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

Christa van der Walt
Stellenbosch University

The category Language Structures and Conventions in the CAPS for English First Additional Language: A critical analysis

The category *Language Structures and Conventions* in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) for language teaching includes what teachers often refer to as 'grammar'. This aspect of language teaching is approached from the perspective of the Communicative Approach to Language Teaching, where the distinction between 'meaning' and 'form' (or structure) is blurred so that the communicative function of language structures are emphasized. Since the CAPS for English First Additional Language in the FET phase emphasizes communicative language teaching, the implication is that the teaching of language structure occurs in the context of communication events. The questions that this article asks are (i) how language structures and conventions are organised in the CAPS document and (ii) how this organisation is aligned with the language teaching approach espoused by the CAPS document. Arguing from the language teaching approach espoused by the curriculum document, the CAPS for English First Additional Language in the FET phase is analysed from two requirements that have been derived from the Communicative Approach: firstly, the idea that language form is expressed in a context that shows its socially appropriate use and secondly, a whole-to-part orientation that implies understanding the way in which language form can function in a text. Some suggestions are made for a possible revision of this aspect of the curriculum.

Key terms: curriculum, Communicative Approach, English first additional language, language structure, grammar.

1. Introduction

As a teacher educator for many years, I have been concerned by what I perceive as prospective teachers' lack of linguistic knowledge. A Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) requires "English Language and Literature at NQF Level 7" (MRTEQ 2015:68), but many departments of English offer only literature, which means that students enter the PGCE with minimal knowledge of the linguistic structure of English. This lack of knowledge translates into prospective teachers being underprepared in terms of what Shulman (1987) describes as pedagogic content knowledge (PCK), that is, knowledge of subject content *plus* knowledge of how to teach such content. In my own module on English language teaching, I would discuss the teaching of 'grammar' by studying (among others) the curriculum and the Grade 12 Paper 1, usually to the prospective teachers' dismay. When we assess their lessons, it is usually difficult to determine just from looking at their lessons plans whether they will be teaching for example the passive voice to Grade 8 or Grade 11. I could ascribe this to lack of experience, but when I looked at the curriculum, it seemed to me that the problem could be located there. This experience led me to a close analysis of the CAPS for EFAL in an effort to answer the question: How does the CAPS EFAL for the FET phase direct the teaching of language structures and conventions (as it is called in the curriculum)?

There are many ways in which one can investigate the content listed under the heading *Language structures and conventions*, from Foundation Phase (where it is referred to as *Language Structure and Use*) up to the Further Education and Training (FET) Phase. Much of what teachers and teacher educators would simply call 'grammar' is included in that category. We could investigate this aspect of language teaching from the perspective of what teachers need to know; the 'content' so to speak, called Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) by Shulman (1987). In terms of teacher education, this would be a worthwhile topic, particularly in view of the (relatively) new requirements for teachers as set out in the *Minimum Requirements for Teacher Educator Qualifications*, known as MRTEQ (2015). From this perspective we could investigate how language structures and conventions are included in textbooks and taught at school level, which would imply considerations of the role of 'grammar' in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the type of pedagogy that could result in grammatical competence.

However, such an investigation is not the purpose of this article, because here I would like to argue that such investigations must be preceded by a study of what is presented in the CAPS document under the heading language structures and conventions. To do so I will provide some theoretical background for the development of a curriculum in general and then discuss the requirements of the Communicative Approach and the Text-Based Approach which are presented as the point(s) of departure for the language curricula. From this background I will derive the tools with which to analyse the CAPS EFAL for the FET phase. My conclusions will focus on the implications of this analysis for teaching and for teacher education.

2.   Studying the curriculum

The Latin meaning of the word *curriculum*, from *currere* meaning 'to run', is often drawn upon by curriculum theorists (notably Pinar 1994, 2011) to indicate the action of running the course of a particular object of study. This conceptualisation of curriculum emphasizes the way in which it unfolds over time as learners, parents and educators at different levels enter the course, pace themselves, dodge stumbling blocks or trip over them, walk up the steep hills and fly down easy parts, generally with a particular end point in mind which they may or may not reach. In teacher education, many of us have a more static view of the concept *curriculum*: it is a document, a set of instructions.

Consider the way in which two theorists at the opposite ends of these two interpretations define and clarify the concept *curriculum*: Pinar (2011:2) emphasizes the importance of the local and the imperative, "to recast curriculum development and design from the realm of the procedural – that is, principles and steps to follow no matter where you are – to ongoing forms of intellectual engagement with one's distinctive situation, however complex and contested that situation is, however tragic one's history, and stressful the present might be". In discussing instructional design, the language teaching expert Jack Richards (2013:6) uses the term curriculum "to refer to the overall plan or design for a course and how the content for a course is transformed into a blueprint for teaching and learning which enables the desired learning outcomes to be achieved"; an instrumentalist view that would definitely not sit well with Pinar.

In this article I would like to use both senses of the term to talk about our current practice of language teaching from the perspective of the way in which language structures and conventions are sequenced in the curriculum document to support learning; in other words, how we conceive of language learning as it progresses over time in the local context of the English First Additional Language (EFAL) Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) for the Further Education and Training (FET) phase (EFAL CAPS 2011), and particularly the teaching of language structures and conventions, as an example of the way grammatical competence is expected to unfold over time. The reasons why I chose the EFAL CAPS have to do with the status of English in South Africa on the one hand and the role of grammar in language curricula on the other. Firstly, the status of English in South Africa (and globally) is evident in a variety of measures that attempt to ensure that participants in exit and entrance examinations perform at a particular standard (Shohamy 2006). English is seen as *the* language of upward social mobility and opportunity (Heugh 2009). The majority of school leavers write the EFAL papers and their success in this subject allows access to higher and further education. When one compares the number of learners writing the NSC examination in 2015, it is clear that EFAL is far ahead in sheer numbers (see Table 1). The number went up again in 2016 to 547 292 (*The real matric marks* 2017).

Table 1: Number of learners in 11 'key' subjects[i] (National Senior Certificate Examination: Diagnostic Report 2015)

Accounting	Agric Sc	Business Stds	Economics	EFAL	Geography	History	Life Sciences	Maths Lit	Maths	Physical Science
140 474	104 251	247 822	165 642	543 941	303 985	154 398	348 076	388 845	263 902	193 189

Secondly, a focus on the category *Language structures and conventions* seems important in view of the debates that preceded the final versions of the CAPS documents for English language teaching (Venter 2011, Gosher, 2011). Since the calls for including grammar in the CAPS, specifically for the Home Language curriculum were successful, it is time to have a closer look at that element of the curriculum.

3. Methodology for analysing CAPS EFAL for the FET phase

The methodology used for the analysis here can be typified as immanent critique, which investigates the inner consistency of a construct, in this case a curriculum document. By studying the document in terms of what it professes to be, I follow Bowen's (2009:38) guideline:

> The researcher/analyst needs to determine not only the existence and accessibility but also the authenticity and usefulness of particular documents, taking into account the original purpose of each document, the context in which it was produced, and the intended audience.

