CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

and

RATIONALE

1.1 Introduction

In 1996, Teaching the English subjects - Green and Beavis' collection of historical studies of English curriculum in Australia - began with these words:

There is a striking dearth of historical perspective and imagination apparent in curriculum work in and on the teaching of English... This is especially the case in Australia... Now, more than ever... English teaching needs to be firmly placed in historical and social context, with due recognition of its complex and contradictory character (p.1).

Moreover, a central project of such a perspective needs to focus on changing conceptualisations of the very definition of the subject itself. What is English? - the title of Peter Elbow's 1990
consideration of the nature of the school subject - epitomises an on-going concern in the field of "English" for re-defining and re-conceptualising this area of the curriculum in quite
fundamental ways. Indeed, trying to capture the nature of "English" is something to which histories of the subject continually return (see 1.3.3 below). "The question of how best to understand and indeed, define, English teaching remains a vexed and contentious feature of English curriculum debate", argue Green and Beavis (1996:7). Homer's comprehensive study of secondary English in Australia contends that the subject's major problem for fifty years has been just what it is that actually constitutes "English" (1973:1) and the central question posed in Medway's study of the recent history of the subject in the UK is, "How is it that, in relation to the demands placed upon it, and upon school subjects in general, this subject could have ended up so eccentric?" (1990: 3). More recently, Goodwyn has argued that "Since its formation, subject English has been the centre of controversy... Perceived by many as the most important subject in the school curriculum, it has been a barometer for the curricular weather systems surrounding it... English has been more than part of larger changes in education and society; it has been the focus of those changes" (2001:149).

"One way of answering the question 'What is English?', argues Morgan, "is to ask 'What was English?' That is, in exploring how the past has left its marks in subtle or blatant ways upon
the present, we often reveal what is taken for granted within a subject area" (Morgan, Robert, 1995:110).

This present study examines a recent period in the history of English for the secondary Years 7-10 in the state of New South Wales (NSW), Australia, and will address the question, "How was Years 7-10 English actually defined as a school subject during this period in NSW?" The period in question is that between the publication of a revolutionary new English Syllabus in 1971 to the year 1992 - the sixth year of implementation of a successor Syllabus. The key question investigated in this study is, "How was Years 7-10 English actually defined as a school subject during this period in NSW?"

Of course, in discussing curriculum, one needs to draw crucial distinctions between the curriculum as designed at state and national levels through Syllabuses, and the curriculum as enacted in the classrooms - between what Goodson describes, respectively, as the "preactive" and "interactive" curricula (Goodson, 1992, 1994a). The "preactive" curriculum as defined particularly in Syllabus documents Goodson refers to as the "written curriculum" (Goodson, 1992, 1994a, 1994b). Others have variously called it the "rhetorical curriculum" (Labaree, 1987) or "policy action" (to be distinguished from "policy talk" - Tyack and Cuban, 1995). This study will focus not on classroom practice, but on constructions of the subject English in Syllabus documents, professional journals, textbooks and examinations. Thus, the emphasis will be on both Goodson's "written curriculum" and other key documents - these latter forming what Lundgren (1977) has called the "curriculum code" - that together form a set of constructions of the subject. These constructions, in their turn, potentially drive the "interactive curriculum".

A related secondary question will be, "What was the relationship between the concepts 'English' and 'literacy' in NSW in the given period?" In addition, a particular framework of analysis is to be applied - that supplied by Christie in a series of commentaries on the history of English in Australia written throughout the 1980s and 1990s - a series that could be said to be advancing a thesis on the history of the subject, and one which is explained in 1.3 below. Christie's thesis on the history of the subject also helps determine the secondary question of this study - "What was the relationship between the concepts 'English' and 'literacy' in NSW in the given period?" - a question not at first obviously arising as a key issue from the main question. The issue is that while, in 1971, the notion of "literacy" seemed to have an unproblematic place in subject "English", by the mid-1990s the Department of Education and Training was producing curriculum documents which would seem to have severed any special relationship that "literacy" might have with "English". The degree to which the culture of "English" has been caught up with its attending to reading and writing skills is enough justification to examine "literacy" as a special aspect of how subject "English" came to be
defined over time in this state. However, another factor gives additional weight to the argument for special attention to "literacy" and its relationship to "English" in this study - and that is the degree to which "literacy" itself by the mid-1990s had come to reflect some aspects of the normative curriculum put forward by Christie. These two issues weigh strongly enough that no study of the recent history of English in this state can afford to ignore the relationship between the concepts "English" and "literacy" - and, indeed, should make that relationship a key issue in definitions of the subject, "English".

1.2 Rationale for the present study

1.2.1 The lack of curriculum history
Calls for increased attention to curriculum histories, particularly subject-specific histories, have been somewhat insistent in the last two decades. Goodson particularly has called frequently for increased attention to curriculum histories (1984; 1985a; 1994b; Goodson and Anstead, 1994). Goodson argues that "to pursue an understanding of the complexity of curriculum action ... over time is a meaningful sequence through which to test, and formulate, theory" (1984: 27). Ball and Goodson (1984) argue that the tendency of school subjects to be viewed as basic forms of knowledge is in itself a good example of the way contemporary phenomena are viewed as natural rather than as the product of history. We forget, they argue, the struggles involved in their establishment, the alternatives promoted by different groups and the changes in content which have been undergone. In Australia specifically, Seddon too has bemoaned the "dearth" of curriculum history, which "means that Australian curriculum workers do not know their own past...the processes by which change occurs over time are insufficiently analysed" (1989: 1).

1.2.2 The need for histories of "preactive curriculum"
According to Goodson, an important emphasis in curriculum history should be the history of written curricula as represented, for example, in Syllabus documents (1992,1994a; 1994b). He makes the crucial distinction already discussed above between "written curriculum" and curriculum as enacted in the classroom at the "interactive level". By definition, the study of written curriculum and related key documents will increase our understanding of the influences and interests active at what he terms the "preactive" level. But, further, such understanding will increase our knowledge of the values and purposes represented in schooling (1992, 1994a:19-20). Goodson goes on to argue:

the written curriculum provides us with a testimony, a documentary source, a changing map of the terrain (1988:16)
...it would be folly to ignore the central importance of controlling and defining the written curriculum...the written curriculum is the visible and public testimony of selected rationales and legitimating rhetorics for schooling...the convention of the school subject, has here both symbolic and practical significance...The first step is plainly to undertake a range of studies of the definitions of written curriculum and, in particular, to focus on the impregnable fortress of the school subject. School subjects are the major categories for schooling (1992: 24)

In general, Goodson sees written curriculum as a major but neglected source for the investigation of schooling (1994a:23). Continually, he calls for investigation of how curricula originate, are reproduced, metamorphose and respond to new prescriptions (1984; 1994a:39; 1994b:113-115; Goodson and Anstead, 1994). "The school subject", he argues, "is in continual flux - a recurrent terrain of contestation" (1992: 25). His own work, for example, on the histories of particular school subjects has tended to argue a general pattern of long-term historical movement in Britain away from a practical and vocational orientation towards making subjects more abstract and academic.

1.2.3 The dearth of histories of "subject English"

English has been a particular case in the argument for increased attention to history. Morgan has echoed Mathieson's (1975) lament of "our formidable historical ignorance" (Morgan, 1990: 231). Within Australia, Christie et al (1991) have recommended that "all teacher training programs in secondary English include...work on the history and current construction of the discipline 'English'" (Recommendation #38) and Brock has argued along similar lines (1993).

As seen above in 1.1 (Green and Beavis, 1996: 1, 7; Homer, 1973: 1; Medway, 1990: 3; Morgan, Robert, 1995: 110), arguments for increased attention to the study of the history of subject English often revolve around the very issue of defining the subject itself - the concern of the present study:

we need to enquire into the social history of English teaching and the English subjects, and to investigate their historical formation as curriculum identities. In part, this involves the perennial question: What is English teaching? What gives English its intelligibility as a specific curriculum formation, within the discursive and disciplinary economy of the school? What counts as 'English'? (Green and Beavis, 1996: 6)

Morgan elsewhere argues that, "what is lost to a profession ignorant of its own history is the weave of ideology in the discourse of English studies" (Morgan Robert, 1990: 231) while Elbow (1990) believes that there is particular value in looking to "tradition" to provide an answer to
questions of understanding and defining English teaching. Indeed, a key theme in Goodson's argument for increased attention to curriculum, and particularly subject-specific, histories is the notion of the making of curriculum being a process of inventing tradition. Written curriculum, he says, is the supreme example of inventing tradition (1994b:118). Goodson and Medway further argue that in "constructing a history and politics of schooling the case of English is especially significant and revealing" (1990: vii), while Green believes that "English needs to be recognised as a matter of particular concern for curriculum research, bringing together theory, history and politics alike" (1995b: 391).

Green and Beavis (p.1) argue that concepts such as "Progressivism" and "Romanticism" in describing English need to be employed with more theoretical rigour and historical grounding, just as notions such as "response", "collaborative learning" and "group work" need to be seen in historical perspectives, rather than as ideas which are somehow simply "natural".

Thus, there is an on-going argument in the curriculum field for increased attention to curriculum history, particularly subject-specific history, and particularly for the history of written curriculum in forms such as Syllabus documents. This argument is strong for subject English and is particularly current in Australia. Moreover, in English, part of this call for history is in terms of echoing Goodson's call for a re-visiting of the very definition of the subject itself. Indeed, Green and Beavis describe their own book as "historicising" attempts to "define 'English' in Australia" (p.11).

1.2.4 The need for "localised" histories of subject English

All of these concerns are addressed by the present study. The present study is also specific to the region of NSW. While NSW cannot, of course, be isolated from movements occurring elsewhere, it is the influence of such movements within this specific region that are important here. Green and Beavis see a "particular need for...region-specific histories of English teaching and the English subjects" in Australia (p.6). This of course is largely because of the political reality that written subject curricula are determined on a state-by-state basis, notwithstanding the drives towards national curriculum and echoes Goodson's recognition of the reality that "local...cultural and political milieux" are key sites in which subject definitions are contested. We "need to know", he believes, "precisely how this global pattern (of subject-based curriculum) interacts and collides with more local/national cultures and structures...We need detailed local and historical studies of how common subject labels override different patterns of knowledge formation and institutionalised practice" (1992:25).
1.2.5 The need for histories of the recent past to investigate the recent "eccentricity" of the subject.

The period 1971-1997 is of course very recent history. One key theme in histories of secondary school English has been the eccentricity of the subject. This is why, of course, the notion of defining the nature of the subject is something to which curriculum histories continually return, as shown in 1.1 and 1.2.3 above. Nevertheless, this was not always the case. Historians have identified certain core features of the subject as consistent - literature, writing and "language work" make a prototypical "grammar" of English for Green and Beavis (p.8) and Medway (1990). Thus, notwithstanding Homer's identifying a long debate over definitions of the subject, this "eccentric" aspect of English may be a relatively recent, possibly post-war phenomenon. This becomes Medway's justification for his study of a recent period, 1958-1968 - identifying this period as a case study in the re-definition of the subject (1990). Goodwyn's description of English as "a barometer for the curricular weather systems surrounding it" characterises the last twenty years as "arguably the most stormy" (2001: 149). Just as Medway showed for the UK, Watson's study showed that this sense of "strangeness" was a recent phenomenon in NSW also, where there was great similarity of approaches and a sense of "core knowledge" from 1911 until the "dramatic departure" of the 1971 Syllabus (1994: 40). As with Medway, it would seem justifiable to study the recent period when such re-definitions become central to debates about the subject.

1.3 Conceptual locus: the Christie "thesis"

In the 1991 report on the preservice preparation of teachers, Teaching English literacy (Christie et al) - widely known as "the Christie report" - a particular construction was advanced concerning the history of English teaching in Australia since the 1960s. The Report argued that the history of English teaching had abandoned the notion of teaching about language, on the grounds that this compromised the capacity of students "to come to terms with using language 'in their own way'"(p.17). This privileging of the students' language, and consequent neglect of teaching about the language was placed firmly at the feet of John Dixon, the Dartmouth Seminar, and the "growth" model of English. Behind this model, it was argued, lay a particular notion of the individual as one who fashioned and shaped his or her own world in private, often independent ways - and also a particular notion of the responsibility of education to promote individual growth (p.17).

Dixon's historical problem, it is argued in the Report, was that in highlighting the former domination of the "skills" and "cultural heritage" models, he did not take account of the development and disappearance of a rhetorical tradition in English studies. It was this
tradition which had had the potential for students to learn to fashion language to serve socially significant purposes - to study language in terms of audience, purpose and meaning. Instead, the study of language had become concerned only with the study of grammar, "an enfeebled pattern of teaching about English parts of speech, sentence parsing and analysis, spelling and handwriting" (Christie et al, 1991: 18) - all equated with Dixon’s "skills model". In turn, the cultural heritage model had grown out of Romantic literary traditions, been enhanced by Arnold as advocate of literature-as-civilising-influence and was finally taken up by Leavis, whose legacy was to have students admire great works, but not to analyse them, or attempt to write their own. Such practices eschewed analysis of language and served to disempower students (Christie et al, 1991: 18).

According to this analysis, Dixon failed to recognise the closeness of his own "growth" model to cultural heritage. Both models were said to attach particular importance to personal voice and experience, seeing the unique individual as the primary focus of attention in English studies. Both models also, it was claimed, eschewed direct teaching about language, again, because of the capacity of such teaching to compromise a student's coming to terms with language and experience "in his or her 'own' way"(Christie et al, 1991: 18). A consequence of this general tendency was for the teacher to take up the role of facilitator, rather than having a central instructional role (Christie et al, 1991: 19-20).

Most importantly, argues the Report, this model was influential in Australia. The Report cites Christie’s own research in the 1970s into state curricula throughout Australia, as well as a 1980 survey of teacher education programs in English to claim that the practices and ideas described above were favoured models in Australian systems and classrooms.

Christie has expanded this thesis about the history of English teaching in Australia in other places (Christie, 1981b, 1990, 1993, 1995). She begins from the classical distinction between grammar and rhetoric. Grammar is concerned with words, the rules which govern them and their relationships, but ignores meaning. Rhetoric, on the other hand, is about the construction of meaning in language, and involves studying whole texts as ways of using language to inform, explain, argue and persuade (1993: 76). One of the legacies of this distinction, she argues, is the "received tradition" in English of distinguishing form from meaning (1981b). This whole thrust was sown in the nineteenth century due partly to the influence of Romanticism on nineteenth century teaching practices, and also due to the fact that the elementary schools for the poor were not designed to produce those who could argue, but to produce compliant workers with minimal literacy - so that any interest in rhetoric was replaced by teaching the ability to spell, to identify parts of speech and to analyse sentences. At the same time, the post-Romantic teaching of literature in the twentieth century
represented “literature” as “great works” to be admired, but not analysed. This manner of thinking about literature as the individual forging great truths discouraged close study of texts, asserts Christie.

Into the twentieth century, then, the only extant language study in schools was derived from the study of “grammar” and involved parsing, analysing and correcting faulty sentences (1993: 79-94).

The growth model that emerged from Dartmouth and was popularised by Dixon reacted against such sterile teaching practices, but ultimately failed the teaching of English because of its:

- romantic notion of the individual, and consequent failure to acknowledge the social
- concentration on persons creating their own meanings, and hence deflecting attention from the nature of language itself

The result of this, according to Christie, was to cause teachers to actively resist teaching about language, on the grounds that this interfered with children’s capacity to use language in their “own” way. Moreover, the teacher was relegated to the role of “trusted” or “sympathetic” adult, facilitating growth in students - this in turn created a general philosophy of reluctance to intervene in the language development of students. By the 1970s, the “growth” model was widespread in Australian curriculum documents, popularising the Dartmouth themes of concern for the “person” and for “ownership”.

Consequent on the post-Romantic, Leavisite approach to literature study was a belief in the privileged role of the English teacher as the guardian of culture and as one who offered moral positions. This view of English as a context for personal and moral growth was what the “cultural heritage” school had in common with the “growth” model - and in the concern for children using their own language to forge truth, they also linked with the “cultural heritage” model in resisting detailed examination of language. The fate of the Curriculum Development Centre’s Language Development Project in the 1970s and 1980s, argues Christie, reflects these tendencies. The Project failed to address the question of appropriate models for teaching about language - this notion being otherwise synonymous with the “received tradition” of grammar. The ideas of not intruding on the individual “voice” (from the “growth” model) or on individual “response” (from Leavis) also linked together to resist teaching about language. Language became “invisible” and the “growth” model failed students (1993: 76-77; 94-98; 101-102).
It is worth emphasising at this point that Christie's thesis depends heavily on evidence from "practive curriculum" - in particular evidence based on Dixon's work and on syllabus documents - rather than being a thesis based on research into actual classroom practice. This is partly why her thesis makes an appropriate conceptual locus for the present study.

Christie deplored the state of affairs she described in her thesis and both Teaching English literacy and her other work argued a normative position for English - that the content of the subject should be the English language itself, underpinned by a concept of language as a social institution, or as Halliday's "social semiotic". This would convert in practice into studies of genres, registers, the grammatical system, dialect, sound systems, spelling and handwriting as well as the systematic linguistic examination of both "literature" and popular culture. The grammar would be Halliday's functional grammar, driven by the semantic, not the syntactic, and hence avoiding the classical distinction between grammar and rhetoric. This, claimed Christie, would create a curriculum grounded in a social theory, not obsessed by individualism, and avoiding the unfairness to disadvantaged groups of being captive of their "own" language. (1993: 98-100). The logic of her view of "English" and the kind of subject that it should become has led her to argue that "English is no longer a viable label and should be replaced by a program addressed to language(s) and literacy" (1995).

Christie is not entirely alone among curriculum historians in some of the detail of this argument. A number of writers, for example, also make a link between "growth" and "cultural heritage". Hamley sees the Cambridge (Leavisite) School, for example, as linking not with "traditional approaches" to literature, but with progressivism, and, in this, Cambridge shared origins with "growth" as manifested by writers such as Rosen, Britton, Doughty and Wilkinson (1979: 347ff). Medway agrees with Hamley and sees both literature-centred and "growth" approaches as having common Romantic values in the authority of individual response and the priority of an intelligence of feelings over one of thought (1990: 22-23). Patterson, too, argues "At the core of English... resides the personal, individual and spontaneous response to literature" (1993: 61) and implies even wider connections between "growth" and Arnold/Leavis, through the notion of "response", which she sees as mystical and atheoretical (1992). Green sees both the Cambridge and London (Britton, Dixon, Rosen etc.) Schools as grounded in what Belsey (1980) presents as an expressive-realist understanding of language, meaning and representation (1995b: 397ff). Davies links Dixon with Hollbrook in sharing a "passionate and confident belief that English teaching is centrally concerned with literature" (Davies, Chris, 1996:19), while Freebody has more recently argued that "there has been a constant tussle between rhetorical and literary wings of English study" (1999: 6).
Christie describes her preferred version of language study - language as "social semiotic"; language as serving socially significant purposes; language study in terms of audience, purpose and meaning - as a "rhetorical" perspective. The equation of the inter-relationship of audience-purpose-meaning with "rhetoric" is, of course, an accepted one. Andrews (1992) sees the "frame" of rhetoric as having the three points of "speaker(s) or writer(s) or makers(s) ...the audience...or reader; and the subject-matter, the 'world' that is to be communicated" (p.2). As he states, this is no more than the "classic communication triangle", but it is a triangle that informs both classical rhetoric and modern linguistics (p.2). The further equation made by Christie between "rhetoric" and language study in terms of its social purposes is also endorsed by Andrews:

it is illuminating... to conceive of rhetoric in this way because not only does such a conception...link itself in an unbroken tradition running back to Isocrates and beyond...but it also enables us to conduct a kind of archaeological dig to unearth the way in which any communicative act is shaped in the present....Take the following situations: a class in a school in New South Wales is being read to by a teacher. The 'text' comes in a book, encased in a cloth binding. There are only so many words on the page. The text is, say, Poona Country by Farrukh Dhondy.

Already there are various rhetorical questions...that can be asked...For example, who has chosen this text? Is the reading the only way the students will experience the text? Will they take the book home to continue by themselves or will the reading always be controlled by the teacher? Dhondy is an Indian by birth and lives in England; what significance has that for students reading him in Australia? Is the book being read for pleasure? Does the way a book encases a text have any bearing on the way the text is structured (e.g. into chapters...) and read? Could we conceive of the same text in a completely different embodiment? Would it still be the 'same' text? How does this text compare to others by Dhondy? to others by Indian writers? to others in the same genre? to the lives of its 'readers'?...all these questions are rhetorical (p.3).

Accepting the particular set of associations that Christie makes about her preferred area of language study as, indeed, being, "rhetorical", then the essential elements of her thesis on the history of English in general, and then transferred to Australia in particular, are that:

• the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon was transferred more or less wholesale into Australia
• teaching about sentence-level grammar was rejected and this led in turn to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general- indeed, there was active
resistance against teaching about language, and this meant a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
• study of literature in terms of analysis of language was abandoned.

