this.

Pacing is described by Bernstein (1990:66) as "the rate of expected acquisition of the sequencing rules, that is how much you have to learn in a given amount of time. Essentially, pacing is the time allowed for achieving the sequencing rules". Framing of pacing, in this study, therefore refers to the degree to which the curriculum controls the rate at which learners acquire grammatical knowledge by the teaching time allowed or specified for grammar. Strong framing of pacing then refers to the decrease in allowance of teachers to determine the length of time spent teaching grammar as timeframes are given to which teachers are expected to adhere. Weak framing of pacing refers to the increase in allowance of teachers to determine the rate of learners' acquisition of grammatical knowledge as time allocations are not clearly stipulated for the teaching of grammar and are left to be determined at the discretion of the teacher.

Evaluative criteria in this study's context do not refer necessarily to criteria set for learners' summative assessment – albeit that may be part of the concept. Evaluative criteria, as defined by Morais (2002:560), are "rules that regulate the extent to which legitimate text is made explicit to acquirers" within the instructional discourse. Strong framing of these criteria would mean that these

rules are made known unambiguously to learners so that they acquire the recognition and realisation rules of the classroom context. In other words, learners come to know what constitutes an appropriate or unsuitable school/classroom piece of writing, oral communication or assessment task. Learners therefore know what they are expected to produce in order to achieve academic success – in this instance, to achieve success in demonstrating their grammatical knowledge. Where framing of evaluative criteria is strong in this study, grammatical knowledge is described in the curriculum in specific terms and is organised into a specific structure or into categories for acquisition. Grammar is communicated as a meta-language which has to be learnt by pupils. Terminology is therefore defined and made explicit through glossaries, tables and examples. Guidelines and stipulations are given for formative or summative assessment of grammar. Where framing of evaluative criteria is weak, grammatical knowledge is integrated into the other language aspects of English to be taught and there is no categorical order or structure explicitly indicated for its acquisition. Grammatical terminology is not defined through any means and there are few or no stipulations regarding what aspects of grammar are expected to be acquired by learners. There are also no guidelines or there is ambiguous information regarding how grammar is to be assessed for formative or summative assessment purposes.

The application of these concepts of classification and framing to the data collected from the three South African English HL IP curricula will be further clarified in Chapter Four of this study. Part of Chapter Four's data analysis also draws on the grammar instruction and early literacy instruction theories introduced in Chapter Two. Additional clarification of the terms used to describe the types of grammar identified in the data of this study is presented below.

3.2 Further theory to define types of grammar

In order to describe the types of grammar constituted in the curricula examined in this study, I have relied on the work of other commentators in the field of grammar instruction to define three types of grammar namely: prescriptive, descriptive and rhetorical grammars. The types of grammar are differentiated by their reasons for teaching grammar, their methods of instruction and in some instances, their content. The terms "prescriptive", "descriptive" and "rhetorical" are used differently by various researchers. Therefore the definitions below are derived from a critical appraisal of the literature reviewed in Chapter Two.

3.2.1 Prescriptive grammar

I define prescriptive grammar as a grammar which aims to teach the application of rules with regards to the use of language structures and conventions mostly through the practice of decontextualised exercises in order to preserve a standard English.

Lefstein (2009:379) refers to prescriptive grammar as "rules-based" grammar. According to him, prescriptive grammar holds the ideal of being able to express oneself clearly and correctly. He sees this as the reason for learning grammatical rules. This often means rules are transmitted from teacher to learners through whole class recitation and individual practice through written grammar exercises which focus on parts of speech and related "common mistakes". Lefstein (2009:379) illustrates his points by quoting an extract on page four of Kenneth Agar's 1980 book, "*Everyday Grammar*", which captures the essence of prescriptive grammar:

> Most of the things that you learn to do need rules. When you play a game, you follow rules. You are allowed to do some things and you are not allowed to do other things. This gives order to the game and helps to make it more enjoyable. If everyone did as they liked, the game could not be played properly. When you speak or write English, you also have to follow rules. You already know many of the rules from learning to talk and from listening to other people. You also learn the rules from reading books. The rules of English are called grammar.

According to Hudson and Walmsely (2005:614), under the auspices of prescriptive grammar, non-standard usages of English are considered to be "common mistakes" rather than variations. Thornbury (1999:11) describes prescriptive grammar as what traditionally grammar instruction was thought of, and teaches what a person *should* say or write.

3.2.2 Descriptive grammar

I define descriptive grammar as a grammar which aims to teach an awareness of language structures and conventions through the study of generalisations of what language users actually say or write so that learners can develop their communicative competence.

According to Hudson and Walmsley (2005:610), descriptive grammar views grammar as "a resource, not a limitation, and that the aim of teaching should be to expand that resource rather than to teach children to avoid errors." Descriptive grammar emphasises its relevance to language in use and within texts. It also, according to the afore-mentioned researchers, is required to describe speech and writing and aims to help learners *use* the language. There is therefore an underlying value of communicative competence within descriptive grammar.

The appreciation of accuracy is not absent in descriptive grammar, but it is backgrounded against the user or context of the spoken or written word rather than meeting a language ideal as in prescriptive grammar. Keen (1997: 437) explains that a descriptive grammar would "prescribe as well as describe, but only in the limited sense that it would tell us which utterances count as grammatical or well-formed in Sophie's [*a two year old research participant*] language system" [italicised insertion mine]. Thornbury (1999:11) describes descriptive grammar as a concern mainly with second

language and foreign language pedagogy and teaches what a person actually *does* rather than what they *should* say or write.

3.2.3 Rhetorical grammar

I define rhetorical grammar as a grammar which aims to teach the effective use of language structures and conventions as choices in relation to the communicative contexts in which they are found through the exploration of different types of texts.

Rhetorical grammar is how Lefstein (2009) describes the types of grammar being promoted through the UK's NLS and successive curricula. As mentioned previously in Chapter Two, Lefstein (2009:380) defines rhetorical grammar as a grammar which considers language structures and conventions as options to be used in various contexts, for different purposes and aimed at different audiences. It aims to equip learners with the ability to make the most effective choices based on the requirements of their usage. Similar to descriptive grammar, in that rhetorical grammar does not teach what learners should do as prescriptive grammar does, it differs to descriptive grammar in that it not only aims to develop a generalised communicative competence, but also the ability of learners to realise and choose the most effective tools for their communicative contexts. This includes formal English where '*should-rules*' regarding specific language conventions may perhaps be the most effective choice. Rhetorical grammar also makes more use of written texts than descriptive grammar, which coming from a SLA theoretical base highlights the grammar of speech. Says Lefstein (2009:380) about rhetorical grammar:

> Rather than being treated as the one correct form, it is taught alongside other language varieties and registers, and in the context of examination of the relationships between communicative situation, language choices and rhetorical effects. Pedagogically, rhetorical grammar teaching involves inductive explorations of texts, discussion of rhetorical and grammatical choices, and pupil application of grammatical knowledge in written communication tasks.

Lefstein (2009:380) summarises the differences between prescriptive grammar (as he called rules-based grammar) and rhetorical grammar in the following table:

Table 3a: Rule-based grammar versus rhetorical grammar [Lefstein (2009:380)]

	Rules-based/prescriptive grammar	**Rhetorical grammar**
Grammatical conventions are…	Rules to be obeyed	Resources to be exploited
Grammatical problems appear in the context of…	Decontextualised grammar exercises	Meaningful communication
Grammar problems tend to…	Have one correct answer	Have multiple possible answers
Solving grammar problems involves…	Knowing the rule	Exercising judgement
Learning grammar involves…	Practice in applying the rules	Awareness, reflection and deliberation

Tacit grammatical knowledge is…	A source of mistakes	A reliable source of knowledge
Standard grammar is…	The structure of proper English	One variety of English, particularly important in formal and academic communication

These three types of grammar do not necessarily depict the historical and chronological trajectory of grammar instruction, however they are indicative of shifting perspectives in language teaching. Dean (2011), in her article reflecting on her twenty five years of English language teaching, echoes these shifts in approaches to grammar instruction or types of grammar. While she does not use the terms used in this study – prescriptive, descriptive and rhetorical – her observations describe these same sentiments. She (2011:20) notes: "when I first started teaching, my district required traditional grammar instruction: parts of speech, diagramming etc. I was comfortable with that perspective because that was the idea of grammar I had been taught: grammar as terminology unrelated to writing; grammar as right and wrong" (reflective of a prescriptive grammar). She continues to note that due to policy change she was then required to teacher grammar in context (reflective of a descriptive grammar). She used imitation exercises allowing students to mirror grammatical patterns from more experienced writers in their own work. "Although I sometimes referred to the grammatical terms of the constructions we were imitating, that wasn't the point of it…We were just playing with language, without naming parts, so that students could have more options as writers…The point of grammar at this time – and in my mind – was to improve writing. Knowing terminology didn't necessarily help writers write better" (Dean, 2011:21). Finally, Dean (2011:22-23) speaks of her present perspective to grammar instruction (reflective of a rhetorical model) which requires one to use lots of texts to teach language from a genre approach to help students use their language skills for specific tasks and rhetorical situations. "We are learning that what we mean by grammar is bigger than identifying parts of speech or even using standard usage expectations…So our language work involves learning the range of options available for different situations – and that requires us to shift perspectives again, repeatedly."

Part of Chapter Four's data analysis also draws on the early literacy instruction theories introduced in Chapter Two. Additional clarification of the terms, used to describe the types of early literacy instruction theories identified in the data of this study, is presented in the following section.

3.3 Early Literacy instruction theory clarification

In order to describe the early literacy instruction theories underpinning the curricula examined in this study, I have relied on the work of other commentators in the field of literacy development to

define three approaches to early literacy instruction: the skills/phonics-based approach, the Whole Language Approach (WLA) and the Balanced Language approach (BLA). These approaches are differentiated by their views on what literacy is, their perspectives on childhood development and how children learn and their recommended pedagogical methods to teach reading and writing. The definitions I very briefly outline below are derived from a critical appraisal of the literature reviewed in Chapter Two, and are how they are applied to the analysis of data in this study.

I define a skills/phonics-based approach to early literacy instruction as an approach which teaches separate components of language and strategies for reading and writing in a systematic and overt manner using mostly teacher-driven learning activities and structured texts.

I define a Whole Language approach as an approach which engages learners in the processes of reading and writing in order for them to construct meaning from authentic texts in order to naturally acquire the skills and strategies needed to become literate. Skills and strategies are integrated into learner-driven learning activities and are not taught explicitly.

I define a Balanced Language approach as an approach which teaches components of language and strategies for reading and writing in an explicit manner *and* allows for learners to engage in reading and writing processes using authentic texts. Both teacher and learner drive the learning process.

While I will use these three approaches to describe the early literacy instruction theories informing the design of the three curricula in this study, the way in which knowledge is structured may reveal a different, actual approach which the curriculum has inscribed. Curriculum reform and hence the organisation of knowledge in a curriculum (to be analysed using Bernstein's classification and framing variables), also influence how grammar is constituted at curriculum level. Therefore a disparity can arise between the ***espoused theories*** informing a curriculum – theories surrounding early literacy and language which curriculum developers aimed to implement – and the ***inscribed theories*** actually reflected in the curriculum design and knowledge structures. The concepts of espoused and inscribed theories, and the potential disparity between them, will therefore be explored and discussed in Chapter Four.

I have thus so far in this chapter shown: How Bernstein's concepts of classification and framing will be used to analyse how grammatical knowledge has been structured and organised in the curricula; how the types of grammar – prescriptive, descriptive and rhetorical – are defined and will be used in this study; and how the types of approaches to early literacy instruction – skills/phonics-based, BLA

and WLA – are defined and will be used to describe the espoused and inscribed theories informing the three curricula and hence their influence on the constitution of grammar. In the next section, I explain my research methodology.

3.4 Outline of methodology and considerations

The research design of this study relies on the textual analysis of parts of three curriculum documents produced and disseminated by the SADoE during three curriculum reforms between 1997 and 2012. The study aims to illuminate how grammar has been conceptualised and how grammar teaching has been envisioned at a curriculum level (i.e. at the level of intention). What I aim to do is dissect the grammatical components of the three curricula, and using the theoretical framework described in this chapter, compare the documents to reveal how and the degree to which grammatical knowledge has been explicated. Added to this, this study aims to explain the influences on the differentiation in explication in the curricula. This is done by exploring the grammar and early literacy instruction theories espoused in the curricula and accompanying literature such as teacher guides, and how these theories are actually inscribed in the curriculum structure.

While this research has not used the participation of people and therefore has not been required to consider the code of ethics relating to human subjects, I have aimed to create (using the theoretical framework) and apply comparative criteria with which to dissect the curricula which are replicable and valid. The documents analysed are public documents which do not require permission for investigation and therefore are available for validation of the conclusions drawn.

3.5 Texts analysed

The focus of the analysis was the dissection and comparison of the three centrally developed, government-issued, English Home Language curriculum documents for the Intermediate Phase which were published in 1997, 2002 and 2011 respectively. The English HL curriculum documents of each curriculum reform are as follows:

Table 3b: English HL curriculum documents analysed in this study

Curriculum	Document Name	Grades specification	Date published
C2005	Language, Literacy and Communication Intermediate Phase	4 to 6	1997
RNCS	Languages: English Home Language	R to 9	2002
CAPS	English Home Language Intermediate Phase	4 to 6	2011

Added to this, Table 3c indicates the other documents which were investigated within each curriculum reform moment to clarify the espoused grammar instruction and early literacy instruction

theories affecting the explication of grammar in the curricula. These documents were teacher guides and written resources to introduce and familiarise implementers of the curricula with the curriculum documents and educational theories underpinning them.

Table 3c: Additional documents accompanying curriculum documents analysed in this study

Curriculum	Document Name	Date published
C2005	Curriculum 2005: Lifelong learning for 21st century: User's guide Understanding curriculum 2005 – An introduction to OBE for Foundation Phase teachers	1997 1997
RNCS	RNCS Grades R – 9 Teacher's guide for the development of learning programmes Foundations for learning Intermediate Phase Language Lesson Plans Grade 4	2003 2008
CAPS	Teachers' resources pack CAPS Home Language CAPs Orientation 2012 Intermediate Phase Grades 4 - 6	2012

3.6 Analytical method

3.6.1 Step 1: Extraction of data from curricula

Step 1 of the analysis process was to extract any data relating to grammatical knowledge from the three curriculum documents and tabulate the data under comparative categories to make the analysis of the differentiated curricula clear (see Table 1 included as Appendix A in this study). Table 1 was compiled using information and extracts from the curriculum documents and page numbers were attributed to the location of the data in the curricula. The first four categories in Section A of Table 1 record how the grammatical component is described and stated in the curricula, namely: whether grammar is constituted as a learning outcome or skill in relation to the other outcomes or skills of the English language curricula; the purposes stated for the grammatical outcome or skill; how the outcome/skill is structured, and whether the curriculum suggests teaching methodologies for grammar.

Section B of Table 1, is concerned with how grammar is explicated within the curricula and the content of the grammatical learning outcome/skill has been set out in categories showing the specification of aspects of grammar instruction. These include: the specification of text types to be used in teaching English language; the specification of language features to be taught from the texts; the specification of word level structures/conventions and word meaning; the specification of sentence level structures/conventions; and the specification of spelling and punctuation. These categories were further divided into grade and termly specifications where applicable in certain curricula. Figure 3A shows an extract from Table 1 – see Appendix A. It shows Section C and parts of Section D which categorise the data from the curricula relating to the time allocation for grammar instruction and directions/guidelines on the assessment of grammar respectively.

Figure 3A – Extract from Table 1 in Appendix A – Time allocation and assessment of grammar components

	C2005	NCS	CAPS
SECTION C: TIME ALLOCATION (WEIGHTING) FOR GRAMMAR COMPONENT			
Allocation of teaching time to outcome/skill	None specified. (Page 32) "... Activities should be undertaken in context and *not in formal grammar lessons*."	None specified. Page 6 to 7 (see above) indicates that all the outcomes should be taught and assessed in an integrated manner and knowledge of outcome 6 must be put into action through the other language skills described in the other outcomes.	(Page 14). 1 hour per two week cycle is allocated for the teaching of Language Structures and Conventions. Page 14 also states that "Language Structures and Conventions and their usage are integrated within the time allocation of the four language skills. There is also time allocated for formal practice..." Time allocations are also assigned to the other three skills of the 12 hours of teaching time for English Home Language in a two week cycle. Page 35 (see above) states that not all items must be taught within that given cycle, but all items in the overview must be covered by year-end.
SECTION D: ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR COMPONENT			
Grade 4 Term 1 Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill	None specified	None specified	Pages 94 to 97 Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) Task 2 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (20% of total Task 2mark)
Grade 4 Term 2 Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) June examination – Language in context in Paper 2 (15% of total June examination mark)
Grade 4 Term 3 Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) Task 2 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (20% of total Task 2 mark)
Grade 4 Term 4 Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions taken from an advertisement (15% of total Task 1 mark) End of the year examination – Language in context in Paper 2 (15% of total End of year examination mark)

3.6.2 Step 2: Analysis of data using theoretical framework

3.6.2.1 Analysis of grammatical knowledge using Bernstein's classification and framing

The data represented in Table 1 (Appendix A) was analysed using the theoretical framework described earlier in this chapter. Bernstein's dimensions of classification and framing were used to evaluate the explication of the grammatical component in each curriculum. Intra-disciplinary classification was measured by using the information categorised in Section A of Table 1 i.e. how grammatical knowledge is presented in the curricula in relation to other language knowledge in the syllabus, and what pedagogies are recommended for grammar instruction. In order for the conclusions drawn during analysis to be replicable, global codes were assigned to the varying degrees of intra-disciplinary classification that could be observed in the different curricula. This was done by reviewing how the curriculum organised grammatical knowledge in relation to the rest of the language knowledge in the curriculum document, and assessing its structure and constitution in light of the criteria stipulated for the intra-disciplinary classification codes as shown in Table 3d. A relevant classification code was then assigned to each curriculum based on how each curriculum showed evidence of the codes' criteria. The criteria for the codes of intra-disciplinary classification and framing were established by defining the criteria of the strongest code first and then the subsequent weaker codes. This was done by doing an initial review of the curricula and determining how curricula have and could have classified and framed grammatical knowledge to the strongest, possible degree and defining what these characteristics were. Table 3d shows the definition of descriptors of the degrees in strength of intra-disciplinary classification:

Table 3d: Codes indicating strength of framing of *intra-disciplinary classification*

Notation indicating degree of classification	Description	Criteria evident in curricula
C++	Very strong classification	• Grammatical knowledge is clearly separated from other language knowledge. • Grammatical knowledge is expressed as having specific terminology to be learnt i.e. a meta-language. • The separate teaching of grammar has been encouraged. • Time has been allocated specifically to grammar instruction. • The separate or specific assessment of grammar is stipulated.
C+	Strong classification	Three or four of the five criteria above are evident.
C-	Weak classification	Two of the five criteria above are evident
C--	Very weak classification	One or none of the five criteria above are evident.

