Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta

Graham A Dampier

University of Johannesburg

Second language acquisition and the national curriculum

ABSTRACT

This article presents a critique of the way in which additional language teaching in the foundation phase has traditionally been conceptualised in South African education. I argue that the curriculum has no clearly defined theory of how language is acquired and that it relies on a concept (viz. additive bilingualism) that never makes the process explicit. Additive bilingualism is seen as the solution to the problem of English second language acquisition, and for most learners English becomes the language of teaching and learning in the intermediate phase. I argue that the pedagogic process of introducing the first additional language (FAL) has not been interrogated thoroughly at a theoretical level, which has profound consequences for the classroom. The curriculum's proposal of how to facilitate the acquisition of the FAL appears to fulfil economic and cultural ideals at the expense of educational parity and epistemic access. Meeting the constitutional ideals of maintaining diversity while integrating into the global market place will be more feasible if alternate models of bilingualism are considered.

Key words: language policy, the national curriculum, additive bilingualism, English as a second language, Universal Grammar.

Journal for Language Teaching, Volume 48, Number 2, pp. 37 – 51. 2014.
ISSN 0259-9570. http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v48i2.2

1. Introduction

The curriculum and assessment policy statement (DBE, 2010) presents a poorly conceived account of additive bilingualism as the solution for the multilingual burden that characterises education in South Africa. Additive bilingualism is seen as best way to accomplish two post-apartheid imperatives: 1) the responsibility of maintaining cultural diversity in the face of pervasive Westernisation, and 2) the need to keep abreast of global trends, while gaining entry to the global economy (Dampier, 2012). The influence of this dual concern on language policy can be traced back to apartheid era language policy debates (Alexander, 1999: 5):

> In South African, let me note parenthetically, during the 'fifties, we debated with waxing passion the question whether we should pay any attention at all to the 'tribal languages' instead of concentrating on English, 'the international language.' The debate was exacerbated and rendered particularly vicious by the fact that at the time, the Afrikaner National Party was using the very sensible UNESCO declarations on the importance of using vernacular languages as media of instruction in schools in order to justify and beautify its racist curriculum, which the world came to know as Bantu education.

Additive bilingualism is the process in which a person acquires an additional language without experiencing a loss of proficiency in his/her mother tongue. According to Alexander (1999: 17), additive bilingualism requires "that the L1 of the learner should be maintained throughout the educational career of the learner and that other languages should be added onto this platform." What is not clear from various curriculum documents is how the addition should occur. Rather, it is not clear how the L1 should be utilised as a pedagogical resource for ensuring that the L2 is successfully added to a person's linguistic repertoire.

The national curriculum (DBE, 2010) presents additive bilingualism as a process that requires the transfer of knowledge from the L1 to the L2. If we are to facilitate the process of additive bilingualism effectively, then, it is necessary to understand how the home language influences the process of learning an additional language. I will argue that the strongest case we can make for the legitimacy of additive bilingualism as an instructional policy is one that will rely on the Chomskyan view that human beings are born with an innate linguistic system, called the Universal Grammar (Chomsky: 1976).

The position taken in the curriculum does not go beyond the assumption that children in the foundation phase can learn the first additional language from the platform of their home language. This conception of additive bilingualism relies on cross-linguistic transfer to be effective. Cross-linguistic transfer refers to the process in which people apply what they know of their home language to what they know of the additional language they are acquiring (Kimbrough Oller & Jarmulowicz, 2007; Grosjean & Li, 2013; Genesee, 2001). But even within the general framework of Universal Grammar, authors acknowledge that "there has to be a certain overlap of the two systems" (Hulk & Muller, 2000: 229). If two

languages share little in common it will be difficult to utilise cross-linguistic transfer as a pedagogical resource, even if it is assumed that the UG is available Languages that stem from a common ancestral root, that is, languages that form part of the same language family are likely to share many common linguistic features (Webb & Kembo-Sure, 2000; Heine & Nurse, 2000; Nurse & Phillipson, 2003). However, when languages develop in linguistic contexts that are vastly different there may be little common basis for cross-linguistic transfer to occur. McWhorter (2011) argues that the extent of linguistic variation in human languages becomes increasingly apparent as people increase the complexity of their language. Languages become ingrown over time, rendering them highly distinct, strange, and, for many second language speakers, quite illogical (McWhorter, 2011).