The Australian Language and Literacy Council referred to the Christie Report itself as “the most substantial Australian contribution yet to the field of English literacy preservice teacher education in the school context” (ALLC, 1995: 21) - and what is possibly the most important recent publication in the area uses the Report as something of a touchstone for historical discussion of English in this country (Green and Beavis, 1996).

Christie's view of the history of English in Australia needs to be addressed precisely because it has excited much debate. Thus, Christie's views have not been without their critics. Brock (1993), for example, rejects the connection between Cambridge and "growth", but, more importantly, perhaps, argues that to simply extrapolate from British models to the Australian experience, as Christie does, ignores the complexity and eclecticism with which curricula evolved in this country. Brock cites Homer's (1973) research particularly as demonstrating that a number of models which Christie ignores were operating alongside each other in Victoria in the early 1970s. Moreover, his own research shows that the designers of the 1975-76 Years 11-12 Syllabus, whom, he implies, represented a "personal response model based on the Leavis/Richards/New Criticism critiques" rejected "personal growth" as a suitable basis for its English curriculum (1993: 32). Green and Beavis (1996), too, are critical of Christie for simply (mis)taking Dixon's markers of periodisation - "skills", "cultural heritage" and "growth" - for history itself. The Christie Report, they argue, "glosses over the complexities of history, and, in doing so, arguably closes off as many opportunities in research and pedagogy as it opens up" (p.5). "At the very least ", they contend, the Christie Report "needs to be carefully and critically scrutinised for the manner in which it uses history in arguing for its own version of both the present and the future directions of the field" (p.9). Corcoran et al (1994) refer to Christie's "treatment of models of English entailing) the particular dismissal of expressively grounded ('growth model') approaches, and in the process deny ing) the historical development and any balanced appraisal of cognitive/constructivist/transactional approaches to teaching and learning " (p.16). Pollock et al (1994) also reported serious objections to casting "the profession as belonging to one or more of 'inappropriate' traditions or models" (p.16).

However, Christie's critics have not produced the detailed study of curriculum documents from the history of English in Australia to refute her thesis in a strong and convincing way. The present study, in seeking to examine how Years 7-10 English was actually defined as a school subject during the period in question will subject the Christie thesis to such detailed
examination via the "written curriculum" and related key documents which interact to form particular constructions of the subject.

1.4 Conclusion

In sum, then, the purpose of the present study may so far be represented diagrammatically as:

A study of the questions

- How was Years 7-10 English defined from the early 1970s to the early 1990s in NSW?
  AND
- What was the relationship between the concepts "English" and "literacy" in NSW in the given period?

to be investigated through the framework of

the Christie thesis on the history of English in Australia since the advent of the "growth model" - a thesis which presents the arguments that:
- the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon was transferred more or less wholesale into Australia
- teaching about sentence-level grammar was rejected and this led in turn to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general- indeed, there was active resistance against teaching about language, and this meant a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
- study of literature in terms of analysis of language was abandoned

with the data being brought to bear being

- Syllabus documents
- professional journals
- school textbooks and
- examinations

The methodology for structuring this study is explained in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The relevant literature will be reviewed in the following key areas:

2.1 - a brief introduction on curriculum history methodology
2.2 - general histories of secondary English
2.3 - the history of secondary English in Australia generally and in NSW in particular.

2.1 Curriculum history methodology

In discussing the growing range of methodologies of the history of education generally, McCulloch and Richardson (2000) identify one clear trend in that history over the past two decades as the influence of social research, using traditions from sociology and critical theory, particularly in policy analysis and policy-oriented research (pp. 11-15, 25ff). The more common approaches to historical study have drawn freely on a range of theories and constructs and present concerns in social science and cultural studies (p. 48). This trend has been particularly evident in curriculum history. Reviews of the field (McCulloch, 1987; Musgrave, 1988; Parry, 1994) have been strongly concerned with this influence and Franklin’s recent coverage of the state of contemporary curriculum history traces the roots of concern with the socially constructed nature of curriculum to “the sociology of knowledge, symbolic interactionism and other brands of phenomenologically oriented social science” (Franklin, 1999: 461).

Green and Beavis identify two major trends in recent curriculum history (1996: 10). The first is that following the lines of historical enquiry inspired by the research of Michel Foucault, variously labelled “archaeology”, “genealogy”, “effective history” or “history of the present”. Other historians have described this trend thus:

The problem of study is to subject the traditions and customs of everyday life to scrutiny. It is to make problematic the everyday language and practices of schooling in order to consider how schooling is possible as a social reality. (Popkewitz, 1987b: 2)

Foucault (sends) repeated calls to expand the boundaries of possible approaches to contemporary problems by using historical investigations to permit a thinking of those
problems in different ways. It is this understanding of the use of history which has come
to be understood as the project of the "history of the present" (Tyler and Johnson, 1991:1).

Genealogical work is differentiated from other approaches to history through its interest
in making the present strange, rather than the past familiar. Its move is away from a
search for origins and foundations and towards an attention to the precise, sometimes
mundane, historical changes which give the present its shape. In the process, the present
becomes a less familiar landscape. Genealogies tend to "wear away" at certain
commonplaces: that which has gone without saying becomes harder to pronounce
(Meredith and Tyler, 1993: 4)

This line of enquiry tends to take as its starting point questions posed in the present,
investigating the terms in which those problems are currently understood, and tracing the line
of descent that has led to problems being posed in these particular ways (Tyler and Johnson,
1991: 2; Meredith and Tyler, 1993: 4). One of the effects of making contemporary categories
problematic - of greater attention being paid to categories or concepts usually treated
unproblematically - is the important ability to pay attention to "specificity and contingency",
which these historians see as lacking in other curriculum history (Tyler and Johnson, 1991:4-5).

The second line of enquiry is that followed by Goodson, Ball and others. While Green and
Beavis do not themselves identify the characteristics of this school, it may be broadly
identified as a group who have driven an interest in subject history (Franklin, 1999; Englund,
1990). Again, this group take a broadly social constructionist perspective (Seddon and Pope,
1989; Goodson, 1991, 1992, 1994 b; Goodson and Dowbiggin, 1990; Hargreaves, 1994; Franklin,
1999). Historical case studies and the elucidation of the human processes behind the definition
and promotion of school subjects – a concern with the motives and activities inherent in their
construction and maintenance - have certainly been a concern of Goodson’s work, as has the
theme of class exclusion. Ball too has tended to see the history of subjects in terms of their
control by members of interest groups over key resources and positions of power. These
perspectives have been a major trend in curriculum histories of the 80s and 90s (see for
example, Ball and Lacey,1982; Ball, 1982; Ball, 1983; Goodson and Ball,1984; Popkewitz, 1987a;
Goodson, 1985b; Goodson and Medway, 1990; Price, 1986). Importantly, Goodson has argued
for socio-historical studies enabling a consideration of the complexities of curriculum from "a
less universalising point of view" (Goodson, 1987a: 3 [see also Baker, 1996: 106]), echoing the
calls from genealogists for "specificity and contingency" (Tyler and Johnson, 1991: 4).

In addition to these trends in curriculum history, Franklin further identifies a group of
curriculum historians embracing the idea of the so-called "linguistic turn" in the social
sciences. These scholars, also influenced by Foucault in particular, are interested in exploring the discursive practices embedded in the language used about curricular knowledge and how that knowledge serves to construct schooling (Franklin, 1999: 473). Codd, for example, deconstructs texts on curricular policy within a "materialist" theory of language that approaches such policies as "cultural and ideological artifacts... that have been constructed within a particular historical and political context" (1988: 242-44). Another such scholar is Popkewitz, who sees his "social epistemology" of schooling focused on language as a "constitutive element in the construction of social life and identity" (1997: 131-36). Central in Popkewitz’s historiography is a scrutiny and re-examination of language as not only describing and interpreting the world but as itself constituting social practices and identity (1997: 138). Part of this project is an emphasis on "regional study", in which the concept of "region" is not so much a physical as a "discursive" location - such as studying the child as "adolescent". The point of such "regionality" is to "more finely locate the foci of the study of schooling" (1997: 153). Ball desires to "replace the modernist theoretical project of abstract parsimony with a more post-modernist one of localised complexity" (1993: 10). Like Goodson's history, these are attempts to be "less universalising" and, as part of the genealogical school of Foucault, to attain "specificity and contingency".

2.2 Histories of secondary English - general

One of the earliest full-scale curriculum histories of English is Shayer's *The teaching of English in schools 1900-1970*. Shayer sees English at the turn of the century as characterised by what he sees as a number of fallacies:

- the classical fallacy, which was an attempt to establish the credibility of English by teaching it as if it were the classics. Thus literary study became about allusion hunting and grammatical analysis
- the Old English fallacy, which referred to the earliest university English courses' emphasis on Old and Middle English
- the imitative fallacy, under which areas such as composition exercises consisted of imitating detailed outlines of how a whole story was to be structured
- the moral fallacy in which literature was seen primarily as a means of conveying moral lessons
- the content fallacy, in which grammar was seen as providing a content that made the subject academic and examinable - and thus respectable (1972: 6-19).

Shayer sees the whole period from 1900 to 1937 as characterised by a battle between the study of grammar and other approaches advocating such things as:
• the need to foster imagination
• learning through doing
• the importance of student interest
• the importance of personal expression
• writing as structuring experience and
• the lack of relationship between knowledge of grammar and writing ability.

These latter approaches were contained in the work of writers such as Margaret Macmillan, Philip Hartog, Caldwell Cook, Dorothy Tudor Owen and particularly George Sampson. Ranged against these were voices opposing "creativity", self-expression and "child-centredness" and these forces won out in the Board of Education's Regulations for elementary schools of 1904, Handbook of suggestions for 1914, Suggestions for the teaching of English in secondary schools in 1924 and the 1931 Report on the primary school (1972: 23-122).

Eventually the Board's 1937 Suggestions located the study of grammar as arising from actual speech and writing, rather than as separate formal exercises. This occurred at a time when Leavis was establishing analysis in place of historical and biographical content in literature study and was emphasising the discipline and humanising potential of literature against "mass" culture. English was to become an agent for "civilised" living and thinking (Shayer, 1972: 123-29). Shayer himself echoes Leavis' ideas on the degeneracy of mass culture:

> since the last war the quality of magazine and comic material has deteriorated considerably and the pressures of commercialism have intensified tenfold (1972: 132).

Shayer sees Marjorie Hourd's The Education of the poetic spirit as a seminal post-war work in establishing links between the Creative Movement, "new English" and Romanticism (Hourd's work is highly influenced by Coleridge, Wordsworth and Ruskin in viewing the child as a potential creative genius). Such links between Romanticism and "creative" teaching emphasised the child being left alone and "free" of repression, while the Classical view had been that individuals must be controlled, directed, organised (1972: 136-40). In Shayer's view, it was David Holbrook who really moved the postwar creative advance into the new era of the secondary modern. Holbrook strongly reflected George Sampson's work and was committed to creativity for the "C" grade child. Holbrook also echoed Leavis in the unique civilising role given to English. Shayer sees Holbrook as instituting an entirely new concept of English based on the pupil's needs in a particular society (1972: 148-52). Thus, for Shayer, Holbrook represents a link between creative teaching and those social class concerns in which he sees dangers:
Perhaps the real danger arises where the 'Dewey' system is exaggerated in the hands of politically committed English teachers who also see themselves as part-time sociologists (1972: 154)

Shayer refers to work such as the *Reflections* series of Clements, Stratta and Dixon as being in an "unholy alliance" with the social sciences and objects to the whole thrust of post-1950s English as "opportunities seep(ing) away...in a fog of Romantic or egalitarian exaggeration" (1972: 186-87). The key trends in this "new English" are:

- an emphasis on creativity
- encouraging the personal and the individual, especially in writing
- perceiving the teacher as helper
- using the pupil's own activity as the basis of planning
- seeing stimulus as important, especially stimulus of the imagination
- "real" writing being more important than "skills"
- English as developing the personality
- writing as tantamount to creating
- English being seen as a unity, emphasising integration and organising textbooks into themes and attaching literature to these themes
- pupils working at their own level
- supporting writing by reading
- emphasising relevance (Shayer, 1972: 164-71)

Shayer's is an essentially elitist position, reflecting that strand in the work of Leavis which rejected the "popular". Despite his characterising of Holbrook (a student of Leavis) as central to the view of "English as social concern", Shayer essentially rejects the egalitarianism as well as the Romanticism.

In his 1973 study, Homer addressed as his central issue the very question this present study addresses, viz, what constitutes "English" - that issue of definition being "the subject's major problem" (p.1). Homer argued that prior to 1921, the major formative factors on the history of English as vernacular in England were the teaching methods of the Classics and the examination system. These were both attacked by Arnold, and with the establishment of the English School at Oxford, an Oxbridge compromise between literary study and philology competed with the "practical" nature of English in public schools to entrench definitional problems, but also, paradoxically, to secure the future of the subject. The Newbolt Report acclaimed the prestige of English literature and re-elevated literature over the nineteenth century attitude of the need for a lettered and literate work force. Nevertheless, Newbolt defined English as "about":
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• training in the speech of standard English
• training in the use of written and spoken English
• training in aspects of reading
• the use of literature

Homer sees the aim of Newbolt English as producing what Dixon was later to call the "skills" and "cultural heritage" models. Effectively, Newbolt separated language from literature. It was also tentative on grammar - rejecting grammar when it was conceived as a separate study that took time from literature, but reluctant to reject grammar itself as supporting the formation of "correct" speech habits and, in composition, the extended ordering of ideas for communication to others (1973: 50-64). It would appear that Homer's study would support the Christie thesis to this point, but, as Section 2.3 demonstrates, Homer argues for a quite different history of the subject in Australia.

Homer further sees the Caldwell Cook "Play way" model as ultimately continuing the "cultural heritage" model, but effectively also allowing room for different views of the subject by introducing a flexible program of activities. At the same time in the UK, W.S.Tomkinson argued for what was effectively a "taste model", which provided pupils with a cognitive framework that when thoroughly absorbed, became the basis of their literary taste, enabling them to assess the merit of literary works. His was an example of teaching based on the inculcation of taste and of acute formalism (Homer, 1973: 73-84).

In the 1950s and 1960s "cultural heritage" came to play the role of countering the narrow specialisation of scientific studies, and was soon allied with what Dixon was to call "skills" because of the strong influence of GCE and "O" level examination systems on the curriculum - an influence reinforced by the arguments of the 1959 Crowther Report, which argued for the effectiveness of the direct language teaching promoted by exams. (Homer, 1973: 110-24).

The Newsom Report, however, was to argue the irrelevance of the grammar school approach for low achievers. Newsom superimposed on the "skills" and "cultural heritage" models a view of English as a means of creative expression, personal development and social competence, with spoken English the key element. English was to include film, the writing of poetry and the development of a critical attitude to the media. By the time of Dartmouth, a more child-centred body of theory had developed along with the coming of the Secondary Moderns. This approach was characterised by an emphasis on process and on English as "activity". Competence in "English" now seemed unattainable by direct teaching of language skills or by the methods of literary criticism (Homer, 1973: 125-28). These ideas had come from a collection of influences throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, viz.:
• Bernstein, whose work led to a new emphasis on different responses coming from working class children and especially the importance of emotions in their general growth. Thus, the "creative" aspects of English - such as drama, creative writing and group discussion - took on a new validity.

• Marjorie Houd, whose 1949 The education of the poetic spirit had stressed imaginative processes, the essential artistic integrity of the child’s vision and the value of process. Houd shifted the interest in “literature” from the text to the writer, from the product to the process.

• the creative writing movement, under the influence of, especially, James Britton (who was arguing that written language orders experience) and Margaret Langdon, who was publishing examples of student writing.

• David Holbrook, whose 1964 English for the rejected validated the child’s poetic vision, by arguing that education was about developing that very poetic function (Homer, 1973: 129-140).

Literature, argued Homer, now fitted into the picture through the use of more modern texts. Anthologies such as Summerfield’s Voices, “preoccupied with death and unhappiness”, typified “relevance” as the criterion for choice (1973: 146-47).

In a very closely argued chapter, Homer is critical of the “growth” model that emerged as the dominant UK voice out of Dartmouth. He calls Growth through English not just an account of a conference, but a “manifesto, a strand of ‘British English’” (p.180). Homer believes that Dixon took a “straw man” approach to the “skills” and “cultural heritage” models of English (pp. 181-84) and effectively avoided defining “English” at all, by stressing what students do in English without arguing why they do is, in fact, “English” (p.4). Homer asks the question, “Why is ‘growth’ ‘English’ at all?” (p.191) and answers that is only English by default, because Dixon’s aims were really general educational aims (pp.198-200). The claims of English as general curriculum aims are, in fact, partly the subject of Chapter 5 below. Homer does, however, at one point define “growth” in terms that are recognisably “English”:

What Growth through English does is to merge the ‘old’ models in a new, child-centred approach, in which the cognitive, mechanical aspects of language, and the body of literature, join with the spoken word in an operational problem-solving process. Language is at once the subject of and means towards learning, and success is measured operationally and qualitatively. Assessment, planning and content are one and the same thing (p. 192)

Finally, Homer feels that “growth” lacks direction, that Dixon’s Reflections series seemed to keep the child wholly within their own world and that any growth seemed to be "growth
towards egocentricity”. Moreover, “the whole of living experience” as the content of English is an impossible aim (pp.196-203). These arguments about the nature of “growth” are taken up in Chapter 4 but, to anticipate briefly, such arguments, I believe, do not sufficiently take into account the extent to which “growth”, as represented by Dixon, was based on a notion of growth in language use itself.

Hodgson called his 1974 study of the history of English teaching an attempt “to show how English teachers come to construct and modify and change what it is they believe about English teaching and how that change achieves communal visibility” (p.7). Hodgson traces the history of English in Britain through a Bernsteinian analysis in terms of classification and framing. Essentially what was being framed in English teaching, he argues was “ways of knowing” vs. “states of knowledge”. Up to 1930, Hodgson argues, English was characterised by a strong transmission model of teaching and strongly classified knowledge. Teachers controlled content and style. Repetition and paraphrase were the elements of knowledge. A carefully selected literature of the past was used to inculcate approved moral and spiritual attitudes and prescribed language standards were adhered to so as to help transmit a received culture (pp. 231-233). From the 1930s to the 1970s, however, English was transformed under the influence of psychology, sharpening ideological conflict over “relevance” and New Criticism, so that liberal humanism became the dominant ideology of English (pp. 275-76).

Hodgson uses content analysis of The Use of English from 1949-1962 as a visible longitudinal indicator of how English teaching reacted to change under the influence of these forces. What he finds is:

- growing consensus about the necessity of making the English classroom a place for personal (individual) expression and social (co-operative) expression
- a slight weakening of the transmission model
- a new consciousness based on “new learning”. This was marked by attacks on the examination system and traditional grammar, both of which legitimated previous institutions and previous modes of teaching
- the continuing strength of the cultural heritage model under the influence of Leavis (pp. 282-314).

The Dartmouth and York conferences were milestones in providing a new and authoritative collective voice and by 1974, Hodgson was able to characterise a small number of distinctly differentiated models of English. These were:

- the personal expression model (“creative writing”) represented by Marjorie Hound and David Holbrook
• a sociological model, dedicated to making the working-class child's milieu relevant. Dixon, Stratta and Clements' Reflections series, of which Shayer had been so critical, represented this model with its "social themes" approach to English
• a negotiations model, represented by the work of Douglas Barnes
• a linguistics-based model, represented by the work of Halliday and the Language in Use materials of Doughty and others
• a synthesis-compromise model, marked by eclecticism and represented by Sydney Bolt's The Right Response and Frank Whitehead's The Disappearing Dais.

Interestingly, Hodgson does not line up the "growth" model of the 60s and 70s alongside these as a liberal or humanist model. Rather, he characterises it as a "super-model" that subsumes all of the others and sets up in opposition to the cultural heritage and explicit skills models. The latter themselves, in Hodgson's schema, subsume traditional transmission - reproduction models of curriculum and make the school into an agency of social conservatism, initiating students into social structures (p. 429). Hence, in shifting the emphasis from acceptance and competition to self-revelation and participation, "growth" encourages creative adaptation or non-conformity and becomes a mechanism for coping with change. It challenges, then, the notion of a permanent hierarchy of social organisation, values or knowledge and contains the politicised view that a "state of knowledge" pedagogy is irrelevant, manipulative and oppressive (Hodgson, 1974: 430-32). "Growth" in these terms becomes a critique of society and, far from being simply liberal-humanist is essentially a "radical" concept, embodying Giroux's notion of "border pedagogy": a curriculum that takes seriously the knowledge and experiences which give meaning to students' lives and draws upon this as a basis for criticising the dominant culture (Giroux, 1993: 33-44).