The strength of framing of selection, the evaluative criteria, sequencing and pacing of grammatical knowledge was also analysed according to the criteria explained earlier in this chapter. In evaluating the strength of framing of selection and the evaluative criteria, data relating to the specification of text types and language structures/conventions at all levels from Table 1 (Appendix A) was used. The naming of assessment requirements (mainly formative assessment) of grammar was also used in the consideration of the strength of framing of evaluative criteria. Strength of framing of sequencing was assessed using the specification of data per term and week as demarcated by the curricula. Time allocations stipulated for the teaching of grammar and the demarcations of time periods in which to cover grammatical content was used to gauge the strength of framing of pacing. Global codes to indicate the degrees in strength of framing were defined along continuums as follows: Table 3e shows codes indicating the strength of framing of selection; Table 3f indicates codes for the strength of framing of the evaluative criteria and Table 3g and Table 3h for sequencing and pacing respectively. The assignment of global codes for framing was done in the same way as the assignment of codes for intra-disciplinary classification with the relevant information provided by the curriculum document being reviewed for evidence as required by the established framing codes.

Table 3e: Codes indicating strength of framing of *selection*

Notation indicating degree of framing	Description	Criteria evident in curricula
F++	Very strong framing	• Grammatical knowledge is defined and specified in clear terms for each grade of learners and is illustrated with examples. • The degree of difficulty in grammatical knowledge increases as grades increase and terms pass. • Text types from which grammar is to be learnt are specified. • Guidelines on the selection of texts from which grammar is to be learnt are provided.
F+	Strong framing	• Grammatical knowledge is defined and specified in clear terms but not necessarily specific to each grade of learners. Some examples are given. • The degree of difficulty in grammatical knowledge between grades and terms is not obvious. • Text types from which grammar is to be learnt are specified. • Guidelines on the selection of texts from which grammar is to be learnt are provided.
F-	Weak framing	• Aspects of grammatical knowledge are defined and some examples are provided. They are not specific to each grade of learners. • There is an attempt to differentiate the degree of difficulty in grammatical knowledge between grades and terms, but it is not consistent. • Examples of text types from which grammar is to be learnt are given but are not specified. • Guidelines on the selection of texts from which grammar is to be learnt are provided.
F--	Very weak framing	• Grammatical knowledge is described through examples only and is not specific to each grade of learners. • The degree of difficulty in grammatical knowledge between grades and terms is not evident. • Text types are broadly defined and are not specified.

Table 3f: Codes indicating strength of framing of *evaluative criteria*

Notation indicating degree of framing	Description	Criteria evident in curricula
F++	Very strong framing	• Grammatical knowledge is organised into categories for transmission with defined examples per grade provided. • Grammatical terminology is defined as a meta-language for acquisition through comprehensive examples. • Guidelines for the assessment of grammar are stipulated.
F+	Strong framing	• Grammatical knowledge is organised into categories for transmission. • Grammatical terminology is defined as a meta-language for acquisition through comprehensive examples. • Guidelines for the assessment of grammar are stipulated.
F-	Weak framing	• Grammatical knowledge is partially organised into categories for transmission. • Grammatical terminology is defined as a meta-language for acquisition through some examples. • Guidelines for the assessment of grammar are not stipulated.
F--	Very weak framing	• Grammatical knowledge is not organised into categories for transmission. • Grammatical terminology is not defined as a meta-language for acquisition. • Guidelines for the assessment of grammar are not stipulated.

Table 3g: Codes indicating strength of framing of *sequencing*

Notation indicating degree of framing	Description	Criteria evident in curricula
F++	Very strong framing	• Grammatical knowledge is structured for transmission in a particular order. • Specific grammatical knowledge is allocated for transmission for specific periods of time. E.g. per grade, per term, per week.
F+	Strong framing	• Grammatical knowledge is structured for transmission in a particular order. • Specific grammatical knowledge is allocated for transmission for specific periods of time. E.g. per grade, per term, per week
F-	Weak framing	• There is an attempt to structure grammatical knowledge in an order. • Specific grammatical knowledge is partially allocated for transmission for specific periods of time. E.g. per grade
F--	Very weak framing	• Grammatical knowledge is not structured for transmission in a particular order. • Specific grammatical knowledge is not allocated for transmission for specific periods of time.

Table 3h: Codes indicating strength of framing of *pacing*

Notation indicating degree of framing	Description	Criteria evident in curricula
F++	Very strong framing	• Grammatical knowledge has been demarcated per grade, per term and further. • Time allocations are specified for the teaching of grammar per grade, per term, per week.
F+	Strong framing	• Grammatical knowledge has been demarcated per grade and per term. • Time allocations are specified for the teaching of grammar per grade and per term.
F-	Weak framing	• Grammatical knowledge has been demarcated per grade. • Time allocations are specified for the teaching of grammar per grade.
F--	Very weak framing	• No demarcations exist. • No time allocations for teaching grammar are specified.

Added to the above analytical tools information, taken from the curricula describing grammar and the purposes of teaching it, was also used to describe how grammar had been constituted in the curricula.

3.6.2.2 Analysis of grammar instruction theories underpinning curricula

In order to answer my second research question – to identify the grammar instruction theories underpinning the curricula – the theoretical terms of prescriptive, descriptive and rhetorical grammar (See 3.2) were used to describe the type of grammars envisioned by the three curricula. This was done by examining the information given in the curriculum about grammar teaching and using the strength of framing and classification of grammatical knowledge as a reference.

3.6.2.3 Analysis of early literacy instruction theories underpinning curricula

In order to answer my third research question – to identify the early literacy instruction theories underpinning the curricula –the theoretical terms of a skills/phonics-based approach, a WLA, and a BLA were used to describe the early literacy theories underpinning the curricula and influencing the constitution of grammar. A distinction between the espoused and inscribed early literacy theories was acknowledged and hence analysed, when during an initial examination of the range of curriculum documents and accompanying guides, they revealed contradictions and confusion surrounding theoretical terminology. Firstly, information taken from the forewords and initial chapters of the curricula (i.e. not the actual syllabi pertaining to grammar) was used to analyse the espoused early literacy instruction theories informing curriculum design. Secondly, names and quotes from other documents (listed in Table 3c) released in conjunction with the three curricula were also analysed to determine the espoused theories of early literacy instruction. This analysis was contrasted with the analysis done using classification and framing of the organisation of the grammar component of each curriculum to determine the inscribed theories of the curricula. Disparities between the espoused and inscribed early literacy theories were then identified and highlighted. A full analysis of the data is discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter Four: Analysis of data

In this chapter, I give a detailed analysis of the data. Firstly, findings with regards to the way in which grammar was described in the different curricula are explained. Secondly, findings regarding the organisation of grammatical knowledge using Bernstein's classification and framing variables are described. Following this, the theories of grammar instruction and early literacy instruction underpinning the three curricula are highlighted. The disparities between the espoused and inscribed theories of the curricula are also discussed where relevant.

4.1 How grammar is defined in the three curricula

Before examining how the three curricula describe grammar, it is interesting to note the names of the subject curricula themselves as they give clues to the types of curricula, in Bernsteinian terms (an integrated or a collection code), they are. **C2005's** English HL content is found in a curriculum document which is called, "Language, Literacy and Communication" for the IP. It is a document encompassing the content and directives of teaching all languages in South Africa at all levels. It adopts an undifferentiated view of language where types of language and the levels of competency are not distinguishable. It was a vehicle through which the government's Language in Education Policy's promotion of additive multi-lingualism could be implemented (SADoE, 1997a:3). It is indicative of the integrated curriculum code which the entire C2005 adopted in which specialisation of subject knowledge was subordinated to the principles of integration.

Grammatical knowledge is conceptualised as an outcome – number five of seven outcomes in the syllabus. Its emphasis is on understanding and applying knowledge of language structures and conventions in context, and its purpose for being included in the curriculum is so that learners develop and improve their communication skills and ability to edit their written work. "…The development of this grammatical competence empowers the learner to communicate clearly and confidently by using grammatical structures (e.g. word order) correctly. Clarity of communication is improved through the development of a learner's editing skills which includes a conscious awareness of the learner's own language usage" (SADoE, 1997a:32). Communicative competence is seen as the end-goal of teaching grammar.

Taking into consideration the recommendations of improving content structure, coherence and specificity of the C2005 review committee report (SADoE, 2000); a differentiated view of different types of languages with definite features and levels was adopted in the **RNCS** i.e. different curricula were written for different languages and were labelled as HL, First Additional Language (FAL), and Second Additional Language (SAL). Content for English HL for IP was included in the curriculum document "Languages: English Home Language" for grades R to 9. OBE was still the underlying

philosophy for this revised curriculum and therefore grammatical knowledge is still described as outcome six of six outcomes, “Language structure and use”. Its aims are for the learner to “know and be able to use the sounds, words, and grammar of the language to create and interpret texts” (SADoE, 2002:6). The outcome became more defined than its expression in C2005 with the specification of the phonological aspect in its definition, and the emphasis of the acquisition of grammatical knowledge through the engagement with text.

> Learners will explore how language works, and develop a shared language for talking about language (a ‘metalanguage’), so that they can evaluate their own and other texts critically in terms of meaning, effectiveness and accuracy. They will also be able to use this knowledge to experiment with language to build meaning (from word and sentence levels to whole texts), and see how a text and its context are related. (SADoE, 2002:57)

The purpose of teaching grammar is also more defined and in addition to building learners’ communicative competence, also emphasises the development of learners’ abilities to evaluate texts and their contexts critically, and the development of a meta-language to describe their English language usage (SADoE, 2002:57). Acknowledgement of specialised English subject knowledge is hence made.

With calls being made for the end of OBE and a return to a knowledge-based curriculum with clear content, skill standards and assessment requirements, **CAPS** constituted grammar as one stand-alone skill of four skills, “Language structures and conventions” in the curriculum document, “English Home Language Intermediate Phase Grade 4 – 6”. The specificity of the name of the document hints at the more detailed and content-based approach which marked the end of OBE and the reinforcement of a differentiated view of language initially acknowledged by the RNCS (language levels and types being specified). Grammar, having not been expressed as an outcome, but as a skill, suggests that acquiring grammatical knowledge is valuable in its own right, and in addition to the other purposes of its teaching, which are expressed as the same as in the RNCS document, the skill of “Language structures and conventions” is expressed as important as “a foundation for skills development in the Home Language (listening, speaking, reading and writing)” (SADoE, 2011:12).

To summarise, in C2005 grammar was constituted as a learning outcome with its end goal being to build a learner’s communicative competence in a language which was not defined by type or level. Grammar within the RNCS was also constituted as a learning outcome but was specified within a type and level of language namely English HL. The end goal of teaching grammar was not only to build communicative competence, but also for learners to develop a meta-language to describe and evaluate their own language usage. Finally in CAPS, grammar is constituted as a skill of English HL to be acquired like reading, writing, listening and speaking. It is also described as important in building

communicative competence and in developing a meta-language, but additionally is described as being foundational to the development of the other language skills in the curriculum.

4.2 The explication of grammar across the curricula

4.2.1 Classification of grammatical knowledge

In **C2005's** curriculum document, the outcome to express learners' grammatical knowledge is divided into three assessment criteria namely: knowledge of grammatical structures and conventions applied to texts; editing of incorrect or inappropriate language usage, and the identification of common features of different languages. These assessment criteria are then elaborated by performance indicators which differentiate how learners will demonstrate their competence if they are using basic language in all learning areas, for main language learning and for additional language learning. These terms are not explained or clarified in the curriculum document. The first assessment criterion's performance indicator requires learners to show their knowledge of grammatical structures and conventions through the creation of different types of texts (texts being defined as "a unit of spoken, written or visual communication, including Sign Language, and alternative and augmentative methods of communication" (SADoE, 1997a:4)). The second assessment criterion should be demonstrated through the identification of language errors in texts and the third assessment criterion through their competence to communicate with learners from different language backgrounds.

The curriculum clearly states that although outcomes are expressed separately in the curriculum document, they exist only to highlight features of language which are to be taught through integrated language activities involving the use of texts.

> The function of an outcome is to emphasise a certain feature of language activity. This feature will often be exemplified in the context of an integrated set of language activities. An outcome and its associated assessment criteria and range statements should therefore not be viewed in isolation (SADoE, 1997a:6).

Regarding the teaching of specialised grammatical knowledge; the curriculum states emphatically: "In the Intermediate Phase no grammatical terminology is used. Activities should be undertaken in context and not in formal grammar lessons" (SADoE, 1997a:32). Classification within this curriculum is therefore coded as very weak (C--) as it promotes the integration of grammatical knowledge and other language knowledge. Grammar is seen, not as a separate entity to be taught, but as a feature to be aware of in other language activities. There is discouragement of teaching grammatical terminology and the development of a meta-language. There are no explicit guidelines on how grammar is to be assessed, however, since the directive is not to teach grammar lessons or terminology, it can be inferred that grammar is not to be assessed separately either.

Classification of the grammatical component of the **RNCS** English HL curriculum is coded as weak (C-) similar to the reasons mentioned above. Boundaries between grammatical knowledge and other language knowledge are blurred as the curriculum clearly states that the knowledge of the outcome, "Language structure and use" is to be "put into action through the language skills described in the other outcomes" (SADoE, 2002:6). The curriculum also emphasises that: "A central principle of the Languages Learning Area Statement is therefore the integration of these aspects of language through the creation and interpretation of texts" (SADoE, 2002:6). The learning outcome is divided into six assessment standards which describe what the learner should be able to demonstrate namely: they are able to work with words, sentences and texts, develop awareness and use of style, develop critical language awareness, and use meta-language (SADoE, 2002:86-88). Since this curriculum acknowledges a separate, specialised grammatical knowledge – meta-language – to be acquired by learners, classification is coded to be stronger than classification of grammar within C2005, but still as weak due to its emphasis on integration.

Grammar in the English HL curriculum document for **CAPS** is constituted as a separate, foundational skill of the curriculum with specific terminology or meta-language to be acquired. The skill, "Language structures and conventions", is specified in categories of word level, sentence level, word meaning, and spelling and punctuation per two week cycle, per term, per grade, based on the text type being used in the cycle (SADoE, 2011:36 – 87). For example in Weeks 7 to 8 of Term 1 of Grade 4, the curriculum (SADoE 2011:39) states that at a word level, personal possessive and demonstrative pronouns are to be taught from an instructional text; at a sentence level, subject and objects of a sentence; and at a word meaning level, borrowed words. It is seen to be best taught in relation to the prescribed texts and in the time allocated to the other skills, but has also been assigned a separate time allocation for formal practice.

Teachers are guided to:

> …choose items from this skill to teach learners language that appears naturally in the focus text type and in order that supports a natural and logical approach to language acquisition. They should construct activities that are meaningful to learners and that relate to the texts they are studying in the two-week cycle. More activities of this nature should be done as learners make progress from grade 4 to 6. Teachers are to select very carefully which rules to explain to learners and to keep these to a minimum. Practice in formal Language Structures and Conventions lessons will refine these skills (SADoE, 2011:35).

Grammar has also been allocated a separate weighting for assessment purposes (SADoE, 2011:94 – 97). From Grade 4 to 6, "Language structures and conventions" are stipulated to be included as 15%

of the total of Assessment Task 1 and 20% of Assessment Task 2 in terms 1 and 3 and 15% in Assessment Task 1 and 15% of examination marks in terms 2 and 4. Boundaries between grammatical and other language knowledge are explicit and therefore grammar is coded as very strongly classified (C++) in this curriculum.

The findings of the strength of classification of grammar within the three curricula are summarised using the notation described in Chapter 3 as follows:

Table 4a: Strength of intra-disciplinary classification of grammar in the three curricula

Curriculum	Coding of intra-disciplinary classification
C2005	C--
RNCS	C-
CAPS	C++

4.2.2 Selection of grammatical content

Selection considers how much control the curriculum exerts over the composition of the grammatical knowledge to be transmitted to learners. In **C2005's** Language, Literacy and Communication curriculum, framing of selection is coded as very weak (F--) as the teacher is left to choose the language structures and conventions to be taught, the text types through which to teach them, and the degree of difficulty at which to set the grammatical knowledge per grade. This can be seen in that the same, few examples of text types are suggested for all grades with no differentiation (See Table 1 in Appendix A), and the examples given show an ambiguous definition of texts and language features e.g. for the specification of word level grammar and word meaning to be taught, the curriculum gives the following examples which learners at a basic language level should know: "vocabulary, word formation, noun classes, pronouns (e.g. possessive), verbal prefixes, verbal suffixes, qualificatives, adjectives (basic), adverbs, prepositions, simple figurative language (e.g. simile, metaphor, personification)" and at a main language learning level: "everything as in basic level as well as enriched and fairly extended vocabulary, vivid and original adjectives, adverbs" (SADoE, 1997a:33). The indiscriminate listing of examples across all types of language structures and conventions and the vagueness of what exactly the learner has to know about each language convention can be seen in these extracts. The teacher is therefore left to decide what to select for transmission.