Policy writers and curriculum developers would do well to rationalise their preference for additive bilingualism by acknowledging and utilising the tenets of UG theory. This position is admittedly problematic, but it would help with presenting the argument that accelerated additional language learning can be successful in the heterogeneous learning environments that characterise South African classrooms. If the UG is active in acquiring the second language (White, 1989, 1992, 2001, 2003), this process won't rely on the assumption that cross-linguistic transfer from the home language to the FAL will be effective.[1] The availability of the UG during the process of additional language learning would open up the possibility for a child to access universal linguistic principles as the FAL is acquired (Cook & Newson, 1996), but this won't solve the issue of additive bilingualism as it is currently conceived in the curriculum. Instead, if UG theory is adopted as a reasonable account of language acquisition a revision and reformulation of the curriculum is necessary, since the first additional language is often treated as separate and isolated from the home language, which is illustrated later on.

After elucidating Chomsky's theory of language knowledge, I analyse the curious way in which additive bilingualism is elucidated in the curriculum and argue that not enough attention is given to the linguistic distinctions between English and other languages of instruction (Heine & Nurse, 2000; Nurse & Phillipson, 2003). I compare the phonology of two languages that are used widely in the foundation phase (i.e. isiZulu and English) to illustrate why cross-linguistic transfer as presented in the curriculum is problematic.

1 In the present rendering of additive bilingualism in the national curriculum, it is argued, albeit tacitly, that cross-linguistic transfer is inevitable and that it is a natural corollary of being exposed to an additional language in the classroom, since the second language is acquired on the platform established by the first.

2 Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition

In this section I offer an account of how Chomsky's theory of language, and the rich array of knowledge that has developed around it, can be used to address the problem of additive bilingualism. Chomsky's UG theory is perhaps the best recourse to saving additive bilingualism from its empty curricula existence. Cook & Newson (1996: 1) write that Chomsky's theory of language describes "language as a property of the human mind" and explains "how it is acquired." A concept that is central to both is the Universal Grammar, which Chomsky (1976: 29) defines as the "system of principles, conditions, and rules that are the elements or properties of all human languages". Viewed in this way, the UG comes to assume a focal significance in the study, description, acquisition and use of language; it is "the essence of human language" (Chomsky, 1976: 29).

Uncovering universals that characterise all human languages is a key objective of linguistics, which is also true of Chomsky's theory of language. The Universal Grammar contains, a set of linguistic universals that according to Chomsky are encoded in the human genome. This set of universals reflects what human beings know of language from birth. Knowledge of language consists of principles and parameters that characterise universal linguistic knowledge (viz. principles that apply to all languages) and knowledge of particular languages (viz. parameters that distinguish one language from another) (Cook & Newson, 1996: 2). Given that its objective is to describe the universals that are encoded in the human genome, Chomsky's theory of language is particularly concerned with the principles that support the acquisition and use of language. The principles of human language are described in order to explain how the parameters of particular languages are acquired and used. Cook & Newson write (1996: 2):

> UG is a theory of knowledge, not of behaviour; its concern is with the internal structure of the human mind. The nature of this knowledge is inseparable from the problem of how it is acquired; a proposal for the nature of language knowledge necessitates an explanation of how such knowledge came into being. UG theory holds that the speaker knows a set of principles that apply to all languages, and parameters that vary within clearly defined limits from one language to another. Acquiring language means learning how these principles apply to a particular language and which value is appropriate for each parameter. Each principle or parameter of language that is proposed is a substantive claim about properties of the mind of the speaker and about the nature of language acquisition.