As far back as 1974, Hodgson is writing of "growth" as seeing for itself a duty to help pupils resist any oppressive and manipulative means of production. He sees that it is "growth" teachers who are explicitly "subversive" and "radical" (p. 437). Giroux's border pedagogy is also effectively contained in Hodgson's characterisation of Rosen's work as representing "a whole pedagogy which would stress cultural relevance and the development of a linguistic competence to resist manipulation" (Hodgson, 1974: 453). In this view, the rejection of a "cultural heritage" model of English goes beyond simply rejecting a non-"growth" version of curriculum into the rejection of a particular middle-class cultural heritage, which denies working class students access to "high culture" and hence to social reward. By 1974, Hodgson argues, English has moved from conservatism through liberal humanism to radicalism (p. 476). Liberal-humanism may still be, in 1974, the central ideological position of English teaching, but in the continuing battle for English curriculum between the forces of liberal
humanism and those of radicalism, the forces of the latter are contained within the "growth" model (pp. 477-528).

Mathieson's *The preachers of culture* sees the early history of English in the nineteenth century as caught up in the debates between Science and the Classics over the notion of a "morally improving" curriculum. Arnold particularly, in arguing for the place of literature in forming the soul, was influential in helping English displace the Classics at the centre of the curriculum. Opposition to industrialism, the influence of Romanticism and the coming of Progressivism all formed a background to the work of George Sampson and the Newbolt Report in defining English, by the 1920s, as the curriculum's centrally humanising element (Mathieson, 1975: 17-80). This theme was then taken up by Leavis and his followers such as Thomson, Bantock, Whitehead and Hollbrook who wanted to counter the trivialising effects of modern culture and what they saw as the consequent impoverished quality of life. It was these teachers who moved Sampson's sense of the English teacher as the "missionary" of culture towards more of a sense of teachers as "warriors" of culture (Mathieson, 1975: 85-139). Progressivism also helped re-define the teacher's classroom role. Since Progressives proposed a romantic, optimistic view of the child whose teacher encouraged him/her to develop his/her own uniqueness, then what follows is a delicate balance for the teacher between involvement and detachment. The teacher's role is to draw out the child's creativity for the child's own personal development. Herbert Read and Marjorie Houd as popularisers of creative writing were of course central figures in this strand of the history of English (Mathieson, 1975: 106-14).

When Progressivism allied with the relativism of modern linguistics, then what effectively became allied was the validity of the child's experience with a hostility to adult standards of correctness, as "appropriateness" became a more key concept. Mathieson saw this also related to New Left reaction against a Leavisite concentration on elite culture. Mathieson, similarly to Hodgson, saw the Left as rejecting "great literature" as inappropriate and inaccessible to the majority of pupils, whose time should be spent on extension of their linguistic competence. Its inclusion in all pupils' curricula to the exclusion of working class culture implicitly supported the present social structure and all its inequalities. Thus Mathieson sees the thematic and project work of the 70s as a dismantling of "great literature" in favour of pupil's personal experience - a movement from the school's values to the pupil's; from teacher's talk to pupil's; from high art to pupils' everyday lives (1975: 139-52).

The historical construction of Hodgson and Mathieson is echoed to some extent in the work of Hamley. Hamley sees the period after 1960 as one in which the Cambridge School of Creber, Whitehead, Inglis and Abbs became allied with the progressive writers through their moral
concerns and anti-industrial bias, creating a literature-based progressivism. At the same time, however, Hamley sees the "growth" movement of the period, as represented by the Rosens, Britton, Doughty and Wilkinson as a different form of progressivism in rejecting the primacy of literature for the emphasis on personal growth. Like Hodgson, within the "growth" movement he sees both a progressive-egalitarian strand, emphasising "relevance" and a thematic approach to literature, and a radical strand, centring on cultural relativism and rejecting the cultural heritage (Hamley, 1979: 347). Hamley sees the growing acceptance of good children's literature as essentially part of the progressive view of the cultural heritage, while Dixon in Growth through English is seen as representing a more radical strand in rejecting the primacy of literature at all (Hamley, 1979: 386, 519).

The sociological-orientation of Stephen Ball took the history of English in new directions from the early 80s. Going beyond the narrative histories of the 70s, Ball examines the reasons for the emergence of these competing paradigms in sociological terms, with emphasis on the conditions of change, structures of change and the relations of change. Ball's "social interaction model of curriculum change" essentially combines traditional historical narrative with a view of subject change as competition between opposing groups (Ball, 1982, 1983, 1985, 1987).

In a 1982 case-study of four English departments Ball and Lacey argued that subject disciplines, contrary to the views of Bernstein (1971), were not undifferentiated academic communities. English in fact could be characterised as representing at least three major paradigms which they classified as "Creative/Expressive", "Grammarian" and "Sociological", with the latter corresponding most closely to the "growth" model. Ball has further traced this theme of a differentiated subject community with competing paradigms in histories of the subject in which he traces the occurrence of territorial disputes from the earliest days when English struggled to establish itself and to differentiate its teaching from that of the Classics (Ball, 1982, 1983, 1985). He sees the essential dispute in English teaching as being over the competing importance of, respectively, grammar, the place of literature and the place of pupil-self expression. Ball sees the first moves from a "subject-centred to a child-centred approach to English language" in the Board of Education's 1905 Suggestions for the consideration of teachers and others concerned in the work of public elementary schools, especially in that document's emphasis on written expression and suggestions for the confining of grammar-teaching to the context of reading and composition lessons (1982: 7; 1985: 58).

In Ball's study of the early years of English up to 1935, the English Association is seen from 1906 as the primary player in a mission to firstly unify the separate components of English (grammar, composition and literature) into a single school subject, then to establish the
dominance of literature and then to replace the teaching methods of the classics with both a literary emphasis and an opportunity for pupil self-expression. The early years of the Progressive movement represented by Greening Lamborn, Percy Nunn and Caldwell Cook and the elite cultural tradition of Arnold represented by George Sampson and Quiller-Couch are seen as the counter-ideology to the classics and grammar (1983: 71-73). Nevertheless, Ball sees the English Association’s input into the Newbolt Report as helping result in the compromise between English as analysis and English as creative and literary that that Report represented. Ultimately, the Association sacrificed the Progressives and creativity to win on the literary aspects of English (1983: 78-79). From then on, to the 1960s, English became a battle for dominance between the literary and the grammatical.

Despite the debates at the level of educational elites and decision-makers, within classrooms themselves, argues Ball, the dominant paradigm up until the 1940s was a grammarian-classicist one (1982: 9; 1983; 1985: 60). This was partly the result of the widespread use of non-specialists to teach the subject and the preponderance of philology and language studies as “English” in the universities. In opposition to this situation, two other camps emerged to have great influence on the subject through the 50s and 60s - the “Cambridge School” of Leavis and Denys Thompson and the re-emerging Progressive movement in which Marjorie Hourd and Herbert Read inherited the mantle of Nunn and Cook. The former were opposed to industrial civilisation and had a keen sense of the place of literature - the pre-eminence of which had earlier been firmly argued by George Sampson and the Newbolt Committee. By World War II, the Progressive movement had made headway against grammar in elementary schools, while the Cambridge school had prominence over grammar in secondary schools (Ball, 1982: 11-15; Ball, 1985: 61ff). Ball is able to trace the growth of English in general and of the Cambridge School in particular through a series of stages described by Mullins for the development of new subject specialisms (Ball, 1982: 13-15; Ball, 1985: 63-67; Mullins, 1973).

The University of London’s Institute of Education and the London Association for the Teaching of English (LATE) together formed another institutional centre of opposition to the classical-grammatical paradigm. Ball refers to their approach as the socio-linguistic paradigm (1982), centred as it was not on literature, but on the use (as opposed to the study) of the mother-tongue language. The key figures of course were Britton, Rosen, Dixon, Halliday, Barnes and Martin. Dixon is said to represent the extreme “social realist” position, Halliday the “linguistic” end of the spectrum and Britton a middle ground which stressed both the functional uses of language and the central relevance of the child’s social experiences of life (1985: 70-71).
The earliest influences in the new National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE) had been Leavisites such as Boris Ford and Denys Thompson, but when NATE incorporated LATE within itself, it took "within itself a militant dissenting incubus" and by the 1970s, the "Britton-Martin model of language" was NATE orthodoxy (Ball, 1982: 17). Ball outlines a number of conditions of change pertaining at the time which also aided the growing influence of the London School, not least of which were the political and social radicalism of the 60s and the "rediscovery" of poverty and social deprivation (1982: 18; 1985: 69ff; 1987: 20ff). The Cambridge School, who controlled The Use of English, strongly opposed the sociological bent of the London School and of books like Growth through English. To some extent, these arguments are reflected in the Bullock Report itself. In fact, argues Ball, these arguments about English becoming too close to sociology, reflect earlier arguments, when English was still struggling to establish itself, about the need to emphasise the differences between English and other subjects (1982).

In "English for the English since 1906" Ball is able to represent the contemporary versions of English schematically along a number of axes. The opposition between paradigms involves both issues of content and of method. Implicit in the former is the polarisation of elite and mass concepts of culture (Ball, 1985; Ball, 1987), and in the latter is a separation of child-centred and subject-centred orientations:
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Ball argues that this matrix makes it possible to plot the current state of the subject or the changes over time either in educational rhetoric or in the practices of teachers (1985: 74).

Ball's 1990 version of the history of English teaching, written with Kenny and Gardiner, is "revisionist" in a number of ways. As in earlier versions of Ball's history, Ball, Kenny and Gardiner are concerned with "the public rhetorics and discourses about English teaching" and with the power structures and the tensions between competing power and interest groups (p. 47). But this particular version specifically investigates the rise of English to its very central position in education within advanced capitalist British society. This opens the issue of the politics of literacy and the role of literacy from the late nineteenth century in the social control of the emergent urban working class mass population. In this view, literacy became a way of teaching the masses to "behave" (p. 49). Along with the mechanical skills of reading and writing came also the values and morality of "literature" in reinforcing national solidarity. Literacy became seen as both technical skill and "moral technology" - thus the similarity between its discourse and that of religion, reinforced by the work of Arnold (pp. 49-50). In this perspective, the work of Sampson and the Newbolt Report are seen as giving English a central place in post-WW1 patriotic fervour by focusing interest on "cultural heritage". Ball, Kenny and Gardiner here see the Newbolt Report as representing the culture of the ruling classes and quite consciously representing their values against those sections of society such as "organised labour movements" who are "antagonistic to and contemptuous of literature" (Newbolt Report in Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990: 53). Leavis is also seen as emerging against a background of working class political and social unrest in the 1930s to champion a moral role for canonical literature against the evils of cultural impoverishment in mass industrial society. In this view, teachers emerging from the Cambridge school were to become custodians of conservatism and a discourse of orthodoxy (pp. 53-55).

The 1960s and 1970s saw a break with this view with the coming of a number of changes in education itself, such as the arrival of the comprehensive high school. Broadly, argue Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, as the grammar school gave way to the comprehensive, "literature" gave way to "language", the "elit"e to the "mass", "cultural heritage" to "cultural relevance", transmission to participation and the Cambridge school of Leavis and his followers to Britton's London school (pp. 57). As Ball had earlier, Ball, Kenny and Gardiner here see the essential differences between Cambridge and London as the difference between two opposed knowledge bases - elite knowledge and the knowledge of the masses. But here they go beyond this view to argue that just as Leavis had celebrated a romanticised vision of the pre-industrial past, so the London school was at risk of romanticising the present to the point of celebrating working class experience, rather than trying to change it. But like Hodgson (1974), they also recognise a split within the London school itself between "progressive" and "radical" versions
of English, though they would probably see the radical stream as a much smaller minority than does Hodgon. In the "radical" version represented by sections of NATE, teachers "went beyond the Reflections-style interest in social issues...tried to inject into the English curriculum the kinds of knowledge and experience which would give working class pupils an understanding of inequality and its causes; the emphasis would be on solidarity rather than upward mobility" (M. Simons and M. Raleigh in Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990: 60). Ball, Kenny and Gardiner explicitly connect this minority view with Aronowitz and Giroux's (1985) "critical literacy". The attitude vis a vis working class culture is not "celebratory", but "critical" of social structures; the unit of analysis is not individual, but social; the attitude to the dominant culture is not "alternative" but "oppositional" (Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990: 61; Ball, 1987: 22-23).

Ball, Kenny and Gardiner go on to trace the history of right-wing attacks on comprehensivisation and progressivism beginning with the Tories' Black Papers in 1969, which linked Britain's economic decline with a decline in literacy standards. Progressivism was linked with egalitarianism, trade unionism, student radicalism, sexual permissiveness, the decline of the family and general moral decay (Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990: 63ff; Ball, 1987: 24-25). The Right's connecting an alleged decline in English with national malaise was not unique to the UK, of course. Green, Hodgens and Luke's study of literacy crises in Australia found similar connections to wider moral and social values. Their documentary history presents a range of media sources over the last four decades, demonstrating that "literacy" (for which, also read "academic standards") has become a code word for many things, including: allegiance to the Crown and Commonwealth; Protestant religious values; discipline and obedience to authority; mastery of British "proper speech"; innate intellectual gifts; monocultural Anglo/Australian nationalism; scientific and technological competitiveness; mental and physical health and, most recently, employability and job competence. On the other hand, "illiteracy" has operated as a stand-in for negative values that include: delinquency; revolutionary or subversive ideologies; sexual immorality and moral decay; barbarity; technological incompetence; American cultural influence; mental and physical handicap; republicanism; socio-economic disadvantage and inadequate assimilation into Anglo/Australian culture (Green, Hodgens and Luke, 1994).

The Black Papers linked Britain's economic decline with three key areas: academic decline, politically motivated teaching, particularly in English, and standards of behaviour and discipline. The result, of course, was the Bullock enquiry and Ball, Kenny and Gardiner see the Bullock Report as reinforcing both of the paradigms "English as language" and "English as literature". "Language across the curriculum" and "basic skills" were the key recommendations. Interestingly, since it is usually admired by progressives at least, they see
the Bullock Report as an attempt at social control. They see it as controlling the "unacceptable" in progressive teaching and reinforcing the economic and political role of English teaching in relation to capitalist society. Part of this was Bullock's reinforcing literacy in terms of a skills-based vocational orientation (Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990: 62-69; Ball, 1987: 26-28). Indeed, in the 80s, "standards", "functional English", "correctness" and "grammar" again became the dominant conceptions in English teaching. Ball, Kenny and Gardiner see this in terms of the orthodoxies of Newbolk and the Classical tradition being re-established.

By 1990, Ball's 1985 matrix has become more refined. The politics of literacy by 1990 has created a space in which various versions of literacy play themselves out and can be represented in a two-by-two matrix as:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORITY 'THE STATE'</th>
<th>'NOT SELF' DIRECTIVE + PRESCRIPTIVE</th>
<th>'NOT SELF' COLLECTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'SELF' INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHENTICITY 'THE PEOPLE SELF'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGOTIATION + PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Various forms of literacy fall on different places on the matrix according to whether the emphasis is on the needs of the individual, or the needs of social institutions. They argue that four major versions of English can be mapped directly onto this matrix thus:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ENGLISH AS THE GREAT LITERARY TRADITION 'STANDARDS AND SENSIBILITIES'</th>
<th>'NOT SELF'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'SELF' PROGRESSIVE ENGLISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHENTICITY</td>
<td>ENGLISH AS CRITICAL LITERACY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'SELF' ENGLISH AS SKILLS 'COMMUNICATION' AND 'LIFE SKILLS'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

This structure enables different forms of literacy to be identified with the different kinds of relationships between the subject and the state. The literacy of skills serves to provide docile
and effective workers and acquisitive consumers. Monagha and Saul (1987) argue, in a similar vein, that an historical predominance in educational concerns of reading over writing also reflects a concern with what can be more easily controlled in terms of values and ideology (see also Musgrave, 1987, Graff, 1987: 35-51). Ideal social relations in this view are those based on the market. In the version of English as "great literature", the notion of what is "literature" is not regarded as problematic, but posits a morality that transcends differences of race, class and gender. Thus English teaches the inevitability of the state, the virtues of citizenship, the demarcation of power. Ideal values here are nation, heritage and tradition. Progressive English is child-centred, the English of creativity and self-expression. Self-discovery, personal growth, feelings, individual responses, participation and interaction are valued. "Radical" English, on the other hand, as defined by Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, is assertive, class-conscious and political. It is aimed at resisting existing inequalities of structural power (see also Ball, 1987: 29-35). Concluding their description of this matrix, Ball, Kenny and Gardiner declare:

Each version of English contains and informs a particular political epistemology, the learner is placed differently in relation to subject knowledge, their teachers and the state. Each produces different kinds of students (and citizens) with different kinds of abilities and relationships with peers. In each version the root paradigm of meanings within and about English differs (1990: 80).

Barnes, Barnes and Clark have also represented schematically their version of competing models of English in practice by the early 80s. These include:

- the cultural tradition - studying set texts for literature exams. This model offers insight into modes of reading and of critical commentary.

- personal growth. This model is a modification of the previous one for pupils of lower ability. Its central rationale is to enable pupils through reading and writing to change their experience of the world. In this model, literature is for pleasure; reading and writing concentrates on private topics and language development is intimately tied up with social and moral awareness.

- belles lettres. In this pupils are to display competence in essays, comprehension exercises and literature, without necessarily involving themselves as people. The content of literature is treated as information.

- basic skills. This is the modification for lower-ability pupils of the previous model. English here becomes a set of surface conventions or skills that can be separated from content and from the writer's purposes. Coursebook exercises practise these skills and literature is a source for such exercises and reading is about "comprehension".

- public rationality. While the cultural tradition model and the belles lettres model have a central assumption of language-as-aesthetic, this version acknowledges both aesthetic and
documentary modes. It includes a range of written work, from private to public, encourages discussion of bias, style and the writer-audience relationship, as well as the discussion of the issues themselves in particular writings (1984: 247-50):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top sets</th>
<th>Bottom Sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(v) PUBLIC RATIONALITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>Engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>(ii) PERSONAL GROWTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) CULTURAL TRADITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) BELLES LETTRES</td>
<td>(iv) BASIC SKILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Ball and others, Wright also sees the years up to Newbolt as "classics in the vernacular", with an emphasis on grammar that Sampson, Cook, Lamborn and others wanted replaced by explorations of the child’s experience ("the practice of English teaching, as exemplified in textbooks, resembled much more closely the rule-governed, knowledge-based approach of classics teaching than the experiential holistic approach one might have expected from the new method theory" [Wright, 1986: 69; also pp.51-67]). Wright, however, also details the reasons for this intransigence as centring on the perceived role of the teacher. Important factors included:

- the tradition of English teaching being modelled on the classics
- the belief that teacher's job was to counteract bad habits of speech and writing
- the teacher's role in experience-based learning being less of an authority role and teachers being most reluctant to expose themselves to this risk
- English being seen as the linchpin of education generally and a general belief that training the mind was necessary, as was clarity of expression, because the latter was particularly connected with the rigour and discipline-based pedagogy of classics
- that making English into a series of increasingly severe tests meant continuing and protecting the expertise of a cultured elite (1986: 69-70).

In 1990, Britton, Shafer and Watson published *Teaching and learning English worldwide*, in which contributors from a large number of countries in which English is "a mother tongue
language or a significant second, or in some cases, third language" produced "a history of the teaching of English in their respective countries between 1945 and the present" (p. vii). Those histories involving English as a "mother tongue" language (even if that is sometimes contested locally) are summarised in the following paragraphs.

In their chapter on England, Burgess and Martin ultimately present a theme of English as victim to a more general educational attack on the immediate post-war egalitarian consensus in favour of a strong public education system. In the immediate post-war years, the thrust of Burgess’ and Martin’s approach revolves around the influence of the new school population: this is there in (the newly formed) LATE’s concern with coursework assessment; in the popularisation through figures such as Pym and Hourd of the idea of writing as an expression of experience; in teachers’ opposition to the elitism of Leavis and in the Crowther and Newsom Reports’ calls for account to be taken of working class culture. Grammar is a key theme, as it is in almost every chapter in Teaching and learning English worldwide. Post-war studies of grammar teaching (again) showed that knowledge of parts of speech and parsing and analysis could not be shown to have any effect on writing and at the same time the growth of "new grammars" opened the possibility of an understanding of the functions of language in society. In fact, Burgess and Martin call the move to considering language in its "social and intellectual functions" the "most significant change in the post-war years" (1990: 14).

In the 1960s, with the setting up of NATE and the Schools Council, research became a key concern and at the same time, English teachers were being influenced by wider social change: English content, de-streaming, integrated studies and thematic organisation were concerns that went beyond "methods" to deal with a need to shape institutions afresh. Burgess and Martin also stress the influence of key exponents of the "new English" at this time: Wilkinson, Clegg, Dixon, the Reflections series and, of course, Dartmouth. Above all, they highlight the influence of Britton and Halliday. Interestingly (and unusually) Britton is discussed in terms of his work on literature and as an exponent of the philosophies of Cassirer and Langer, and also in terms of a developmental emphasis, so that, in his thought, English became conceived of less as a particular content and more as a set of processes in children’s learning. Halliday became the central theorist in popularising a social theory of language that, for English teachers, was to produce such innovative projects as Breakthrough to literacy and Language in use.