There is no differentiation between grades in terms of content for any of the levels of grammar. It should be noted (as it will be when discussing the framing of evaluative criteria) that C2005 does not specify levels of grammar but for the sake of a comparative analysis between the curricula, I have

created such categories. The same method of communicating examples to be taught is used to describe sentence level grammar e.g. a learner is required to apply "his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text" and the teacher is instructed to "select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned" (SADoE, 1997a:32-33). For the basic language level, some examples of sentence level grammar stated are: basic tenses, concord, active and passive, simple sentences, common expressions, paragraphing, simple concrete language, "some sensitivity of language regarding gender/race/cultural issues" (SADoE, 1997a:34) . For main language level sentence level examples, the curriculum includes everything as in basic level as well as complex sentences, idiomatic expressions, abstract language, varied sentence connections, and "some sensitivity… and well developed sensitivity of language regarding gender/race/cultural issues/ethnicity" (SADoE, 1997a:33). As in word level grammar, there are indiscriminate choices of sentence level language conventions listed, as well as ambiguities regarding the degree of knowledge to be acquired of each language convention. Even less information is given regarding the selection of spelling and punctuation e.g. for both basic and main language levels the selection of spelling and punctuation grammar, that a learner has to know and recognise as errors, is simply described as "spelling, basic punctuation…spelling errors, incorrect and inappropriate punctuation" (SADoE, 1997a: 33-34). No glossary of grammatical terminology or meta-language is stated in the curriculum as the acquisition of this is discouraged.

The strength of selection in the **RNCS'** grammatical component is coded as weak (F-), although there is an attempt to differentiate the selection of what is to be taught between grades by stating different examples of texts and grammatical terms per grade. A closer look at the assessment standards per grade reveals that the degree of specification of grammatical terminology, examples and content, does not show a clear progression in degree of difficulty or in amount of content to be transmitted. The teacher is left to select the degree to which he/she uses and teaches grammatical terminology when teaching word, sentence, and text level language conventions as the examples provided are not comprehensive or grade specific. For example, in specifying word level and word meaning grammar per grade, the curriculum states for grade 4, the learner:

"…uses prefixes, stems and suffixes to form words; explores the origin of words (*e.g. words borrowed from Afrikaans and African languages*); records words in a personal dictionary; identifies and uses nouns, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, prepositions" (SADoE, 2002:86) [my italics].

For grade 5, the curriculum states that the learner: "uses prefixes, stems and suffixes/extensions to form words; explores the origin of words (*e.g. words borrowed from French*); records words in a personal dictionary; identifies and uses nouns, pronouns, prepositions, *articles and conjunctions*"(SADoE, 2002:86) [my italics].

And for grade 6, the learner: “uses prefixes, stems and suffixes/extensions to form words; explores the origin of words (*e.g. words borrowed from Latin and Greek*); records words in a personal dictionary; identifies and uses nouns, pronouns, prepositions, *articles, conjunctions, and modals*” (SADoE, 2002:87) [my italics].

There is limited progression in the degree of difficulty stipulated per grade as the assessment standard is worded the same for each grade but simply uses different application examples e.g. words borrowed from different languages and different examples of parts of speech to be identified. These examples do not reflect an increasing degree of difficulty in grammatical knowledge as the grades progress, making the bases for progression in grammatical knowledge seemingly arbitrary. There is therefore ambiguity concerning what grammar, and to what extent the teaching of it, should be done per grade. Another such example is the content provided to illustrate an assessment standard of language awareness and style. The curriculum states that a learner in grade 4 “understands and uses figurative language such as simile (e.g. ‘He looks like an angel’)” (SADoE, 2002:88); in grade 5: “understands and uses figurative language such as personification (e.g. ‘The flames were licking the building.’)” (SADoE, 2002:89); and in grade 6: “understands and uses figurative language such as metaphor (e.g. ‘He is an angel.’)”(SADoE, 2002:89). Clearly what the learner is required to demonstrate is exactly the same for all grades except with a different example provided – once again making the bases for progression seemingly arbitrary. This leaves the teacher to question whether the content knowledge is being built on or if only that particular example must be taught in that grade.

Text types also need to be chosen by the teacher from which the relevant assessment standards of the grammatical outcome must be taught. Examples are given of text types that should be used per grade in the IP, but there is little variance of selected texts between grades nor a clear progression in the difficulty of the text to be used (See Table 1 in Appendix A for all the texts suggested). For example in grade 4, the curriculum gives the following examples of oral texts to be used: “conversations, speeches, poems, choral verses, narratives (e.g. fables, legends, stories), reports of events, jokes, riddles and limericks, weather reports, interviews, short talks, songs, word games, instructions (e.g. for a game), directions” (SADoe, 2002:58), in grade five: “speeches, radio shows, oral poems (e.g. praise poems, ballads), narratives (e.g. stories, fables, myths, legends), instructions, directions, news, reports (e.g. weather, sports), choral chants, talks/short lectures, debates, plays, jokes, humorous anecdotes” (SADoE, 2002:59) and in grade 6: “discussions, meetings, debates, stories, plays, radio shows - a variety of different formats, news, instructions, directions, explanations, oral poems/poetry reading, anecdotes, negotiations” (SADoE, 2002:61). The choice of

examples provided per grade is arbitrary. The sentence level grammar and spelling and punctuation are described in the same way as the word level grammar with ambiguity in progression and in the examples given. With the acknowledgement of a meta-language for English, a seven-page, "*Language Learning Area Glossary*" is provided on pages 136 to 142 which defines some of the grammatical terminology used in the curriculum. This, however, is not specifying what the learner should acquire, but what the teacher should know. It does, however, provide parameters for the selection of grammatical knowledge to be taught.

In **CAPS**, selection is coded as strongly framed (F+) as the curriculum has specified and named mandatory grammatical terminology which is to be taught for each grade of learners in the categories of word level, sentence level, word meaning, and spelling and punctuation per two weeks per term (See Appendix A for this explication). However, grammatical content to be acquired is seemingly randomly organised and specified according to the type of text being used *within the grades* which are repetitive. For example, adverbs are listed in grade 4 to be taught from a novel, and then adverbs of place and degree from a short story (twice in the year); in grade 5 it states that adverbs are to be taught from a folklore twice, a novel, information text (weather report) and a short story, and adverbs of manner, time, place and degree from an information text (instructions) (six times in a year); and in grade 6 the curriculum states that adverbs should be taught from an information text (weather chart) and adverbs of degree, duration and frequency from an information text and descriptive essay, and adverbs of manner, time and place from an instructional text (three times in the year) (SADoE, 2011:36-87). While there is some progression in the types of adverbs to be taught, the frequency and amount of content on this specific grammatical structure is erratic. In some language structures and conventions, progression in concept difficulty and amount of content is clearer e.g. when sentence level work is specified through a poem in term 1 for grade 4 learners, it states simple sentences are to be covered (week 3 to 4); in grade 5 simple sentences and statements are to be covered (week 9 to 10); and in grade 6: statements, questions, and commands (week 9 to 10).

Within the categories of grammar explicated (i.e. word, sentence spelling & punctuation levels), the teacher is also still to select the degree of difficulty to which he/she teaches the grammar as examples are specified per grade but not in context e.g. In week 1 to 2 of term 1 for word level grammar, the curriculum states for grade 4: "common nouns, proper nouns, countable and uncountable nouns" (SADoE, 2011:36); in grade 5 "common and proper nouns, noun prefixes, suffixes, synonyms (word meaning)" (SADoE, 2011: 54) and in grade 6: "nouns, pronouns

(interrogative), tenses" (SADoE, 20011:72). The contexts in which these terms should be taught e.g. within sentences, large texts or in learners' own writing, and the complexity of the use e.g. identification, use, explanation, or conjugation of these terms, are unclear.

What assists the strength of selection in this curriculum is the specification of grammatical terms on pages 20 to 24 which give examples of what learners should know thereby assisting teachers in selecting content. "*Examples of Language Structures and Conventions*" gives examples in context of punctuation, spelling, parts of words, nouns, determiners, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, verbs, conjunctions and transition words, interjectives/ideophones, vocabulary development and figurative language, clauses, phrases, sentences, conditional sentences, passive voice and reported speech (see Figure 4B later in this chapter). There is no differentiation between grades in these definitions. This feature is more specific and explicit in defining grammatical terms than the RNCS which defined an arbitrary choice of language terminology very briefly as part of the curriculum document's overall glossary. Furthermore in the CAPS, a seven-page glossary is provided on pages 105 to 111 defining selected terminology used in the curriculum document.

Text types and the language features that are to be taught from the text are also specified per two week cycle per grade. Text types and language features to be taught from them are explained in a summary on pages 27 to 31 which guides the teacher on what materials to select for grammar lessons (see Figure 4A later in this chapter).

The findings showing the strength of framing of the selection of grammatical knowledge within the three curricula are summarised using the notation described in Chapter 3 in Table 4b below:

Table 4b: Strength of framing of the selection of grammatical knowledge within the three curricula

Curriculum	Coding of framing of selection
C2005	F--
RNCS	F-
CAPS	F+

These codes describing selection also reflect the clarity of progression evident in the curricula. In **C2005** progression is unclear due to the absence of differentiation in text type, content and degree of complexity in grammatical knowledge between grades. In the **RNCS**, while differentiation in grammar content and text types exists between grades, the bases of the differentiation are arbitrary. Progression is therefore also vague. In **CAPS**, differentiation between grades in text types and grammatical knowledge is clearly specified and in some categories of grammar, an increasing

degree of complexity between grades is evident. However, in some categories, the bases of differentiation between grades seem arbitrary (other than the basis of the text type being used). Added to this, within grades there is no changing specification on how learners are to engage with grammatical terminology (e.g. identification, use, conjugation etc.). Progression in the acquisition of grammatical knowledge is therefore considered to be ambiguous in the CAPS curriculum.

4.2.3 Framing of evaluative criteria of grammar

The framing of evaluative criteria refers to how clearly the curriculum has set the evidence for the successful acquisition of grammatical knowledge for learners to attain. The framing of evaluative criteria is closely linked to the degree of classification of grammatical knowledge within the curriculum. Generally, the stronger the classification, the stronger the framing of evaluative criteria is. This is because the more separately grammatical knowledge is constituted from the rest of the curriculum and is viewed as specialist knowledge, the more specificities of what constitutes grammatical knowledge have to be made known. While the framing of evaluative criteria is mostly manifested through pedagogy, the curriculum informs the framing within the pedagogy through its specification of what has to be transmitted to learners. In **C2005**, the evaluative criteria of the acquisition of grammatical knowledge are framed very weakly (F--). This is because the grammar outcome expresses itself through three, vague performance indicators e.g. "This will be evident when learners can communicate at a basic level with learners from a different language background" (SADoE, 1997b:35), and grammatical knowledge is not organised into any structure or categories. There is no specification of what learners have to know about grammar per grade other than examples given, and the acquisition of a meta-language is discouraged (as discussed in 4.2.1). Therefore there is no definition of terminology through glossaries or summaries. With regards to guidelines on how the acquisition of grammatical knowledge should be assessed, there are none given in the curriculum document.

Framing of evaluative criteria in the **RNCS** is also weak but is stronger than C2005 as there is an attempt at differentiation of grammatical knowledge per grade and the acquisition of a meta-language is promoted. It is therefore coded as F-. The evaluative criteria of grammatical knowledge are communicated as six assessment standards differentiating between grammatical knowledge at a text, sentence and word level, and language awareness and the usage of a meta-language. They are also differentiated for each grade, although as expressed in 4.2.2, the examples given per grade per assessment standard are not specific enough, nor do they show an increase in degree of difficulty or content per grade. For example, with regard to the specification of the evaluative criterion of using a meta-language, the curriculum stipulates for grade 4 that the learner: "uses meta-language (terms such as direct speech, indirect speech, idioms, proverb, formal, informal, simile, quotation marks)"

(SADoE, 2002:88); in grade 5: "uses meta-language (terms such as articles, conjunctions, topic sentence, audience, tense, personification)" (SADoE, 2002:89); and in grade 6: "uses meta-language (terms such as main clause, subordinate clause, conjunction, active and passive voice, metaphor)" (SADoE, 2002:89). Evaluative criteria for spelling and punctuation are framed the most weakly. For example in grade 4, the learner: "uses phonics and spelling rules to spell words correctly, and uses punctuation correctly (e.g. quotation marks for direct speech, apostrophe for possession)" (SADoE, 2002:86); in grade 5, the learner: "uses phonics and spelling rules to spell words correctly and consolidates use of punctuation learned so far"(SADoE, 2002:87); and in grade 6: "uses phonics and spelling rules to spell words correctly and uses punctuation correctly (e.g. comma to separate subordinate clause from main clause)"(SADoE, 2002:89). A glossary of terms, as described in 4.2.2, does assist in defining evaluative criteria. However, with regards to guidelines on how the acquisition of grammatical knowledge should be assessed, there are none given in the curriculum document, only that grammar should be assessed through the assessment of the other language outcomes.

Evaluative criteria in the **CAPS** curriculum are coded as strongly framed (F+). This is because grammatical knowledge is specified in categories for acquisition namely word level, sentence level, word meaning and spelling and punctuation per two week cycle per grade based on the text type specified for each cycle. Features of language and grammatical conventions to be taught from the specific text types are tabulated in "*A summary of text types across the phases*" on pages 27 to 31 of the curriculum. Below is an extract from this summary (SADoE, 2011:27):

Figure 4A: Extract from "A summary of text types across the phases" in the IP CAPS English HL curriculum (SADoE, 2011:27)

Essays			
Text type	**Purpose**	**Text structure**	**Language features**
Narrative text/essay	To entertain	Orientation that introduces characters and setting, e.g. *Once upon time there was an old woman who lived with her son called Jack. They were very poor.* Events leading to a complication, e.g. *Jack spent all the money his mother gave him on some magic beans. His mother was angry.* Resolution and ending, e.g. *Jack came back with the Giant's treasure and they lived happily ever after.*	Written in the first or third person Written in the past tense Events described sequentially Connectives that signal time, e.g. Early that morning, later on, once Makes use of dialogue Language used to create an impact on the reader, e.g. adverbs, adjectives, images
Descriptive text/essay	To describe something in a vivid way	Identification: gives a general orientation to the subject, e.g. *There was a huge beast* Description: describes features or characteristics of the subject, e.g. *It had a huge bulbous body with bloated pustules dripping green slimy liquid onto the floor.*	May be written in past or present tense Creates a picture in words Uses adjectives, adverbs Uses figurative language, e.g. simile, metaphor, personification, alliteration

Here we see the curriculum indicating the purpose, text structure and language features which are to be taught to learners from essays – differentiating between a narrative text and a descriptive text – and which are expected to be evident in learners' own production of essays.

The meta-language of grammar is further explicated on pages 20 to 24 as seen in the extract below which specifies the types of punctuation, spelling strategies and features, parts of words and types of nouns which may be taught in the IP (SADoE, 2011:20):

Figure 4B: Extract from "Examples of Language Structures and Conventions" in the IP CAPS English HL curriculum (SADoE, 2011:20)

Example of Language Structures and Conventions	
Punctuation	Full stop, exclamation mark, question mark, comma, colon, semi-colon, apostrophe, quotation marks, parentheses, ellipses, hyphen
Spelling	Spelling patterns, spelling rules and conventions, abbreviations, dictionary usage
Parts of words	Prefixes, roots, and suffixes
Nouns	Noun prefixes (including gerund / infinitive class prefix (African languages))
	Countable (e.g. *chair/chairs*) and uncountable (e.g. *furniture*) nouns
	Number (singular and plural), e.g. *chair/chairs*
	Nouns with no change in number in the singular form, e.g. *scissors, trousers*
	Common nouns (e.g. *woman*) and proper nouns (e.g. *Thandi*)
	Abstract nouns, e.g. *love, fear, respect, honesty*
	Compound noun, e.g. *rainbow, childlock*
	Concrete nouns, *e.g. ball, chair*
	Possessive forms of nouns, e.g. *Lesego's desk, learners' desks children's toys*
	Collective nouns and classifiers, e.g. *a swarm of bees, a bar of soap*
	Gerunds, e.g. *swimming* is good, *driving* is pleasant, *crying is therapeutic*
	Predicate and object,
	Gender, e.g. cock, hen, stallion, mare
	Diminutives, e.g. cigar, cigarette, river, rivulet
	Augmentatives
	Articles, e.g. *a, an* and *the*
	Nouns derived from other parts of speech

A glossary on pages 105 to 111 as explained in 4.2.2 is also present in the curriculum document.

Furthermore, how grammar is to be assessed per grade per term is clearly stipulated. This includes how much the assessment of grammar will constitute learners' overall language assessment (SADoE, 2011:94-97). In grade 4, term 1, language structures and conventions make up 15% of assessment task 1's total and 20% of task 2. Some specificity regarding how grammar is to be assessed is stipulated e.g. in grade 4 term 4 task 1, language structures and conventions should be assessed "from an advertisement", and language structures and conventions should be examined e.g. in grade 6 in term 2, Paper 3 consists of "Language in context" which assesses the content of the "Language structures and conventions" skill (15% of exam total) and comprehension.