Based on the premise that it is possible to describe those principles that characterise human languages, Chomsky and his followers analyse linguistic data to specify what these principles are and how they structure language acquisition. The principles uncovered in this process are thought to be encoded in the human genome. As Chomsky's theory of language developed, it became clear that the UG is a complex feature of the human mind that cannot satisfy the demand for theoretical parsimony. This necessitated a process of simplification. In an interview with McGilvray, Chomsky (2012) explains the need

for simplicity, or minimalism, was an important development in his theory of language (2012: 61 – my emphasis):

> Plainly, to the extent that language is a system in which *the computation just involves rearrangement of what you've already got, it's simpler* than if the system adds new things. If it adds new things, it's only specific to language. Therefore, it's more complex; therefore, you don't want it, unless you can prove that it's there. […] If you are going to have a recursive procedure, the best possible system would be one in which everything else follows from optimal computation.

So while the initial aim was to uncover all the universals that human beings are genetically endowed with, as the theory of Universal Grammar developed it became clear that certain aspects of it needed to be revised. The consequence is that since the early 1990s, Chomsky and a group of scholars working within the UG framework have been trying to distil the various principles of human language into optimal computational principles (Chomsky, 1995).

The minimalist program should not be seen as a theoretical U-turn but as the attempt to develop the UG framework by emphasising the need for a more economical view of linguistic knowledge (Chomsky, 1995). Cook & Newson write (1996: 312): "the linguistic system needs to be as economical as possible, in terms of both how it represents and generates structures, clearly the smallest possible set of devices to account for language phenomena should be used – the defining characteristic of the Minimalist Programme." The principles that once were thought to characterise the UG are systematically being revised in the minimalist programme to address a serious theoretical issue: complexity. Chomsky illustrates this (1995: 1):

> Recognition of the unsuspected richness and complexity of the phenomenon of language created a tension between the goals of descriptive and explanatory adequacy. It was clear that to achieve explanatory adequacy, a theory of the initial state must hold that particular languages are largely known in advance of experience. The options permitted in universal grammar (UG) must be highly restricted; limited experience must suffice to fix them one way or another, yielding a state of the language faculty that determines the varied and complex array of expressions, their sound and meaning, in a uniform and language-independent way. But this goal receded still further into the distance as generative systems were enriched in pursuit of descriptive adequacy, in radically different ways for different languages. The problem was exacerbated by the huge range of phenomena discovered when attempts were made to formulate actual rule systems.

Before the drive to simplify the linguistic universals that are thought to be embedded in the UG was initiated, it was possible to ask: *If the Universal Grammar consists of various linguistic principles that characterise all human languages, how did these principles*

evolve phylogenetically to become encoded in the human genome? The emphasis now is on distilling basic computational principles.

The purpose of elucidating the way in which the UG developed theoretically is to forward an explanation of how Chomsky's theory of language can be used to support additional language learning. The emphasis on uncovering basic computational principles is a powerful theoretical drive, as it is likely to produce valuable insights into the process of second language acquisition (SLA), but presently SLA theorists have not evaluated the implications of the minimalist program extensively enough. Second language theorists tend to develop their ideas in terms of the parameters that constrain grammar, rather than trying to apply computational principles to the process of learning a second language.

The role of UG in learning a second language (L2) has been conceptualised using three hypotheses, and theorists tend to favour one over the others: 1) the UG is not active during the acquisition of a second language and has no part to play (Cook & Newson, 1996); 2) second language learners have full access to the UG (Flynn, 1996; White, 1989, 1992, 2001, 2003; Schwartz & Sprouse, 1996); and 3) certain parts of the UG, which serve to constrain L2 grammar, are available to second language learners. Recent work has seen many scholars argue that the UG is either fully-active and available to second language learners, or that it is partially available (White, 2003).

I explore the second alternative that the UG is fully active and available to second language learners, as this approach accounts for the influence of the first language (L1) on the acquisition of the second. White (2003) argues that non-native grammars, also referred to as interlanguage grammars, are systematic and rule governed. She writes that "L2 learner language is systematic" and that "the errors produced by learners do not consist of random mistakes but, rather, suggest rule-governed behaviour" (2003: 1). The systematic nature of the errors exhibited by second language learners is used as evidence of the UG's tendency to constrain interlanguage grammars. This is often used to explain why second language learners do not develop 'wild' grammars that are free from linguistic patterns, which typically suggest the influence of rule-governed principles. Flynn (1996) supports this view. She argues that second language learners appear to construct grammatical knowledge of the L2 "under the constraints imposed by UG" (1996: 150).