Language-across-the-curriculum, in texts such as Language, the learner and the school is also highlighted as a key development and an important direction for the future. It is seen as arriving when social deprivation was becoming a key concern and as sociolinguists began
criticising deprivationist versions of language and culture. But in the England of the mid-70s, politics is seen as overtaking such developments. Despite its birth in right-wing concerns about standards of literacy, Burgess and Martin see the Bullock Report positively. Unlike Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, who see it as an instrument of social control (1990: 62-69), Burgess and Martin stress the findings that fears of falling literacy standards were shown to have no basis and also stress the firm support given to language-across-the-curriculum. Nevertheless, the key recommendations were ignored and Burgess and Martin see the era from the Black Papers to the Thatcher years as a time of conflict between policy development and important curriculum theorising. They argue that "the extent of language study, the teaching of grammar still form the issues where gaps and divisions exist" because these, above all, are symbolic of wider ideological positions (1990: 34).

On the other side of the Atlantic, Simmons, Shafer and Shadiow (1990) see the post-war history of the subject in the USA not so much in terms of "internal" curriculum-model conflicts overlaid by external political pressure as in terms of a swinging pendulum. The immediate post-war years were still influenced by Deweyan principles and on "adjustment for life". This conflicted with content-discipline-based approaches to curriculum. Soon this battle became hardened into one between process-growth-progressive advocates, led by the newly formed NCTE, and language-and-literature-content-based-conservatives (Simmons, Shafer and Shadiow, 1990: 89-92). Under the mood of the Eisenhower years, however, the conservatives dominated and American English teaching was characterised by grammar in the earlier grades and literature (the "classics") in senior high school - the latter supplemented by further grammar and the five-paragraph theme. What large-scale debates there were tended to centre, in grammar, over the kind of grammar to be taught and, in literature, over historical approaches versus those of "explication de texte". With the Sputnik scare and the creation of the National Defense Education Act, however, the NCTE attempted to galvanise support for change. Alliance with the Modern Languages Association, the American Studies Association and the College English Association, however meant a predominance of college English professors at a series of conferences which produced the influential "tripod" curriculum model. English was defined as language, literature, composition and nothing else (Simmons, Shafer and Shadiow, 1990: 92-98). The other major influence of the time was, of course, Jerome Bruner, and after the setting up of the Curriculum Study Centres under Kennedy, Bruner's influence on the sequencing of material produced for "Project English" was central. Other characteristics of the Centres' materials included the tripod model, an emphasis on transformational-generative grammar, a target audience of above-average ability and "teacher-proof-ness". The Centres effectively furthered the conservative-academic view of the subject.
At Dartmouth in 1966, the British specialists in English teacher education bearing the "growth" model based on language experience met an American contingent dominated by professors of English armed with Bruner, Chomsky, Project English and the tripod. Though the British had a huge influence on altering the perspectives of American teacher educators, political events again took over. Middle America's reaction to the activism of the 60s, that saw the election of Nixon, forged an alliance between "back to basics" and accountability that meant a preoccupation with behavioural objectives and eventually the state-wide testing movement of the late 70s - a series of trends continued under Reagan with A Nation at Risk. Simmons, Shafer and Shadiow see the basic theme of their history as the attempt to define "What is English?" and their dominant metaphor is the pendulum. The effect of their thesis, however, is to show a continuous strand of Aronowitz and Giroux's "conservative" view of the subject, diverted only occasionally by largely ineffectual outbreaks of progressivism.

The conflict between curriculum theorising and public policy and/or the metaphor of the pendulum are echoed in most of the other histories in the Britton, Shafer and Watson collection. In Scotland, Northcroft argues that post-war history spawned a number of "growth" oriented documents that continually conflicted with the Scottish preoccupation for testing, grading and accountability (Northcroft, 1990). In Ireland, nationalist feelings from the 1920s rendered the teaching of English "moribund" (Killeen and Mullins, 1990:76) until the 1960s when the newly formed Association of Teachers of English fostered a dialectic between pupil experience and literature as the centre of the curriculum. On the whole, according to Killeen and Mullins, this dualism, though with shifting relative emphases, has remained at the centre of English in Ireland.

In Canada, the story is again told of a move away from "information-based" curricula from the mid-1960s towards a model that "allows for individual expression and freedom", with the latter coming under challenge from those wanting a return to the rigour of grammar (Robinson et al, 1990: 131-36). During the 1970s, Canadian Syllabuses squarely faced the issue of the lack of causal connection between learning about language and using language, though some provinces included both as valid, though separate, areas of the secondary curriculum. This did not necessarily break the hold of grammar-teaching-as-writing-instruction, though in the 80s the twin forces of "growth through English" and approaches based on traditional rhetorical concerns with purpose, invention and audience have, according to Robinson et al, transformed writing pedagogy. In terms of literature teaching, Canada has been marked more by a concern for content in the form of Canadian literature (see also Morgan, Robert, 1990) than with pedagogy - the latter remaining largely traditional literary criticism. In reading pedagogy, the influence of Smith and the Goodmans meant a move towards a psycholinguistic approach to reading from the mid-70s in line with other nations.
New Zealand adopted "growth model" practices from the beginning of a major Syllabus revision in 1969, with strong emphasis on the processes of language growth, groupwork and talk. This Syllabus was not finally implemented until 1982 for Forms 3-5, replacing a Syllabus in place since 1945 (Catherwood et al, 1990).

Medway's (1990) study of English in the UK during the 60s - on which the methodology of the present study is to be based - is another which investigates the alliances between literature-centred and language-centred approaches. Medway sees the 60s beginning with some debate over the relative places of literature (the "Cambridge school") and a language-as-growth model, however, the definition of the subject was not a crucial issue. Writing, for example, was unquestioningly bound by restrictive conventions of "composition". By the end of the 60s, however, the definition of what constitutes "English" is at the centre of the agenda, with the main schools represented being:

- English as the ordering of experience, represented by Britton and Dixon
- English as social communication, represented by Flower
- English as the study of language itself in all its variety, represented by Halliday

Writing in English has become almost totally "creative writing", with "what it feels like to be the unique experiencing subject" (p. 19) becoming now a central topic of writing. In tracing the changes that occurred during the 60s, Medway rejects the "London vs. Cambridge" dichotomy presented by Hodgson (1974) and Ball (1982, 1983, 1985). He sees "London" and "Cambridge", on the contrary, as having common Romantic values in the authority of individual response and the priority of an intelligence of feelings over one of thought (1990: 22-23). As shown in 1.3 above, this view aligns Medway with aspects of Christie's thesis on the history of the subject. It was the alliance of a Lawrentian-Leavisite inheritance with a particular construction of "personal experience" that led, according to Medway, to a construction of English preoccupied with "feeling", and a certain anti-intellectualism (1990: 25). Moreover, argues Medway, "growth" also gave "English" a unique content touched on nowhere else in the curriculum: "personal experience" and "literature" (1990: 27). Medway attributes the causes of these shifts at just this time to changes in the institutional environment - particularly comprehensivisation - and to cultural changes such as the Countercultural emphasis on the individual's self-determination and self-discovery and to economic changes that created a consumer society seeking impulse gratification (1990: 29-31). He concludes thus:

Instead of transmitting a legitimated and authorized set of values English now helps students with the "identity work" inescapably demanded of members of a plural society and required by a consumption-based economy (1990: 33)
Given the arguments of Christie, Medway and others (see 1.3 above), it is ironic that much contemporary criticism of "growth" came from those who felt that it downgraded "literature" - as discussed in 4.4.4 below (see also Green, 1990). Such was the extent of contemporary reaction in this vein that some writers on the period still feel constrained to defend theorists such as Britton from charges of downgrading literature (Burgess, 1993:109). In any case, other commentators have stressed the place in 1970s Britain of the Language in Use strand of English founded by Halliday which, according to Willinsky, brought sociolinguistics into the classroom and turned English away from literary criticism. The language studies led "an intellectual fight to broaden the democratic mandate of equal opportunity in education", emerging out of highly charged political debate over language and dialect (Willinsky, 1990:11).

A quite different perspective has been thrown on the history of English by the work of Hunter. Essentially Hunter eschews explanations of the history of English which involve curriculum philosophy or theory. Virtually all academic discussion of the school system, he argues, is highly "principled" in two ways:

- it treats the existing school system as the partial or failed realisation of certain underlying principles
- academics themselves enact this principled-ness by seeking to realise the capacity to see through the merely empirical reality of the existing system to its true principles (1994: xv-xvi).

He sees his own work as "unprincipled" and adopts a "genealogical" approach in the manner of Foucault. He looks past any "deep origins" of the school system and concentrates on the contingent circumstances in which the school system came into being. Approached in this way, two aspects of the modern school achieve unusual prominence in his work: its relation to the apparatus of administration and its relation to the institutions of Christian pastoral guidance (1994: xvi-xviii). He advances the thesis that modern literary education is no more than an aesthetic imperative deployed as a discipline for the government of populations. Literature, he argues, was opened up to the inarticulate and illiterate because the popular school opened up a new and more powerful form of popular supervision. Hence, "English", played its part in a supervisory technology in which "culture" and "criticism" played no role at all (1987a: 2-19; 1987b). Hunter puts forward three hypotheses on the history of the subject:

1) the cultural attributes targeted by popular education are not formed by a logic derived from "culture as art", but are built up from a profile delineated by a specific investigative and administrative machinery aimed at the government of populations and the formation of a citizenry.
2) aesthetic culture is not the foundation of popular pedagogy, but a distinct minority practice producing a caste of ethical exemplars

3) the birth of English is the outcome of the redeployment of the minority aesthetic practice of the ethical exemplar inside a governmental pedagogy organised by a technology of moral supervision - a series of piecemeal historical changes allowed the literary text to emerge as the privileged support of the supervisory techniques (1987a).

In this view, Matthew Arnold’s advocacy of literature teaching, for example, stems not from his “world-historical role as prophet of culture but from his position as the agent of a particular moral technology” (1987b: 573). Arnold, according to Hunter, “did not become a school inspector in order to disseminate culture and criticism...he practised culture and criticism in order to become (amongst other things) a school inspector” (1987b: 586).

English gained a special place in this administrative machinery for basically three reasons, according to Hunter:

1) The claim of English to bring “the real life of the child” into the ethical space of the school was the foundation of all other scholastic and vocational capacities, since it allowed the classroom to be the place where all that is lived could be put in order.

2) English emerged as a specialised pedagogy based on correction through self-expression. Thus, English became both the space of play, but also the place for the correction of individualised responses to literature in the light of general social norms. It developed a corrective pedagogy based on a process of negotiation between personal desires and social norms. English took shape in a special teacher-student relationship, with the English teacher as friend and confidante, but also as one who represented the moralising force of great literature in the classroom (1987b: 575; 1994: 82).

3) English appeared in the guise of a new formation of the literary text and a new kind of literary reading - between the freedom of one who spoke within an expressive pedagogy and yet within the constraints of a corrective one (1987a: 121-27).

Undoubtedly, Hunter’s views are provocative and allow us to see the history of the subject in an unusual light, however it cannot be fairly argued that his position is somehow “a-principled” as he claims in making the distinction between principled positions and concrete and improved realisations. As da Silva says, the privileging of historical contingency over ideas is itself a principle - and in Hunter’s hands, Foucault’s sense of the contingent nature of social invention is reversed, so that instead of social arrangements appearing arbitrary, they are made to appear fixed, irresistible and inescapable (da Silva, 1995: 317-22).
It is the argument of the present paper that the products of the state under consideration - the relevant Syllabuses which formed a key context by which "English" was defined in 1977 and 1992 in NSW- did, in fact, consciously emanate from particular educational theory and, hence are "principled".

Most recently, of course, curriculum theorists writing from a post-structuralist perspective have been critical of "growth" terms of its failure to approach questions of ideology in any radical way. This will be taken up further in 8.4 below. Suffice it to record here that under these views of history "growth" pedagogy is seen as "individualist", "liberal", "progressive" "naturalising" and "expressive", rather than "social" or "radical" (Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990; Griffith, 1992; Patterson, 1992, 1993; Peim, 1993; McCormick, 1994). Burgess argues that "Britton returned the artist to everyday life" but failed to insist on the extent to which "literature" is a social construct. Universalist in orientation, "growth" as espoused by Britton offered no purchase on how it is that some works or readings come to be preferred as a matter of cultural practice. Similarly, in supporting psycholinguistic views of the reading process, "growth" pedagogy saw reading in interactional and naturalistic terms which privileged the cognitive, rather than the social or historical (Burgess, 1993: 109-11).

Green argues on the other hand that, while post-structuralism can provide an important critique of the "new English", that the more radical and socially-critical versions of English teaching that arise from post-structuralism are still essentially within the same modernist "project" as the "new English" they critique (1995a). Green himself stresses the essential difference between post-1960s English and the preceding views of the subject. At one level, he agrees with those views (such as Christie’s and Medway’s) which stress the "literariness" of both the "London" and "Cambridge" schools (1988, 1990). At the same time, he emphasises the internal struggles within the "English-as-Language" paradigm between the more linguistic orientation of Halliday and the more educational orientation associated with Britton (1995a). He emphasises Medway’s view that as the population’s characteristics as consumers became more important than their characteristics as a labour force, then English helped students with the "identity work" required by members of a pluralistic, consumption-based society (1995b: 394-95). Green, however, goes further than this and argues that this latter notion can be understood in terms of the emergence of a "postmodern subject" and moreover, that this movement coincided with a growing curricular interest in popular culture. The result is that - despite his earlier view that both the "new English" and its post-structuralist critics shared an essentially modernist view of the world - Green comes to a view of post-60s English as post-modern. This is manifested in its commitment to process, experience and pleasure, its fluid and dynamic sense of disciplinary and social boundaries and its attitude to concepts of difference and marginality (1995b: 395-403).
2.3 Histories of secondary English in Australia generally and in New South Wales in particular

Probably the earliest attempt to write a substantial history of subject English which strongly incorporated the subject's place in Australia was Homer's 1973 study. Homer argues that the twentieth century in Australia inherited a "skills" model of English in primary education and a "style" model (a compromise between utilitarian and Classical emphases that stressed the study of the "style" of literature) in secondary. Essentially, English in Australia, at the beginning of the twentieth century, was preoccupied with correctness, forms and patterns (Ch.2). If cultural heritage was prominent in England by 1921, in Australia an obsession with what could be checked and inspected meant an emphasis on those accomplishments and skills which could be polished for inspection (p.48). From 1921 to 1941, Newbolt was circulated and accepted in Australia. At the same time, Homer shows that the teaching of grammar underwent changes from formalism to functional teaching and from a belief that it trained pupils in clear and logical thought and imparted good sentence structure to a belief in the ability to understand sentence structure as an aid to better writing. Though he uses Victoria as his example, Homer argues for "a uniform Australian faith in the value of grammar to a child's writing" (pp. 96-98).

Importantly, Homer sees little sense of the "cultural heritage" model in the Australia of the first half of the twentieth century, unlike the position in the UK. Here, the emphasis, he argues, was on the knowledge of grammar and the accomplishment of good speech. Composition lessons were on formal elements of instruction in style (pp.100-104). By 1961, only the NSW and Victorian Intermediate Certificates included questions on formal analysis - a position in marked contrast to the UK. Nevertheless, the early textbooks by Ridout (English today) and Ridout and McGregor (English in Australian schools) represented the fundamental issues of English in Australian schools, viz: word building, sentences, paragraphs, composition, dictionary practice, paraphrasing, sentence correction, comprehension, reported speech and literary and grammatical terms. When standards were perceived as dropping with the rapid growth of secondary and technical schools after the war, the reaction was to intensify the drills and the use of texts such as those of Ridout and McGregor. The Wyndham Report in NSW also held up reform in English by re-emphasising cultural heritage, drill and discipline, spelling and grammar (pp.139-62).

Those Syllabuses which were to re-define English in terms of new approaches to "growth" were to appear later in the form of the 1966 Victorian Technical Schools Syllabus and the "fundamentally changed" 1972 Syllabus in NSW (pp.162-67). By 1970, Dixon had been widely read in Australia and was influencing the actual implementation of the Victorian Technical
Schools Syllabus and in NSW, the “Revised English Syllabus, Forms I-IV commends itself as the most carefully considered application of ‘growth’ principles yet seen in Australia” (p. 212). Homer sees the peculiarly Australian flavour of “growth” in the widespread use of thematic study throughout the 1970s, which, he believes (and thus partly agrees with Christie) led to the disappearance of the linguistic and literary elements, as students vacillated between themes and skills (pp. 217-61). He especially laments, for example, that poetry might be studied for the relevance of its themes, rather than for the special nature of the poetic form (pp.271-72).

In 1976, Christie herself submitted a historical study of English teaching in NSW. Though it covered only the period 1848-1900 and was set in elementary schools, some issues are relevant for the present study. Christie argues a number of propositions in this study:

• Literacy was about social utility in this period - to create a people capable of functioning as citizens and industrious workers (Ch. 1). Nevertheless, the NSW community remained divided about the “propriety of denying children the right to work” (p. 276). In high school, English was regarded as for the "dullards" and was offered to those intending to enter commercial pursuits, as opposed to the offering of Classics and Mathematics to those suited for university study (Ch. 2).

• Educational theory also taught that the acquisition of the abilities to read, write, spell, parse and analyse sentences properly promoted the growth of various mental faculties.

• Methods used were always based on a sense of orderly progression, which were in turn themselves based on assumptions about the development of mental faculties in children. For example, reading pedagogy moved children from letter or sound recognition to repeated reading of phrases to reading simple sentences (Chs. 2-4). This focus on orderly progression came about as a result of focus on products - on proficient reading, accurate, neat handwriting and a mastery of sentence structure (Ch. 6).

• The study of grammar was a paramount one - only after prolonged exercises in parsing and analysis was the child capable of writing a sentence him/herself. Grammar, in fact, gained more time in the curriculum as the child moved up the school, partly because of a belief in its efficacy for training logical and abstract thought. This dominance of grammar continued despite objections from the 1870s by Professor Charles Badham of Sydney University, by University examiners and by school inspectors - all of whom complained that students were "parroting" exercises and terminology with little understanding, and that delaying writing for the study of grammar was self-defeating (Chs. 5-6).

Boomer's brief coverage of the history of the subject in Australia confirms the embryonic influence during the mid-60s of international figures such as Holbrook, Flower and Chomsky. Thematic texts such as Delves and Tickell's Themes and responses, Hannan, Hannan and
Allinson's *English part one*, Carozzi's *Patchwork* and Hansen's *The tiger and the rose* became prominent in this period and the Victorian Technical Schools picked up the notion of exploring the needs and interests of students (Boomer, 1977: 4-5). In the 1972 UNESCO Seminar, Britton's work became well known in Australia, soon to be followed by that of Martin, Dixon, Halliday, Rosen and Barnes. Boomer sees opposing tendencies among the *followers* of Halliday and those of Barnes and Rosen, with the former stressing "studying language as an end in itself" and the latter stressing the notion of learning language through use, rather than through studying language (1977: 10). Boomer believes that in 1977, "the bulk of English teachers in Australia know precious little about any of the map-makers... and even less about their maps...(but) all is changed, irrevocably changed... no one remains unaffected" (pp.10-11).

Brock's histories of the development of the subject have been somewhat more wide-ranging. He sees English teaching in NSW in its earliest days growing out of a British tradition with very little significant North American influence. The ruling paradigm for NSW secondary English was dominated by "heavy" literature, grammar and "formal" written expression (1983a:177). It was also dominated before the 1911 introduction of the Intermediate Certificate by the matriculation requirements of Sydney University (Nay-Brock 1, 1984a). Using an organisational change analysis developed by Imershein, itself based on Kuhn, Brock argues that English in NSW was not controlled by sets of rules, but rather a "common set of practices". He argues that it was not the Syllabuses which directed teaching from the early 1900s until the 1950s, but rather external examinations, text-books and English teaching folklore (Brock, 1983a:177ff; 1983b: 28-29). The two key themes in which this scenario was played out were in debates over the role of literature in English and on the issue of the usefulness of grammatical study to improving writing. For example, nowhere is the prominence of "teaching folklore" more evident than in the strong emphasis on teaching the rules of grammar through parsing and analysis, which was downplayed in two of the four Years 7-10 (or equivalent) Syllabuses written between 1911 and 1962, but remained ever-present in classrooms (Brock, 1983a: 176ff; 1983b: 19-222; Nay-Brock, 1984a).