In the next section, I will sketch the origin and theoretical point of departure of the document as a way of meeting these requirements. Since I am not looking for recurring themes across a variety of documents, I am not doing directed content analysis (Hsieh 2005), but rather using immanent critique as a way of showing how the CAPS contradicts itself. As Sabia (2010:691) points out, "immanent critique interrogates and challenges conventional understandings of the authoritative texts that ultimately ground practices and norms by developing allegedly superior interpretations of their identity or authenticity, meaning, coherence, and import". I do not claim to present 'superior' interpretations, but

I do challenge the document in terms of its own structure (a cyclical presentation of language structures) and its theoretical point of departure (the Communicative and Text-Based Approach).

4. A brief overview of the development of the CAPS

Despite the announcement that the Minister of Basic Education (Angie Motshekga) had done away with Outcomes Based Education, the current CAPS documents were designed on the basis of the previous National Revised Curriculum Statements, where outcomes were the starting point for backwards instructional design. What this meant was that the outcomes to be reached were used as the starting point from which teachers planned 'backwards' as it were to identify materials, activities and procedures that would ultimately lead to the identified outcomes. The process by means of which the CAPS documents were developed, is described as follows in a DET document announcing the introduction of the CAPS (*Curriculum News* 2011:7):

> Writing teams were appointed in January 2010 to develop CAPS for all approved subjects in each grade. Their brief was to use the National Curriculum Statement as a starting point for filling in gaps, reducing repetition and clarifying where necessary. The existing curriculum's outcomes and assessment standards were reworked into general aims of the South African curriculum, the specific aims of each subject, clearly delineated topics to be covered per term and the required number and type of assessments per term with the view to making it more accessible to teachers. Each subject now has a grade-by-grade and term-by-term delineation of content and skills to be taught and learnt.

The last sentence of the quote resembles what Richards (2013:29) calls, 'forward design' with specific reference to language teaching:

> A forward design option may be preferred in circumstances where a mandated curriculum is in place, where teachers have little choice over what and how to teach, where teachers rely mainly on textbooks and commercial materials rather than teacher-designed resources, where class size is large and where tests and assessments are designed centrally rather than by individual teachers. Since forward design can be used to develop published materials there will generally be a wide range of teaching resources and materials to choose from. Forward design may also be a preferred option in situations where teachers may have limited English language proficiency and limited opportunities for professional development, since much of the planning and development involved can be accomplished by specialists rather than left to the individual teacher.

In South Africa, this applies to a certain extent. In the abovementioned extract from *Curriculum News* (2011:7), "making it more accessible to teachers" implies that not all teachers are able to do their own instructional design. In its report on the National Curriculum Statement (as a prelude to the development of the CAPS), the task team notes *(Curriculum News 2009:42)*, "It has also become apparent that teachers' lack competency (sic) in English is a major factor impacting on the quality of teaching at the classroom level in SA, and this has received very little attention".

Although teachers have relative freedom to set their own tests and design their own materials, the textbook industry plays an important role. The NSC examination, which is set centrally, has a powerful influence on grades lower down, so that most tests in lower grades follow the format of the exit examination. (See for example the requirements for formal assessment in Grades 9 and 10, where the three papers written in the final examination mirror that of the NSC examination in Grade 12 (CAPS EFAL Grades 7 – 9, 2012:120).) In the CAPS for English First Additional Language (EFAL) Grades 10 – 12 (2011:12), the possibilities for teacher initiative are not excluded:

> When planning a two-week unit of lessons, teachers should integrate language skills, together with the basics of language. They should choose a text type and a topic that will interest learners as little or no learning can be achieved if learners are not engaged and motivated.

The flexibility implied in this quote is, however, illusory. There is fierce competition among publishers to provide textbooks that the Department of Basic Education approves for use in schools. The textbook authors interpret the curriculum and provide the text type, topics, activities, vocabulary and grammar exercises and writing activity. The curriculum itself constrains the teacher in terms of oral and writing activities required for particular two-week cycles. Just one example can be found in weeks 9 and 10 of the Grade 12 EFAL CAPS (2011:70), where there are very specific activities that need to be completed:

Table 2: Extract from Grade 12 EFAL CAPS

9 and 10	Reading aloud of a literary text OR a text from internet Oral: Introducing a speaker	Intensive reading of **multimodal text** for research, from, e.g. **web page, encyclopaedia, reference work/text book**. Assess how the visual and written elements contribute to meaning. **Literary text 6:** Intensive reading appropriate to the text. e.g. figurative language, struture, character etc.	Writing an email (address/subject/ message) OR writing a webpage (symbol, signs, logos, layout features, viusual images and their effect) Pay attention to visual features **Formal letter:** Write a letter of request, e.g. donation, sponsorship, etc	**Vocabulary** related to reading text Meta-language related to multimodal and visual texts Jargon words Dictionary practice

With regard to literature teaching, the CAPS EFAL Grades 10 – 12 (2011:49) states that "The teacher should choose a setwork for literary text study"; yet we know that there are prescribed literary texts which become the exclusive focus of literature lessons from Grade 10 onwards.

It seems that the CAPS turned a backward design process into a forward design. It has, in effect, limited (some may say severely) the space and degree to which teachers can interpret the curriculum in a way that would suit their learners' needs and competencies. Moreover, the prescriptive nature of such a curriculum may compromise the degree to which teachers can take the complexity of language learning into account, as I will argue next.

5.   A view of CAPS from a language learning perspective

CAPS and earlier versions of the EFAL curriculum, even before Curriculum 2000 and the Revised National Curriculum Statement, present the same language forms and content every year. Any teacher of English knows that you teach for example active and passive voice every year, supposedly at increasing levels of complexity. It should therefore be possible to isolate particular elements of the curriculum so that the cycles in which they appear from one year to the next can be taught and learnt in the context of the curriculum for that year and in response to the learners' particular level of development. This means that the point at which the teacher starts, may differ from one year to the next, since language learning does not always follow predictable patterns of development. Breen and Candlin (2001:20) observe that sequencing content in a communicative curriculum "is therefore likely to be a cyclic process".

The CAPS documents for EFAL, right from foundation phase up to the FET phase, present content in such a cyclic format, which acknowledges that language is not learnt in a step-wise fashion. This resonates with a dynamic systems approach to language learning and teaching (Larsen-Freeman 1996 and 2006), where the complexity of language development means that there is an implicit mismatch between a linear curriculum and a non-linear process (language learning). In the Communicative Approach, where the authenticity of language input is emphasized, we need to acknowledge that although a language learner is expected to experience language in all its complexity, it will be difficult to structure this complexity from week to week. Teachers often have to double back and re-trace their steps to ensure that learners get maximum exposure to an aspect they may find difficult.