This has led some scholars to argue that second language learners "begin by transferring all the parameter-settings from their L1" (Mitchell et al, 2013: 91). If two languages share a common parameter, there will be no need for the second language learner to delve into the UG to obtain a parameter that fits the L2, and additive language learning can be said to occur. White (1992: 219) writes that if "the L1 and L2 share a parameter setting, this might be expected to offer an advantage to the language learner, and lead to some kind of 'positive transfer'". When L1 parameters do not conform to the input received from the second language, hypotheses are revised, or rather, second language learners proceed to "develop new hypotheses which are constrained by the Universal Grammar" (Mitchell,

2013: 92). This will conceivably entail some period of delay, since the second language learner will need to delve into the UG to obtain the most suitable parameter. According to White (1992: 219), "if the L1 and L2 settings differ, some form of 'negative transfer' might be expected […] Where the L1 and L2 differ as to the setting they require, the L1 setting causes difficulty and delay in acquiring the L2 setting but the difficulty does not manifest itself in the form of an inappropriate parameter setting".

Schwartz & Sprouse (1996) refer to the process of using an L1 parameter-setting to learn the L2 as the full transfer/full access model. They argue that the transfer of L1 principles to the L2 can be observed in both children and adult language learners. In the context of language acquisition theory, 'transfer' refers to a process in which a second language learner uses his/her knowledge of language to aid the process of acquiring knowledge of the L2. According to Smith & Truscott (2006), the term was initially used by behaviourists to argue that all L2 acquisition entails the process of overcoming L1 habits (2006: 202). But the emergence of nativism and psycholinguistics in the 1960s saw the term lose its epistemic currency, with cross-linguistic influence becoming the preferred term by the 1980s (2006: 202). Smith & Truscott explain (2006: 202-203):

> The essential problem is that transfer, in the everyday sense of moving something from one location to another, does not make immediate and obvious sense. The L1 elements that are supposed to be imported into an L2 do not leave the L1 and automatically impoverish it. Hence, the closest we can get to this conceptualisation is to say 'transferring' something must mean 'copying' or 'cloning' it, leaving the original in place […] 'Full transfer', as conceived of in FTFA [full transfer/full access], would result in a 'cloned' L1 system presumably operating with new L2 lexical content and perhaps some L2 phonological structure as well.

The effect that this process of transferring/cloning has on individual learners is unclear and one can only assume that a period of hypothesis testing will persist before second language learners revert back to the Universal Grammar to constrain their knowledge of the second language (Schwartz, 1998). Accordingly, most second language English learners in South Africa will begin by trying to transfer/clone the principles of the first language onto the input they receive from their second language. This can be viewed as a default position that second language learners will always fall back on to make sense of the unusual linguistic data they are receiving.

These issues are still in dispute and SLA theorists who work within the framework of the Universal Grammar have not resolved them yet. But it appears transferring/cloning L1 parameters and principles as the L2 is acquired is the most expedient way of rationalising additive bilingualism within the South African context, since the Bantu languages of the country are linguistically distinct from English (the dominant L2). The possibility of successful cross-linguistic transfer that does not rely on some innate understanding of linguistic universals appears untenable.

3 Additive bilingualism and a poorly conceived additional language curriculum

Additive bilingualism is given a rather curious exposition in the curriculum and assessment policy statement (CAPS) on "English First Additional Language" (DBE: 2010). The discussion begins with a statement on learning to read and write in the home language: "Children come to school knowing their home language. They can speak it fluently, and already know several thousand words. Learning to read and write in Grade 1 builds on this foundation of oral language. Therefore, it is easier to learn to read and write in your home language" (2010: 8). It is hard to find fault with this. But then a recommendation is presented. As children are exposed to the first additional language in Grade 1, a strong oral foundation needs to be built; presumably so that it is easier to learn to read and write in this language (2010).