Brock sees especially the 1953 and 1971 Syllabuses as bringing into NSW important new directions in English from the UK - 1953 being derived strongly (thirty years on) from Newbolt English and 1971 from Dixon's *Growth through English*. As will be detailed further in Chapter 4, Brock argues that the 1971 NSW Syllabus was a revolutionary document that was the first to implement the ideas contained in *Growth through English* (Brock, 1983a: 179;

---

1 "Nay-Brock" and "Brock" as quoted throughout this study refer to the same person. The particular name used at any point will reflect that used by the author in the relevant article.
1983b: 27; 1996: 46ff; Nay-Brock, 1984a: 56ff; 1984b: Ch.9). As will also be detailed in Chapter 4, in his view, the influence of the Chairman of the Committee, Graham Little, was crucial - and Little was heavily influenced in turn by Dixon, and especially by James Moffett’s Teaching the universe of discourse. Brock also detects in the 1971 document the more general influence of the Reconceptualists, especially Eisner, in both its reaction against behaviourism and its prescription for professional responsibility on the part of teachers in developing relevant curricula (Brock, 1983a). In practice, what was taken up enthusiastically was thematic teaching based on the publication of a rash of theme-based textbooks (Brock, 1983a: 178; 1983b: 28-29). Despite the efforts of the young NSW English Teachers’ Association (Brock, 1983b: 30-31; Nay-Brock, 1984a: 56; 1984b: pp.205ff), an early lack of adequately funded training also meant that, until the early 1980s, intelligent implementation of the new Syllabus was, at best, partial (Brock, 1983a: 184-85; 1983b: 26-28; Nay-Brock, 1984a: 57 [see also Watson, 1978; 1979]).

In arguing against the notion that Australian versions of English since the 1960s have simply adopted overseas influences, Davis and Watson point to a number of factors that have had particular impact in this country: the multicultural nature of Australia; the consequent search for a national identity; economic pressures; a notable lack of support from university English departments and the division of the education system into a number of separate state-based systems (1990:152). Despite the latter issue, Davis and Watson see the period prior to 1960 characterised by a large degree of national conformity: the use of sets of anthologies of poetry and short stories and one-act plays, spelling lists, comprehension passages, parsing, analysis, sentence correction and a fragmented curriculum (1990: 154-56). Changes to this situation came from the early 60s with the establishment of state English Teachers’ Associations, as well as the Australian Association for the Teaching of English. The journals of these organisations, as well as the rise of theme-based textbooks led the move away from repetitive language exercises and comprehension passages. Dartmouth and Dixon were very influential from the late 60s and NSW - along with by Victoria, South Australia and Queensland - soon gave official endorsement through Syllabuses to the "new English". Such endorsement was followed in some states by the appointment of state and regional consultants, who were potent "change agents". The 1972 UNESCO Seminar with James Britton and Roger Shuy as consultants led directly to the establishment of the National Committee on English Teaching and its Language Development Project, with Frances Christie as Project Officer. Davis and Watson attribute the early failure to widely implement the spirit of the "new English" in Syllabuses to the "back to basics" movement of the 1970s, especially as led by the Australian Council for Educational Standards (ACES) (Davis and Watson, 1990: 156-59; also, Watson, 1994: 38-40).
Within NSW in particular, Watson’s argument is that the nature of English teaching has historically been driven by two forces: examinations and textbooks. For example, while the Syllabus of 1911 somewhat downplays the place of grammar instruction, the Intermediate Certificate examination of the succeeding years strongly emphasised parsing and analysis. Though an influential figure like Alexander Mackaness - for two decades senior lecturer in English at Sydney Teachers’ College, and hence overseeing the training of all graduate English teachers in NSW- advocated the practices of Caldwell Cook’s *The play way*, the examination system “provided an effective brake on change” (1994: 34). The other theme which has dominated the history of English in this state, according to Watson, was the obsession with grammar. Watson, like Brock, highlights the obsession with grammar of the 1944 and 1962 Syllabuses, despite, he argues the popularising of the research which questioned the value of grammar for writing (1994: 35-37). Despite the changes wrought by the 1971 Syllabus and its 1987 successor, when writing in 1994, Watson still saw English in NSW as in conflict between “new English” and the “back-to-basics” movement that had lingered on since the 1970s (p. 41).

### 2.4 Selected themes from the literature review

Central themes emerge from the localised histories that are of relevance to this study. Each relates to the key issue of the subject’s definition. English, as with any academic discipline, has evolved in a way that tends to be oppositional: London vs. Cambridge, literature vs. language, skills vs. growth etc. Yet, as the literature shows, simply deciding what constitutes these binary pairs is itself problematic in the history of English. Has a literature-centred model of the subject actually been allied to “growth” models? If so, were “London” and “Cambridge” actually in alliance, or did the former actually represent a different strand of the subject from “growth” in any case? Or did “London” represent a linguistically based sub-division of “growth”? The fact that these questions even arise demonstrates the complexity of definition that has characterised the history of English.

The place of grammar is another recurring theme. The main issue to arise from the literature review concerns the degree to which the study of grammar has become identified with “knowledge about language” and how “teaching folklore” has assumed a connection with “using language” despite any research evidence to the contrary. This has been a universal issue, especially as forming part of “back-to-basics” calls, but even given this universal tendency, the issue of the place of grammar has had particular effects in NSW. This will be discussed as an aspect of “literacy” in the following chapters.
The place of literature - its particular status, the role of literature in forming the imagination, the role of literature in reading development, the degree to which it is tied to, or opposed to, the study of language - is also key theme arising from the literature. It is, of course, central to the Christie thesis that literature has held a sacred place in the history of English in this country with the effect of excluding the rhetorical study of language. Hence, the place of literature - especially vis a vis the study of language will form an important discussion in the following chapters.

The special place of the "growth" model is a theme which every specific historical study has addressed, with many being critical of its lack of direction, or of its emphasis on the life of the child to the detriment of close textual study. This study will argue that the application of the "growth" model in NSW had very specific features of which the Christie thesis does not take account. Moreover, Chapter 4 will argue that these features are, in any case, actually contained in Dixon's own formulation.

The newer histories also tend to be critical of "growth" in not going "beyond" the lived experience of the child into helping them critique the parameters of that experience as represented in the texts that have impact on their lives. This issue is examined in Chapter 9.

In NSW specifically, historians such as Brock and Watson have tended to place much emphasis on the roles of textbooks and examinations in shaping the subject. For this reason, it will be noted that in the following discussion of methodology, textbooks and examinations have been included among the evidence to be gathered, in addition to the sources used in precedent research by Medway which is to be used as a model for the present study.

Finally, by setting large questions about the definition of the subject in a particular place and time the following study attempts to achieve the "specificity and contingency" which has been called for by recent historiographers of the curriculum field.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

As shown in tabular form at the end of Chapter 1, the present investigation can be so far summarised as:

A study of the questions

- How was Years 7-10 English defined from the early 1970s to the early 1990s in NSW?
- What was the relationship between the concepts "English" and "literacy" in NSW in the given period?

to be investigated through the framework of

the Christie thesis on the history of English in Australia since the advent of the "growth model" - a thesis which presents the arguments that:
- the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon was transferred more or less wholesale into Australia
- teaching about sentence-level grammar was rejected and this led in turn to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general- indeed, there was active resistance against teaching about language, and this meant a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
- study of literature in terms of analysis of language was abandoned

with the data being brought to bear being

- Syllabus documents
- professional journals
- school textbooks and
- examinations.

Choices about the relevant data are explained in the following sections.
3.1 Medway’s methodology for recent curriculum history

For the purposes of this study, an approach used by Medway in the writing of his own "local" and "recent" history for English serves as a useful precedent and an interesting variant. In his (1990) study of the period 1958-1968 in the UK, he set out with broad aims - "to account for aspects of English as practised today, to throw light both on what is distinctive about English in relation to other school subjects, and, more generally, to provide a case study of how curriculum is made in England and Wales" (p. 3). Unusually, he chose to pursue these aims by eschewing a continuous narrative of the ten-year period in favour of the in-depth study of the two years which constituted the beginning and end years of his study. The methodology is, in a sense, to "cut slices" through the period and attempt to illuminate the period by an in-depth examination of the "slices". As he says, such a methodology, while sacrificing breadth and continuity, allows for consideration of greater depth in the examination of evidence. A problem with continuous histories of subjects, argues Medway, is that the basis on which sources were selected often appears unsystematic. One is never confident that sources not considered were excluded by any clear rationale. One advantage of taking "slices" of time, despite the risks of partiality and the potential for their being atypical, is the possibility of examining all published sources. Nor is Medway the only curriculum historian to take such an approach. In studying the image of the teacher as portrayed by the British press over the period 1950-1990, Cunningham (1995) also took an approach of studying selected years as "slices of time" in depth. Moreover, advocates of the view that curriculum history should not treat "context" simply as a backdrop, but as interacting with the curriculum also strongly advocate an approach to curriculum history based on "slices of time" (Seddon, 1986, 1989; Lundgren, 1985). Seddon sees such a methodology in terms of a "relational" view of history and an important alternative to "chronological" history:

The distinction between these two views of history emphasising chronological, and a more relational historical, time, lies in the conception of the object of study. The former takes a theme or issue, such as the social efficiency reformers, and examines it over time. It becomes the object which is seen secondarily, "in context". The latter view of history focuses upon a historically specific slice of society in which a constellation of related elements are interacting to give historically specific effects (Seddon, 1989: 8)

Medway's particular procedure was to seek to examine all the books and articles which were published in Britain about the teaching of English as a first language in the years 1958 and 1968, with the exception of material which fell outside his chosen age group. He argues that this allows him to infer reasonably about what was taken as normal practice and what bids
for changes were being made. Once again, Medway, of course, is not the only precedent available for such a documentary analysis of professional journals. Hodgson’s (1974) history of English teaching in the UK relies heavily on content analysis of The use of English from 1949 to 1962 as a visible longitudinal indicator of how consciousness in English teaching reacted to his identified dimensions of change (Hodgson, 1974: 282ff).

Medway’s main sources for the study of 1958 were the journal, The use of English, two “method” books (Gurrey’s Teaching the mother tongue in secondary schools and Reeves’ Teaching poetry), as well as numerous school textbooks. For 1968, The use of English was able to be supplemented by the then new English in education and the major formative book was Lawton’s Social class, language and education.

Medway’s methodology has advantages for the present study. The issue of how English is defined is a broad one and coverage over a continuous period, even one of approximately twenty-two years, could lead to problems of superficial generalisation. Close study of all published sources in particular years has a clear advantage when one is considering the appropriateness of a broad thesis such as Christie’s to a particular selected area and time. Also, like Medway’s, the present study is concerned not with classroom enactment of the written curriculum, but in how that written curriculum itself is conceptualised, as well as the concepts of curriculum that adhere to sources such as professional journals, textbooks and examinations.

### 3.2 Adapting Medway’s principles

#### 3.2.1 Slices of time

The chosen “slices of time” in this study will be the years 1977 and 1992. These years represent equivalent periods of time into the implementation of the 1971 and 1987 Syllabuses for Forms I-IV and Years 7-10\(^1\) respectively. The study will, however, proceed by setting these “slices of time” within the context of these Syllabuses themselves. A detailed discussion of the Syllabuses will thus precede each “slice of time” in order to place those years, 1977 and 1992, within the contexts of the Syllabuses against which relevant curriculum debate occurred.

---

\(^1\)Syllabuses in NSW occasionally present a nomenclature problem, according to whether they are referred to by year of publication or year of implementation. The first Syllabus under discussion here was published in 1971, though first implemented in 1972, and will be referred to, following general usage, as the "1971 Syllabus", though some few sources may be seen referring to it as "1972". The 1987 Syllabus was published and implemented immediately and presents no such problem. The years 1977 and 1992 thus represent equivalent years in the implementation of the respective Syllabuses. In NSW, Forms I to IV and Years 7-10 are also equivalent school grade levels.
The NSW Syllabus in English for Forms I-IV of 1971 is a particularly appropriate document to begin this study - which examines Christie's thesis about the implementation of the "growth" model in Australia, since it was the first "growth" Syllabus in NSW. Detailed examination of the Syllabuses themselves - as context - will thus begin to throw light on the extent to which the "written curriculum" of the period reflect Christie's thesis.

3.2.2 Documentation

Medway's methodology of using the key "method" books, journals and textbooks of certain "slices of time" will thus be replicated here by selecting those from 1977 and 1992 which are likely to be of special relevance in NSW. Of course, international material is of great relevance here, but in order to make the scope of the study manageable, the present study will confine itself to those journals and books produced within Australia. Thus international influences, which were of course central, will be studied as they are "filtered" through their representation in local material.

For NSW teachers, the key local journals were the Newsletter of the NSW English Teachers' Association, its journal, The teaching of English, and the journal English in Australia. The latter is not of course confined to NSW alone, but as it is widely available in NSW as an automatic part of membership of that state's professional body, it is important to include it as part of this study, since it is a widely dispersed forum for curriculum discussion in NSW. In these journals - of the English Teachers' Association of NSW and of the Australian Association for the Teaching of English - one is focusing on the impact of professional groups through the subject associations. This has precedents in defining a view of the school subject (Goodson, 1985b, Price, 1986), nevertheless it is true that one may be encountering the views of "those who might be termed experts, and organised experts at that" (Seddon, 1989: 6). To some extent, the use of textbooks broadens this view. Nevertheless, in this study, it is important that one does encounter the "leading edge" of the profession through subject associations and "method books", since these are the groups most likely to be strongly advocating the theories regarded as so damaging by Christie.

The choice of "method" books and school textbooks will be made by selecting those which were both published in Australia in the relevant years and also reviewed in the Newsletter of the NSW English Teachers' Association, The teaching of English and English in Australia. Again, it is reasonable to assume that, if reviewed in these journals, they are likely to be representing an important perspective on the subject in this state. In 1977, the NSW English Teachers' Association itself published a substantial "method" book supporting the central tenets of the 1971 Syllabus, and in 1992, the national association also published a substantial text on the teaching of literature.
In an attempt to add further depth to the study, this investigation will also supplement Medway's sources by including an analysis of the interpretation of English as embodied in relevant systems-wide official examinations. Barnes and Seed (1984) have argued that "a public examination is ...a message about curriculum priorities. Examination papers...offer to teacher and taught the most persuasive arguments about what model of the subject is appropriate". For NSW in 1977 and 1992, the relevant examinations were the School Certificate Reference tests in English.

Thus, in sum, the methodology will be an analysis of relevant documents that could be said to be defining "English" at this time. The data that will be brought to bear on the research questions in this time frame are the relevant Syllabus documents, professional journals, textbooks and examinations, viz:

- the 1971 and 1987 Syllabuses
- the journal *English in Australia* for 1977 and 1992
- the *Newsletter* and the journal *The teaching of English* of the NSW English Teachers' Association for 1977
- the journal *The teaching of English* of the NSW English Teachers' Association for 1992
- "method" books published in Australia in 1977 and 1992 and reviewed in the above journals
- school textbooks published in Australia in 1977 and 1992 and reviewed in the above journals
- the NSW School Certificate Reference tests of 1977 and 1992

In order to add another dimension and to strengthen the depth of the study, the views of relevant key personnel will also be sought, viz:

- the Chairman of the 1971 Syllabus Committee
- a long-term member of the 1987 Syllabus Committee, who was also a co-editor of the key "method book" of 1977
- the editors of the relevant journals in 1977 and 1992 respectively

The conceptual diagram which ended Chapter 1 and began this chapter can thus now be further elaborated as:

**A study of the questions**

- How was Years 7-10 English defined from the early 1970s to the early 1990s in NSW?  
  AND
- What was the relationship between the concepts "English" and "literacy" in NSW in the given period?
to be investigated through the framework of

the Christie thesis on the history of English in Australia since the advent of the "growth model" - a thesis which presents the arguments that:

• the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon was transferred more or less wholesale into Australia
• teaching about sentence-level grammar was rejected and this led in turn to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general - indeed, there was active resistance against teaching about language, and this meant a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
• study of literature in terms of analysis of language was abandoned

with the data being brought to bear being

• the 1971 and 1987 Syllabuses
• the journal *English in Australia* for 1977 and 1992
• the Newsletter and the journal *The teaching of English* of the NSW English Teachers Association for 1977
• the journal *The teaching of English* of the NSW English Teachers Association for 1992
• "method" books published in Australia in 1977 and 1992 and reviewed in the above journals
• school textbooks published in Australia in 1977 and 1992 and reviewed in the above journals
• the School Certificate Reference tests of 1977 and 1992

3.3 Organisation of the discussion

In terms of the progression of the argument, the organisation of chapters is as follows:

Chapter 4 deals with an analysis of the 1971 Syllabus, including its key influences. Special attention will be given to how the Syllabus and its key influences define "English" and "literacy". A discussion of the Syllabus in terms of the main themes of the Christie thesis will be central.

Chapter 5 deals with elements of the historical and general curriculum contexts in which the 1971 Syllabus was implemented. Part of the "historical moment" of implementation was one of the most widespread media attacks on the standards of literacy in Australia, with the 1971
Syllabus incurring much blame for the situation in NSW. In terms of curriculum history in particular, the 1971 Syllabus was being implemented at a time when "language across the curriculum" was a key theme in curriculum discussion. This priority was eventually to translate in NSW into two key government curriculum documents: Reading K-12 and Writing K-12 - though these were, respectively, late in the life of the 1971 Syllabus or released during the early days of the Syllabus of 1987. Hence, specific discussion of these documents will appear in Chapter 8.

Chapter 6 is the first of the “slices of time” in the manner of Medway. This chapter deals with how the professional literature of 1977 - the sixth year of implementation of the 1971 Syllabus and the year of publication of the NSW English Teachers’ Association’s *English in secondary schools: today and tomorrow* - defined "English" and advocated its study. Key themes of the Christie thesis will be discussed in the light of this literature, as will the notion of “literacy”. Apart from *English in secondary schools: today and tomorrow*, the literature to be considered are the two main journals of the NSW English Teachers’ Association, the Newsletter and *The teaching of English*, as well as the national journal available to NSWETA members, *English in Australia*. This study will be supplemented by discussion of those English textbooks published in Australia in 1977 and reviewed in these journals. The School Certificate Reference test of that year will also be examined as another source of evidence on how “English” was defined. Again, the notion of “literacy” will be considered, and all of this material will also be discussed in the light of Christie’s thesis. A complete set of summaries of all of the relevant professional literature is contained in Tables 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4. Table 6.5 contains a detailed analysis of the textbooks under consideration.

Chapter 7 is equivalent to Chapter 4 in dealing with the 1987 NSW English Syllabus for Years 7-10. Special attention will be again be given to how the Syllabus and its key influences define "English" and "literacy". A discussion of the Syllabus in terms of the main themes of the Christie thesis will be central.

Chapter 8 deals with elements of the historical and general curriculum contexts in which the 1987 Syllabus was implemented. An important part of the discussions of curriculum which formed the context of implementation of the 1987 Syllabus was the so-called "genre debate" in which Christie and others put forward a view of curriculum that set itself in opposition to what they termed "process" - the 1987 Syllabus being one of the main documents demonised by the "genre" schools. This chapter argues for a re-conceptualisation of the genre debate in terms of learning theory, rather than textual products. This re-conceptualisation is placed within the context of the Christie thesis. Part of the background to implementation in 1987 was provided by the state government’s development of policies on Reading K-12 and
Writing K-12, the latter being represented by a document with which certain genriots had an ambivalent relationship, and a relationship which is analysed here in terms of the suggested re-conceptualisation of the genre debate. During the early-mid life history of the Syllabus, the state government also implemented a K-6 English Syllabus that, arguably, introduced the kind of Syllabus design that Christie advocates. The National Statement and Profiles also reflected something of this design, and these are also discussed in terms of their relationship to NSW concerns. Finally, the notion of critical literacy is discussed as an emerging concept during the life of the 1987 Syllabus that is also having important effects on the definition of "English" in NSW.

Chapter 9 is the second of the "slices of time" in the manner of Medway. This chapter deals with how the professional literature of 1992 - the sixth year of implementation of the 1987 Syllabus - defined "English" and advocated its study. Key themes of the Christie thesis will be discussed in the light of this literature, as will, again, the notion of "literacy". The key "method" book published in 1992 was Jack Thomoson's Reconstructing literature teaching for the Australian Association for the Teaching of English. Apart from this text, the literature to be considered is, again, the (by then only) journal of the NSW English Teachers' Association, The teaching of English, as well as English in Australia. This study will again be supplemented by discussion of those English textbooks published in Australia in 1992 and reviewed in these journals. The School Certificate Reference test of that year will also be examined as another source of evidence on how "English" was defined. Again, the notion of "literacy" will be considered, and all of this material will also be discussed in the light of Christie's thesis. A complete set of summaries of all of the relevant professional literature is contained in Tables 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3, while Table 9.4 contains a detailed analysis of the textbooks under consideration.

Chapter 10 acts as a brief "post-script" which is concerned solely with the release of NSW state government policies on "literacy" - policies which reflect a particular version of Christie's preferred emphasis on language, but which may serve to sever "English", at least in schools under the auspices of the NSW Department of Education and Training, from its historically special role in the implementation of "literacy".