The findings showing the strength of framing of the evaluative criteria of grammatical knowledge within the three curricula are summarised using the notation described in Chapter 3 as follows:

Table 4c: Strength of framing of the evaluative criteria of grammatical knowledge within the three curricula

Curriculum	Coding of framing of evaluative criteria
C2005	F--
RNCS	F-
CAPS	F+

4.2.4 Framing of sequencing and pacing

In this study, the strength of framing of sequencing and pacing in a curriculum refers to the degree of control the curriculum gives to the teacher to determine the order and rate at which learners acquire grammatical knowledge. In **C2005**, sequencing and pacing are considered to be framed very weakly (F--). This is because the curriculum stipulates few rules regarding progression between or within grades. It does not state timeframes in which grammatical knowledge should be taught (per term or week). It therefore leaves the teacher to determine this aspect of the pedagogy. The examples of language structures and conventions are listed in no particular order or sequence in which to be acquired by learners. Pacing is considered to be weak as there are no restrictions or guidelines given on the amount of time to be spent on teaching grammar in the overall curriculum and in a language lesson.

In the **RNCS**, sequencing is considered to be weak (F-) and pacing is coded as very weak (F--) for the same reasons as explained above for C2005. However, demarcations between what grammatical knowledge should be learnt per grade are made, thereby suggesting a sequence to the grammatical knowledge a learner should acquire in the IP. As in C2005, there are no demarcations of terms or weeks within the grammatical content to be acquired. No restrictions or guidelines are given on the amount of time to be spent on teaching grammar in the overall curriculum or within a language lesson. Pacing is thus left to the discretion of the teacher.

Contrary to the previous two curricula, **CAPS** shows strong framing of pacing and aspects of sequencing. Pacing is considered to be framed very strongly (F++) as grammatical content is differentiated and stipulated per grade per term and per two-week cycle based on a specified type of text. Teachers therefore have little control over how much time to spend on certain grammatical components. A time allocation for the formal teaching of grammar is stipulated per two-week cycle i.e. 1 hour every two weeks, although it is also made clear that grammar should be integrated into other language lessons. As mentioned in 4.2.2, the curriculum explains that "not all items must be

taught within that given cycle but ensure that all the items listed in the overview are covered by the end of the year" (SADoE, 2011:35), thereby giving teachers a marginal degree of control over pacing.

Framing of sequencing within the CAPS curriculum is coded as very strong (F++). This is because within each grade, teachers are required to teach specific grammatical concepts every two weeks, in a specific order within a term, according to the text stipulated for that two-week cycle. It is stated, however, that "not all items must be taught within that given cycle" (SADoE, 2011:35) and that teachers should ensure they have covered the stipulated grammatical concepts by the end of the year. This therefore gives teachers some degree of control on when to teach particular content. However, as was noted in the analysis of selection of this curriculum, although sequencing is framed very strongly, there is no clear progression in degree of difficulty or amount of content to be acquired between grades.

The findings, showing the strength of framing of the sequencing and pacing of grammatical knowledge within the three curricula, are summarised using the notation described in Chapter 3 as follows:

Table 4d: Strength of framing of sequencing and pacing of grammatical knowledge within the three curricula

	SEQUENCING	PACING
Curriculum	**Coding of framing**	
C2005	F--	F--
RNCS	F-	F--
CAPS	F++	F++

4.2.5 Summary of findings regarding organisation of grammatical knowledge

The table below summarises the findings regarding the strength of classification and framing of all three curricula.

Table 4e: Summary of findings

Curriculum	INTRA-DISCIPLINARY CLASSIFICATION	FRAMING			
		SELECTION	EVALUATIVE CRTERIA	SEQUENCING	PACING
	CODE				
C2005	C--	F--	F--	F--	F--
RNCS	C-	F-	F-	F-	F--
CAPS	C++	F+	F+	F++	F++

The findings show a clear strengthening of classification and framing of grammatical knowledge from the earliest curriculum, C2005, to the most recent CAPS. This is indicative of the change in codes from an integrated curriculum to a collection coded curriculum. The classification codes reveal that

grammatical knowledge has been constituted as specialised knowledge and as a discrete language area in CAPS, as opposed to C2005, which strongly encourages an integration of grammatical knowledge with the rest of the language curriculum. Attempts to develop a grammatical meta-language was evident in the RNCS, however this was subordinated to the ideal of integration of intra-disciplinary knowledge within English HL.

As classification has become stronger in order to specialise grammatical knowledge through the curriculum reforms, so has the framing of its pedagogy. The English HL teacher has been given less control over the selection, evaluative criteria, sequencing and pacing of the transmission of grammatical knowledge as the curricula have become more specific in prescribing these elements of pedagogy. While the shift in the strengthening of sequencing and pacing through the curriculum reforms is most acute – an attempt to guide teachers in the rate at which transmission should occur – the findings reveal that the framing of the selection, and what constitutes the successful acquisition of grammatical knowledge in all three curricula, have *not* been framed *very* strongly. Most notably the degree to which grammatical content has been specified, and the degree of its difficulty per grade has not been made explicit in all three curricula, although more apparent structuring of grammar (e.g. into categories) is evident in the CAPS – hence the F+ code having been assigned. Progression is therefore unclear in all three curricula but to varying degrees. The bases of progression in the acquisition of grammatical knowledge are arbitrary in the RNCS and in some grammatical categories in the CAPS. I, therefore, suggest that clarity of the degrees of conceptual difficulty of particular grammatical structures and conventions should be made explicit, for meaningful progression in grammatical knowledge to be evident. The influences of grammar and early literacy instruction theories underpinning the curricula will be explored in the next sections. Issues of progression, and other implications that these findings show, will be further discussed in Chapter Five.

4.3 Types of grammar espoused by the curricula

In this section of analysis, I use the definitions of types of grammar I termed in Chapter Three namely prescriptive, descriptive and rhetorical grammars to describe the grammar and potential grammar pedagogy each curriculum envisions. This was done by examining the information given in the curriculum about grammar teaching and using the strength of framing and classification of grammatical knowledge as a reference.

In **C2005**, the type of grammar espoused is radically descriptive – descriptive in that its emphasis and purpose is clearly on language awareness and meaning and building communicative competence;

and radical in that there is discouragement of teaching any grammatical terminology explicitly. The purposes of teaching grammar in C2005 are stated as:

> This specific outcome aims to develop a language user's understanding and knowledge of grammar. The development of this grammatical competence empowers the learner to communicate clearly and confidently by using grammatical structures (e.g. word order) correctly. Clarity of communication is improved through the development of a learner's editing skills which includes a conscious awareness of the learner's own language usage (SADoE, 1997a:32).

There is a clear emphasis on learners becoming aware of their language during usage. This curriculum does not aim to teach the rules of grammar and what is right or wrong in texts, but rather what the learner is actually using or with which texts they are engaging. As mentioned in 4.2.1, with the emphatic discouragement of teaching formal grammar lessons or terminology it is clear that this curriculum aims to purposefully take a step away from a prescriptive type of grammar. With its weak classification and framing of selection and evaluative criteria, the grammatical component in C2005 is conceptualised, not as a body of knowledge to be acquired in its own right (more indicative of prescriptive grammar), but as something to be used to describe language usage through integrated activities using texts (which are not prescribed either). In Chapter Three, I also mention that Thornbury (1999:11) describes descriptive grammar as being born from a second language or foreign language pedagogy. As I will explain later in this chapter, C2005's undifferentiated view of language and supporting literature released with the curriculum, suggest that the language curriculum views languages (English included) as still to be acquired by learners hence being informed from a SLA theoretical framework.

Likewise in the **RNCS**, descriptive grammar is espoused. However, it is a less radical form of it in that there is an acknowledgement of the value of developing a meta-language. This acknowledgement aims to assist learners in not only describing their language usage, but doing this using accurate grammatical terminology which should be learnt. The purposes of teaching grammar are described in the curriculum as follows:

> Learners will explore how language works, and develop a shared language for talking about language (a 'metalanguage'), so that they can evaluate their own and other texts critically in terms of meaning, effectiveness and accuracy. They will also be able to use this knowledge to experiment with language to build meaning (from word and sentence levels to whole texts), and see how a text and its context are related. They will become aware of how language changes over time and between cultures, and how it changes in different situations (SADoE, 2002:57).

Accuracy is once again foregrounded, but the emphasis as in the previous curriculum is to use a language to make meaning and describe usage. While there is a suggestion at the end of the above statement of a rhetorical grammar in trying to highlight changing communicative contexts, the weak

framing of selection and evaluative criteria does not bring this to fruition. The weak classification and framing also does not support the curriculum's alleged goal to develop a meta-language for learners. The "*Language Learning Area Glossary*" on pages 136 to 142 of the curriculum document is restricted in the extent to which it shows teachers the grammatical terminology to be acquired. The CLT approach encouraged by this curriculum (and discussed later in this chapter) also comes from a SLA theoretical viewpoint which would also inform a descriptive grammar.

The **CAPS** curriculum, with its strong degree of classification and framing of grammatical knowledge, proposes a different type of grammar to the other two curricula. This curriculum guides teachers to transmit a rhetorical grammar through the curriculum's organisation and structure, but may be interpreted in its transmission by teachers as a prescriptive grammar. The first type of grammar can be seen through the encouragement of teaching certain language structures and conventions typical of a text prescribed for each two-week cycle. The teaching of grammar through different text types, seemingly promotes the development of learners' ability to evaluate the grammatical choices appropriate for the text being explored or produced. With stronger framing of selection (prescribed texts, activities, language features and grammatical knowledge), the use of more written texts is more obvious in the CAPS curriculum than in the previous two curricula. As mentioned in 4.2.3, the tabulation, "*Summary of text types across the phase*", on pages 27 to 31 of the curriculum, also highlights the promotion of rhetorical grammar as it is encouraging the inductive exploration and creation of texts in order to observe and use specified grammatical choices. For example, in the afore-mentioned tabulation under the prescribed text type, descriptive essay, the language features specified to be highlighted and taught are: "…may be written in past or present tense; creates a picture with words; uses adjectives, adverbs; use figurative language e.g. simile, metaphor, personification, alliteration". (SADoE, 2011:27) Each text type and its language features are specified in this way along with the purpose and structure of each text type. This is also reflective of a genre-based approach to language teaching which focuses on teaching language (including reading, writing, language structures and conventions) through the production and understanding of selected genres or types of texts. Although the CAPS curriculum document does not state this approach is being used, rhetorical grammar is congruent with this approach. Like the genre-based approach, rhetorical grammar highlights grammatical choice in relation to the context of text types, and suggests that if a learner is to be successful in producing a particular type of English discourse, he/she must be able to produce texts which fulfil the expectations of the text recipient in terms of grammatical accuracy.

The curriculum explains the purpose of teaching grammar as follows:

> A good knowledge of vocabulary and grammar provides the foundation for skills development (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in the Home Language. Intermediate Phase learners will build on the foundation that was laid in Grades R – 3.
> Learners will learn how **Language Structures and Conventions** are used, and will develop a shared language for talking about language (a 'meta-language'), so that they can evaluate their own and other texts critically in terms of meaning, effectiveness and accuracy. They will also be able to use this knowledge to experiment with language to build meaning from word and sentence levels to whole texts, and to see how a text and its context are related. Through interacting with a variety of texts, learners extend their use of vocabulary and correctly apply their understanding of **Language Structures and Conventions** (SADoE, 2011:12).

As mentioned in 4.1, the purposes are worded almost exactly as that of the RNCS. However, the acknowledgement of grammatical knowledge as a foundational skill for the other language skills, gives the learning of grammar a stand-alone importance. There is also the setting-aside of thirty minutes per week of formal grammar practice, which could mean to some teachers interpreting the curriculum, that written, decontextualised exercises to practise a specific grammatical structure must be done – characteristic of a prescriptive grammar. In elaborating on this, the curriculum gives the following instructions to teachers:

Create activities related to these texts that will enable learners to use these items, in context. Similarly, the writing texts learners will write will include some of the language items. Give your learners guidance on appropriate and correct usage of these items. *Select some of the items your learners have difficulty with and give them formal practice. In the Intermediate Phase, thirty minutes is set aside for formal instruction and practice in language structure and conventions.[my italics]* (SADoE, 2011:12)

As noted in the UK literature of Watson (2013) reviewed in Chapter Two, the type of grammar that is enacted in the classroom, may be different to that espoused in the curriculum. And so while the CAPS curriculum overall promotes a rhetorical grammar; teachers may interpret the encouragement of formal grammar lessons, and the return to specified grammatical content, as an indication to teach a prescriptive grammar. The CAPS' strong framing and classification of grammatical knowledge has once again promoted a grammar which is seen as a skill to be practised, however it has also promoted this practice within contexts. This suggested practice is more indicative of a rhetorical rather than a prescriptive grammar.

The table below summarises the findings regarding the types of grammar being propagated in all three curricula.

Table 4f: Summary of types of grammar prevalent in curricula

Curriculum	Type of grammar
C2005	Descriptive
RNCS	Descriptive
CAPS	Rhetorical

The CAPS clearly marks a shift in the type of grammar being conceptualised in the English HL curriculum – from a descriptive grammar to a rhetorical one. This can mainly be seen where CAPS specifies the language structures and conventions to be taught from prescribed texts, and where it conceptualises grammar as a skill to be practised. Its emphasis is therefore on grammatical accuracy according to context choice, which is typical of a rhetorical grammar. This contrasts with the descriptive grammar in the other two curricula which emphasises awareness rather than accuracy of grammar usage and the development of communicative competence. C2005 and RNCS show these elements of descriptive grammar in that they conceptualise grammar as an outcome to be integrated with the other language outcomes and not as an aspect needing practice or separate teaching. The weak framing and classification of grammatical knowledge in the two earlier curricula further subordinate specificity and the requirements of accuracy. While the organisation of grammatical knowledge in CAPS supports the type of grammar it espouses, the early literacy instruction theories underpinning the curriculum do not show the same theoretical view of skills teaching. The findings of the early literacy instruction theories underpinning the three curricula, and the disparities between the espoused and inscribed theories, are discussed in the next section.

4.4 Early literacy instruction theories and language teaching methodologies informing the curricula

One of the sub-questions I sought to answer in this study was: What early literacy instruction theories have underpinned and influenced each English HL IP curriculum change? These theories, as reviewed in Chapter Two, expound arguments on how children become literate. They therefore emphasise or de-emphasise particular aspects of reading, writing and language pedagogy e.g. a skills/phonics-based approach to literacy instruction favours the teaching of compartmentalised parts of language such as grammar, while the WLA promotes an integrated methodology to teaching literacy in which skills are learnt through processes. The type of grammar and how grammar is taught are therefore affected by the underlying early literacy instruction theories informing curricula.

However, curriculum change and hence the organisation of knowledge in a curriculum (as analysed earlier in this chapter using Bernstein's classification and framing variables), also influence how grammar is constituted at curriculum level. Therefore a disparity can arise between the espoused theories informing a curriculum – theories surrounding early literacy and language which curriculum developers aimed to implement – and the inscribed theories actually reflected in the curriculum design and knowledge structures. Through the examination of forewords and advice for curriculum

implementers in the curriculum documents and accompanying teacher guides and literature published simultaneously with the curricula, I am able to determine the espoused theories of literacy and language instruction that the curricula aimed to implement. However, I contrast this with the analysis done earlier in this chapter which reflects the way in which grammatical knowledge is explicated, to demonstrate the actual, inscribed theories at work in the curricula. I then highlight the disparities, if present, between the espoused and inscribed theories in each curriculum.

4.4.1 Espoused and inscribed theories of C2005

In the C2005 Language, Literacy and Communication IP curriculum document, no literacy theories or recommended language teaching methodologies are explicitly stated. Other documents/guides printed for C2005 which I examined were the "*Curriculum 2005: Lifelong learning for 21st century: User's guide*" (SADoE, 1997b) and "*Understanding curriculum 2005 – An introduction to OBE for Foundation Phase teachers*" (1997). These guides give information mainly about principles of OBE, not specifically literacy or language instruction. However, the emphasis in the documents is clearly on reading/learning language to make meaning – characteristic of a WLA. In the "*Curriculum 2005: Lifelong learning for 21st century: User's guide*", the first goals of the Language, Literacy and Communication learning area are listed as follows: "Language (including Sign Language) and language learning empowers people to: make meaning, negotiate meaning and understanding..." (SADoE, 1997b: 24-25). In the guide, "*Understanding curriculum 2005 – An introduction to OBE for Foundation Phase teachers*" (1997:3), it reads: "The communicative approach to language learning helps learners to develop competency…To read effectively learners must be able to *extract meaning from text*. You cannot read with understanding in a language you do not know." [my italics]

The latter quote also shows that the CLT approach is the method of language teaching promoted by the curriculum developers with the main aim of developing communicative competence. A CLT approach is also evident through the curriculum's aim to create a competence within learners: "Competence in the language of learning and teaching (LoLT) is crucial for academic mastery across the curriculum" (SADoE, 1997a:6). The CLT method is closely linked to the language policy aims of C2005 to promote multilingualism and to promote the equal use of all languages – hence the integrated and undifferentiated curriculum. The curriculum document is also clear on the rejection of formal grammar instruction (SADoE, 1997a:32) which is indicative of a WLA where the explicit teaching of separate skills is not promoted.

The structure and design of the C2005 language curriculum reflects the espoused theories. The language curriculum is expressed in seven outcomes which are to be taught in an integrated manner

and within the context of texts. A WLA is therefore evident with the emphasis of skills being learnt through reading and writing of texts and the idea that skills cannot be separated from the construction of meaning. In looking at the structure of grammatical knowledge in outcome five, weak framing and classification are evident which supports the WLA of an integrated approach to teaching language. The espoused theories of a WLA and CLT of the curriculum match the inscribed theories signalled in the content and design of the curriculum.