What is missing from this discussion already is how the home language will conceivably interact with the FAL as this new oral foundation is being built. Will pupils be exposed to an entirely new, independent, and autonomous set of phonemes, or will the process of creating awareness of the way in which English is phonemically structured latch on to what pupils know of their home language? It appears that this oral foundation is expected to develop autonomously, since simple speech that is embedded in a particular semantic context is seen as the best way to expose learners to the sounds of English. An English inventory of speech sounds is built anew: "They need to hear lots of simple, spoken English which they can understand from the context" (DBE, 2010: 8).

Additive bilingualism as an approach should always draw on what a child knows of his/her home language, in order to facilitate the cross-linguistic transfer of what is already known of the home language (Kimbrough Oller & Jarmulowicz, 2007; Grosjean & Li, 2013). The emphasis is on maintaining and entrenching the home language as the basis for acquiring the additional language (Cummins, 2000; Alexander, 1999). The full transfer/full access model requires a certain degree of linguistic overlap of the L1 and L2, as parameters are taken from the former to constrain the latter.

Next, the curriculum draws attention to the shift from the home language to the FAL as the language of teaching and learning in Grade 4. It emphasises the need for a "high level of competence in English," which, judging by what has been presented so far, is to be achieved by exposing children to simple English formulations. On the basis of what children develop knowledge of in Grade 1, which appears to be a very rudimentary, inchoate, and poorly conceived English oral foundation that is never given the opportunity to interact with the L1, "progress in literacy must be accelerated in Grades 2 and 3" (2010: 8). Even if the UG were to contribute significantly to building this phonological base, the brief period in which this is supposed to occur is unrealistic and troubling if one considers that only 3 hours a week are devoted to the FAL in Grade 1. Half of this time is meant to be devoted to listening with the rest of the time being spent on reading, phonics and writing (2010: 9).

This allocation of time to the FAL is grossly inadequate. Too little time is devoted to immersing children in the FAL. It takes the average child three to four years to develop a level of mother tongue proficiency that can be used as the basis for teaching him or her to read and write that language (Fernandez & Cairns, 2011). Linguists, cognitive scientists and language acquisition theorists argue continually that young children possess advanced cognitive capacities for acquiring a language (Chomsky, 2012; Tomasello, 2009; Kuhl, 2000, 2004, 2010; Kuhl, Conboy, Coffey-Corina, Padden, Rivera-Gaxiola & Nelson, 2008; Grosjean & Li, 2013; Gopnik, Meltzoff & Kuhl, 1999; Moon, Lagercrantz & Kuhl, 2013 – to name a few). The critical period hypothesis (CPH) and 'less is more' hypothesis have been used to account for the systematically declining ability of children to acquire new languages, no matter what approach to bilingualism is taken (Grosjean & Li, 2013; Paradis, 2007). As we age, our ability to learn a new language is significantly poorer (Kuhl, 2000, 2004, 2010), which is not to argue that some innate capacity to systematise linguistic input is not available, although we will see that this does affect our ability to produce phonemic inventories of other languages.

With regard to building a phonemic inventory in particular, which is the pivot that oral language rests on, Kuhl presents evidence in various studies (2000, 2004, 2010, Kuhl et al, 2008; Moon et al, 2013) to support the argument that the human ability to differentiate semantically relevant sounds from the morass of sounds we make is most productive, most effective, and most active in babies younger than 18 months of age. As we grow older we become what she refers to as culture-bound listeners (Kuhl et al, 2008). By the time children enter school they have built a phonemic inventory for their home language (Fernandez & Cairns, 2011). They understand the way in which the sounds of their home language are logically connected and constituted. Their ability to distinguish meaningful sounds in other languages is not nearly as effective as it was when they were in nappies, which means that relying on some innate phonological processing ability that does not draw on the home language at this late stage of development is likely to be untenable (Kuhl, 2000). Simply speaking to children in Grade 1 will clearly not be sufficient for developing an English phonemic inventory that will allow FAL literacy development to be accelerated (DBE, 2010). More time is needed to develop an understanding of what is an alien, illogical language to most foundation phase children.