Chapter 11 concludes the argument by re-visiting Christie's thesis in the light of how the data in the "written curriculum" and related key documents reveal the approach which "English" in NSW has taken to particular key aspects of that thesis, especially the study of language. A discussion of the relationship between "English" and "literacy" will also be presented.
CHAPTER 4

THE CONTEXT OF THE "WRITTEN CURRICULUM":

THE 1971 NSW SYLLABUS IN ENGLISH FOR FORMS I-IV

4.1 The 1971 Syllabus

As has been already suggested in Chapter 2, the 1971 NSW English Syllabus for forms I-IV was a revolutionary document, certainly within NSW itself. Nay-Brock has called it "the most dramatic re-definition of junior secondary English for NSW in this century" (1984b: 272). This revolutionary nature is usually seen with respect to its adoption of the then still relatively new "growth model" of English espoused by John Dixon, James Britton and others of the "London School". Homer soon after its implementation referred to it as "the most carefully considered application of 'growth' principles yet seen in Australia" (1973: 212). Later reflections on the document have rarely changed that view. Watson calls it "a dramatic departure from previous Syllabus statements... a deliberate shift in emphasis from English as information to English as activity" (1994: 40). Nay-Brock echoes this very point:

The 1971 document shifted its focus from content onto the student engaged in the processes of learning, growing and experiencing through language...the 1971 NSW syllabus is suffused with the spirit of... the 'new English' of the 1960's which led to and flowed from the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966. (1984b: 204).

With the '71 Syllabus, "Dixon's personal growth model had received official endorsement" (Davis and Watson, 1990: 159). Brock later placed the document's revolutionary character in a larger international context, referring to it as "The first 'personal growth' model syllabus anywhere in the English speaking world" (1993: 30).

The 1961-2 Syllabus for forms I-IV in NSW, which the 1971 document replaced, had reflected the division of the English course into Advanced, Credit, Ordinary and Modified levels. It had been characterised by such features as:

- heavily prescribed content presented in lengthy detail and based on term-length segments
- an emphasis on form and style in writing
- a large quantity of Latinate grammatical terminology, with over three foolscap pages of grammatical-terminology definitions at Ordinary level alone; though the degree of
compulsion about teaching such grammar was "modified" officially, if not in classroom practice, by an amendment of 1968 (cf Nay-Brock, 1984b; Brock, 1996 and Watson, 1994).

Partly because of instructions from the Secondary Schools' Board to produce a relatively short document of aims and objectives, divested of vast amounts of specific detail (Nay-Brock, 1984b: 34), the 1971 Syllabus overturns each of these features of its 1961-62 equivalent. The central document is itself only seventeen pages long. While English is still recognised as catering for students of "advanced", "ordinary", "credit" and "modified" abilities (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 16-17), no separate courses of study are laid down for these student groups. Indeed, no central, specific content for English is actually prescribed. Instead the Syllabus presents a statement of principles, a statement of aim and a series of objectives. Even the separately published, extensive Notes to the Syllabus take the form of suggestions as opposed to prescriptions. In writing, "pupils' ability to express themselves" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 11) is the primary aim and the Syllabus explicitly eschews any requirement "for systematic knowledge of (linguistic or literary topics)" (p. 2).

A more detailed outline of these aspects of the 1971 Syllabus follows.

4.1.1 The "Introduction" to the Syllabus

The statement of principles contained in the "Introduction" to the 1971 document stresses the active use of language and, as Watson and Nay-Brock point out above, it replaces an "English as content" model with an "English as activity" model:

This syllabus assumes that English for twelve to sixteen year-olds should be an active pursuit: a matter of pupils developing competence by engaging in an abundance of purposeful language activities...For this reason, all objectives of English are stated as "ability to do something" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 2).

This...represents a deliberate shift of emphasis from English as information to English as activity (NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndA: 6).

In fact, the rejection of the requirement "for systematic knowledge of (linguistic or literary topics)" is precisely because "competence in the language in a wide variety of situations is sufficiently demanding" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 2). Further important principles are:

• curriculum content is to be school-based, according to pupil need
• speaking is to be seen as equal in importance to writing
• "self-expression" and "perception" are regarded equally
integration is encouraged, and, while the traditional "fragmented" curriculum is recognised as valid, the concept of units of work is explicitly put forward as an alternative to this pattern. (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 2-3)

4.1.2 The aim of English

The aim of English as stated in the Syllabus is "to develop in pupils the utmost personal competence in using the language" (p. 4). This of course reflects the principles outlined above, and runs counter to earlier formulations in NSW Syllabus documents not only in stressing "competence" over "knowledge", but in placing the notion of "personal" competence above any sense of an external, verifiable ideal of "competence" to which students must attain. In this, it certainly represents the spirit of "personal growth" ("competence... necessarily involve[s] mental and emotional processes of great importance to personal development"(p. 4).

"Competence" itself is the grasp, in any language situation of meaning (what is being said), form (how it is being said) and values (the worth of its being said, and said in a particular way) (p. 4). Achievement of the aim involves "competence in the language in use in context" (p. 6).

The document is famously represented by a triangular symbol, each angle of which represents one of the three elements of this central phrase, "The language in use in context". Hence one angle of the triangle represents "LANGUAGE" and deals with the Syllabus' objectives for understanding and control of usage, vocabulary, structure and style. Another angle represents "USE" and deals with the Syllabus' objectives for developing skills in writing, speaking, reading and listening. The third angle represents "CONTEXT" and deals with the Syllabus' objectives for being able to understand and use language in literature, media, personal expression and everyday communication. Thus each of the three angles are sub-divided into four areas of objectives. The twelve lines converge in the centre of the triangle which represents "competence", the grasp of meaning, form and values (pp. 6-7)
It is worth noting this design and the concern with simple, elegant representation that can be contained diagrammatically. Competence is defined with respect to three areas: meaning, form and values. Achieving competence involves comprehension and skill in three areas: the language, in use, in context. There is no sense that these triads correspond to each other. Indeed, the three elements of competence are meant to be overlaid against each subset of the comprehension and skill areas. Thus, for example, student “competence” with respect to “context” means a grasp of the meanings of, say, literature and the media, a grasp of the forms used in literature and the media and the values inherent in the literature and media studied. At the same time, this same grasp of meaning, form and values will be operating in the student’s own “use” of the skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking.

4.1.3 The objectives of English
The rest of the Syllabus deals with the specific objectives for each of the twelve subsets of “the language in use in context”. The section on “the language” deals with the abilities to be achieved in usage, vocabulary, structure and style (pp.8-9). The section on “in use” deals with the abilities to be achieved in listening, reading, speaking and writing. The section on “in contexts” deals with the abilities to be achieved relevant to the particular contexts of everyday communication, the media, literature and personal expression.

4.2 Influences on the 1971 Syllabus: Dixon and Moffett

The Syllabus of 1971 had, of course, a number of influences. The opening page of the Syllabus document carries a series of quotes which might be said to reflect its sources - and they are quite an eclectic mix: Nathaniel Bailey, Matthew Arnold, David Daiches, Marshall McLuhan, W.H. Perkins, Denys Thomson, the US National Council of Teachers of English and two previous NSW Syllabuses (the 1965 Literature Syllabus for Forms V-VI and the 1962 Syllabus for Form I). Two quotations, however, seem to centre this document in its time more than most and perhaps reflect its most immediate intellectual roots- those from John Dixon and James Moffett:

"English is the meeting point of experience, language and society"

John Dixon: Growth Through English
"Most children, by the time they are ready to begin school, know the full contents of an introductory text in transformational grammar...Any child...is a 'linguistic genius'. However...an uneven genius."

James Moffett: Teaching the Universe of Discourse

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971:1).

4.2.1 Dixon and Growth through English

As shown above, the 1971 Syllabus was and is regarded as an attempt to implement the central tenets of the "growth" model of English, as expressed by Dixon in Growth through English. It is worthwhile briefly reviewing this relationship.

Dixon's favoured model of English, which he termed "personal growth" focused on re-examining learning processes and the meaning for the individual student of what was being covered in English lessons. The revolution brought about by this model was in re-defining English not in terms of curriculum content, but in terms of processes - in contrast to what he characterised as the "skills" and "cultural heritage" models. The first point to note about Dixon's famous triad is that it attempts to be historical. The "skills" model, which emphasised drills in aspects of language and literacy, is seen by Dixon as issuing from an era that had demanded an emphasis on initial literacy. The "cultural heritage" model which stressed the "given-ness" of "high" culture, with its roots in Arnold and Newbolt, had grown, according to Dixon, out of a belief in the need for a civilising and culturally unifying content. (Dixon, 1975:1). The problem with these approaches, argued Dixon, was in ignoring the lived experience of the learner - and, hence, in ignoring processes. Instead, "skills" and "culture" were simply, "given". Under the "personal growth" model, English became defined as activity - a key element, as we have seen, in the 1971 Syllabus. Central activities were talking and writing and the ordering of experience that these involved. The importance of personal experience meant in turn a necessary respect for the language which students brought to the classroom and a recognition that identity was bound up with that language. As language learning up to school-age had been based on an active use of language in varying contexts, the school ought to attempt to replicate that situation, rather than to engage in "dummy runs" at language (Dixon, 1975: Ch.2). The 1971 Syllabus' stress on active use, on processes and on communicative ability reflects these key notions.

---

1The quote attributed to Moffett is actually an error. It appears in the "Introduction" to the original 1968 version and was written by Roger Brown. However, it certainly captures the spirit of Moffett's text, especially the chapter on grammar.
An approach that emphasised contexts and use, rather than isolated skills, required an integrated approach to curriculum structure, rather than the fragmentary approach. Thus "integration" became a keystone of the growth model (Dixon, 1975: 32-33), and was, again, echoed in the NSW Syllabus which followed Growth through English. The material of the classroom on which students brought to bear their organising and learning powers had usually been literature. Dixon wished to see other experiences valued as well, since "one can also look at people and situations direct". The life of city children, if it was to be valued as classroom experience, needed to have aspects of that experience examined. So, a thematic approach to curriculum organisation was envisaged as part of Dixon's model. The 1971 Syllabus also widened the key "contexts" beyond "literature" to three others explicitly - the media, "everyday communication" and "personal expression". "Everyday communication" as a context meant placing the ability to communicate in a range of everyday situations, both within the classroom and without, in a position of equal importance to literary appreciation. This exactly echoed Dixon's valuation of experience. Dixon's inclusion of pupils' own work in the "literature" of the classroom (1975: 55) is again echoed explicitly in the 1971 Syllabus (p. 13). If any further evidence was needed about the centrality of Dixon's work, it is the Syllabus' conclusion of the "Objectives" section with two sentences on the context of "personal expression":

Ability to use all the modes of expression dealt with in the syllabus to explore and to communicate personal experience, thought and feeling.

This involves all objectives of the syllabus in all activities in English, and is at once the basis and ultimate goal of English in Forms I-IV.

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 15)

The first of these sentences virtually echoes Dixon's definition of English as being about "the intellectual organizing of experience...but also a parallel ordering of the feelings and attitudes with which pupils encounter life around them" (1975: 7). And, again, like Dixon, the second sentence sees that expression as itself the "ultimate goal of English".

What has gone down in history often to the exclusion of all else about Growth through English is the skills/cultural heritage/growth triad. This ignores one of the book's central themes - the search for what it is that constitutes "growth" in reading, writing, listening and speaking. In the later editions, it was this idea to which Dixon returned and on which he expanded. In his 1975 Growth through English in the perspective of the seventies, Dixon's extra chapter, entitled "In the perspective of the Seventies" is almost entirely about the issue of what constitutes such growth and how it could be recognised.
Dixon’s famous statement that English curriculum design needs "something less specific than a curriculum and something more ordered than chaos" (1975: 91) characterises this theme of his book - a recognition of the need for a sense of order, but less certainty about direction than is the case in the rest of *Growth through English*. Dixon rejects a list of skills, proficiencies and knowledge as the basis of a curriculum and canvasses "not a single level of abstraction, but a hierarchy of levels" (1975: 85), which revolve around teachers setting up frameworks within which pupils can make choices suited to their developmental levels and interests. The 1971 Syllabus stressed all three of these areas: teacher knowledge of pupils and relevant decision-making; student developmental levels and student interests:

... it would be inappropriate to make detailed provision for different stages and levels of study. If English courses are to cater for varied needs, interests and capacities, they will need to be flexible...

In Forms I and II, English needs to be imaginative, active and directly self-expressive, and should develop from and expand children's interests...

In Forms III and IV, English still needs to be imaginative, active and varied. It needs also to appeal to interests that are becoming more reflective, less directly personal and more social...

It should be kept in mind that though pupils may differ in intellectual capacity, their social maturation is not a simple product of such capacity. Slower learners need material that though simple in form is relevant to their age-group in content, and not even the brightest pupils are adults. (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 16)

When Dixon tentatively presents a series of continua of growth, those which he presents are those of James Moffett from what was eventually to become *Teaching the universe of discourse*.

4.2.2 Moffett and *Teaching the universe of discourse*

If Moffett stands - misquoted- as only one among a number of quoted luminaries on the opening page of the 1971 NSW Syllabus, this belies the extent of his influence. Nay-Brock sees the two dominant factors in the creation of the Syllabus so soon after Dartmouth as the growth and influence of the NSW English Teachers’ Association and the personal commitment of the chairman of the Syllabus Committee, Graham Little (Nay-Brock, 1984b: 204-5). Little’s personal influence was, indeed, enormous. Nay-Brock argues that "None of his predecessors as chairmen of the English Syllabus Committees exercised the degree of personal influence upon the shaping of a syllabus that Graham Little did in the construction of the 1971 document" (1984b: 210). Of key interest here is Little’s contention that "the single most
important influence upon him, immediately prior to his being appointed chairman of the Syllabus Committee in June, 1969, was his reading of Moffett's book" (Nay-Brock, 1984b: 212).

Moffett's 1968 classic, Teaching the universe of discourse was, of course, a seminal work in curriculum theorising. In it, he reflects rhetorical theory in arguing that all discourse can be essentially reduced to three elements: a speaker, a listener, and subject, which he formulates in traditional grammatical terms as "a first person, a second person, and a third person" (p.10). Hence, all discourse consists of "I-You-It" relationships. Moffett's thesis led to the argument that development of discourse occurred along certain central lines, those he most developed being:

a) increasing distance between audience and speaker (the "I-You" continuum). The key stages here he called-

Reflection - intrapersonal communication
Conversation - interpersonal communication between two people in vocal range
Correspondence - interpersonal communication between remote individuals or small groups with some personal knowledge of each other
Publication -interpersonal communication to a large anonymous group extended over space/time

Each stage was more selective, composed and public than the one preceding and at each stage, feedback was increasingly slower, until it disappeared altogether. (p. 33)

b) increasing distance between speaker/writer and subject, ie increasing abstraction of subject matter (the "I-It" continuum) The key stages here are represented in the following table-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is happening</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happened</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>Generalising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What may happen</td>
<td>Logical argument</td>
<td>Theorising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Moffett one of these stages cannot take place until the ones before it have, and "outer events" are increasingly replaced by "inner events"(p. 35). One of his most influential statements in this section is the notion that "Whereas adults differentiate their thought into specialized kinds of discourse such as narrative, generalization and theory, children must for a long time make narrative do for all" (p. 49), echoing Barbara Hardy's famous statement of the same year about narrative as "a primary act of mind"(Hardy, 1968). Moffett also postulates an
extension of the theory in which growth in the "fictive mode" occurs in the reverse order, with the child beginning in the far-fetched (fantasy, folk heroes etc) and moving, with psychological growth, increasingly towards the self, studying inner experience (p. 50).

One of the key distinctions made by Moffett and which was to appear in the NSW 1971 Syllabus is that between studying the forms of English and using them:

Learning and learning how to result in very different kinds of knowledge

(Moffett, 1968: 3)

all objectives of English are stated as "ability to do something"...Such a formulation of the aims of English differs significantly from formulations in terms of set knowledge about linguistic or literary topics. In this syllabus, there is no requirement for systematic knowledge of this kind.

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 2)

Like Dixon, Moffett is critical of previous curricula built around content-knowledge of "linguistic or literary topics". His two sets of hierarchies ("I-You"/"I-It") are meant to represent a complete structure for the possibilities of discourse:

units on style, logic and rhetoric can teach little more than abstract information if these things are not kept as functions of each other, and they can be kept so only in the ultimate context of somebody-talking-to-somebody-else-about-something....

......Within the relation of the speaker to his listener lie all the issues...of "rhetoric"...Within the relation of the speaker to his subject lie all the issues of the abstractive process...But of course these two relations are in turn related: what and what for are factors of each other (pp. 5, 10)

When the 1971 NSW Syllabus re-formulates its own triad of "meaning-form-values", which itself corresponds to Moffett's "what-how-what for", it closely adopts Moffett's phraseology:

An alternative formulation of the ideas expressed in this ("Aims and Scope of English") section is one in terms of communication, for instance:

---

2 According to Nay-Brock, in his original memorandum on meaning-forms-values, Little had defined "meaning" as "what is being said", "form" as "how something is being said" and "values" as questions such as "was this worth saying and in this way?" (Nay-Brock, 1984: 246).
Like Dixon, Moffett sees the subject itself as about "Nothing less than the growth of the whole human being" (Moffett, 1968: 215). When it comes to facing the issue of "Stages and Levels", the 1971 Syllabus presents a simple general statement that echoes Moffett's key notion of "decentring":

The movement is from childish interests towards a more adult orientation, and from relatively concrete and egocentric thinking to a more reflective outlook upon a wider world, usually accompanied by an increase in self-consciousness. (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 16)

4.2.3 Teaching the universe of discourse as a system

Moffett, of course, is a creature of his time and John Dixon has given a very useful account of the mid-'60s influences behind Moffett's book. Dixon does not point to specific debates on the nature of English, but rather argues that Teaching the universe of discourse reflects more general 60s phenomena such as the popularity of Structuralism, particularly that of Jakobson and Levi-Strauss; the fascination with the mind and symbolism; the American post-Sputnik obsession with science; the growth of the New Curriculum projects and the general revolutionary spirit of the age (Dixon, 1988).

All of these influences can be readily traced in Moffett's work. Indeed, one point to be made about Moffett's work is its concern with elegant, precise, scientific structures. He begins by arguing for a "structural curriculum" in English. Moffett's particular brand of structuralism stresses relationships in the manner of Suzanne Langer (Moffett, 1968: 1). The particular relationships to be stressed in a curriculum for English are the components of discourse events - speaker, listener and subject; first, second and third person; I-You-It. These reflect Jakobson's influential addressee-address-addressee model of communicative events (see Lodge, 1988: 32-56) and expresses a rhetorical situation in terms of a "grammar" of its component elements. Moffett is able to express the developing relationships between "I" and "It" and between "I" and "You" in such a view in the simple elegance of his tables.

---

3 The punctuation of this formulation is as per the Syllabus itself
It is worth repeating one of these tables at this point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is happening</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happened</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>Generalising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What may happen</td>
<td>Logical argument</td>
<td>Theorising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Moffett, 1968: 35)

The first column represents what Moffett saw as paradigmatic verbal forms in which particular abstractions (the third column) occur. The second column represents the traditional discourse categories of schooling represented by those levels of abstraction. It can be seen that Moffett is able to "fit" traditional school genres to particular points on the abstractive hierarchy. Moreover, each degree of abstraction in the continuum is represented by a corresponding characteristic verbal form.

In addition, as we have seen, Moffett postulates an extension of the abstraction theory in which growth in the "fictive mode" occurs in the reverse order, with the child beginning in the far-fetched (fantasy, folk heroes etc) and moving, with psychological growth, increasingly towards the self, studying inner experience. In a fascinatingly suggestive statement, Moffett argues that this latter progression "recapitulates the history of the species" in the sense that (Western) literature has moved from epic and myth towards inner and underground fiction (pp. 50-51).

Moffett’s design of structures which encapsulate all elements of discourse in all modes goes beyond any straightforward statement of the "growth model" and begins to resemble a typically structuralist "totalising" theory (Pope, 1998: 127) which attempts to embrace everything, a 60s version of Grand Unified Theory in discourse - a tendency reinforced by his seeming concern for simplicity and elegance of structure. These same totalising structuralist tendencies are reflected in the NSW Syllabus. Little reports that reading Moffett "was a kind of ‘silent upon the peak of Darien’ experience for me. The basic insights in this book were quite amazing to me. They were quite wonderful and I will say that the reading of it was a turning point in my whole thought" (Nay-Brock, 1984b, Vol.II: 53). It was Little who designed the triangle which summed up and contained the propositions in the 1971 Syllabus (Nay-Brock, 1984b: 248ff) and there is in that symbol also something of the attempt to capture the sense of a complete system, another Grand Unified Theory. Certainly, Little’s “WH-” schema (“WHO says WHAT to WHOM? WHY? HOW with WHAT EFFECTS”) exactly echoes Moffett’s formulation of the totality of discourse and the totality of the concerns of English.
Green has made a convincing argument that the "new English" was informed by certain social and curricular imperatives that were essentially post-modern. (Green, 1995b). However, in a fundamental sense, the 1971 Syllabus can be seen as a modernist document, in that its totalising structuralist tendencies strongly reflect Lyotard's defining characteristic of modernism - the "grand narrative" - as does the work of Moffett in particular (Lyotard, 1984). In an interview, when I asked Little about this, he referred to back to Moffett's work as "a gestalt...a beautiful model...synoptic, totalising, comprehensive - trying to 'see things steadily and see them whole" (Little, 2000).