One of the ways in which the problem of sequencing content over time has been solved is by identifying certain structures as 'easy' and others as 'difficult', with the assumption that 'easier' elements should be taught (and therefore acquired) first. In his chapter on learning and teaching grammar, Cook (2001:28) draws the conclusion that "an order of acquisition cannot be based solely on an order of difficulty". In their discussion of the communicative curriculum, Breen and Candlin (2001:20) point out that "[i]n learning, the

various and changing routes of the learners crucially affect any ordering of content, so that sequencing derives from the *state of the learners* rather than from the implicit 'logic' of the content itself".

I argued in an earlier paper (Van der Walt 2010) for a curriculum that acknowledges that language learning:

> is not discrete and stage-like but more like the waxing and waning of patterns; that, from a target-language perspective, certain aspects of the behavior are progressive, others, regressive; that change can be gradual and it can be sudden; and that the latter notably heralds the emergence of a new order qualitatively different and novel from earlier organizations (Larsen-Freeman 2006: 590).

This 'waxing and waning' of forms makes it very difficult to prescribe and assess language learning in measurable steps of increasing difficulty: from one semester to the next, from one year to the next. From the perspective of both language learning theory (a dynamic systems theory) and a language teaching approach (the Communicative Approach) a cyclical approach, which we find in the CAPS EFAL, makes sense. However, the way in which the section on *Language structure and conventions* is presented, may stymie the ability of the teacher to exploit the cyclical nature of the curriculum to the full.

6. A view of CAPS from a language teaching perspective

The EFAL CAPS quite explicitly states its approach to language teaching in Section 2. Statements are made about what language is (*Languages in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement,* CAPS EFAL 2011:8), what language learning is (*Specific aims of learning additional languages,* CAPS EFAL 2011:9), an overview of the language curriculum from foundation phase onwards (CAPS EFAL 2011:10), and a section on *Teaching the first additional language* followed by the four organising principles of the CAPS EFAL. Note that all of these headings refer to first additional language in the abstract. There is no reference to English in particular. This section is the same in all first additional language curricula. The problem of generic language curricula has been pointed out elsewhere (Van der Walt 2010), but it is important to note the lack of reference to English because it obscures the very specific function of English in the education system. This also goes against the call by the task team for the National Curriculum Statement ((Report of the Task Team) 2009:42, emphasis added) that "English, as a First Additional Language and language of learning, needs *greater specification* in the curriculum, with attention paid to preparation for the use of English across the curriculum". (This particular aspect is discussed in great detail by Kaiser, Reynecke and Uys (2010) and is not the focus here.)

The language teaching approach is described in Section 2.5 of the FET EFAL CAPS, where the text-based and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are mentioned as points of departure (CAPS EFAL 2011:16):

> A **text-based approach** teaches learners to become competent, confident and critical readers, writers, viewers, and designers of texts. It involves listening to, reading, viewing, and analysing texts to understand how they are produced and what their effects are. Through this critical interaction, learners develop the ability to evaluate texts. Authentic texts are the main source of content and context for the communicative, integrated learning and teaching of languages. The text-based approach also involves producing different kinds of texts for particular purposes and audiences. This approach is informed by an understanding of how texts are constructed.

> A **communicative approach** suggests that when learning a language a learner should have a great deal of exposure to the target language and many opportunities to practise or produce the language. Learners learn to read by doing a great deal of reading and learn to write by doing much writing.

These approaches are amplified by more specific references to the process approach to reading and writing and, interestingly, a full page on the teaching of literatureii. I would like to concentrate on the above two approaches, and specifically on the Communicative Approach (CA) or Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) that links up with the text-based approach in its focus on authentic texts and the appropriacy of texts for various audiences. In fact, when we look at current discussions of language teaching (Breen and Candlin 2001, Met 1998, Jacobs and Farrel 2003), the description under the heading 'A text-based approach' relates better to CLT than that under 'A communicative approach', where the definition can be said to describe almost any approach to language teaching. Instruction in a text-based approach, according to Richards (2017), "shares some features with Task-based language instruction, since it focuses on preparing learners for real-world uses of English. Rather than organizing instruction around tasks, however, texts are chosen as the framework for teaching."

A communicative curriculum, according to Breen and Candlin (2001:10),

> defines language learning as learning how to communicate as a member of a particular socio-cultural group. The social conventions governing language form and behaviour within the group are, therefore, central to the process of language learning.

The words *language form* and *social conventions* echo the idea of language structures and conventions as it appears in the CAPS. The emphasis is on context and language-in-use rather than isolated practice in the form of decontextualized transformation exercises, drills or memorized dialogues, as was the case in the Audio-Lingual Method.

In the CAPS, the category *Language structures and conventions* (Table 1 below) is one of four organising principles which are all included in each two-week cycle, further reinforcement of the idea that language structures and conventions are presented in a contextualised manner.

Table 3: Organising principles of the language curriculum

GRADE 10 TERM 2				
Weeks	Listening & Speaking 1 hour	Reading & Viewing 4 hours	Writing & Presenting 3 hours	Language structures and conventions 1 hour (integrated and explicit)

Such contextualisation echoes Met's perspective (1998:38) of linking Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) explicitly to constructivism: "a constructivist (and communicative) approach to language curriculum design would suggest that vocabulary and grammar be taught in clusters related to given contexts and topics' which are 'authentic' in the sense that they are taken from the 'real interactions' with 'real life purposes'". In distinguishing CLT from earlier methods of language teaching, Jacobs and Farrell (2003:8) list the ways in which it is different, including their observation that CLT focuses on

> A whole-to-part orientation instead of a part-to-whole approach. This involves such approaches as beginning with meaningful whole texts and then helping students understand the various features that enable to texts to function, for example, the choice of words and the text's organizational structure.

This description links CLT very neatly with the concept of a text-based approach and is in line with authors like Breen and Candlin (2001), Met (1998) and Richards (2017). It also seems to resonate with the idea that language structures be taught in an integrated manner, as required by the curriculum.

However, with reference to the teaching of grammar in particular, the EFAL CAPS (2011:15) indicates that "grammar and vocabulary also need to be taught, both in context and in activities with a specific focus on these aspects of language'. The curriculum encourages a sensitivity to learners' needs in this regard, by requiring teachers to note common errors and to develop "a systematic programme": "Grammar should be taught purposefully; attention should be given to meaning as well as form" (EFAL CAPS (2011:15).

Although grammatical competence from the CLT perspective would encompass both form and meaning, the teaching of grammar as formalized in the CAPS seems to divorce form and meaning when it requires grammar to be taught 'purposefully'. Moreover, despite the requirement that teachers should develop 'a systematic programme' for teaching language structure based on the learners' needs, particular points of grammar are included with the assumption that they will be taught explicitly (CAPS EFAL 2011:15). This approach seems to go against a learner-centred, communicative approach, since "we cannot assume that any step-by-step or cumulative sequence of content will necessarily be appropriate" (Breen and Candlin 2001:20).