In keeping with the tenets of additive bilingualism, the curriculum explains that "children can transfer many literacy skills from their home language" (DBE, 2010: 8). What is not stated is that cross-linguistic transfer must be possible for this to be effective. Writing is used as an example of a skill that only needs to be taught once: "if learners are taught handwriting well in their home language, they can use this skill when writing in English" (2010: 8). This is certainly true when languages share writing systems. Since isiZulu and English share a common representational or orthographic system, it is obvious that knowledge of how to write in the home language (viz. isiZulu) will be transferred easily when writing in English. This unfortunately is not a linguistic skill, but one that belongs more appropriately to literacy. And it is not a higher order cognitive skill in the same way that say developing morphological awareness is.

The next statement is troubling: “If they learn phonics in their home language, they do not need to learn sound-spelling relationships all over again in English. They only need to apply their knowledge in English and learn those sound-spelling relationships that are different in English” (2010: 8). Phonics is not a literacy skill; it is a teaching strategy, or pedagogical resource, that is used to develop phonological awareness, which is a metalinguistic skill that affects literacy development (Fernandez & Cairns, 2011).

It is hard to see how knowledge of how to spell isiZulu words will enable children to spell English words. The languages consist of two very different phonemic inventories and two distinct ways of spelling words. With the exception of Ndebele, the official Nguni languages (Zulu, Swati, Xhosa) of South Africa have a five-vowel system (Gowlett, 2003), whereas due to variation in the language it is hard to determine just how many vowels are used in English (Ogden, 2009; de Klerk, 1996); typically it uses a vowel system that consists of various vowels and a set of diphthongs, which are not as common in Nguni languages. To complicate matters, Zone S languages[2] consist of large consonant inventories (Zulu consists of over 50 consonants, including 15 clicks), and a distinctions is made between stops and affricates: voiceless unaspirated, voiceless aspirated and voiced (Gowlett, 2003), whereas English consists of 46 sounds in total (Ogden, 2009). Zulu has “borrowed extensively from the Khoisan click system” and employs dental, alveolar and alveolateral clicks (Gowlett, 2003), which do not occur in English. Zone S languages have “a two tone system, or a system in which some syllables are accented (by a High tone) while other syllables are unaccented” (Gowlett, 2003). All of this affects the correspondence of sounds and letters, which in turn affects how words are spelt.

While Zulu and English employ a common representational system – both use the Latin alphabet – they differ in how distinct graphemes are used to represent phonemes. This means that even if a Zulu child will have a smaller set of new spelling rules to learn, this child will have to learn an entirely new way of using symbols to represent sounds. Often the English spelling system will contradict the way in which words are spelt in Zulu. For instance, the symbols “c,” “q” and “x” are used to represent dental, alveopalatal and lateral clicks respectively, while in English these symbols assume a very different representational significance.

2 According to Malcolm Guthrie’s classification of Bantu languages (in which he places linguistically related Bantu languages into zonal demarcations), Zone S languages can be allocated to six different groups. These are the Shona, Venda (consisting solely of Venda), Sotho-Tswana (includes Tswana, Kgalagadi, Northern Sotho, Sesotho se Leboa, Pedi, Southern Sotho, etc.), Nguni (includes Xhosa, Zulu, Swati, Ngwane, Phuti, Nedebele, Sumayela Ndebele, etc.), Tswa-Ronga Group (includes Gwamba, Tsonga, Ronga, etc.) and Inhambane (includes Copi, Lenge, Shengew, etc.) groups (Maho, 2003). Languages in the Zone S classification typically share basic linguistic features, such as large consonant inventories, a two tone system and noun classification systems.