This overview of the contribution of the work of Dixon and Moffett and their influence on the 1971 NSW Syllabus has not been intended to be exhaustive, nor, for the purposes of this study, has it been comprehensively critical. There has been no discussion, for example, of whether Dixon's skills/cultural heritage/growth triad actually has empirical, objective validity in terms of the ways in which syllabuses were, in fact, implemented. The important point for this study is that Dixon's triad became an important way of viewing the world of English up to, and during, the planning of the 1971 Syllabus. Nor has there been an attempt to identify influences beyond the immediate ones of Dixon and Moffett. The important issues for this study are the ways in which the 1971 Syllabus reflected important principles of the "growth" model.

4.3 The 1971 Syllabus and "literacy"

Possibly the most important point to make about the concept of "literacy" in the 1971 Syllabus is that it is an unproblematic "given". There is an uncontested sense in 1971 that "literacy" is within the province of "English" in NSW secondary education. The word "literacy" is not mentioned in the central Syllabus document itself - in fact, if any word were to substitute for "English" in this document, it would be "language":

1. The aim of English is to develop in pupils the utmost personal competence in using the language.
2. Competence is grasp, in any language situation, of...
   - meaning...
   - form...
   - values...

The competence sought is not some aggregate of separate skills, but the ability to deal with a range of language situations....
...English in Forms I-IV is not concerned with form without meaning, or with values that are not established by consideration of the actual language used.

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 4)

One could make the identical substitution in Dixon's work. His chapter on the skills which "English" is to engender is entitled "Processes in language learning" (1975, Ch.2). For Moffett, the relevant term would probably be "discourse", the structure of which he equates with the structure of "English" (Ch.1). For Dixon the notion of "literacy" as an area of the English curriculum is not a problematic issue, rather it is, again, an assumed "given"; for Moffett, the term "literacy" itself has a complex history, as will be shown below, but there is no doubt that he saw the macro-skills of reading and writing as the central business of "English".

If asked to identify those areas of the 1971 Syllabus that were specifically about "literacy", the framers of the document would no doubt have referred to the sections on "Reading" and "Writing", since the most common use of the term in secondary English at the time, as a way of describing an area of the curriculum, was probably in Wilkinson's distinction between "oralcy" and "literacy", (Wilkinson, 1971: 114). (Dixon similarly distinguishes between "talk and drama" and "writing and reading" [1975, Ch.2]). In the contemporaneous Student-centered language arts and reading, K-13, however, co-authored with Betty Jane Wagner, in which reading is considered at length, "literacy" is also a central concept related to reading and discussed in some detail. It is used to refer to curriculum content in the same way as Wilkinson does- "verbalization" is distinguished from "literacy", the former referring to speech, the latter to print (Moffett and Wagner, 1976: 122). Moffett and Wagner are careful to make other distinctions:

reading... sometimes means literacy, or "beginning reading" ("decoding"), and sometimes verbalization or "reading comprehension"...

What is unique about reading is not the intellectual part, the comprehending...but the translating of print into speech...

the literacy level of reading (involves) how to teach decoding or word attack...This chapter focuses mainly on reading as comprehension

(Moffett and Wagner, 1976: 122-23)

Here "literacy" is distinguished from "comprehension" and equated with "decoding", which itself is equated with "beginning reading". "Literacy" is basic to reading, but is not "intellectual" or concerned with meaning. Here a major influence on the 1971 Syllabus defines "literacy" in such a way as to give it the sense of a low-level recognition skill characteristic of beginning readers.
Because the concept is not directly referred to, in order to study the 1971 Syllabus' view of the English teacher's job with respect to "literacy", one needs to examine what the document had to say about the areas of reading and writing. But, as I will later show, a major component of what was to become seen as "literacy" in the 1990s was a knowledge of grammar, and so it will be of use to also address what the document says about grammar. Ongoing reference will also be made to what Dixon and Moffett write with respect to these areas.

4.3.1 "Reading" in the 1971 Syllabus

Reading of course falls within the "IN USE" area of the totality of "language in use in context". Thus it is one of the four-macro-skills to be developed in 7-10 English. The objective of the 1971 Syllabus with respect to reading "is the development of competence in oral and silent reading in various situations". The related elements were enjoyment, speed, comprehension, reading aloud interpretatively, reading aloud with appropriate pronunciation and intonation and reading efficiently for a wide range of purposes and in a wide range of situations (p. 10). Enjoyment is seen as key - thus some sense of deep student engagement, even choice of reading material, is implied. The notion of variety of material and purposes highlights the importance given to wide reading. Silent reading is valued. Thus, another implication is that time will be set aside for individualised reading programs in classroom time.

Comprehension is an aim, and the identification of sets of skills is contained in one of the later "Notes on the Syllabus...". This list of "skills" in fact mixes what may be regarded as "skills" with purposes and even materials:

(a) the acquisition and enlargement of **vocabulary**...

(b) **word recognition** which will embrace
(i) recognising whole words by sight, e.g. utilising context clues,
(ii) **phonics analysis** or the ability to identify new words by their sound patterns,
(iii) **the structural analysis** of words by affixes, syllabification and compounds,
(iv) **dictionary skills**

(c) **comprehension skills**
(i) **literal**......
(ii) **interpretation**......
(iii) **inference** and **generalisation**...

(d) **study skills**

...........................................
(e) Creative reading
Using the written material as a stimulus......

(f) Recreational reading
....... a wide range of popular newspapers and magazines

(g) 'Survival' reading
Reading for a wide range of everyday purposes......

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndD: 4)

Moffett’s approach to reading had been interesting. In *Teaching the universe of discourse* he had not directly addressed “reading” in any overall way and this is not simply because his discourse categories overrode or cut across the “language arts” categories, since he did single out writing for extended discussion. Moffett accepts sub-skills such as decoding, or even of comprehension as “givens” and attends to reading in the context of discussing his discourse category, “narrative”. In some ways, Moffett is far more interested here in the works that are to make up the reading curriculum than in the act of reading itself. However, he takes a radically structuralist approach, implying that reading of narrative in itself delivers “reading lessons”, which are ultimately about “reading” narrative structures. In this, he draws a distinction between form and meaning:

> Spontaneous attention to form will tell the reader more about what the author is doing and what he means than a direct analysis of meaning will do

(Moffett, 1968: 145)

Most of us are content-bound by training. We ask ourselves unnecessarily complicated questions about what a story means and what the author is doing, when a simple glance at the communication structure of the work would answer any of these questions.

(Moffett, 1968: 149-50)

This is not the approach to reading in *Student-centered language arts and reading, K-13*, which makes distinctions between decoding (“literacy”) and comprehension and dwells in detail on sub-skills for both areas. The area of “comprehension” effectively equates with “response” (Moffett and Wagner, 1976, Chs 7, 9).

While Dixon controversially re-defined “literature” in *Growth through English* so that students’ own work was to be included in the definition, his approach to traditional literature was one based firmly in response theory (“There is no short cut...to each pupil learning to read for himself” - Dixon, 1975: 56). He saw much previous literature teaching being in fact
the teaching of literary criticism because that provided a defined content, in place of attempting an active engagement of the student with the literature itself.

In fact, despite its owing much to a general model of English and a general approach to language and discourse represented so clearly by Dixon and Moffett, the 1971 Syllabus would seem to be remarkably free of explicit theoretical underpinnings about reading specifically\(^4\) - even those that had influenced the approaches to reading of Dixon and Moffett themselves.

4.3.2 "Writing" in the 1971 Syllabus

The detail of the "Writing" section of the Syllabus differs from the "Reading" in strongly reflecting the chief language theorists of the day, in particular Dixon and Moffett. It is worth quoting at length:

> The objective is development of pupil's ability to express themselves in writing, which is closely related to their pleasure and developing competence and confidence in writing. This involves:

(a) *Something to say*. Ability to express observation, thought, feeling and imagination. Activities should include writing from general experience; writing in response to particular stimuli such as pictures, sounds, discussions, performances, excursions...; writing stimulated by others' speech and writing in all forms.

(b) *A sense of the situation in which it is said*.

(i) Ability to write to a purpose, to describe, narrate, reflect, inform, persuade, argue, make an exposition...

(ii) Ability to write to an audience: the class, the teacher, other persons, imagined persons or groups, the general reader, oneself...

(iii) Ability to write in various forms: personal records, stories, poems, plays, articles, letters, news items, items for use in various media...

\(^4\) In his interview with me, Little stated that he had not read anything by Frank Smith, or the Goodmans, for example, prior to completing the Syllabus. In addition, the "General bibliography and commentary" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndA) contained no references to any books on reading specifically. A later bibliography supporting the Syllabus contained only one teacher reference on reading methodology - and that on "Remedial Reading" (Directorate of Studies, 1976: 7).
Here is Moffett’s structure of discourse echoed exactly:

- *messenger, message, audience* ("a first person, a second person, and a third person; a speaker, listener and subject; informer, informed and information; narrator, auditor and story; transmitter, receiver and message...somebody-talking-to-somebody-about-something" - Moffett, 1968: 10)
- *purpose and an appropriate form* ("Generalizing.../what happens.../History; .....Theorizing.../what will, may happen...Science, Metaphysics - Moffett, 1968: 47).

Moffett’s highlighting of function and audience was to become far more widely influential in the work of the Schools Council Writing Projects (Britton et al, 1975; Martin et al, 1976), but already we can see the outlines of his work being laid down in NSW.

The issues with which Dixon was concerned in writing are also present. Central to Dixon’s work is Britton’s notion of the shaping of experience. This is important in both speech and writing. Dixon believed that previous approaches to writing had so stressed the social conventions that the shaping experience of writing had been neglected. Talk and writing should be closely related and forms of writing should be left to student choice in order to leave the stress on what it is that students have to say (1975: 43-48). This stress on what it is that students have to say and on the importance of student experience in writing is exactly what is taken up in the 1971 Syllabus. Like Dixon himself, the Syllabus also emphasises the importance of classroom experiences themselves in students’ having “(s)omething to say” (Dixon, 1975: 52-54).

4.3.3 Grammar in the 1971 Syllabus

The "Introduction" to the 1971 Syllabus effectively removed the conscious study of grammar from being an objective of subject English:

(the current) formulation of the aims of English differs significantly from formulations in terms of set knowledge about linguistic or literary topics. In this syllabus, there is no requirement for systematic knowledge of this kind. This is not to deny the validity of literary and linguistic scholarship, but to refrain from placing it as an objective of Forms I-IV, when competence in the language in a wide variety of situations is sufficiently demanding (p.2).
Various supplementary Notes to the Syllabus stressed this point strongly and repeatedly:

...while the forms of language need positive treatment with young people...it is neither necessary nor sufficient to deal with them through the formal definitions and rules of some abstract system of language-theory, whether traditional or modern....

...English is not constituted by knowledge of literary and linguistic terms, ideas and information, but by pupils' personal experiences and responses to language (NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndA: 5-6)

The syllabus makes clear that the evaluation of competence is in terms of what the pupil can do with the language, rather than what he knows about it in some theoretical way. Under this syllabus there is no requirement for knowledge of any grammatical system (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 1)

The teaching of language must take place within meaningful contexts. 'Dummy-run' exercises (sentence correction, fill-in-the-blank exercises) and lists of unrelated words should be avoided....

While some purpose may be served by acquainting the child with common terminology (parts of speech, phrase, clause), his linguistic competence will not be increased by the study of grammar as such (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1979: 1)

It is generally this aspect of its approach to language structure that is emphasised in discussions of the Syllabus (for example, Nay-Brock, 1984b: 244-52). However, to stress the removal of conscious language knowledge from the objectives of the subject and from its assessment is to tell only half the story. Part II. A. 3 (OBJECTIVES: THE LANGUAGE in use in context: Structure) of the Syllabus stresses the positive application of structural-linguistic knowledge:

The objective is to develop a sense of structure in the spoken and written forms of the language. This involves:

(a) Ability to use varying sentence patterns and to appreciate their influence on meaning.

(b) Ability to respond to and use common indications of structure: punctuation in writing; inflexion, pause and pace in speech.

(c) Ability to arrange sentences in meaningful relationships with one another and to appreciate the effectiveness of such relationships in others' use of language.
(d) Ability to discern, evaluate and where appropriate use larger structural patterns.

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 9)

An important distinction needs to be made here between "conscious" and "operational knowledge" - a distinction that well before 1971 had certainly become embedded in the research literature, if not in the application of that research by those charged with devising curricula. Wilkinson records the major research studies from the turn of the century until the 1960s which showed that "the training of formal grammar had no beneficial effect on children's written work" (1986: 23). By the time the 1971 Syllabus had begun to be written, the most well-known of these studies - that of Harris (Harris, 1962, 1965) - was still quite recent and Wilkinson's history of this strand of research argues that Harris' study made any further research pointless ("It is after all centuries since anyone took the trouble to demonstrate that the earth moves around the sun" - Wilkinson, 1986: 23). On the other hand, a series of major studies describing the pre-school child's acquisition and use of syntax were, of course, well known by the late 1960s. It is this distinction between what one can consciously describe in language and the knowledge one demonstrates through "use" that is captured in the wrongly attributed quote from Teaching the universe of discourse at the beginning of the 1971 Syllabus:

Most children, by the time they are ready to begin school, know the full contents of an introductory text in transformational grammar.....

The 1971 Syllabus, then, was not so much "proscribing" (Nay-Brock, 1984b: 243) the study of grammar as arguing that competence in its use was a more fundamental objective than its conscious analysis, and that the one did not necessarily depend on the other. During 1966, while a Fellow with the Commonwealth Institute in London, Little himself had become particularly interested in what Wilkinson was arguing about grammar. Back in Australia the following year, Little - as President of the English Teachers' Association and Chair of the Syllabus Committee - had become immersed in the debate over the place of grammar in English. The ETA had been agitating for "all that grammar to be put in its place" (Little, 2000). They particularly objected to the then "levels" of English (Ordinary, Credit, Advanced) being defined by knowledge of "minute bits of grammar" (Little, 2000). Little felt he had a brief to act. His solution - to continue to use traditional Latinate terminology as a tool, "but that was it" (Little, 2000) - became reflected in the Notes on the Syllabus for "Language". These simply reiterated the perceived lack of connection between the study of grammar and "competence", but went on to say that, "Teachers are...free to use or not to use grammar, like any other

---

1 For a representative summary of this work, see the chapters and accompanying bibliographies in Section V of Cashdan and Grudgeon, 1972.
'teaching-aid'. Competence, not the use of the 'aid', is the objective" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976:1). Little says, "we could use the terminology, but...essentially, I didn't want meta-language to be an objective for a 7-10 Syllabus. Meta-language is for seventeen-year-olds" (Little, 2000). What was proscribed, however, was the use of grammatical knowledge as a form of assessment:

at no time should formal knowledge of any grammatical system or performance in formal exercises such as parsing or analysis of clauses be made part of the evaluation of competence in English in Years 7-10 under this syllabus


Little traces his own attitude to assessing language competence through a knowledge of grammar to being an anti-Benthamite and hence opposing the atomisation of aspects of communication (Little, 2000). As Chair of the Syllabus Committee, he quickly disposed of Question 2 ('Parse the following passage and analyse the underlined words......') from the School Certificate examination.

4.3.4 Grammar in Teaching the universe of discourse

Moffett discusses the research on the relationship between knowledge of grammar and improvement of writing, arguing that the debate is ultimately a question about how to achieve access to standard dialects and about how to develop linguistic elaboration in students. The former is a social question that entails class-based and racial de-segregation of schools; the latter is largely a matter of cognitive development, since, orally, most children master most grammatical transformations prior to schooling. As far as written grammar is concerned, playing the spectrum of discourse is most likely to develop grammatical elaboration, though Moffett does suggest certain "cognitive tasks" as alternatives to grammar teaching that are likely to aid syntactic maturity (Moffett, 1968, Ch 5).

4.3.5 Grammar in Growth through English

Dixon's attitude to the kinds of tasks which the 1971 NSW Syllabus sought to move away from is easily inferred. The "skills" model emphasised drills in aspects of language and had its origins in an era when initial literacy was the key concern. A model which emphasised English as activity and competence in language use was one which favoured verbs over nouns - "(C)onceptualizing" over "'concepts' as things, reified objects to be handed over by the teacher" (Dixon, 1975: 10-11). Dixon's attitude to grammatical study rests on the key principle that "language is learnt in operation, not by dummy runs" (p. 13) - the very principle reflected so strongly in the Syllabus itself. Dixon argues that, as students have learnt language successfully prior to schooling, that it should be the aim of schools to build on these successful
principles, through continued active use of language in meaningful situations. The conscious study of language should always follow its use, not vice versa (pp. 31, 78). In terms of the specific study of grammar, Dixon fears that it may intrude on the active use of language. He does not reject grammatical study outright, arguing rather that while research has shown that study of Latinate grammar does not aid language use, the question is open as to whether the newer grammars may be more successful. Realistically, however, such study is of a degree of abstraction that is best left to the higher grades of secondary school and, in any case, language study is potentially broader than the study of grammar (pp. 75-79).

4.4 The 1971 Syllabus and the Christie thesis

The central elements of the Christie thesis of the history of English in Australia are:

- the more or less wholesale transfer into Australia of the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon
- the rejection of teaching about sentence-level grammar leading to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general- indeed, active resistance to teaching about language, leading to a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
- the abandonment of the study of literature in terms of analysis of language

At this point, the analysis of the 1971 Syllabus represented in this chapter so far will be extended to compare its essential elements to those of the Christie thesis.

4.4.1 The 1971 Syllabus and "growth"

To the extent that the 1971 Syllabus reflected the main ideas of Dixon, Christie is undoubtedly correct in her view that "growth" was transported to NSW. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the Syllabus has been hailed in a positive manner by a number of commentators for being in the vanguard of precisely this movement. Dixon's model focused on re-examining learning processes and the meaning for the individual student of what was being covered in English lessons. The revolution brought about by this model was in re-defining English not in terms of curriculum content, but in terms of processes. English became defined as activity. Central activities were talking and writing and the ordering of experience that these involved. Personal experience, and the active use of language, particularly through talk and writing, became central elements of the English classroom in this model. An integrated approach to curriculum structure was seen as important in the achievement of these aims. All of these elements are reflected in the 1971 English Syllabus for Years 7-10 in NSW.
Christie's reaction against the model is rooted in her rejecting Romantic notions of the individual and concentration on persons creating their own meanings. Yet, when one examines one of the central themes of *Growth through English*, one encounters what is perhaps a much more "hard-headed" notion of "growth"- the search for what constitutes "language growth". In the 1975 edition of his book, it was this idea and on which he expanded in his extra chapter, entitled "In the perspective of the Seventies", which deals at some length with the issue of what constitutes such growth and how we would recognise it. As we have seen, in his later review of Moffett's work, Dixon characterised Moffett's schematic formulation of discourse development in *Teaching the universe of discourse* as exemplifying mid-sixties Structuralism and representing the spirit of Jakobson and Levi-Strauss and Chomsky and the New Curriculum projects (Dixon, 1988). While not himself so schematic, in returning in 1975 to the issue of what constitutes growth and how one would recognise it, it is Moffett's structures that he attempts to refine (1975, p.111ff). He does this by discussing them in relation to particular implications of the London Writing Unit's division of language into the transactional-expressive-poetic schema. Much of Dixon's later work - such as his work in analysing staging points in writing at 16+ - continued to be concerned with this attempt to characterise language growth (Dixon and Stratta, nd).

The profound influence of Moffett on the Syllabus itself thus gives a particular focus to the way "growth" was "transported" into NSW, and in order to examine this further, the next item of Christie's thesis needs to be addressed.

### 4.4.2 The 1971 Syllabus and rhetoric

Rather than neglecting the "rhetorical" aspect of language, it would appear that the 1971 Syllabus in NSW is actually steeped in rhetoric in the sense in which Christie defines that term (the inter-relationship of audience, purpose and meaning). The Syllabus' emphasis on "competence" is one which simultaneously places the emphasis on "meaning". Moreover, this emphasis is placed in the context of connecting linguistic knowledge - albeit not knowledge to be assessed through parsing and analysis - with its use. The thrust of Part II.A.3 quoted above is "rhetorical" in precisely Christie's sense ("Ability to use varying sentence patterns and to appreciate their influence on meaning..... Ability to arrange sentences in meaningful relationships with one another and to appreciate the effectiveness of such relationships in others' use of language" [NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 9, my emphases]).

The objectives of the Syllabus with respect to writing particularly would also seem "rhetorical" in Christie's sense. The objectives of writing are defined precisely in terms of constructing
particular conventional generic forms and the construction of those forms with particular audiences in mind:

(i) Ability to write to a purpose: to describe, narrate, reflect, inform, persuade, argue, make an exposition...

(ii) Ability to write to an audience: the class, the teacher, other persons, imagined persons or groups, the general reader, oneself...