From the words 'integrated and explicit' we can infer that there are actually two teaching strategies: What Long (1998:38) calls a focus on forms, where language structures are taught for their own sake and *focus on form*, where the language structure emerges from the texts studied. These two strategies need not be in competition, although CLT purists might want to argue against an exclusive *focus on form*. The CAPS EFAL actually seems to contradict itself (2011:49, emphasis added) by saying,

> This curriculum presents an **explicit** grammar focus. In practice, language will take about an hour every two weeks, with **half taught in context** with writing and reading, and **half taught explicitly**.

A bigger problem, however, is that there does not seem to be a clear theoretical framework from which this aspect of language teaching can be conceptualised and taught. In the description of what should be taught as 'language structures and conventions' the focus on accuracy suggests a fairly traditional, prescriptive grammar approach, as can be seen in directives like: "Forming adverbs (*e.g.quick-he ran quickly*) and adjectives (*e.g. amaze-the boy was amazed*)" (CAPS EFAL 2011:53). In contrast, the list of language functions (CAPS EFAL 2011:26) is reminiscent of the functional-notional approach to language teaching (Finocchiaro and Brumfit 1983).

In addition to the mix of theoretical approaches, the current CAPS EFAL seems to regard the category 'language structures and conventions' as a type of catch-all by including elements of literary terminology; for example 'Sound devices, e.g. rhyme, refrain, rhythm, alliteration, stock phrases and rhymes' (CAPS EFAL 2011:62); as well as textual features like "Generalisation and stereotype" (CAPS EFAL 2011:57) and "Paragraph structure: topic sentence and supporting details" (CAPS EFAL 2011:63). If teaching functions and notions constitutes the main approach to teaching grammar in the CAPS, as the list of functions on page 26 suggests, it could be that the items mentioned above should not be seen in isolation, but in terms of the texts that are presented for the categories listening and speaking, reading and viewing, writing and presenting.

When we look at the two-weekly guidelines from the perspective of the Communicative Approach, it is possible to derive at least two concepts that can be used to analyse the CAPS: firstly, the idea that language form is expressed in a context that shows its socially appropriate use and secondly, the *whole-to-part* orientation (Jacobs and Farrell 2003:8) that implies understanding the way in which language form can function in a text. These concepts will guide my analysis of the sequencing of language forms in the two-weekly cycles in the next section.

7.   The sequencing of grammar in two-week cycles

When we think of learners moving through the CAPS over time and becoming increasingly proficient in the target language, it is possible to think of three types of sequencing:

*   Firstly, there is sequencing in the conventional sense of moving from one two-weekly cycle to the next, from term 1 to term 2 and from grade 10 to grade 11. This is what we see when we read the CAPS two-weekly plans from weeks 1 – 2 up to weeks 33 – 34.

*   Secondly, there is sequencing in the sense of presenting examples of language use in context (for reading or listening activities) before expecting production of particular language forms (in writing and speaking activities). This is what we see when we read the CAPS two-weekly plans from left to right within a particular cycle.

*   Thirdly, there is sequencing from for example, a basic knowledge of verb forms to the ability to distinguish transitive from intransitive verbs to the ability to form a sentence in the passive voice and finally to use the passive voice in appropriate contexts. This is what we should be able to see when we read the various CAPS two-weekly plans from foundation up to FET phase.

The problem in the CAPS EFAL is that these types of sequencing are not always evident or they are not unpacked in sufficient detail – as required by a forward design process. Let us take these types of sequencing one by one from the perspective of contextualised grammar teaching and a whole-to-part orientation.

7.1   Moving from one two-weekly cycle to the next in the EFAL CAPS

Although it is accepted that language structures do not develop in a stage-like, linear fashion, it does help if the various language structures and conventions as well as the texts and activities reinforce particular language structures not only within a cycle but also from one two-week cycle to the next. However, when we look at the CAPS EFAL for the FET the lack of specificity from one two-week cycle to the next creates the sense that there is a list of grammatical items that are allocated randomly across the two-week cycles. Purely in terms of contextual affordances, it is not obvious why

- *Statements, sentence structure (Subject-verb -object)* in **weeks 1 and 2** of grades 10 and 11 should be followed by adjectives and adverbs in **weeks 3 and 4** and then by *Reported speech* in **weeks 5 and 6** of Grade 10 and *Nouns* in Grade 11.

- In **weeks 1 and 2** of Grade 10 *Use of the simple present tense* occurs in isolation – there is no revision of a separate tense for the rest of the year. There is some follow up in **weeks 9 and 10** in the form of *Verbs revision integrated with reading and writing – explain meaning of verbs in use* and a further follow up in the form of *Verb tenses* that appear again in **weeks 23 and 24**.

- *Conditional sentences integrated with writing* appears in **weeks 15 and 16** of Grade 10, but modal verbs appear only in **weeks 27 and 28**. Since modal verbs form such an important part of conditional sentences, it is difficult to justify this type of separation.

- In Grade 11, **weeks 15 and 16**, formal language is highlighted in the form of *Conventions related to minutes: past tense, numbered, formal, concise language*. In **weeks 31 and 32**, revision is done of active and passive voice. Again, the use of the passive voice is often linked to formality, which might have been useful in weeks 15 and 16 already, particularly since CLT places such a high premium on contextualized and authentic language use.

These are all examples of how the teaching of grammatical competence is stymied by a lack of coherence between text and language structure.

However, in terms of CLT and the text-based approach, grammar should emerge from the texts that are read and listened to. This means that there need not be the kind of 'progression' that I argue for above, at least not for a particular grade, because that would imply that there is some kind of natural or logical progression in terms of which mastery over grammatical forms develop, which is not supported by research. It makes sense then that the sequencing of language structures should be analysed from the perspective of the texts in each cycle, because they would provide context for the teaching of language structures and conventions.

7.2 Moving from language in context to develop grammatical competence

A clear example of how texts provide context for language structures is provided in a sample lesson plan based on Grade 10, Term 1, Weeks 5 and 6 (CAPS EFAL 2011:50ff). The two-week cycle is presented as follows in the CAPS (2011: 53):

Table 4: Weeks 5 and 6 in the CAPS EFAL for Grade 10.

5 and 6	Giving opinions. In groups each learner gives an opinion of a photograph or picture which includes an unusual detail, e.g. a fashion potograph with a tattoo	Intensive reading. **Text giving opinion/attitude**, *e.g. from magazine or newspaper article.* Identify and explain writer's attitude. Explain and justify own attitude/opinion This text can be related to the theme of the photograp h used for listening or not	Fill in a **form** for a competition Write a **letter** OR write a **dialogue** **Focus on:** **Process writing** Planning, drafting, revising, editing proofreading and presenting **Text structure and language features** (see 3.3)	Emotive language, generalising stereotyping. Reported speech Punctuation conventions of reported speech and dialogue **Vocabulary:** related to reading text

As can be seen, a particular text (a photograph) is linked to a text which provides the context for a letter or dialogue. If teachers were to use the suggested material, the use of emotive language around generalizing and stereotyping would certainly emerge and constructing a dialogue from this should flow fairly easily from such texts.