4.4.2 Espoused and inscribed theories of the RNCS

According to the RNCS English HL curriculum document, a BLA to literacy development has been used. "It is balanced because it begins with children's emergent literacy, it involves them reading real books and writing for genuine purposes and it gives attention to phonics" (SADoE, 2002:9). The curriculum continues to explain that with regards to reading, it adopts the approach that certain skills such as auditory and visual discrimination do not have to be in place before a learner starts to read and write, and should be developed during children's early learning experiences.

The other two supporting documents investigated alongside this curriculum were the "*RNCS Grades R – 9 Teacher's guide for the development of learning programmes*" (SADoE, 2003) and "*Foundations for learning Intermediate Phase Language Lesson Plans Grade 4*" (SADoE, 2008). In the former guide it does not explicitly state that a BLA to literacy instruction is used in the RNCS, but speaks more to the language teaching methodologies used. It reads: "The following aspects of learning and teaching are peculiar to the Languages Learning Area: Text-based approach, Process approach to writing, Reading strategies, Reading and writing in an Additional Language, Communicative approach" and defines a text-based approach as:

> Language is always explored in texts, and texts are explored in relation to their contexts. The approach involves attention to formal aspects of language (grammar and vocabulary) but in the context of the chosen texts and not in isolation. In order to talk about texts, learners need a 'meta-language': they need to develop a vocabulary of the words necessary to describe different aspects of grammar, vocabulary, style and writing genres. The purpose of a text-based approach is to enable learners to become competent, confident and critical readers, writers, viewers and designers of texts. (SADoE, 2003:26).

This is in line with the description of the BLA by Pearson (2004:243) in Chapter Two, who noted that the BLA places emphases on the reading of authentic texts and tasks, writing, literature, response and comprehension, but it also heavily foregrounds the explicit instruction of phonics, word identification comprehension and spelling. While the above shows that grammar is still to be taught, the promotion of its integration with other language activities suggests a WLA influence.

In the same publication, "*RNCS Grades R – 9 Teacher's guide for the development of learning*

programmes", there is a lengthy description of what the communicative approach entails. One comment is:

> Many of us (teachers) were trained in a method based on the structures of language and organized around separate skills, i.e. speaking, reading, writing and listening, rather than an integrated approach...Some of the most important principles of communicative language learning are: Language is acquired in a gradual and mainly subconscious process; it cannot be quickly and consciously 'learned' through teaching grammar structures, for example (this should not be misunderstood to imply that grammar structures should or should not be taught) (SADoE, 2003:29).

As discussed in Chapter Two, the CLT approach to language teaching and the BLA mirror each other's principles. However, it is worth noting that the former arises from a second language acquisition theoretical framework while the BLA has its interest in learners becoming literate. It is clear from the above-mentioned publication and the second one, "*Foundations for learning Intermediate Phase Language Lesson Plans Grade 4*" (SADoE, 2008), that a BLA and CLT are the espoused theories of the RNCS. In the latter, it supports this by saying that the NCS:

> …also includes a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, where language is developed while learners engage in texts and activities with real purposes. With much of the grammar, spelling words and spelling rules, learning happens incidentally while learners are engaged in these activities. A central principle of the Languages Learning Area is therefore the integration of all of these aspects of language through the creation and interpretation of texts, as stated in the NCS and the Milestones. (SADoE, 2008:12)

However, the inscribed theories of the RNCS depicted through the structure and design of parts of the curriculum are more reflective of a WLA than the espoused BLA. The language curriculum is expressed in six outcomes which are to "be taught and assessed in an integrated manner" "through the creation and interpretation of texts" (SADoE, 2002:6). The grammatical component, outcome six, is also to be demonstrated through the other outcomes, and the weak explication of this outcome as seen in the analysis earlier in this chapter of weak framing and classification, casts doubt on the curriculum's BLA in which grammar should still be explicitly taught.

While there is the espoused goal of developing learners' meta-language, the weak classification and framing of explicative criteria and selection of grammar content (where examples are given but not explained) and weak framing of sequencing and pacing of the same, suggest that the curriculum does not support an emphasis on skills teaching. According to Moats (2007:18), process writing, shared and guided reading are also more indicative of a WLA rather than a BLA. The accompanying guides investigated (SADoE, 2003: 26-27 & SADoE, 2008:9-10) encourage these methodologies. There seems to be a conflation of terms within this curriculum as a BLA is used to describe the literacy development approach used in the curriculum document, yet the language teaching methodologies, including reading and writing strategies, seem to have more in common with a WLA.

Therefore, while the espoused literacy instruction theory stated by the curriculum is a balanced one, the inscribed theory is more in line with a WLA philosophy. There is therefore a disparity between stated intentions and the actual structure of knowledge in the RNCS English HL curriculum. The weak classification of the grammar outcome, and weak framing of evaluative criteria, selection, sequencing and pacing of grammatical content, seem to advocate that the explicit teaching of skills is viewed as secondary to learners' acquiring competency (demonstrated through the emphasis on using CLT), and interpreting and creating meaning through texts (seen in the reading and writing strategies promoted). A WLA is still dominant in the inscribed curriculum of the RNCS.

4.4.3 Espoused and inscribed theories of the CAPS

The theories promoted by the CAPS English HL IP curriculum and its accompanying guide investigated, "*Teachers' resources pack CAPS Home Language CAPs Orientation 2012 Intermediate Phase Grades 4 – 6*" (SADoE, 2012), are the same as the espoused theories of the RNCS. The same descriptions and wording are often used to describe the approaches to language teaching, e.g. on page 12 of the curriculum document it states "the approaches to teaching language are text-based, communicative and process orientated. The text-based approach and the communicative approach are both dependent on the continuous use and production of texts." The curriculum (SADoE, 2011:12) describes the text-based approach as exploring how texts work; listening to, reading, viewing and analysing texts to understand how they are produced and what their effects are; and producing different kinds of texts for particular purposes and audiences. The communicative approach is described as: "when learning a language, a learner should have an extensive exposure to the target language and many opportunities to practise or produce the language by communicating for social or practical purposes." These are the same methodologies propagated in the RNCS curriculum. The curriculum (SADoE, 2011:12) also says:

> Language teaching happens in an integrated way, with the teacher modelling good practice, the learners practising the appropriate skills in groups before applying these skills on their own. The structure of each lesson should be one that engages the whole class before practising in groups and applying the new skill individually. The terms used are Listening and Speaking, Shared Reading and Writing, Group, Guided and Independent Reading/Writing.

These methodologies are once again more aligned with a WLA to literacy development. The emphasis is on communicative competency (through a CLT method) rather than specific skill instruction and an integrated approach to skill acquisition with the promotion of shared and guided reading.

However, in the guide used for teacher training in CAPS, "*Teachers' resources pack CAPS Home Language CAPs Orientation 2012 Intermediate Phase Grades 4 – 6*" (SADoE, 2012:64-65), it describes

the overall literacy development approach used by CAPS as a BLA and outlines other methodologies as follows:

> The approach to teaching language and learning skills should focus on both process and product. The basic language skills such as oral, reading and writing should be taught as processes. For example, before learners can read a text, they should preview its features such as table of contents, index, glossary, etc. then read and clarify the meaning of the text and finally, respond to questions to demonstrate understanding.

It then lists the same methodologies as cited in the actual curriculum document. Therefore, there seems as in the case of the RNCS, a confusion in the CAPS of what is understood by a BLA and WLA and how these approaches are implemented.

Nonetheless, the structure and design of the CAPS English HL IP curriculum is more reflective of a BLA due to the clearer explication of the skill, Language Structures and Conventions, and stipulation of formal lessons therein. While the curriculum and supporting documents espouse the same theories as the RNCS, and the language pedagogical approaches are the same (CLT, text-based and communicative), the shift through reforms in curriculum from an outcomes-based to a knowledge/contents- based curriculum has resulted in an English HL curriculum which stipulates and explicates grammatical knowledge. This thereby foregrounds skills and is reflective of a BLA to literacy. The stronger classification of grammatical knowledge; and the stronger framing of selection of texts and grammatical knowledge to be taught, evaluative criteria, sequencing and pacing, has validated compartmentalised skills instruction. This results in an inscribed theory of a BLA to literacy.

Although the term, BLA, is used confusingly still in the CAPS curriculum document to describe methodologies and strategies more reflective of a WLA, the result is a closer match between the espoused and inscribed early literacy theories underpinning CAPS. This hasn't been assisted through clearer definition or communication of the principles of BLA in curriculum documents and guides, but is rather due to a shift in curriculum organisation from an outcomes-based to a more contents-based curriculum. The clearer specification of content as a result of stronger framing and classification evidenced in the analysis of the grammatical component of the curriculum, is more indicative of an encouragement to teach componential skills explicitly which is associated with a BLA rather than a WLA. A WLA encourages integration of skills and strategies and therefore would more likely underpin an integrated curriculum while a BLA still encourages compartmentalised teaching of skills in conjunction with engagement with authentic reading texts, and therefore is more likely to underpin a collection coded curriculum.

The following table summarises the findings regarding the types of early literacy instruction theories underpinning all three curricula. It also shows the disparities between the espoused and inscribed early literacy theories where relevant.

Table 4g: Summary of early literacy instruction theories underpinning curricula

Curriculum	Espoused theory	Inscribed theory
C2005	Whole Language	Whole Language
RNCS	Balanced Language	Whole Language
CAPS	Balanced Language	Balanced Language *

**It should be noted that although the espoused and inscribed theories align in the CAPS, there still exists in the curriculum documents confusion regarding the definition and intended early literacy instruction approach to be implemented.*

What the table highlights is firstly, the move in early literacy theories with the changes in curricula from a WLA to a BLA, which affects the way in which grammar is constituted (most basically as an outcome or skill). And secondly, it shows the theoretical unease informing the curriculum design evident in the RNCS regarding how a WLA and BLA were defined and implemented. My analysis using Bernstein's classification and framing has shown the influence of the changing early literacy instruction theories' influences on the structure and organisation of grammatical knowledge. The ambiguity in the curricula's intentions and implementation regarding literacy development are discussed further in the next chapter.

Chapter Five: Discussion and conclusion

In this chapter, I summarise the findings in answer to my three research sub-questions and highlight the main themes regarding grammar constitution through curriculum reform prevalent in this study. I discuss how these themes indicate three areas of concern: the need for teacher training in grammar instruction, conceptual unease within curriculum documentation, and a lack of progression in SA English HL curriculum design.

5.1 How the constitution of grammar has changed

The constitution and the explication of grammar in SA English HL IP curricula have changed and been influenced by shifting views in curriculum, early literacy instruction, language pedagogy and acquisition theoretical bases. This can be seen through this study's examination and investigation of three, different curriculum documents and their accompanying literature through three curriculum reform moments. The analysis has shown how movements in types of curricula as described by Bernstein as integrated and collection code, and how knowledge is structured and how pedagogy is informed by the strength of classification and framing, have resulted in different conceptualisations of grammar and the teaching of it. Added to this, changes in theoretical perspectives on early childhood literacy and language development have affected pedagogical approaches to reading and writing which have also positioned the principles and methods of teaching grammar differently. Literature, mainly based in the UK, has shown that different types of grammar or approaches to grammar have emerged as a result of the value placed on grammar and the understanding of its contribution to language development or preservation – with the latter sometimes becoming a political concern.

The three curricula examined in this study have highlighted shifts in all of the afore-mentioned areas. **C2005's** "*Language, Literacy and Communication Intermediate Phase – Grades 4 to 6*" document (SADoE, 1997a) is reflective of the integrated coded curriculum where integration of knowledge and skills within the learning area are promoted. The curriculum adopted an undifferentiated view of language required to be used by teachers of all language types and levels. The strength of classification of the outcome concerned with grammar is therefore weak, and framing of the selection, evaluative criteria, sequencing and pacing of grammatical knowledge is also weak. Grammar is therefore not clearly explicated and there is a clear discouragement of learners acquiring grammatical terminology or a meta-language. The conceptualisation of grammar in this curriculum is that it is merely a component to be included in the development of the other language outcomes and that is has little value in being learnt in itself. The curriculum structure matches the espoused theories of C2005 which adopted a WLA emphasising the acquisition of language and

literacy as a meaning-making process which is to be acquired through processes such as reading and writing in real-life contexts – and not through the explicit instruction of separate skills such as grammar. Communicative competency promoted through the CLT approach is also an end-goal of this language curriculum thereby resulting in a descriptive grammar being taught which aims to teach an awareness of language structures so that learners can describe characteristics of their actual communicative actions.

In the English HL IP curriculum of the **RNCS**, "*Languages: English Home Language – Grades R to 9*" (SADoE, 2002), there was a minor shift in curriculum structure. This was after criticism, partly aimed at its lack of specificity, was made by the RNCS review committee. OBE was still the philosophy informing its design and therefore the result was a language curriculum organised similarly to C2005 into outcomes, but it specified a language type and level i.e. English HL, with attempts to differentiate language knowledge between grades. The strength of classification of the learning outcome concerned with grammar remains weak, and framing of the selection, evaluative criteria, sequencing and pacing of grammatical knowledge is also considered to be weak. However, as Chapter Four outlines, these are considered to be stronger than C2005 due to attempts to specify grammatical terminology via a glossary and examples, and the differentiation of grade requirements. A notable progression from C2005 is the requirement of the development of a meta-language to enable learners to describe and talk about their English usage. However, due to the weak framing of selection and evaluative criteria of grammatical knowledge, a clear, specific framework from which to build and teach this meta-language is absent. The conceptualisation of grammar in this curriculum is therefore ambiguous with conflicting values evident in the curriculum document. On one hand the curriculum acknowledges the value in teaching grammar in order for learners to develop a meta-language. On the other, it does not frame the selection and evaluative criteria of grammatical knowledge strongly so that the grammatical knowledge to be acquired by learners is not clearly defined.

Such ambiguity is resultant and reflective of the theoretical unease informing the curriculum design. The theoretical approach to literacy and language development in this RNCS curriculum is advocated as the BLA. However, the recommended reading and writing strategies in it and the accompanying guides, as well as the expressed values of the curriculum, are more in line with a WLA. Communicative competency is favoured over skills development – seen through the suggested language teaching methods and curriculum organisation – and therefore it seems that while the intention was to adopt a BLA to literacy development in the RNCS, a WLA still strongly prevails. A

descriptive grammar, which aims to teach an awareness of language structures so that learners can describe characteristics of their actual communicative actions, is therefore evident in this curriculum as communicative competency supersedes the learning of grammatical accuracy of terminology.

Therefore, since the previous curriculum reform moment of C2005, the constitution and explication of grammar in the RNCS remained somewhat unchanged. This was due to conceptual unease within curriculum design, as mentioned by Hoadley (2011:151) in reference to the entire RNCS, and confusion in theoretical views informing literacy development. The report of the RNCS review committee echoed these sentiments diagnosing the same ambiguity as this study has in values, methods and intentions in the curriculum document and its accompanying literature:

> Different versions of documents contain different aspects of the most up-to-date information, and this is confusing for teachers. A number of the documents also contradict one another, sometimes in terms of emphasis and at other times more directly. For example, whilst the *GET Languages National Curriculum Statement* document attempts to articulate a balanced approach to language learning, the Learning Programme Guideline takes an explicitly 'whole language' or communicative approach… In summary, the current documents are not user friendly. Many are overly long and unwieldy, and at times verbose, and there is repetition across documents. Many of the documents also contain errors and contradictions. They are also unnecessarily complex, partly because a number of documents need to be read together in discerning what is to be taught and learnt, and how. In several instances, there is a lack of alignment between the curriculum statements, assessment tasks and subject assessment frameworks and guidelines. (SADoE, 2009:19-20)

The latter report's recommendations to clarify and specify curriculum policies and guidelines resulted in the most notable shift in the constitution of grammar of the three curriculum reforms via the CAPS.

The English HL IP curriculum of the **CAPS**, "*English Home Language Intermediate Phase Grades 4 – 6*" (SADoE, 2011), shows evidence of the change in curriculum organisation from an outcomes-based one to a knowledge-based one. Language is no longer specified in learning outcomes and assessment standards but is instead specified in terms of skills, prescribed texts, content, language features and terminology to be taught. The language curriculum continued to adopt a differentiated view of language with the curriculum acknowledging language types and levels. Grammar is constituted as a separate skill in its own right and its acquisition is not only expressed as a means to an end, but as an end itself. Its acquisition is even expressed as foundational to the development of the other language skills. As explained in Chapter Four, the strength of classification of the grammatical skill is considered to be strong in this study, as well as the framing of the selection, evaluative criteria, sequencing and pacing of grammatical knowledge. The conceptualisation of grammar in this curriculum is therefore significantly different to the other two curricula. The

beginning of a shared meta-language has been developed for teachers to transmit to learners, and grammar is given academic value through the clearer explication of its content and the prescription of its teaching time and assessment weighting.

With the stipulation of language features and grammatical terms to be learnt from specific texts prescribed in two-week cycles per grade and per term, it is clear that the type of grammar to be taught is linked to the type of text and hence context. A rhetorical grammar inculcating the ability in learners to make grammatical choices according to their contexts and choice of text underpins the curriculum. However, with the clearer specification of grammatical terms and prescribed time allocation for its teaching, the way in which this curriculum structure informs teachers' pedagogies may be different according to their training and knowledge. A prescriptive grammar pedagogy may therefore result in some classrooms if the intentions of the curriculum are not communicated effectively through sufficient training. Disparity discussed below is already evident in the theories outlined in the CAPS documents and training manual, and while the curriculum design has resulted in a re-emergence of the importance of skills-based language teaching with grammar leading the way, there is confusion in approaches to literacy development.