What is perhaps most troubling about the curriculum's discussion of additive bilingualism is that it only considers the approach as useful for developing a strong literacy foundation in the FAL. It does not acknowledge the role this approach plays in second language learning. If the notion of "lingualism" can be considered to refer to both language competence and literacy ability, then we must see the omission of a clear idea of how the home language can be used to facilitate knowledge of the second language as a serious problem with the national curriculum's elucidation of additive bilingualism. Most South African children will continually struggle to acquire English as the language of teaching and learning if we don't have a clear idea of how to ensure that they develop the ability to use the language effectively: "This is [not] what is called 'additive bilingualism' – developing a strong literacy foundation in the Home Language and building

First Additional Language literacy onto this" (2010: 9). A more appropriate label would be "additive biliteracy development," which can be defined as the use of a particular literacy skill a child has developed in his or her home language to develop a similar skill in an additional language. Phonemic awareness, word segmentation, decoding, handwriting, etc. can all be considered literacy skills that are distinct from linguistic knowledge, but are nevertheless dependent on it to develop. This means it is possible for a second language speaker to use word segmentation meaningfully to analyse words into their constituents, if, and only if, the speaker knows how phonemes interact to constitute morphemes and how morphemes are used to produce words.

4 Discussion

Without an explicitly defined theory of language acquisition to rely on, the curriculum will forever present superficial solutions to the problem of additional language teaching and learning. Simply stating that additive bilingualism is the preferred approach to teaching the FAL is insufficient, as it invests far too much on a concept that is not conceptualised rigorously in the curriculum. One of the biggest problems for pupils, teachers, schools, districts, provincial departments of education, the national department of basic education, the government, and South African society as a whole, is ensuring that the FAL, South Africa's unofficially official language, English, is acquired by children before they enter into the intermediate phase. Otherwise, we should do away with English as the medium of instruction entirely. After all, we know that people learn best when their learning is conducted in their home language, but the problem with this is that the government will have to allocate a significant portion of its annual budget to developing the country's official Bantu languages. And this is a more complex, more vexing, more time consuming problem to solve.

References

Alexander, N. 1999. *English Unassailable But Unattainable: The Dilemma of Language Policy in South African Education.* A paper presented at the biennial conference of the International Federation for the Teaching of English. University of Warwick: England.

Chomsky, N. 1976. *Reflections on Language.* London: Temple Smith

Chomsky, N. 1995. Bare Phrase Structure. In: Webelhuth, G. (Ed.) 1995. *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Programme.* Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 383-440.

Chomsky, N. 2012. *The Science of Language: Interviews with James McGilvray.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. & Newson, M. 1996. *Chomsky's Universal Grammar.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Cummins, J. 2000. *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Cross-fire.* New York: Multilingual Matters.

Dampier, G. A. 2012. The (F)utility of Additive Bilingualism in South African Education. *Education as Change* 16(1): 69-81.

Department of Basic Education. (2010). *Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS).* Pretoria: DBE.

de Klerk, V. 1996. *Varieties of English Around the World, Volume G15: Focus on South Africa.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Fernandez, E. M. and Cairns, H. S. 2011. *Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Flynn, S. 1996. A Parameter-Setting Approach to Second Language Acquisition. In:

Ritchie, W. and Bhatia, T. (Eds.) 1996. *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition.* San Diego: Academic Press. pp. 121-158.

Genesee, F. 2001. Bilingual First Language Acquisition: Exploring the Limits of the Language Faculty. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 21: 153-168.

Gopnik, A., Meltzoff, A. N., & Kuhl, P. K. 1999. *The Scientist in the Crib: Minds, Brains and How Children Learn.* New York: William Morrow.

Gowlett, D. 2003. Zone S. In: Nurse, D. & Phillipson, G. (Eds.) 2003. *The Bantu Languages.* London: Routeldge. pp. 609-638.

Grosjean, F. & Li, P. 2013. *The Psycholinguistics of Bilingualism.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heine, B. & Nurse, D. 2000. *African Languages: An Introduction.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hulk, A. & Muller, N. 2000. Bilingual First Language Acquisition at the Interface Between Syntax and Pragmatics. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 3: 227-244.