The CAPS uses this two-weekly cycle to provide an example of how teachers can interpret the curriculum. In Table 5 below, I extracted the language structures and conventions elements from the extended lesson plan provided in the CAPS document (CAPS EFAL 2011:50ff). There is a context for the grammatical features listed below (see Table 4 above). The first lesson focuses on a picture "which includes an unusual detail".

The second includes a text that links up with the 'unusual detail'; a magazine article is mentioned. A third text on generalisation and stereotyping seems to be suggested. Reported speech is introduced with no reference to the magazine or newspaper article, which could have provided context. In the table below I include comments in the right hand column on the suggestions for grammar teaching in the sample lesson.

Table 5: Annotated extract from CAPS EFAL (2011:50ff).

LESSON	STRUCTURAL ELEMENT	COMMENT
Lesson 2	Teach structure of an opinion: statement and reasons with supporting details.	This is an example of functional-notional, contextualised grammar teaching. It is worth noting that this two-week cycle lists the use of emotive language, generalising and stereotyping as the first point under 'Language structures and conventions'. To a certain extent this might be in conflict with the type of argumentative writing (albeit informally) required here.
Lesson 3	The final product is a letter or email to a friend sharing their opinion … This writing is for possible assessment – teacher skims/marks. *Makes list of common errors*.	Example of error analysis as prescribed by the curriculum.
Lesson 5	Some integrated grammar features of the text; Remedial grammar from common errors in writing marked from lesson 3.	Whole-to-part orientation in the form of text-based grammar with feedback on error analysis. It is assumed that all errors are to be noted, not just those linked to structures of expressing an opinion.
Lesson 9	Reported and direct speech conventions (revision). Learners write an exchange (five responses for each character) between Nomsa (Themba) and uTata in direct speech. This can be group work.	There does not seem to be a link between the previous grammatical features and revision of direct and indirect speech.

184

LESSON	STRUCTURAL ELEMENT	COMMENT
Lesson 10	Teach conventions of dialogue in contrast to conventions of reported speech.	If the purpose is to write a dialogue, it is difficult to see why this should be done in the form of reported speech first. This type of exercise does not take the authentic, real-world use of reported speech into account either.
Lesson 11:	• Grammar forms of common errors from writing in lessons 9 and 10. • Reported and direct speech conventions (revision). Learners rewrite some of what is in direct speech in reported speech.	The writing task seems to depend on learners using the sentences from the dialogue/exchange to write in reported speech. This might cause confusion regarding the conventions of dialogue writing and again teaches reported speech outside of any real-life context.

What we see in this lesson plan is that the teacher has some choice in the texts that need to be read and written and the language structures and conventions that need to be included. However, the language structures do not always link up with the texts that need to be produced and the typical reported speech structure is not integrated meaningfully. The reference to a magazine or newspaper article in the actual two-week cycle three pages further on (CAPS EFAL 2011:53) could provide the context for revision of reported speech in an authentic text, but this is not made clear in the sample lesson. There is no integration of the opinion structures and reported speech in the lesson sample, which misses an opportunity since the texts that could show authentic use (newspaper or magazine) are included in the curriculum for this two-week cycle. Contrasting well-argued opinions with emotive language in a newspaper or magazine, including generalisations and stereotyping, could also integrate those aspects.

In line with the text-based approach and CLT, the language structures and conventions should emerge from the texts and genres that are prescribed for a particular cycle (whole-to-part orientation). In Grade 12, weeks 15 to 16 we see the integration of text, topic and functional language use quite clearly (CAPS EFAL 2010:72):

185

Table 6: Weeks 15 and 16 in the CAPS EFAL for Grade 12.

15 AND 16	Formal researched speech on an aspect of visual media, e.g. *film genres, production methods, history* Role play formal speeches: introducing a speaker and offering a vote of thanks	View a **scene from a film** OR read a **review** of a film/ documentary/ TV series **Literary text 9:** Intensive reading appropriate to the text, e.g. figurative language, structure, character etc.	Write a **persuasive letter or paragraph** recommending the film you have watched OR write a film review **Focus on:** **Process writing** Planning, drafting, revising editing, proofreading and presenting **Text structure and language featues** (see 3.3)	Revision: Emotive writing Adjectives and aderbs Remedial grammar from learners' writing **Vocabulary** related to reading text Technical vocabulary related to film production

There is enough detail in the curriculum to make the link between visual media (possibly linking it to a historic speech) and review of a film and a literary text. In turn this links up with the writing task (a film review) and the language structures (adjectives and adverbs). Writing a review would certainly require some emotive writing with the use of adjectives and adverbs.

This type of progression shows grammar emerging from the texts read and therefore the integrated teaching of grammar can occur 'naturally' and in context. This is a typical example of a focus on form. If the teacher were to focus on errors related to adjectives and adverbs in learners' writing, explicit grammar teaching would reinforce integrated grammar teaching.

Unfortunately this is not always the case. When we look at Grade 10 weeks 13 and 14 (see Table 7 below), the best grammatical point that curriculum developers could find was concord, something that could (and maybe should) be the focus in any week and with any text. Why would concord (in context) emerge specifically from researched speeches or the study of literary characters and themes?

Table 7: Weeks 13 and 14 in the CAPS EFAL for Grade 10.

13 AND 14	Formal researched speech on an aspect of choice. Listen to an audio clip/text read.	**Literary text 5** Intensive reading. Explore themes further. Compare or contrast **Literary text 6** Intensive reading.	Short **paragraph** on setwork, *e.g. describe a character and justify, describe the setting and its effect, identify theme and effect.* **Focus on:** **Process writing** Planning, drafting, revising, editing, proof-reading and presenting. **Text structure and language features** (see 3.30	Concord in context-examples from listening practice or literary texts five and six. Remedial grammar from learners' writing. **Vocabulary** related to the reading/ listening text.

From the lesson plans in Grade 10 to those in Grade 12, the incidence of isolated grammatical features increase. In most cases they might appear in the texts and themes prescribed for a particular two-week cycle, but the texts read and produced do not seem to create optimal opportunities to model or produce the structure in question. A few examples are:

- Grade 10, Weeks 11 and 12: prepositions (revision);

- Grade 10 Weeks 27 and 28: modal verbs;

- Grade 11, Weeks 11 and 12: prepositions (revision), adjectives, comparison of adjectives (sic);

- Grade 11 Weeks 23 and 24: verb tenses;

- Grade 11 Weeks 31 and 32: passive and active voice;

- Grade 11 Weeks 33 and 34: verbs;

- Grade 12 Weeks 3 and 4: revision of passive voice and indirect speech;

- Grade 12 Weeks 5 and 6: revision of verb tenses and concord;

- Grade 12, Weeks 7 and 8: prepositions (revision);

- Grade 12, Weeks 11 and 12: passive voice;

- Grade 12, Weeks 15 and 16: adjectives and adverbs;

The problem here is not so much that these grammatical features need to be dealt with and revised, particularly at Grade 11 and 12 level, but that they have no obvious context or communicative function in the two-weekly lesson plans. In many cases, as with concord, prepositions and verbs, it is not only the lack of contextualisation, but also that these structures are ubiquitous and it is difficult to decide what the point of listing them within a two-week cycle might be.