The theoretical approach to literacy and language development in this CAPS curriculum is advocated as the BLA. However, the recommended reading and writing strategies in it and the guide used for training teachers, as well as the expressed values of the curriculum, are more in line with a WLA. As with the RNCS, there is conceptual confusion of what the meaning and implications of the BLA and WLA are. However, as opposed to the RNCS, the inscribed theory in the curriculum design actually corresponds with the seeming intention of curriculum developers to foster a BLA, as skills instruction is once again foregrounded despite the encouragement of WLA reading and writing strategies. The constitution and explication of grammar in this curriculum is therefore clearer but is still, due to a conflation in literacy instruction theories, open to interpretation by curriculum implementers i.e. teachers.

5.2 Implications for curriculum design and curriculum implementers

This study has shown how changes in prevailing curriculum, early literacy instruction and language theories can influence how a particular aspect of language, namely grammar, is constituted and explicated in different language curricula. Therefore what and how grammatical knowledge is structured and proposed for transmission, through pedagogy at a curriculum level, can determine the degree to which learners acquire a meta-language for English. While the literature reviewed in this study showed some of the differing views on the value of teaching grammar and the different

agendas (sometimes political) informing the promotion of grammar in schools, it was by no means exhaustive, highlighting some of the main theoretical views on grammar and its teaching. This study's analysis shows a shift towards a view consonant with those authors who see intrinsic value in teaching grammar and that the ability of learners to describe their own language practices using a commonly understood meta-language is valuable for the development of learners' literacy and appreciation of language. The CAPS goes some way towards a curriculum which is explicit in its expectations of learners' acquisition of an English meta-language through the specification of grammatical content and terminology.

5.2.1 The IP English HL teacher and his/her training requirements

The curricula's designs presume competencies, attributes and training that teachers must have in order to implement the content of them. In the language curriculum of **C2005**, the lack of specificity infers that the curriculum presumes the teacher implementing it has a high degree of competency in many areas and *does not require much guidance.* Firstly, there is the presumption that the teacher is proficient in teaching a language –not necessarily English – to learners. The teacher has the ability to teach non-mother-tongue learners (defined as a basic level of language learning) and mother-tongue speakers (defined as main language learners) and is able to gauge the appropriateness of content to meet the needs and abilities of the various learners. This is inferred from the weak framing of selection of texts and language features to be taught in the curriculum. It is also presumed the teacher has a working knowledge of language conventions and constructs him/herself and has a developed meta-language as definitions of grammatical terminology are not explicated in the curriculum, and framing of evaluative criteria of grammatical knowledge is weak. The teacher is also expected to select the degree of difficulty and rate of acquisition of grammatical knowledge for the different grades of learners as there is weak framing of sequencing and pacing. The weaker the framing of the curriculum, the more control the teacher has over what and how knowledge is transmitted, therefore putting more onus on the teacher to establish what constitutes valid language or grammatical knowledge.

In the **RNCS** English HL curriculum, less is presumed of the teacher due to the attempts at more specificity through stronger framing. The presumption is that the teacher *may need guidance* in teaching English as the framing of selection and evaluative criteria is stronger than in C2005. However, it is assumed the teacher has the ability to gauge the degree of difficulty of content suitable to the grade of learners as clear progression in content between grades is not evident. The teacher is also expected to select the rate of acquisition of grammatical content according to the grade of learners as there is weak framing of sequencing and pacing. It is not assumed that all

teachers understand and share a common meta-language for English as a glossary of language terminology is provided.

The **CAPS** English HL IP curriculum presumes that the teacher *needs guidance* in teaching English as there is strong framing of selection and pacing. While the framing of evaluative criteria of grammatical content is also stronger than in the RNCS, the teacher is still expected to determine the degree of complexity of the grammatical terms needing to be taught. He/she is expected to be able to integrate the teaching of grammar into the other three skills of the curriculum. Progression in the degree of difficulty between grades is also not clearly defined in all categories of grammar. As mentioned previously in this chapter, while a rhetorical grammar seems to be constituted in this curriculum, the successful transmission of such a grammar is dependent on the knowledge, understanding and attitude of language teachers towards the value and significance of grammar teaching. As UK-based researchers Lefstein (2009) and Watson (2013) point out, what is inscribed in the curriculum may not be enacted in the classroom if teachers' own competencies or attitudes clash with that proposed at a curriculum level. Young teachers, themselves having being schooled using the language curricula of C2005 and the RNCS in which grammar was not explicated, will likely not have the level of competency required to teach the grammar constituted in the CAPS. And, as in the UK, a training programme for language teachers focussed specifically on grammar may have to be considered.

5.2.2 Conceptual unease and a lack of progression in SA English HL curriculum design

Two more implications for English HL IP curriculum designers, highlighted by this study, are the improvements required in clarity of theoretical concepts underpinning English HL curricula and in making progression within curricula clearer. The first concern has been evident since the inception of the RNCS where ambiguity regarding early literacy instruction approaches in curricula and accompanying guides is evident in this study's analysis and in the analysis done by the RNCS review committee (SADoE, 2009:19-20). In the present study's analysis of CAPS, it reveals that the same ambiguity continues. However, due to the reform in curriculum organisation to a content-based, collection coded curriculum, the organisation of grammatical knowledge is more in line with the espoused BLA to literacy development despite the WLA being promoted in parts of the CAPS documents. Conceptual unease and ambiguity make the interpreting of the curriculum by curriculum implementers, such as subject advisers and teachers, more difficult. Added to this, the training that is required for teachers to understand how the new curriculum constitutes grammar, is inhibited by conceptual unease and vagueness. Clarification of the theories at play should be communicated plainly and visibly to teachers and other enactors of the curricula, thus ensuring more continuity at the level of classroom.

A lack of clarity in progression has also been highlighted by the findings of this study, and has been a consistent area of concern in all three curricula studied. As shown in Chapter Four, the analysis done of the grammatical components of the three curricula, revealed weak framing of selection, evaluative criteria, sequencing and pacing in C2005 and the RNCS. This leaves the definition of the terms and rate of progression for learners to the discretion of the teacher. In the CAPS, while the strength of framing of these elements of the instructional discourse were coded as stronger thereby aiding progression, stronger framing of selection and evaluative criteria is still required in terms of providing absolute clarity to teachers on the degree of difficulty of grammatical terminology between grades, in particular categories of grammar.

While the types of grammar and early literacy instruction theories affect the way in which grammar is constituted, I suggest that differentiation in the level of conceptual difficulty of learning particular grammatical structures and conventions should be made consistently. As there are already hints at a hierarchy of conceptual difficulty in certain grammatical terms e.g. sentence types: simple sentences, complex sentences etc., this should be carried through all categories of grammatical knowledge e.g. types of nouns, adverbs. Additionally, the tasks to be done with the grammatical terminology, e.g. identify verbs, define them, use them, or conjugate them, should be graded according to the conceptual difficulty involved. The bases then for the differentiation of grammatical knowledge between grades, and terms and weeks within grades, would not therefore be arbitrary and clearer grounds for progression would be substantive. A clear understanding of the complexity of learners developing a meta-language for English would therefore be made more explicit at curriculum level. Additionally, in order for the intended grammar and its pedagogy to be implemented more consistently in diverse English HL contexts, progression in the constitution and transmission of grammatical knowledge has to be explicit at curriculum level. And what is clear from this study's analysis is that in the current IP English HL curriculum, this can be further explicated.

5.3 Conclusion

This study sought to determine how grammar and its pedagogy in SA English HL curriculum documents in the IP, have been constituted and explicated through three curriculum reform moments between 1997 and 2012. It also sought to show how these have been influenced by changing grammar and early literacy instruction theories and language teaching methodologies.

The study has shown South African English HL curriculum designers' return to a contents or knowledge-based curriculum via the CAPS. Therefore grammatical knowledge has been more strongly classified and framed, resulting in a more explicit constitution of grammar as a skill to be acquired by learners for the development of their own meta-language, and improvement of their

other language skills. This clearer constitution of grammatical knowledge mirrors the re-emergence of grammar instruction in the new 2014 English curriculum of the UK which includes a mandatory grammar assessment at the end of Key Stage 2 for 11 year old learners. South Africa's needs are similar to those of the UK, where teacher training in grammar is required (Watson, 2013:11-12) to ensure teachers' own understanding of grammatical knowledge, pedagogy and the curriculum's intentions thereof. Added to this, the intended conceptualisation of grammar and its pedagogy may not be realised or implemented by SA curriculum enactors. This is due to ambiguity surrounding the intended literacy development theories influencing the constitution of grammar, as well as indistinct progression requirements between grades pertaining to the acquisition of specific grammatical knowledge. The ambiguities in these two areas in curriculum documentation need to be resolved to enable the effective execution of teacher training to improve English HL teachers' own grammatical knowledge and understanding of the curriculum's intended conceptualisation of grammar and its pedagogy.

Bibliography

Basic education says grammar will be taught. (2011) [Online] 20 August 2013. URL: http://www.mg.co.za/article/2011-03-04-basic-education-says-grammar-will-be-taught/

Bernstein, B. (1971) 'Introduction: the relationship between sociolinguistic and educational codes'. In *Class, codes and control, vol. 3.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul: 20 – 30.

Bernstein, B. (1975) 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge'. In *Class, codes and control, vol. 3.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul: 77 – 106.

Bernstein, B. (1990) 'Social class and pedagogic practice'. In *Class, codes and control, vol. 4.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul: 63 – 93.

Bernstein, B. (1996) 'Pedagogic codes and their modalities of practice'. In *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity.* London: Routledge: 3 – 24.

Bertram, C. (2006) 'Knowledge, pedagogy and assessment in the old and new Further Education and Training History curriculum documents' *Education as Change,* vol. 10 (2): 33 – 51.

Burgess, T. (1998) 'Mouse and Grammar: connecting use and structure in English teaching'. *Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education*, vol. 5(2): 103 – 113.

Burgess, J and Etherington, S. (2002) 'Focus on grammatical from: explicit or implicit?'. *System 30*: 433 – 458.

Cajkler, W. (2004) 'How a dead butler was killed: the way English national strategies maim grammatical parts'. *Language and Education*, vol. 18 (1): 1 – 15.

Chick, J. K. (1992) 'English as a medium and as a subject in a post-apartheid South Africa' *Southern African Journal of Applied Language Studies,* vol. 1 (1): 29 – 40

Christie, F & Macken-Horarik, M. (2007) 'Building verticality in subject English'. In F. Christie & J.R. Martin (eds.) *Language, pedagogy and knowledge – functional linguistic and sociological perspectives.* London: Continuum: 156 – 183.

Clark, L. (2012) *Thousands of teachers go back to school to learn basic Maths and grammar so they can deliver tough new lessons*. [Online] 20 August 2013. URL: http://www.dailymail.co.uk /news/article-2157950/Thousands-teachers-school-learn-basic-maths-grammar-deliver-tough-new-lessons.html

Clark, U. (2010) 'Grammar in the curriculum for English: what next?'. In *Changing English: Studies in culture and education.* London: Routledge: 189 – 200.

Dean, D. (2011) 'Shifting perspectives about grammar: Changing what and how we teach'. *English Journal,* vol. 100 (4): 20 – 26.

Diamondstone, J. (2002) 'Language Education in English Education: Grammar instruction, grammar plus, or critical social analysis?'. *Teaching Education*, vol. 13 (3): 317 – 328.

Fiske, E. and Ladd, H. (2005) 'Outcomes-based education and equity'. In *Elusive Equity: Education Reform in post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC press: 154 – 172.

Goodman, K. (1984) 'Unity in reading'. In A. C. Purves and O. Niles (eds.) *Becoming readers in a complex society - eighty-third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part I.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 79 – 114.

Gosher, S. (2011) *Deep concerns about English CAPS*. [Online] 20 August 2013. URL: http://www.teachenglishtoday.org/index.php/2011/02/deep-concerns-about-english-caps/

Hoadley, U. and Ensor, P. (2009) 'Teachers' social class, professional dispositions and pedagogic practice'. *Teaching and Teacher Education, vol.* 25: 876 – 886.

Hoadley, U. (2011) 'Knowledge, knowers and knowing: Curriculum reform in South Africa'. In L. Yates & M. Grumet (eds.) *Curriculum in Today's World: configuring knowledge, identities, work and politics.* London: Routledge: 139 – 154.

Hudson, R and Barton, G. (2002). 'Glamour or grind?' in *The Times Educational Supplement.* [Online] 30 August 2013. http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/dick/papers/TES.htm

Hudson, R & Walmsley, J. (2005). 'The English patient: English grammar and teaching in the twentieth century'. *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 41: 593 – 622.

Jannuzi, C. (1997) 'Key concepts in literacy: Phonics vs whole language'. *Literacy across cultures*, vol 1 (1). [online] 09 September 2013. http://www2.aasa.ac.jp/~dcdycus/LAC97/phonics.htm

Keen, J. (1997) 'Grammar, metalanguage and writing development'. *Teacher Development: An international journal of teachers' professional development*, vol. 1(3): 431 – 445.

Kerper Mora, J. (2013) 'Second and foreign language teaching methods' [Online] 28 November 2013. URL: http: //moramodules.com/ALMMethods.htm

Koustourakis, G. and Zacharos, K. (2011) 'Changes in school mathematics knowledge in Greece: a Bernsteinian analysis'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 32 (3): 369 – 387.

2013 Key Stage 2 tests: English grammar, punctuation and spelling test . (2013) [Online] 20 August 2013. URL: http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/assessment/ keystage2 /b00208296/ks2-2013/english-tests/grammar-punctuation-spelling-test

Lefstein, A. (2009) 'Rhetorical grammar and the grammar of schooling: Teaching "powerful verbs" in the English National Literacy Strategy'. *Linguistics and Education*, vol. 20: 378 – 400.

Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. (2006) 'Explaining second language learning'. In *How languages are learned (3rd ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 29 – 76.

Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. (2006) 'Language learning in early childhood'. In *How languages are learned (3rd ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1 – 28.

Maxwell, J.A. (1992) 'Understanding and validity in qualitative research'. *Harvard Educational Review,* vol. 62 (3): 279 – 300.

Moats, L. (2007) *Whole-Language High Jinks: How to Tell When "Scientifically-Based Reading Instruction" Isn't.* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

Morais, A. (2002) 'Basil Bernstein at the micro level of the classroom'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* vol. 23, (4): 559 – 569.

Morais, A., Neves, I. and Pires, D. (2004) 'The *what* and the *how* of teaching and learning'. In J. Muller, B. Davies & A. Morais (Eds.). *Reading Bernstein ,researching Bernstein.* London: Routledge Falmer: 75-89.

Nykiel-Herbert, B. (2004) 'Mis-Constructing Knowledge: The Case of Learner-Centred Pedagogy in South Africa'. *Perspectives*, vol. 34 (3): 249 – 265.

Parker, D. (2006) 'Grade 10–12 Mathematics curriculum reform in South Africa: A textual analysis of new national curriculum Statements'. *African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, vol. 10(2): 59 – 73.

Paterson, L. (2010) 'Grammar and the English National Curriculum'. *Language and* Education, vol. 24 (6): 473 – 484.

Pearson, D. (2004) 'The Reading Wars'. *Educational Policy*, vol. 18 (1): 216 – 252.

Savignon, S. (2002) 'Communicative Language Teaching: Linguistic Theory and Classroom Practice'. In S. Savignon (ed.). *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press: 1 – 27.

South African Department of Education (1997a) *Curriculum 2005: Language, Literacy and Communication Intermediate Phase.* Pretoria: South African Department of Education.

South African Department of Education (1997b) *Curriculum 2005: Lifelong learning for 21st century: User's guide.* Pretoria: South African Department of Education.

South African Department of Education (2000) 'Chapter 3: Structure and design of the curriculum'. In *A South African Curriculum for the 21st Century - Report of the Review Committee on C2005*. Pretoria: South African Department of Education. 28 – 52.

South African Department of Education (2002) Revised *National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 9 (Schools) Policy: Languages: English Home Language*. Pretoria: South African Department of Education.

South African Department of Education (2003) Revised *National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 9 Teacher's Guide for the development of learning programmes*. Pretoria: South African Department of Education.

South African Department of Education (2008) *Foundations for learning Intermediate Phase Language Lesson Plans Grade 4*. Pretoria: South African Department of Education.

South African Department of Basic Education (2009) *Report of the Task Team for the Review of the Implementation of the National Curriculum Statement*. Pretoria: South African Department of Education.

South African Department of Education (2011) *National Curriculum Statement: Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement English Home Language Intermediate Phase Grades 4 - 6*. Pretoria: South African Department of Education.

South African Department of Education (2012) *Teachers' resources pack CAPS Home Language CAPs Orientation 2012 Intermediate Phase Grades 4 - 6*. Pretoria: South African Department of Education. Retrieved 01 October 2013 from http://www.thutong.doe.gov.za/artsandculture/IPCAPSforAllsubjects/tabid/5032/Default.aspx

Thornbury, S. (1999) 'Why teach grammar?'. In J. Harmer (ed.). *How to teach grammar.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited: 14 – 29.

'Understanding curriculum 2005 – An introduction to OBE for Foundation Phase Teachers'. (1997) Sandton: Heineman Publishers.

Venter, M. (2011) *Goodbye language teaching*. [Online] 20 August 2013. URL: http://www.teachenglishtoday.org/index.php/2011/02/goodbye-to-language-teaching/

Watson, A.M. (2013) 'Conceptualisations of 'grammar teaching': L1 English teachers' beliefs about teaching grammar for writing'. In *Language Awareness*. London: Routledge: 1 – 14.