Kimbrough Oller, D. & Jarmulowicz, L. 2007. Language and Literacy in Bilingual Children in the Early School Years. In: Hoff, E. & Shatz, M. (Eds.) 2007. *Blackwell Handbook of Language Development.* Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 368-386.

Kuhl, P. K. 2000. A New View of Language Acquisition. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 97(22): 11850-11857.

Kuhl, P. K. 2004. Early Language Acquisition: Cracking the Speech Code. *Nature Reviews: Neuroscience* 5(11): 831-843.

Kuhl, P. K., Conboy, B. T., Coffey-Corina, S., Padden, D., Rivera-Gaxiola, M. & Nelson, T. 2008. Phonetic Learning as a Pathway to Language: New Data and Native Language Magnet Theory Expanded (NLM-e). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* B 363: 979-1000.

Kuhl, P. K. 2010. Brain Mechanisms in Early Language Acquisition. *Neuron* 67(5): 713-727

Maho, J 2003 A Classification of the Bantu Languages: An Update of Guthrie's Referential System. In: Nurse, D. & Phillipson, G. (Eds.) 2003. *The Bantu Languages. London:* Routeldge. pp. 639-651.

McWhorter, J. 2011. *What Language Is (And What It Isn't And What It Could Be).* New York: Gotham Books.

Mitchell, R., Myles, F. & Marsden, E. 2013. *Second Language Learning Theories.* London: Routledge.

Moon, C., Lagercrantz, H. & Kuhl, P. K. 2013. Language Experienced In Utero Affects Vowel Perception After Birth: A Two Country Study. *Acta Paediatrica* 102(2): 156-160.

Nurse, D. & Phillipson, G. 2003. *The Bantu Languages.* New York: Routledge.

Ogden, R. 2009. *Language and Linguistics: Introduction to English Phonetics.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Paradis, J. 2007. Second Language Acquisition in Childhood. In: Hoff, E. & Shatz, M. (Eds.) 2007. *Blackwell Handbook of Language Development*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 387-406.

Schwartz, B. D. 1998. The Second Language Instinct. *Lingua* 106: 133-160.

Schwartz, B. D. & Sprouse, R. 1996. L2 Cognitive States and the Full Transfer/Full Access Model. *Second Language Research* 12: 40-72

Smith, M. S. & Truscott, J. 2006. Full Transfer Full Access: A Processing-Orientated Interpretation. In: Unsworth, S., Parodi, T. & Sorace, A (Eds.) 2006. *Paths of Development in L1 and L2: In Honour and Bonnie D. Schwartz.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. pp. 201-216.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1984. *Bilingualism or Not: The Education Minorities.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Tomasello, M. 2009. *Constructing a Language: A Usage-Based Theory of Language Acquisition.* Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Webb, V. & Kembo-Sure 2000. African Voices: An Introduction to the Languages and *Linguistics of Africa.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

White, L. 1989. *Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

White, L. 1992. Universal Grammar: Is it Just a New Name for Old Problems? In: Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L. (Eds.) 1992. *Language Transfer in Language Learning. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.* pp. 217-232.

White, L. (2001) Crosslinguistic influence revisited: An L2 perspective. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 4(1): 46-48.

White, L. (2003) *Second Language Acquisition and Universal Grammar.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Graham A. Dampier

GNA 228, Robert Sobukwe Building, Soweto Campus
University of Johannesburg

E-Mail: gadampier@uj.ac.za

Graham Dampier is lecturer in the Department of Childhood Education at the University of Johannesburg. His research interests include Item Response Theory, test measurement theory, test validity, cognitive linguistics, corpus linguistics and the work of the Irish Poet William Butler Yeats.

Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta Polelo - Buka ya Thuto ya Puo - Jenale ya Thuto ya Dipuo - Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi - Jena?a ya u Gudisa Nyambo - Jenala yo Dyondzisa Ririmi - - Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig - Journal for Language Teaching - Ijenali yokuFundisa iLimi - IJenali yokuFundisa iiLwimi - Ibhuku Lokufundisa Ulimi - Tšenale ya tša Go ruta