In cases where the structural elements can be contextualized in particular text types or genres, the opportunity is not created or exploited. In Grade 10 Weeks 25 and 26 (Table 7) the texts and writing tasks seem to be in direct opposition, with the oral proficiency task focused on a formal speech and the writing mainly on short pieces of transactional writing. The language structure category seems to focus on superficial elements of grammar as related to formal and informal register:

Table 8: Weeks 25 and 26 in the CAPS EFAL for Grade 10.

25 AND 26	Formal prepared/ researched. Peer assessment for listening practice (to promote Extended Reading and independent research)	Intensive reading on a specific topic. Compare register, style and voice with similar forms, e.g. letters.	Write an email. Write an invitation (formal or informal) **Focus on:** **Process writing** Planning, drafting, revising, editing, proof-reading and presenting **Text structure and language features** (see 3.3)	Abbreviations, texting symbols, *e.g.* layout, font, script, decorative elements as visual communication Remedial grammar from learners' writing. Vocabulary related to reading text.

It is not immediately obvious how "layout, font, script, *decorative* elements as visual communication" would be related to a formal invitation. However, a functional approach to for example, formality in making requests can raise awareness of increasing formality (from 'Can you…?' to 'I would appreciate it….') and could be integrated with the use of modal auxiliaries.

The disjuncture between text and language structure can also be seen in Grade 10, weeks 15 and 16 (Table 9) where the focus seems to be on visual texts and humour. Again, it is possible to imagine a humorous text in which a conditional sentence would appear, but such a text hardly seems like the best vehicle to provide examples of using conditionals. Texts that model the use of different types of conditionals are important in this case, because the injunction is to integrate conditional sentences with writing. In this case there is thematic unity (visual elements of a humorous nature), but it does not support the required structural feature, which means that the whole-to-part orientation is disturbed.

Table 9: Weeks 15 and 16 in the CAPS EFAL for Grade 10.

15 AND 16	Tell, listen and respond to jokes Read written account to class/group Extension: view advertment which uses humour as a device	Intensive reading. **Humorous text,** e.g. cartoon, comic strip/comic video and examine effect Examine devices used in humour,.e.g. irony, conflict, climax and resolution **Literary text** **7-**revision/summary/ concluding le4sson/ enrichment text	**Personal recount.** Describe an amusing incident. Register, style and voice **Focus on:** **Process writing** Planning, drafting, revising, editing, proof-reading and presenting. **Text structure and language features** (see 3.3)	Conditional sentences integrated with writing. Remedial grammar from learners' writing. **Vocabulary** Meta-language related to cartoons etc., e.g. frame, speech bubble. Vocabulary related to reading text(s).

When we look at these examples it is not only a case of inappropriate texts for a particular grammatical structure, the problem is also that the grammar stays at a level that is neither challenging nor particularly useful for the development of productive knowledge. The list remains:

- Tenses
- Concord
- Active- passive voice

- Direct-indirect speech

- Conditionals

- Conjunctions

- Parts of speech (verbs, prepositions, modals, etc)

These are amplified by 'problem areas' like punctuation, poetic language, style, register. This static conception of grammar is the reason why teacher trainers[iii] see lessons at Grade 11 level explaining the formation of the passive voice at the most basic level: subject becomes object, the verb is formed by using *to be* in the correct tense and number plus the past participle: *The boy kicks the ball*. This is in strict accordance with the curriculum, but we have to ask if this is effective use of time? How is this kind of teaching different from what learners were taught in Grade 8? This third type of sequencing, which addresses increasing complexity across the different phases, will be discussed next.

7.3   Moving from basic to more complex knowledge

This aspect of sequencing is probably the most difficult to achieve when different groups of curriculum developers work on different phases. However, there seems to be a serious lack of coherence when content is simply repeated at the same level from grade 5 up to grade 12. How is it possible, for example, that the CAPS EFAL for the Intermediate Phase (Grade 5 term 4) could stipulate, "Uses adverbs of manner (e.g. quickly, slowly)" and the CAPS EFAL for FET (Grade 10 term 1) requires "Forming adverbs (e.g. quick - he ran **quickly**)"? Most teachers would assume that the Grade 10 lesson intends to revise adverbs, but the problem remains the implied lack of progression.

The lack of increasing complexity from one phase to the next becomes incongruous when we look closely. As an example, the teaching of adjectives progresses as follows from Grade 1 to Grade 12:

Table 10: Summary of the teaching of adjectives from Grade 1 to Grade 12.

GRADE 1	Understands and begins to use a few adjectives (e.g. happy, sad) and adverbs (e.g. slowly, quickly)
GRADE 2	Understands and begins to use a greater range of adjectives and adverbs.
GRADE 3	Understands and uses comparative adjectives (e.g. fast, faster, fastest)
GRADE 4	Builds on use of adjectives (before nouns), e.g. The small dog; Uses different types of adjectives including those relating to age, temperature; Builds on understanding and use of comparative adjectives
GRADE 5	• Builds on understanding and use of comparative adjectives. • Uses different types of adjectives including what things are made of, e.g. woollen. • Uses some adjectives as comparatives and superlatives.
GRADE 6	• Uses different types of adjectives including age/temperature/what things are made of, e.g. woollen. • Builds on use of adjectives before nouns, e.g. The small dog and begins to use those that come after nouns, e.g. The dog is small. • Builds on understanding and use of comparative and superlative adjectives. • Uses different types of adjectives including those relating to where things come from.
GRADE 7	Adjectives, degrees of comparison, superlatives, demonstrative, relative, numerical
GRADE 8	Adjectives: comparative, superlative
GRADE 9	Adjectives (attributive)
GRADE 10	Adjectives (revision); forming adjectives (e.g. amaze-the boy was amazed); Comparison of adjectives
GRADE 11	Adjectives (revision);
GRADE 12	Adjectives

Of course there are more things that need to be learnt at the beginning, but from Grade 7 onwards, there is mere repetition. The question must be asked whether word level grammar should even have a place in the FET phase. If the focus should increasingly be on the way in which language is used in texts and on developing learners' ability to construct texts beyond sentence level, we can ask why these items are even mentioned. Whether there should be revision of a whole range of grammatical elements is not the point here: each teacher will know which learners need support to decide whether they are boring or bored. The point is to what extent time is wasted on word-level grammar, like adjectives, adverbs, verbs and prepositions, and transformation exercises, like changing sentences from direct to reported speech, as suggested in the sample lesson for the FET phase (CAPS EFAL 2011:50ff).

When we go beyond the level of parts of speech to a structure like the passive, the same happens: the CAPS EFAL for the Intermediate Phase (Grade 5 term 4) simply states, "Uses the passive voice"; the CAPS EFAL for FET states "Active and passive voice" (Grade 10 term 4); "Passive and active voice" (Grade 11 term 4) and "Passive voice" (Grade 12 term 1). In its discussion of grammar teaching in Section 2.4 (CAPS EFAL 2010:15) the passive voice is used as an example of how the focus should be on meaning as well as form:

> Grammar should be taught purposefully; attention should be given to meaning as well as form. For example, the passive is used when the object is more important than the subject and you want to make it the topic of a sentence, or when the actor is unknown, unimportant or not worth mentioning, for example, 'Gold was mined on the Witwatersrand'.