Wilmot, D. (2008). 'Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse: A framework for understanding how teacher educators in a Namibian college of education interpret and practice learner-centred pedagogy' John Nyambe (National Institute for Educational Development, Namibia).

Young, M. (2007) 'What is schooling for?' In H. Daniels, H. Lauder and J. Porter (eds.). *The Routledge Companion to Education*. London: Routledge: 1 – 10.

Appendix A

Table 1 - Comparison of grammar content in in SA English HL IP curricula			
Comparative criteria	**C2005**	**RNCS**	**CAPS**
Name of curriculum document	Language, Literacy and Communication Intermediate Phase	Languages: English Home Language Grade R to 9	English Home Language Intermediate Phase Grades 4 - 6
SECTION A: DESCRIPTION OF GRAMMAR COMPONENT			
How the grammar component is described	**(Page 3)** Described as outcome 5 of seven outcomes: "Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context."	**(Page 6)** Described as outcome 6 of six outcomes (Language Structure and Use): "The learner will know and be able to use the sounds, words and grammar of the language to create and interpret texts."	**(Page 9)** Described as one of four skills: "Language Structures and Conventions"
Stated purpose of the outcome/skill	**(Page 32)** "This specific outcome aims to develop a language user's understanding and knowledge of grammar. The development of this grammatical competence empowers the learner to communicate clearly and confidently by using grammatical structures (e.g. word order) correctly. Clarity of communication is improved through the development of a learner's editing skills which includes a conscious awareness of the learner's own language usage."	**(Page 57)** "Learners will explore how language works, and develop a shared language for talking about language (a 'metalanguage'), so that they can evaluate their own and other texts critically in terms of meaning, effectiveness and accuracy. They will also be able to use this knowledge to experiment with language to build meaning (from word and sentence levels to whole texts), and see how a text and its context are related. They will become aware of how language changes over time and between cultures, and how it changes in different situations."	**(Page 12)** "A good knowledge of vocabulary and grammar provides the foundation for skills development (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in the Home Language. Intermediate Phase learners will build on the foundation that was laid in Grades R – 3. Learners will learn how Language Structures and Conventions are used, and will develop a shared language for talking about language (a 'meta-language'), so that they can evaluate their own and other texts critically in terms of meaning, effectiveness and accuracy. They will also be able to use this knowledge to experiment with language to build meaning from word and sentence levels to whole texts, and to see how a text and its context are related. Through interacting with a variety of texts, learners extend their use of vocabulary and correctly apply their understanding of Language Structures and Conventions."
How outcome/skill is constituted	**(Pages 32 to 35)** Outcome 5 is divided into three assessment standards each being further explicated by performance indicators (PI) and examples. The assessment standards and PIs are as follows: "1.Knowledge of grammatical structures and conventions is applied to structure text. – PI: This will be evident when learners create texts as designated..." "2. Incorrect and/or appropriate language usage by self and others is edited – PI: This will be evident when learners can apply the language structures and connections ...to their editing work." "3. Common features and patterns of different languages are identified, explained and applied – PI: This will be evident when learners can communicate at a basic level with learners from a different language background."	**(Pages 86 to 89)** Outcome 6 is divided into six assessment standards each being further explicated with examples. The assessment standards are: ● The learner works with words. ● The learner works with sentences. ● The learner works with texts. ● The learner develops awareness and use of style. ● The learner develops critical language awareness. ● The learner uses meta-language.	**(Pages 36 to 87)** Language structures and conventions are specified in categories of word level, sentence level, word meaning and spelling and punctuation per two week cycle per term per grade based on the text type being used in the cycle.

Guidelines on teaching the outcome/skill	**(Page 6)** "The language outcomes are directed at an 'ideal language user' in that they relate to all languages and all levels of language learning. The multidimensional and dynamic nature of language can hardly be expressed in a set of linear statements as found in the rationale, outcomes and assessment criteria. Different language outcomes tend to overlap. The function of an outcome is to emphasise a certain feature of language activity. This feature will often be exemplified in the context of an integrated set of language activities. An outcome and its associated assessment criteria and range statements should therefore not be viewed in isolation…The seven outcomes are achieved through the integrated use of listening, observing, speaking, signing, reading and writing skills." **(Page 32)** "In the Intermediate Phase no grammatical terminology is used. Activities should be undertaken in context and not in formal grammar lessons."	**(Page 6)** "Outcome 6 deals with the core of language knowledge - sounds, words and grammar - in texts. This knowledge is put into action through the language skills described in the other outcomes. These outcomes have been written to give specific focus to particular kinds of knowledge and skills, and to make them clear and understandable. When we use language, however, we integrate knowledge, skills and values to express ourselves. A central principle of the Languages Learning Area Statement is therefore the integration of these aspects of language through the creation and interpretation of texts." **(Page 7)** "Listening and speaking, reading and viewing, writing, thinking and reasoning, and knowledge of sounds, words and grammar - although presented as separate outcomes - should be integrated when taught and assessed. For example, learners: …read and analyse key features of another text of the same type (for example, use of simple present tense, passive voice, linking words such as 'first', 'next', 'then')…"	**(Page 35)** "**How the Language Structures and Conventions are addressed** The content of the 'Language Structures and Conventions' section is related in most cases to the types of texts prescribed under the headings Listening and Speaking, Reading and Viewing, and Writing and Presenting, and will naturally be given attention in the process of engaging with the texts and during the time allocated for Listening and Speaking, Reading and Viewing, Writing and Presenting. For example, if a story is being done, learners will naturally use the simple past tense and will read texts using this tense. However, it is also important that activities be developed that focus on particular language structures, in context. Choose items from the 'Language Structures and Conventions' section to teach learners language that appears naturally in the focus text type and in an order that supports a natural and logical approach to language acquisition. Not all items must be taught within that given cycle but ensure that all the items listed in the overview are covered by the end of the year. Construct activities that are meaningful to learners and that relate to the texts they are studying in the two-week cycle. More activities of this nature should be done as learners make progress from Grade 4 to 6. Select very carefully which rules you explain to learners and keep these to a minimum. Practice in Language Structures and Conventions will refine these skills. Teaching should integrate all the language skills and language structures as they are interrelated. All of these should be taught in context. Note however that there is also specific time allocated to formal instruction in Language Structures and Conventions." **(Page 12)** "It is expected that Language Structures and Conventions should be taught in context as other language skills are taught and developed. The teaching plans contain a list of Language Structures and Conventions (items) that should be covered in each grade. When selecting listening and reading texts for each two-week cycle, make sure that they contain some of the language items you want to cover. Create activities related to these texts that will enable learners to use these items, in context. Similarly, the writing texts learners will write will include some of the language items. Give your learners guidance on appropriate and correct usage of these items. Select some of the items your learners have difficulty with and give them formal practice. In the Intermediate Phase, thirty minutes is set aside for formal instruction and practice in language structure and conventions."

SECTION B: EXPLICATION OF GRAMMAR COMPONENT			
Grade 4 Term 1 **Specification of text to be used**	**Pages 32 to 35**	**Pages 58 to 62**	**Pages 25 to 26 and 36 to 87**
	Engage with texts such as: **Basic level:** Completion of sentences, close procedure, unscrambling of paragraphs (logical sequencing), writing of descriptive and factual paragraphs, dialogue, subjective reports, informal letters **Main language learning:** short compositions, giving opinions on books, objective reports, newspaper reports, writing of poetry, short stories, short plays **(Page 4)** "The term 'text' refers to a unit of spoken, written or visual communication, including Sign Language, and alternative and augmentative methods of communication. Spoken texts include conversations, speeches and songs etc. Written texts include poetry, drama, novels, letters, magazines and newspaper articles and scripts etc. Visual texts include posters, cartoons, advertisements, environmental print (e.g. road signs, signs on electronic equipment, icons), maps, diagrams and charts."	**Oral:** Conversations, Speeches, Poems, Choral verses, Narratives (e.g. fables, legends, stories), Reports of events, Jokes, riddles and limericks, Weather reports, Interviews, Short talks, Songs, Word games, Instructions (e.g. for a game), Directions **Written/Visual:** Poems, Stories, Reports (e.g. science, weather, accident, sports), Narratives (e.g. fables, legends, stories), Procedures (e.g. recipes, instructions), Comics/cartoon strips, Letters, Diaries, Reference books (e.g. dictionaries, encyclopaedias), Textbooks (from different Learning Areas), Drawings, Collages, Bar graphs, Charts (e.g. flow charts), Mind maps, Maps, **Multimedia:** Children's television dramas, Television cartoons, Television advertisements, Computers or CD-ROMs (where available), Live performances, Advertisements	Week 1 to 2: Short story and personal account Week 3 to 4: Poem/song Week 5 to 6: Folklore, myth, legend Week 7 to 8: Instructional text Week 9 to 10: Newspaper/magazine article
Grade 4 Term 2 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Information text - weather report Week 3 to 4: Short story Week 5 to 6: Folklore, myth, legend Week 7 to 8: Instructional text (procedures) with visuals
Grade 4 Term 3 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Novel extract Week 3 to 4: Information text Week 5 to 6: Poem Week 7 to 8: Information text with visuals Week 9 to 10: Drama
Grade 4 Term 4 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Newspaper/magazine article Week 3 to 4: Short story Week 5 to 6: Information text: Advertisement Week 7 to 8: Drama/dialogue
Grade 5 Term 1 **Specification of text to be used**	**Engage with texts such as:** **Basic level:** Completion of sentences, close procedure, unscrambling of paragraphs (logical sequencing), writing of descriptive and factual paragraphs, dialogue, subjective reports, informal letters **Main language learning:** short compositions, giving opinions on books, objective reports, newspaper reports, writing of poetry, short stories, short plays **(Page 4) "**The term 'text' refers to a unit of spoken, written or visual communication, including Sign Language, and alternative and augmentative methods of communication. Spoken texts include conversations, speeches and songs etc. Written texts include poetry, drama, novels, letters, magazines and newspaper articles and scripts etc. Visual texts include posters, cartoons, advertisements, environmental print (e.g. road signs, signs on electronic equipment, icons), maps, diagrams and charts."	**Oral:** Speeches, Radio shows, Oral poems (e.g. praise poems, ballads), Narratives (e.g. stories, fables, myths, legends), Instructions, Directions, News, Reports (e.g. weather, sports), Choral chants, Talks/short lectures, Debates, Plays, Jokes, humorous anecdotes **Written/Visual:** Poems, Narratives (e.g. stories, fables, myths, legends), Letters, Book reviews, Diaries, Journals, Procedures (e.g. instructions, recipes), Reports, Reference books (e.g. dictionaries, encyclopaedias), Textbooks (from different Learning Areas), Posters, Photographs, Graphs and pie charts, Tables, Mind maps, Diagrams **Multimedia:** Television dramas, Films, Television cartoons, Computers, Internet and CD-ROMs (where available), Performances, Exhibits	Week 1 to 2: Short story or personal account Week 3 to 4: Information text with visuals Week 5 to 6: Newspaper/magazine article Week 7 to 8: Folklore, myth, legend Week 9 to 10: Poem
Grade 5 Term 2 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Instructional text: instructions Week 3 to 4: Information text: interview report Week 5 to 6: Poem Week 7 to 8: Folklore, myth, legend
Grade 5 Term 3 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Novel/ book review Week 3 to 4: Information text with visuals: advertisement Week 5 to 6: Folklore, myth, legend Week 7 to 8: Information text: weather report Week 9 to 10: Drama: play script/dialogue
Grade 5 Term 4 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Short story/friendly letter/diary entry Week 3 to 4: Information text with visuals: news report Week 5 to 6: Information text and descriptive essay Week 7 to 8: Instructional text

Grade 6 Term 1 **Specification of text to be used**	**Engage with texts such as:** **Basic level**: Completion of sentences, close procedure, unscrambling of paragraphs (logical sequencing), writing of descriptive and factual paragraphs, dialogue, subjective reports, informal letters **Main language learning**: short compositions, giving opinions on books, objective reports, newspaper reports, writing of poetry, short stories, short plays **(Page 4)** "The term 'text' refers to a unit of spoken, written or visual communication, including Sign Language, and alternative and augmentative methods of communication. Spoken texts include conversations, speeches and songs etc. Written texts include poetry, drama, novels, letters, magazines and newspaper articles and scripts etc. Visual texts include posters, cartoons, advertisements, environmental print (e.g. road signs, signs on electronic equipment, icons), maps, diagrams and charts."	**Oral:** Discussions, Meetings, Debates, Stories, Plays, Radio shows - a variety of different formats, News, Instructions, Directions, Explanations, Oral poems/poetry reading, Anecdotes, Negotiations **Written/Visual:** Biographies, Novels, Short stories, Short plays, Poems, Newspaper and magazine articles, Reports (e.g. crime, accident, sports), Procedures (instructions), Directions, Reference books (e.g. dictionaries, encyclopaedias), Textbooks (from different Learning Areas), Advertisements, Photographs, Graphs - a variety of different types, Tables, Charts, Diagrams, Maps **Multimedia:** Films, Documentaries, Cartoons, Television shows, Television advertisements, Computers, Internet, CD-ROMs (where available), Performances, Exhibits	Week 1 to 2: Radio/newspaper report Week 3 to 4: Folklore, myth, legend Week 5 to 6: Persuasive text (advertisement, speech) Week 7 to 8: Drama (script/dialogue) Week 9 to 10: Poem
Grade 6 Term 2 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Instructional text Week 3 to 4: Novel/book review Week 5 to 6: Short story Week 7 to 8: Information text with visuals
Grade 6 Term 3 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Novel/ book review Week 3 to 4: Folklore, myth, legend (character sketch) Week 5 to 6: Short story/friendly letter/diary entry Week 7 to 8: Visual text: cartoon/comic strip Week 9 to 10: Drama (script/dialogue)
Grade 6 Term 4 **Specification of text to be used**			Week 1 to 2: Information text/descriptive essay Week 3 to 4: Instructional text Week 5 to 6: Short story/summary Week 7 to 8: Poem
Specification of language features from texts to be taught	None specified	None specified	"A summary of text types across the phase" is tabulated on **pages 27 to 31** which includes the text structure and language features (word level, sentence level, and word meaning grammatical conventions are referenced) of the types of texts referred to in the curriculum.
Grade 4 Term 1 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**	**Pages 32 to 35** **•The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic level:** vocabulary, word formation, noun classes, pronouns (e.g. possessive), verbal prefixes, verbal suffixes, qualificatives, adjectives (basic), adverbs, prepositions, simple figurative language (e.g. simile, metaphor, personification) **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as enriched and fairly extended vocabulary, vivid and original adjectives, adverbs **•The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic level:** inappropriate vocabulary **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as inappropriate figurative language	**Pages 86 to 89** The learner: • uses prefixes, stems and suffixes to form words • explores the origin of words (e.g. words borrowed from Afrikaans and African languages) • records words in a personal dictionary • identifies and uses nouns, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, prepositions • understands and uses figurative language such as simile (e.g. 'He looks like an angel.') • uses meta-language (terms such as direct speech, indirect speech, idioms, proverb, formal, informal, simile, quotation marks)	**Pages 36 to 87** Week 1 to 2: common nouns, proper nouns, countable and uncountable nouns Week 3 to 4: abstract and concrete nouns, compound nouns (Word meaning: rhymes, borrowed words) Week 5 to 6: prefix, roots and suffix (Word meaning: proverbs, idioms) Week 7 to 8: personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, demonstrative (Word meaning: borrowed words) Week 9 to 10: articles (English & Afrikaans), plurals (noun prefixes – African languages) (Word meaning: antonyms)
Grade 4 Term 2 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: adjectives, degrees of comparison Week 3 to 4: adjectives, verbs – main verbs, regular verbs, transitive and intransitive verbs Week 5 to 6: regular and irregular verbs, finite and infinite verbs, stative verbs (Word meaning: idioms and proverbs) Week 7 to 8: auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, moods
Grade 4 Term 3 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: adverbs (Word meaning: one word for a phrase) Week 3 to 4: conjunctions, prepositions (Word meaning: figurative, similes, metaphors) Week 5 to 6: conjunctions (Word meaning: personification, alliteration, similes, metaphors, rhythm, rhyme) Week 7 to 8: stems Week 9 to 10: collective nouns, reflexive pronouns, stems
Grade 4 Term 4 **Specification of word level structures and conventions& word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: conjunctions, auxiliary verbs (Word meaning: synonyms, antonyms) Week 3 to 4: adverbs of place and degree, tenses, conjunctions, pronouns (focus on concepts that have been covered) Week 5 to 6: conjunctions Week 7 to 8: : infinitive verbs (Word meaning: similes, metaphor, idioms and proverbs)