There is a suggestion here of how the passive could be taught at a higher level, but this is just one language structure. Moreover, the example is a sentence: there is hardly any acknowledgement of how the passive voice would function at text level, in other words, how academic texts, for example, exploit the passive voice beyond sentence level.

The reason why the structural elements that are supposed to be taught in a particular two-week cycle should be showcased or modelled in a text, is to show how language functions beyond sentence level, particularly if the purpose is for learners to integrate these structures into their writing. However, the curriculum does not provide any guidance in this regard and sentence level grammar is obvious throughout: "conditional sentences integrated with writing" (CAPS EFAL 2011:55), "Statements, sentence structure (Subject-verb-object)" (CAPS EFAL 2011:61), "Formal style elements: vocabulary, longer sentences, no contractions" (CAPS EFAL 2011:75). Although there are references to paragraph writing, this is not linked to, for example, the use of different tenses in a narrative, or the alternate use of direct and reported speech to liven up a newspaper article, or avoiding the overuse of the passive in expository writing. In fact, with regard to the assessment of language structures and conventions, the curriculum refers explicitly to sentence level structures at Grade 12 level (CAPS EFAL 2011:84):

C: Language structures and conventions (assess in context)

•   Vocabulary and language use

•   Sentence structures

•   Critical language awareness

For the curriculum to be more effective in refining learners' knowledge and use of language structure *beyond sentence level*, there needs to be a deepening of grammatical knowledge and a sense of increasing complexity. One way of doing this would be to distinguish between grammar at word level (for example parts of speech) and grammar at discourse level (for example the use of active-passive voice and using reported speech) as a possible distinction between primary and secondary school levels. If a whole-to-part orientation is a key concept in the teaching of language structures in the Communicative Approach, there cannot be isolated parts of speech in an FET EFAL curriculum. If learners' grasp of for example transitive verbs remains tenuous, this needs to be integrated with a revision of passive voice structures in texts and activities where the passive voice is used functionally. By remaining at sentence level (in the FET phase), learners do not learn anything new about the passive voice: its formality, its brevity, its so-called neutrality.

The three sequencing problems mentioned in this section must be solved for the category *Language structures and conventions* to play a productive role in refining learners' knowledge and use of language in extended writing and speaking activities. Suggestions for how that can be done is the topic of the next section.

8. Conclusion

The two questions that were asked in this article were: (i) how language structures and conventions are organised in the CAPS document and (ii) how this organisation is aligned with the language teaching approach espoused by the CAPS document. From the perspective of the Communicative Approach, two concepts were used to analyse the CAPS EFAL for the FET phase from different perspectives to answer these questions. In terms of both these concepts, namely the contextualisation of grammatical concepts and a whole-to-part orientation, the language structures and conventions section of the CAPS fails to operationalise the teaching of grammar in a way that would satisfy the requirements of the Communicative and Text-Based Approach.

Despite repeated references to vocabulary in context and the possibilities offered by some texts for contextualised grammar, the principles of these approaches, particularly for the development of grammatical competence, is not evident in the CAPS EFAL curriculum for the FET phase. Jacobs and Farrell (2003:16) explain the rationale for contextualised grammar teaching and a whole-to-part orientation succinctly:

> Even though recent years have seen a greater role for explicit grammar instruction, this explicit instruction still takes place within the context of whole texts-beginning with an understanding of the text and its communicative intent, then looking at how the grammar aids the accomplishment of that intent within the specific context from which that intent derived.

In their original work on the theoretical bases of the Communicative Approach, Canale and Swain (1980:27) defined grammatical or linguistic competence as "the levels of grammatical accuracy that are required in oral and written communication". It is clear that teaching language structure needs to be approached from a perspective that takes communication as the context for grammar. The current CAPS for EFAL fails to a large extent to integrate linguistic structures within the two-week cycles and it also fails, from one two-week cycle to the next, to meet the requirement of *clustering* as described by Met (1998:38) who asks that "vocabulary and grammar be taught in clusters related to given contexts and topics". Although there are examples of functional grammar, for example *structure of an opinion* (Grade 10, Weeks 5 and 6); *Reason, cause and effect* (Grade 10 weeks 17 and 18); *stock phrases of thanks* (Grade 10 and 11, Weeks 35 and 36), prescriptive grammar dominates.

From my own observations of classrooms and from student teachers' feedback, it is true that some learners do not know their verbs from their nouns or their objects from their subjects. However, going back to 'basics' seems counter-productive: since learners have not mastered these grammatical rules in isolated sentences and paradigmatic drills, a repetition of such activities is hardly likely to lead to success. What we need to insist on as a minimum at FET level is for learners to recognize the form and function in extended texts and to use them with increasing accuracy and fluency in focused writing above sentence level.

What should be done is to describe minimum levels of expectation in explicit language, so that what seems like mere repetition can be structured in a way that guides teachers more directly regarding the expected minimum levels. Even when we stick to the types of grammatical structures that we have had for such a long time, we need to set certain minimum levels of knowledge that we require at particular levels. If we insist on using parts of speech as an organising principle, we need to link them to discourse grammar, as suggested in Table 11. The idea is not that a table such as this be included as part of the two-week cycles, but rather as a guideline for teachers who may struggle to move beyond discrete point, fill-in type grammar exercises. In terms of a forward design curriculum such guidelines are important.

Table 11: Suggestion for increasing levels of complexity for the teaching of verbs.

STRUCTURAL ELEMENT	BASIC	BY GRADE 10	BY GRADE 12
Verbs	Identify verbs: know the difference between transitive – intransitive; finite – non-finite, how verbs form tenses.	Transitive – intransitive: use active – passive voice accurately at sentence level. Finite - non-finite: formulate complex sentences, linking up with conjunctions and modal auxiliaries. Conditionals: distinguish the different types and their meaning in texts. Use correctly at sentence level. Tense: eliminate unmotivated tense switching; stick to a basic family of tenses when writing/ speaking (e.g. past indefinite, past continuous, past perfect in a narrative text).	Transitive – intransitive: recognize the appropriate use of passive voice in different texts and genres; use accurately and appropriately in writing. Finite - non-finite: ability to vary simple and complex sentences in their writing, linked to the ability to recognise and revise incomplete sentences. Conditionals: Use appropriately and accurately to make an argument in an extended text. Tense: Are able to recognize how tenses are changed to suit meaning in a text; use a variety of tenses according to text requirements.

Of course, a category like verbs can be linked to virtually all forms of language, which might make it too broad. The different headings in the third column can be treated separately. The challenge will then be to match these structures to particular texts and topics, but for this purpose there are a variety of international textbooks that provide examples of a text-based approach to linguistic structures and conventions.

 There is an urgent need to bring the two-weekly lesson plans in line with the description of objectives in the CAPS for EFAL (2011:9, emphasis added):

> The challenge in Grades 10-12, therefore, is to provide support for these learners at the same time as providing a curriculum that enables learners to meet the standards required in Grade 12. These standards must be such that learners can use their additional language *at a high level of proficiency* to prepare them for further or higher education or the world of work.

To my mind, the current two-weekly lessons do not provide enough differentiation in terms of language structures and conventions to develop a *high level of proficiency*. Without ensuring the integration of structures and texts within a particular two-week cycle, the clustering of texts, grammar and vocabulary across the two-week cycles, and explicit requirements for movement beyond sentence level across phases, this category of the curriculum remains disjointed and underutilized.

For pre-service teacher education, particularly at PGCE level, the task of the teacher trainer is complicated by the fact that many undergraduate modules for English focus exclusively on the teaching of literature. This means that students have little understanding of linguistic terms. The task of developing pedagogical content knowledge is stymied by students' lack of content knowledge (Shulman 1987). The teacher educator needs to help students to develop content knowledge before the issue of pedagogic content knowledge can be tackled. Time restraints often mean that this aspect of language teaching is neglected, which places a bigger burden on the curriculum to provide guidelines.

The fact that language learning does not progress in a linear and step-wise fashion does not mean that there should be no rationale for the sequencing of language structures and conventions in the CAPS for English first additional language. For Grades 10 to 12 the organization of the CAPS requires extensive revision of this category in particular.

References

Breen, M. & Candlin, C. 2001. The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. In Hall, D. & Hewings, A. Eds. 2001. *Innovation in English Language Teaching.* London, UK: Routledge, 9-26.

Bowen, G.A. 2009. Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal* 9(2):27-40.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1(1).

Cook, V. 2001. *Second language learning and language teaching.* London: Arnold.

Curriculum News. 2011. Department of Basic Education.

National Senior Certificate Examination: Diagnostic Report. 2016. Department of Basic Education.

English First Additional Language Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement Further Education and Training Phase (Grades 10 – 12). 2011. Cape Town: Department of Basic Education.

English First Additional Language Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement Senior Phase (Grades 7 – 9). 2011. Cape Town: Department of Basic Education.

English First Additional Language Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement Intermediate Phase (Grades 4 – 6). 2011. Cape Town: Department of Basic Education.

English First Additional Language Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement Foundation Phase (Grades 1 – 3). 2011. Cape Town: Department of Basic Education.

Finocchiaro, M. & Brumfit, C. 1983. *The Functional-Notional Approach.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gosher, S. 2011. Deep Concerns about English CAPS. *Teaching English Today* 1(i). At https://teachenglishtoday.org/index.php/2011/02/goodbye-to-language-teaching/ on 27 April 2017.

Heugh, K. 2009. Contesting the monolingual practices of a bilingual to multilingual policy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique* 8(2): 96-113.

Hsieh, H. & Shannon, S.E. 2005. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research* 15(9):1277-1288.

Jacobs, G. M. & Farrell, T.S.C. 2003. Understanding and implementing the Communicative Language Teaching paradigm. *RELC*, 34(5):5-30.

Kaiser, K., Reynecke, M & Uys, M. 2010. Eating soup with a fork – why the EFAL syllabus cannot promote learning across the curriculum. *Journal for Language Teaching,* 44(2): 52067.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 1997. Chaos/ Complexity Science and Second Language Acquisition. *Applied Linguistics,* 18(2):141-165.

Larsen-Freeman D. 2006. The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written: Production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistics* 27(4): 590–619.

Long, M. 1998. Focus on form in task-based language teaching. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL*, 16 (2): 35-49.

Met M. 1998. Curriculum decision making in content based language teaching. In Cenoz, J. & Genesee, F. Eds. 1998. Beyond bilingualism: *Multilingualism and multilingual education.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp 35–63.

197

Minimum Requirements for Teacher Educator Qualifications. 2015. Government Gazette 596 (38487). Pretoria.

Pinar, W.F. 1994. The Method of 'Currere' (1975). *Counterpoints* 2: 19-27.

Pinar, W.F. 2011. Allegories of the Present: Curriculum Development in a Culture of Narcissism and Presentism. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies* 1(2). At http://www.ijocis.com/index.php/ijocis/article/view/37 on 5 May 2017.

Report of the Task Team for the Review of the Implementation of the National Curriculum Statement. 2009. *Final report October 2009.* Pretoria.

Richards, J.C. 2013. Curriculum Approaches in Language Teaching: Forward, Central, and Backward Design. *RELC Journa*l 44(1):5-33.

Richards, J.C. 2017. Blogpost on the limitations of the text-based approach: http://www.professorjackrichards.com/limitations-of-the-text-based-approach on 27 April 2017.

Sabia, D. 2010. Defending Immanent Critique. *Political Theory* 38(5)684-711.

Shohamy, E. 2006. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches.* London: Routledge.

Shulman, L. 1987. Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review.* 57 (1), 1-22.

The real matric marks. 2017. News24: http://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/the-real-matric-marks-20170107 on 20 March 2017.

Van der Walt, C. 2010. Of shoes–and ships–and sealing-wax: A dynamic systems approach to language curriculum orientation. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 28(4): 323–337.

Venter, M. 2011. Goodbye to 'language' teaching. *Teaching English Today* 1(ii). At https://teachenglishtoday.org/index.php/2011/02/goodbye-to-language-teaching/ on 27 April 2017.

Endnotes

i   The reference to 'key subjects' appears in the minutes of the Parliamentary Committee on Basic Education: https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/23951/?via=cte-menu There are references in the minutes to 12 key subjects which then appear in the media too. In the DBE National Senior Certificate Diagnostic Report (2016) there are only 11 subjects. It is not clear to me where the concept of 12 key subjects come from.

ii   It seems that the curriculum developers ignored the 2009 task team again, when they argue ((Report of the Task Team) 2009:42, emphasis added) that, "Clarity is also required around the differences between home language instruction and the teaching of English as the FAL, providing precise criteria and pedagogical steps for this. It is important to recognize that second language learners have special requirements (Christie, 2005), *and* thus *transposing English mother tongue instruction as a model onto the teaching of English as a FAL is inadequate.* The overemphasis on literature is evidence of the persistent belief that EFAL teaching is a watered down version of English Home Language teaching, as argued extensively by Kaiser, Renecke and Uys (2010:54): "[T]he content of the FAL syllabus is similar to that of the Home Language in terms of the focus on creative writing, the study of literature, and the study of grammar instead of equipping learners with academic literacy skills".

iii   This usually happens when they do assessments of lessons when pre-service teachers are doing their practicum.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

C van der Walt

Faculty of Education, Stellenbosch University

Christa van der Walt is Vice-Dean Research and professor of language education in the Faculty of Education, Stellenbosch University. Her area of interest is English language teaching in multilingual contexts

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