Grade 5 Term 1 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**	**•The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic level:** vocabulary, word formation, noun classes, pronouns (e.g. possessive), verbal prefixes, verbal suffixes, qualificatives, adjectives (basic), adverbs, prepositions, simple figurative language (e.g. simile, metaphor, personification) **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as enriched and fairly extended vocabulary, vivid and original adjectives, adverbs **•The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic level:** inappropriate vocabulary **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as inappropriate figurative language	The learner: • uses prefixes, stems and suffixes/extensions to form words • explores the origin of words (e.g. words borrowed from French) • records words in a personal dictionary • identifies and uses nouns, pronouns, prepositions, articles and conjunctions • understands and uses figurative language such as personification (e.g. 'The flames were licking the building.') • uses meta-language (terms such as articles, conjunctions, topic sentence, audience, tense, personification)	Week 1 to 2: common and proper nouns, noun prefixes, suffixes (Word meaning: synonyms) Week 3 to 4: finite verbs, infinite verbs (Word meaning: personification, proverbs, idiom, simile) Week 5 to 6: prepositions, determiners, articles (Word meaning: antonyms) Week 7 to 8: noun prefixes, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, conjunctions (Word meaning: proverbs, idioms, metaphor) Week 9 to 10: conjunctions (Word meaning: personification, alliteration, similes, onomatopoeia, metaphors, rhymes, rhythm)
Grade 5 Term 2 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: adverbs of manner, time, place, degree; prepositions, moods, adjectives Week 3 to 4: adjectives, pronouns, conjunctions, connections Week 5 to 6: : collective nouns, abstract nouns, interjections (Word meaning: : alliteration, (assonance, consonance), personification , rhythm, rhyme, metaphor, simile Week 7 to 8: : infinite verbs, gerund, singular and plural, diminutive prefixes (African languages), adjectives
Grade 5 Term 3 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: relative pronouns, reflexive pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, connections, interjections (Word meaning: similes, proverbs, idioms) Week 3 to 4: degrees of comparison, adverbs Week 5 to 6: verbs (infinitives), adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, conjunctions, types of nouns (Word meaning: metaphors, similes, idioms, proverbs, homophones) Week 7 to 8: verbs (gerunds), pronouns, adverbs, adjectives, conjunctions, abstract nouns (Word meaning: onomatopoeia, homophones, homonyms, polysemy, antonyms, synonyms) Week 9 to 10: verbs (gerunds) (Word meaning: oxymoron)
Grade 5 Term 4 **Specification of word level structures and conventions& word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: prepositions, determiners, adjectives, adverbs, nouns, pronouns Week 3 to 4: conjunctions, moods (Word meaning: synonyms, antonyms, homophones, homonyms, polysemy) Week 5 to 6: definite and indefinite articles, adjectives (Word meaning: metaphors, similes, proverbs, idioms) Week 7 to 8: stems, prefixes, suffixes (Word meaning: antonyms, synonyms, metonymy)

Grade 6 Term 1 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**	**•The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic level:** vocabulary, word formation, noun classes, pronouns (e.g. possessive), verbal prefixes, verbal suffixes, qualificatives, adjectives (basic), adverbs, prepositions, simple figurative language (e.g. simile, metaphor, personification) **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as enriched and fairly extended vocabulary, vivid and original adjectives, adverbs **•The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic level:** inappropriate vocabulary **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as inappropriate figurative language	The learner: • uses prefixes, stems and suffixes/extensions to form words • explores the origin of words (e.g. words borrowed from Latin and Greek) • records words in a personal dictionary • identifies and uses nouns, pronouns, prepositions, articles, conjunctions, and modals • understands and uses figurative language such as metaphor (e.g. 'He is an angel.') • uses meta-language (terms such as main clause, subordinate clause, conjunction, active and passive voice, metaphor)	Week 1 to 2: nouns, pronouns (Interrogative), tenses Week 3 to 4: common and abstract nouns (Word meaning: antonyms, proverbs, metaphors, idioms) Week 5 to 6: conjunctions (Word meaning: idioms and proverbs) Week 7 to 8: (Word meaning: synonyms, antonyms) Week 9 to 10: prepositions (Word meaning: alliteration (consonance and assonance), metaphor, simile, personification)
Grade 6 Term 2 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: stems, prefixes, suffixes Week 3 to 4: verbs (finite, infinitives) Week 5 to 6: auxiliary verbs (Word meaning: idioms) Week 7 to 8: adjectives (attributive)
Grade 6 Term 3 **Specification of word level structures and conventions & word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: : interrogative, demonstrative, indefinite pronouns Week 3 to 4: verbs (gerunds) Week 5 to 6: : adjectives (predicative), tenses, connecting words Week 7 to 8: verbs (participle), moods, adverbs, adjectives Week 9 to 10: stems, prefixes, suffixes
Grade 6 Term 4 **Specification of word level structures and conventions& word meaning to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: adverbs of degree, duration, frequency (Word meaning: understatement, multiple meaning, ambiguity) Week 3 to 4: adverbs of manner, time, place Week 5 to 6: (Word meaning: pun) Week 7 to 8: (Word meaning: similes, metaphors, personification, simile, onomatopoeia, symbol)
Grade 4 Term 1 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**	**•The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic level:** basic tenses, concord, active and passive, simple sentences, common expressions, paragraphing, simple concrete language, some sensitivity of language regarding gender/race/cultural issues **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as complex sentences, common, idiomatic expressions, abstract language, varied sentence connections, some sensitivity and well developed sensitivity of language regarding gender/race/cultural issues/ethnicity **•The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic level:** basic tense errors, concord errors, incomplete sentences, incorrect expressions, "sentence connection faulty", inappropriate tone **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as faulty paragraphing, use of clichés, "insensitivity of language as regards gender", race and culture, inappropriate figurative language, use of stereotypes	The learner: • identifies the subject and predicate of a sentence • uses conjunctions to form compound sentences (e.g. 'She worked hard so she passed the exam.') • uses subject-verb concord • uses a variety of sentence types correctly and appropriately (statements, questions, commands, exclamations) • uses complex tenses correctly (e.g. past progressive - 'She was watching TV when …') • uses direct and indirect speech • uses an appropriate degree of formality/informality (register) • uses topic and supporting sentences to develop a coherent paragraph; • links sentences in a cohesive paragraph using, for example, pronouns and connecting words such as 'also', 'finally'	Week 1 to 2: simple sentences Week 3 to 4: simple sentences Week 5 to 6: simple sentences, complex sentences Week 7 to 8: subject, object Week 9 to 10: simple sentences, statements, questions
Grade 4 Term 2 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: simple past tense, future tense Week 3 to 4: subject, object, subject-verb agreement, present tense Week 5 to 6: subject-verb agreement, past tense Week 7 to 8: future tense
Grade 4 Term 3 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: complex sentences Week 3 to 4: past continuous tense, future continuous tense Week 5 to 6: statements, simple sentences Week 7 to 8: simple sentences, complex sentences, verb clause Week 9 to 10: subject-verb agreement
Grade 4 Term 4 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: subject, object, subject-verb agreement, tenses Week 3 to 4: noun phrase, noun clause Week 5 to 6: adjectives, adverbs Week 7 to 8: main clause, dependent clause (simple)

Grade 5 Term 1 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**	**•The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic level:** basic tenses, concord, active and passive, simple sentences, common expressions, paragraphing, simple concrete language, some sensitivity of language regarding gender/race/cultural issues **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as complex sentences, common, idiomatic expressions, abstract language, varied sentence connections, some sensitivity and well developed sensitivity of language regarding gender/race/cultural issues/ethnicity **•The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic level:** basic tense errors, concord errors, incomplete sentences, incorrect expressions, "sentence connection faulty", inappropriate tone **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as faulty paragraphing, use of clichés, "insensitivity of language as regards gender", race and culture, inappropriate figurative language, use of stereotypes	The learner: • identifies subject and predicate • uses subject-verb concord • uses direct and indirect speech • uses complex tenses correctly (e.g. past perfect progressive - 'He had been working …') • uses language appropriate for the audience, purpose and context (e.g. formal/informal register) • uses topic and supporting sentences to develop coherent paragraphs • links sentences in cohesive paragraphs using, for example, pronouns and connecting words such as 'therefore' • shifts from one tense to another consistently and appropriately	Week 1 to 2: simple present tense, complex tense Week 3 to 4: subject -verb agreement, tenses Week 5 to 6: simple past tense, simple future tense Week 7 to 8: subject, object, subject-verb agreement, concords Week 9 to 10: statements, simple sentences
Grade 5 Term 2 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: : simple sentences, complex sentences Week 3 to 4: past continuous tense, future continuous tense, active and passive voice, reported speech, question form Week 5 to 6: present continuous tense Week 7 to 8: object; questions, direct and indirect speech
Grade 5 Term 3 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: simple present tense, simple past tense, concords Week 3 to 4: simple short sentences, subject-verb agreement Week 5 to 6: statements, questions, commands, direct and indirect speech Week 7 to 8: simple sentences, compound sentences, future tense Week 9 to 10: statements, questions, commands, simple sentences, compound sentences, direct and indirect speech
Grade 5 Term 4 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: subject, object, one word for a phrase, conditional clauses Week 3 to 4: noun phrase, adjectival phrase, adverbial phrase, prepositional phrase Week 5 to 6: noun clause, verb clause, negative form, question form Week 7 to 8: subject-verb agreement, verb phrase, clauses, phrases
Grade 6 Term 1 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**	**•The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic level:** basic tenses, concord, active and passive, simple sentences, common expressions, paragraphing, simple concrete language, some sensitivity of language regarding gender/race/cultural issues **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as complex sentences, common, idiomatic expressions, abstract language, varied sentence connections, some sensitivity and well developed sensitivity of language regarding gender/race/cultural issues/ethnicity **•The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic level:** basic tense errors, concord errors, incomplete sentences, incorrect expressions, "sentence connection faulty", inappropriate tone **Main language learning:** Everything as in basic level as well as faulty paragraphing, use of clichés, "insensitivity of language as regards gender", race and culture, inappropriate figurative language, use of stereotypes	The learner: • uses subject-verb concord • uses complex tenses correctly (e.g. 'He will have finished by now.') • identifies and uses complex sentences – sentences with an independent (main) clause and a dependent (subordinate) clause linked by a conjunction(e.g. 'When the bell rang, Thabo went home.') • uses the passive voice to focus on the object of a sentence (e.g. 'Gold is mined in South Africa.') • explains how language varies according to audience, purpose and context (register) • uses topic and supporting sentences to develop coherent paragraphs; • links sentences in cohesive paragraphs using, for example, connecting words such as 'however', synonyms and antonyms; • shifts from one tense to another consistently and appropriately	Week 1 to 2: subject, subject - verb agreement, reported speech Week 3 to 4: simple present tense, simple past tense, simple future tense Week 5 to 6: simple sentences, complex sentences Week 7 to 8: simple sentences, complex sentences Week 9 to 10: statements, questions, commands
Grade 6 Term 2 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: subject, object Week 3 to 4: present continuous tense, past continuous tense, future continuous tense Week 5 to 6: present perfect tense Week 7 to 8: simple past tense
Grade 6 Term 3 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: simple present tense, past tense, future tense Week 3 to 4: future perfect tense Week 5 to 6: past perfect tense; future perfect tense Week 7 to 8: active voice, passive voice, direct and indirect speech Week 9 to 10: active voice, passive voice
Grade 6 Term 4 **Specification of sentence level structures and conventions to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: direct speech, indirect speech Week 3 to 4: compound sentences, complex sentences Week 5 to 6: noun phrases and clauses, verb phrases and clauses Week 7 to 8: subject; object

Grade 4 Term 1 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**	**• The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic & main language learning levels:** spelling, basic punctuation	The learner: • uses phonics and spelling rules to spell words correctly • uses punctuation correctly (e.g. quotation marks for direct speech, apostrophe for possession).	Week 1 to 2: full stop, capital and lower case (small) letters Week 3 to 4: full stop, comma Week 5 to 6: full stop, comma, colon, semi-colon Week 7 to 8: none specified Week 9 to 10: question mark, exclamation mark, dictionary use
Grade 4 Term 2 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**	**• The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic & main language learning levels:** spelling errors, incorrect and inappropriate punctuation		Week 1 to 2: none specified Week 3 to 4: full stop, comma, question mark, exclamation mark, etc. Week 5 to 6: none specified Week 7 to 8: word division, dictionary use
Grade 4 Term 3 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: none specified Week 3 to 4: Capital and small letters, full stop, comma Week 5 to 6: dictionary use, abbreviations – acronyms, truncation, initialisation Week 7 to 8: colon Week 9 to 10: full stop, commas, colon, semi-colon, question marks
Grade 4 Term 4 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: dictionary use, word order, word division Week 3 to 4: capital letters, full stops, commas, word division Week 5 to 6: exclamation mark, colons, capital letters Week 7 to 8: none specified
Grade 5 Term 1 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**	**• The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic & main language learning levels:** spelling, basic punctuation	The learner: • uses phonics and spelling rules to spell words correctly • consolidates use of punctuation learned so far	Week 1 to 2: full stop, comma, quotation marks, question marks, dictionary use Week 3 to 4: none specified Week 5 to 6: question marks, dictionary use, word order Week 7 to 8: dictionary use, word order Week 9 to 10: capital letters, word division, dictionary use
Grade 5 Term 2 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**	**• The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic & main language learning levels:** spelling errors, incorrect and inappropriate punctuation		Week 1 to 2: full stop, exclamation marks, abbreviations – acronyms, initialisation, truncation Week 3 to 4: ellipsis, exclamation mark, quotation marks, question marks Week 5 to 6: word division, dictionary use, exclamation mark Week 7 to 8: quotation marks
Grade 5 Term 3 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: full stop, comma, dictionary use, word division Week 3 to 4: abbreviations, inverted commas Week 5 to 6: colon, semi-colon, inverted comma, capital letters Week 7 to 8: none specified Week 9 to 10: quotation marks, semi-colon, inverted commas
Grade 5 Term 4 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: word division, dictionary, capital letters Week 3 to 4: word division, dictionary, capital letters Week 5 to 6: dictionary use, word division Week 7 to 8: dictionary use, vocabulary development
Grade 6 Term 1 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**	**• The learner applies his/her knowledge of the following grammatical structures and conventions to structure text. "Select those that are relevant to language being studied and add others specific to that language but not mentioned below":** **Basic & main language learning levels:** spelling, basic punctuation	The learner: • uses phonics and spelling rules to spell words correctly • uses punctuation correctly (e.g. comma to separate subordinate clause from main clause)	Week 1 to 2: word division, dictionary use, full stop, comma, colon, semi-colon, question mark, exclamation mark Week 3 to 4: dictionary use Week 5 to 6: none specified Week 7 to 8: quotation marks Week 9 to 10: none specified
Grade 6 Term 2 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**	**• The learner shows the ability to recognise and correct the following errors:** **Basic & main language learning levels:** spelling errors, incorrect and inappropriate punctuation		Week 1 to 2: word division, dictionary use Week 3 to 4: dictionary use Week 5 to 6: none specified Week 7 to 8: dictionary usage
Grade 6 Term 3 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: dictionary usage, word division Week 3 to 4: commas Week 5 to 6: word division, dictionary usage Week 7 to 8: dictionary use, word division Week 9 to 10: quotation marks
Grade 6 Term 4 **Specification of spelling & punctuation to be taught**			Week 1 to 2: question mark Week 3 to 4: none specified Week 5 to 6: colon, semi-colon, contraction Week 7 to 8: parentheses

Definition of meta-language/ grammatical terminology	None specified	A seven-page, "Language Learning Area Glossary' is provided on **pages 136 to 142** defining selected terminology used in curriculum document (words such as tense, verb, noun are not defined).	Five pages of "Examples of Language Structures and Conventions" are provided on **pages 20 to 24** giving examples in context of punctuation, spelling, parts of words, nouns, determiners, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, verbs, conjunctions and transition words, interjectives/ideophones, vocabulary development and figurative language, clauses, phrases, sentences, conditional sentences, passive voice and reported speech. A seven-page, "Glossary" is provided on **pages 105 to 111** defining selected terminology used in the curriculum document.
SECTION C: TIME ALLOCATION (WEIGHTING) FOR GRAMMAR COMPONENT			
Allocation of teaching time to outcome/skill	None specified. **(Page 32)** "... Activities should be undertaken in context and *not in formal grammar lessons* ."	None specified. **Page 6 to 7** (see above) indicates that all the outcomes should be taught and assessed in an integrated manner and knowledge of outcome 6 must be put into action through the other language skills described in the other outcomes.	**(Page 14)**. 1 hour per two week cycle is allocated for the teaching of Language Structures and Conventions. Page 14 also states that "Language Structures and Conventions and their usage are integrated within the time allocation of the four language skills. There is also time allocated for formal practice..." Time allocations are also assigned to the other three skills of the 12 hours of teaching time for English Home Language in a two week cycle. **Page 35** (see above) states that not all items must be taught within that given cycle, but all items in the overview must be covered by year-end.
SECTION D: ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR COMPONENT			
Grade 4 Term 1 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**	None specified	None specified	**Pages 94 to 97** Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) Task 2 -– Language Structures and Conventions in context (20% of total Task 2mark)
Grade 4 Term 2 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) June examination – Language in context in Paper 2 (15% of total June examination mark)
Grade 4 Term 3 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) Task 2 -– Language Structures and Conventions in context (20% of total Task 2 mark)
Grade 4 Term 4 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions taken from an advertisement (15% of total Task 1 mark) End of the year examination – Language in context in Paper 2 (15% of total End of year examination mark)

Grade 5 Term 1 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**	None specified	None specified	Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) Task 2 -– Language Structures and Conventions in context (20% of total Task 2mark)
Grade 5 Term 2 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) June examination – Language in context in Paper 2 (15% of total June examination mark)
Grade 5 Term 3 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) Task 2 -– Language Structures and Conventions in context (20% of total Task 2 mark)
Grade 5 Term 4 **Guidelines on assessment of grammar component**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions taken from a text (15% of total Task 1 mark) End of the year examination – Language in context in Paper 2 (15% of total End of year examination mark)
Grade 6 Term 1 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**	None specified	None specified	Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) Task 2 -– Language Structures and Conventions in context (20% of total Task 2 mark)
Grade 6 Term 2 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) June examination – Language in context in Paper 3 (15% of total June examination mark)
Grade 6 Term 3 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions in context (15% of total Task 1 mark) Task 2 -– Language Structures and Conventions in context (20% of total Task 2 mark)
Grade 6 Term 4 **Guidelines on assessment of outcome/skill**			Task 1 – Language Structures and Conventions taken from a text (15% of total Task 1 mark) End of the year examination – Language in context in Paper 3 (15% of total End of year examination mark)