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 11)

This is not surprising, given the emphasis on rhetoric in the work of Moffett, and Moffett's influence on the Syllabus itself. Moffett's work was self-consciously based on moving "English" from "grammar" to "rhetoric". He discusses the structure of discourse which underlies his curriculum as a question of rhetoric and the description of his task in Teaching the universe of discourse is exactly reflected in the Syllabus section on writing quoted in the previous paragraph:

The elements of discourse are a first person, a second person, and a third person...The structure of discourse, and therefore the super-structure of English, is this set of relations among the three persons...

Within the relation of the speaker to his listener lie all the issues by which we have recently enlarged the meaning of "rhetoric"... Within the relation of the speaker to his subject lie all the issues of the abstractive process...But of course these relations are in turn related: what and what for are factors of each other...

... the set of relations is of course not static, and, as the ultimate context, this structure governs the variations in style, logic and rhetoric of all the sub-structures beneath it - the word, the sentence, the paragraph, and the compositional or literary "form"...What creates different kinds of discourse are shifts in relations among persons (Moffett, 1968: 10-11).

Thus Moffett's thesis on "kinds of discourse" relates ultimately to specific forms: interior dialogue, conversation, correspondence, and, above all, narrative and drama. Moffett argued, as a modern linguist such as Christie might, that contexts of meaning created appropriate structures - from such conventional forms to the grammar of the sentence itself (Recording/what is happening ...... Reporting/what happened...Generalizing/what happens....Theorizing/what will happen). The 1971 Syllabus itself certainly stressed strongly individual experience, but it also stressed conventional forms and purposes - the forms
reflecting Moffett’s discourse categories and even, to some extent, modern “genre” categories (“describe, narrate...argue, make an exposition...”).

This "respect" for conventional forms would also seem to contradict the Christie claim that Australian versions of "growth" failed to take account of the social construction of language.

Similarly, the explicit emphasis on purpose, audience and form (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 11) would seem to contradict the idea that Australian versions of "growth" led away from considering language within a rhetorical paradigm.

Probably the most important evidence on the issue of Christie’s claims about a lack of rhetorical perspective in Australia is in Little’s "WH-" schema, which exactly echoed Moffett’s formulation of the totality of discourse and the totality of the concerns of English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>says</th>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>WHOM?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>with</th>
<th>WHAT EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 5)

A Syllabus which aims at defining English in terms of “Who says what to whom, why, how and to what effects?” would seem to be placing rhetoric-in-action at the centre of its concerns. Little, in fact, calls that formulation “a... rhetoric’. His own conceptualisation of English is consciously rhetorical:

*Approach to Literature* (Little’s first book) was really a book on teaching writing, on rhetoric. I was treating the kids’ work as literature. I was very directive, very interventionist and structuralist (I look for patterns in things)... it was rhetorically oriented in the manner of Cicero...

...At the WEA, I was teaching them rhetoric: from conversation through to performance...

I believe in semanto-syntactic systems. Language study should be rhetorical

(Little, 2000)

Moreover, what Little says about Moffett’s influence on himself and on the Syllabus continually emphasises the rhetorical:
Moffett in one stroke had put together the two histories I was interested in: the history of mind - the idea of mind, the human faculties - and... rhetoric...Moffett put the rhetorical tradition AND the growth tradition together through his concept of levels of abstraction (Little, 2000).

4.4.3 The 1971 Syllabus and language study

Of course, the 1971 Syllabus was firmly centred in "language". "Language", clearly, was synonymous with "English" and the very aim of the Syllabus was "to develop in pupils the utmost personal competence in using the language" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 4).

Christie's argument is that the specific study of language as a phenomenon was foregone, even resisted, in Syllabuses such as the 1971 document in NSW. Indeed, in the Syllabus, "mastery" and "use" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 1) were seen as intimately connected and "mastery" was the aim. The Syllabus is explicit about not requiring "systematic knowledge of (linguistic or literary topics)" precisely because "competence in the language in a wide variety of situations is sufficiently demanding" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 2). The Notes to the Syllabus on "Language" pick up this issue, and do so in a way that reflects the Syllabus' adherence to the contemporaneous research showing a lack of connection between competence and, specifically, the conscious study of grammar:

It is ...hoped that the syllabus makes clear that the evaluation of competence is in terms of what the pupil can do with language, rather than what he knows about it in some systematic, theoretical way. Under this syllabus, there is no requirement for knowledge of any grammatical system... at no time should formal knowledge of any grammatical system or performance in formal exercises such as parsing or analysis of clauses be made part of the evaluation of competence in English in Years 7-10 under this syllabus (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 1).

With regard to other aspects of conscious language study, the Syllabus puts forward a number of propositions that would seem to actually reinforce an important role for language study:

It is also clear that all pupils can enlarge their powers of understanding and expression by direct, attentive dealing with language in listening, reading, speaking and writing activities which they find of interest and importance (NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndA: 5)
Moreover, the approaches to language study in the Syllabus are those which Christie would presumably define as "rhetorical". Under Objective A.1, for example, on "Usage" ("The development of appreciation and control of various kinds and levels of usage..."), the Notes on the Syllabus for "Language" state that "Pupils should at all times be encouraged to evaluate language in its setting" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 1). Similarly, Objective 4, "Style", argues that style is best dealt with by "attending to how something is said as part of grasping precisely what is said in particular instances. It involves full attention to context: utterer, audience, intention, occasion, medium, and so on, as relevant" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 8). But perhaps the most extensive statement of the ways in which the Syllabus advocates language study in what might be considered a rhetorical mode is the discussion from the "Language" Notes on Objective A.1 (a): "Ability to recognize and evaluate various kinds of usage in the contexts suggested by the syllabus:

A grasp of usage is most likely to be developed through the examination by pupils of many and varied samples of the language used in everyday communication, the mass media and literature, with attention to what is being said, how it is being said and the values (sic) of its being said in that way. There are many ways in which such a study may effectively be approached. As an example of the kind of possibility which exists, one might consider the tape recording of samples of speech on radio, taking in the language of various advertisers, disc-jockeys, newsreaders, politicians, interviewers and their respondents, news and sports commentators, school and religious broadcasters and so on. Examination of the nature and effectiveness in context of their uses of language, followed by uses of language by the pupils in such ways should be illuminating. A wealth of samples of written language is similarly desirable, paralleled(sic) by wealth of experience in using the written language in the ways experienced, and supported by the critical analysis that will have taken place. (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 2-my emphases)

This approach to the study of language echoes the Syllabus' "WH-" schema exactly and encourages analytical language study that would appear to root itself in the inter-relationship of purpose, audience and meaning. In fact, this approach again picks up not only Moffett's overtly rhetorical emphasis, but another theme of Dixon's that is often lost in discussions of Growth through English - the degree to which Dixon himself supported language study, provided it went beyond the study of grammar alone. One of Dixon's expressed fears in his book is that interest in "new and superior English grammars" (1975: 75) would simply replace one ineffective body of knowledge with another. The really useful approach to language, he argues, is one that studies "forms of knowledge that affect judgements, choices, and decisions" (1975: 76). The notion of studying the making of rhetorical choices in language use is precisely what underlies Dixon's recognition of "a curiosity about language much wider
than that of the grammatical level" (1975: 77), because he feels that the most useful kind of conscious linguistic knowledge is that which potentially affects use, the kind of "(T)eaching which aims at leading students outward from their sense of language as an artifact, a given, to a sense of themselves as organizers of experience in the act of speaking and writing" (1975: 77). Moreover - and interestingly, given Christie's argument that literary studies dominated over language studies, and that the former ignored close study of language - this "sense of themselves as organizers of experience"... is a matter for linguistic as well as literary insights" (1975:77).

Such an approach would lead to the teacher's introducing abstract frames of reference when necessary and, eventually, to the "study of language, a study which 'would stand among other studies of a socio-scientific nature as an option in the higher grades of High School...'. It would study problems...for from such studies a body of knowledge is gradually drawn in, for the sake of its relevance in providing a frame of reference within which the issues can be effectively discussed" (1975: 79).

But, if Dixon's and Moffett's work and the 1971 Syllabus do reflect a rhetorical approach to both language use and language study, then what does the Syllabus' rejection of the requirement "for systematic knowledge of (linguistic or literary topics)" actually mean? It would seem that there are two answers to this question:

- In devising a Syllabus that "represent(ed) a deliberate shift of emphasis from English as information to English as activity" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndA: 6) and in picking up Moffett's notion that "Learning and learning how to result in very different kinds of knowledge" (1968:3), Little and his team were staking a claim for the priority of "use" over "study". The Syllabus explicitly does "not...deny the validity of literary and linguistic scholarship", but prioritises use precisely because "competence in the language in a wide variety of situation is sufficiently demanding" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 2).
- The key term in rejecting the requirement "for systematic knowledge of (linguistic or literary topics)" would appear to be "systematic". Little's Syllabus seeks to reject that view of English which revolved around systematic, programmed practice in, particularly, grammatical analysis.

Christie argues that the rejection of parsing and analysis by "growth" adherents meant that the opportunity was lost to re-create a rhetorical tradition which connected the study of language to meaning. Certainly, "growth" as expounded by Dixon, and as manifested in the 1971 Syllabus, did reject parsing and analysis as of no use to language development, but this did not accompany a rejection of all language study. On the contrary, the inter-relationship of purpose, audience and meaning as the basis of a study of language would seem to be
advocated as a positive by both Dixon and the 1971 Syllabus. Moreover, it is absolutely fundamental to the work of Moffett.

4.4.4 The 1971 Syllabus and literature

It is something of an irony that Christie and others link Leavis, Arnold and Dixon by emphasising the commonalities between "cultural heritage" and "personal growth" on the grounds that they both value individual voices and hence issue from the same Romantic tradition (Christie, 1993; Christie et al, 1991; Hamley, 1979: 347ff; Medway, 1990: 22-23; Patterson, 1992, 1993: 61; Green, 1995b: 397ff) - because some of the earliest criticism of "growth" came especially from a literature-centred school of English curriculum yoked to the cultural heritage which Dixon was himself questioning. These critics vigorously rejected the widened definition of literature at Dartmouth that would include all writing in Britton's spectator role as "literature". Especially rejected was the notion of defining the pupil's own work as suitable "literature" for classroom consideration, but above all, "substitution" of the pupil's experience for the elevating effects of literature was seen as a denigration of the curriculum (Whitehead, 1976; Allen, 1980). This was sometimes particularly so when the experience being privileged was now that of the urban poor. Thematic teaching based on these experiences was often parodied in defence of the heritage:

relevance in English classrooms meant the presentation of local material to stimulate talk. 'What's it like in your house when the truant officer comes?'...The urban poor were marked for salvation...English teachers began to cut back on the freight of literature or jettison it altogether. If all pupils cannot cope with literature, then none need have it (Hansen, 1979).

Thus, shifting the curriculum towards the concerns and lives of the majority of students is seen in this view as a downgrading of the curriculum and a lowering of standards. "Growth" and "literature-centredness" were seen by these critics as opposing notions in curriculum design. Homer's history of the subject argues that by the late 60s, "child-centredness" was so strong that people were wondering whether there was a role for literature at all (Homer, 1973: 142).

But of course, Christie's view on the study of literature is not just that "growth" links to "cultural heritage", but that the nature of the study of literature itself discouraged the close study of texts - encouraging not close language analysis, but simply 'admiration'. Christie does not claim that this tendency in the cultural heritage, as manifested by Leavis, had a direct influence on "growth" itself - the claim is rather that this tendency in the teaching of literature existed more or less alongside "growth", with the combined effect on the curriculum of "English" of rendering language "invisible" (Christie, 1993: 76-77; 94-98; 101-102; Christie et al, 1991: 18).
Christie's characterisation of Cambridge English as practised by Leavis as "eschew(ing) analysis" is itself problematic, given that both Richards and Leavis are often seen as the British equivalent to, or pioneeers of, American New Criticism - their names being closely associated with "close reading" and "practical criticism" (Eagleton, 1983: 43ff; Thomson, 1987: 94; Dixon, 1991, Pt. II). Nevertheless, the concern here is not with Christie's view of Leavis, but rather whether the alleged neglect of language analysis in the teaching of literature had its effect on English curriculum in this state.

The Syllabus puts forward a view of the prominent place of literature in English as unproblematic:

No apology is made for the special prominence given to literature, as drawing together the threads and concerns of English in a particularly fruitful way (if we find the right texts)

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndA: 7).

Of all the "contexts" of English, none is more important than literature

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndB: 1).

In fact, "find(ing) the right texts" was the usual form of the quite extensive supporting documentation developed for literature in the form of recommended reading (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1974a, 1974b, 1974c, ndC). Other material generally supported a breadth of approaches to the study of literature, which was not to be confined to literary criticism, but was to value the "pupil's own response" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndB:2).

Above all, the Syllabus stresses the pedagogical principles of:

- breadth of experience
- relevance of experience
- depth of experience

In relation to "depth of experience", the Syllabus includes as an objective, the ability to respond to "the form of a work, its structure and style; its parts and their relations to one another and the whole...its narrative and descriptive methods;...its management of dialogue, imagery, humour, irony, its control of pace, tone and rhythm" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 13). Thus, while valuing the "pupil's own response", the Syllabus, far from discouraging a close study of language as contributing to a work's rhetorical effects, would, rather seem to be positively encouraging that very study and urging teachers to lead pupils to
recognise "the contribution of (language) to...total meaning and value" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 13).

4.5 Summary

Based on the above, the 1971 Syllabus in NSW did represent the transfer into Australia of the "growth" model of English - indeed, its pioneering of that model in this country is one of its greatest claims to historical importance. Nevertheless, this begs the further question of just what "growth" actually meant - both in general, and in this Syllabus in particular. Key defining points of both "growth" in general and in this Syllabus include:

• the shift from English as information to English as activity
• curriculum content to become school-based, according to pupil need
• speaking to be seen as equal in importance to writing
• "self-expression" and "perception" being regarded equally
• the encouragement of an integrated curriculum

The Syllabus, in fact, reflects very closely the main precepts of Dixon's *Growth through English*. The Syllabus also reflects, however, the influence of Moffett's *Teaching the universe of discourse*. Indeed, Dixon himself was influenced by Moffett's work, so that it is probably accurate to describe "growth" in general as also containing Moffett's most important precepts. Regardless of the degree to which history might see the trans-Atlantic complementarity of Dixon and Moffett as constituting the "growth" model in general, it is true to say that the peculiar flavour given to "growth" in NSW depended heavily on qualities brought to it by Moffett as much as by Dixon.

While Dixon, Moffett and the 1971 Syllabus united in accepting the research that had denied any value in the study of grammar for the improvement of competence, it was not the case that this led to neglect of the study of language, especially in terms of giving a rhetorical emphasis to such study. The influence of Moffett particularly was behind the central statement of what English was in this Syllabus, viz. "WHO says WHAT to WHOM? WHY? HOW with WHAT EFFECTS?". This formulation picked up exactly the very strong approach to English-as-rhetorical-study that characterised Moffett's seminal text - a text in which discourse itself is defined in terms of relationships between speakers, audiences and forms. Moreover, the Syllabus' "WH-" formulation as expressed in this way is picked up in the extensive description of the kinds of language study which are encouraged in the Syllabus - and these are certainly studies that are rhetorical: studies of language in use which attend to "what is
being said, how it is being said and the values (sic) of its being said in that way" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 2).

Literary study does indeed retain a prominent place in the Syllabus, but the approach to literature, again, includes close study of the language of texts and, again, in a sense that one would label "rhetorical"("the contribution of [language] to ...total meaning and value"- NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 13). On most counts, then, Christie's thesis about the history of English in this country would not seem to be applicable to the very Syllabus that represented the coming of "growth" to NSW, and to Australia.

Finally, with respect to the notion of "literacy", it is probably true to say that in 1971, the concept was still regarded as unproblematically the province of "English" in NSW. The key synonym for "English" both in NSW and in the UK was "language"- and "literacy" would seem to be have been regarded as a kind of sub-set of "language". The relationship of "English" to "language" in the professional literature in NSW, and the part played by "literacy" in this relationship is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5

ASPECTS OF THE CONTEXT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1971 SYLLABUS:

LANGUAGE ACROSS THE CURRICULUM AND CRISES IN LITERACY

5.1 Language in the total curriculum

One major factor in the context of implementation of the 1971 Syllabus that was certainly a central feature of curriculum debate in the 1970s - and culminated in the release in the late 70s in NSW of the document Reading K-12 and in the late 80s with the document Writing K-12 - was the language across the curriculum movement. The extent to which this movement influenced the NSW view of what "English" meant and the extent to which "English", in its concern for language, "slid over" into the broader curriculum is the subject of the first section of this chapter. The argument involves investigating those themes which English in NSW appeared to be picking up from not only its obvious influences in Dixon and Moffett, but from broader work in "language" emanating particularly from Halliday and Barnes.

5.1.1 The 1971 English Syllabus and the total curriculum

Newbolt had stated in 1921 that, "It is impossible to teach any subject without teaching English" (Newbolt, 1921: Ch1) and the 1962 Syllabus in English for NSW placed itself squarely within this traditional frame of belief in stating that "English...must always be the central subject" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1962: 1). One of the defining characteristics of the age in which the 1971 Syllabus was produced was, of course, the notion of "language" itself being an across-the-curriculum concern. Having concern with language in all subject areas does not, of course, prevent "English" standing alone with its own peculiar curriculum concerns, however much it is centrally focused on "language". Both Dixon and Moffett have a concern with this potentially problematic issue, though offering different answers to the ways in which "English" might stand alongside other subjects, while at the same time taking as its central interest those very areas of communication (reading, writing, speaking, listening) which all subject areas hold in common.

5.1.1.1 Dixon: "Beyond the 'English' lesson"

In his marking out of "experience" as the peculiar field of English, Dixon did define a content that was not likely to be explored in the same way in other areas of the curriculum. On the
other hand, Dixon's virtual equation of "English" with "language" was always liable to lead to 
a "spilling over" of English into other areas of the curriculum. Dixon's description of learning 
in the subject areas linked very closely to Britton's description of the value of "spectator role" 
language (Britton, 1970) which in turn linked to a view of learning that was about the ordering 
of experience in general:

at the level of language...we make for ourselves a representational world...making it 
afresh, reshaping it, and bringing into new relationships all the old elements (Dixon, 
1975: 9)

At one level, it looks as if Dixon could simply be talking about self-expression. Yet, at another 
level, in the connections of meaning being made here between "experience", "language" and 
"English", the latter, in this view, looks beyond any sort of traditional subject matter and 
becomes of itself a vehicle for learning in general. In the terms of another triad of the time - 
Halliday's "learning language", "learning about language" and "learning through language" 
(Halliday, 1980b) - "English" here finds itself in the camp of "learning through language".

Dixon also saw Britton's notion of the shaping of experience to be important to approaches 
taken to writing. According to Dixon, previous approaches had so stressed the social 
conventions that the shaping experience of writing was neglected (1975: p.45). Talk and 
writing should be closely related and forms of writing should be left to student choice in order 
to emphasise what it is that students have to say. In discussing learning in other subject areas, 
he was concerned above all with the ways in which their use of linguistic forms, particularly 
in writing, structure learning. In this, he anticipates many of the terms of the modern "genre 
debates" in Australia (see Sawyer, 1993; Sawyer and Watson, 1991, 1995). While the modern 
functional-systemic linguists are concerned with how linguistic forms structure knowledge, 
and how those forms can be taught, Dixon is concerned with how linguistic forms structure 
learning in particular subjects. The issue for Dixon (and for Harold Rosen, who is quoted 
extensively on this issue in Growth through English) is that of distinguishing between the 
"linguistic-conventional and the linguistic-intellectual". Subject knowledge is often expressed 
in a language divorced from students' experiences, and the efforts of teachers are directed at 
trying to teach the linguistic forms rather than the subject knowledge:

We are just beginning to realize...how appropriate linguistic forms enable pupils to raise 
and answer the kinds of questions specific to each subject. At present each school subject 
seems to operate within its own sub-language encrusted with linguistic 
conventions...School textbooks frequently show us these sub-languages at their 
worst...The verbalization of concepts within different subjects has a complex history; it is
probably not a matter of perfectly evolved language that embodies one kind of rational thought. Is there only one possible statement of Boyle’s Law? ... scientists are not made by teaching pupils the passive voice and the avoidance of the second person, but by inculcating awareness and attitudes (towards certain kinds of data) that will draw on the necessary linguistic forms (Dixon, 1975: 67-69)

At this point, for Dixon, the key concern is how such language is divorced from pupils’ experience and thus potentially impedes learning. The role of the English teacher is as an "integrator" - English as a subject is concerned with "levels of experience and the matrix of language from which all specialist concerns develop" (Dixon, 1975: 70). (This matrix would seem to be very close to Britton’s “expressive” language). If the English teacher leads the way in tracking familiar experience, perhaps other teachers will follow. Thus the English teacher is to stand as a kind of model for other teachers, but, interestingly, this still remains "the concern(s) of English in its widest sense" (Dixon, 1975: 70). Presumably, then, "in its widest sense", English specifically is concerned with learning across the whole curriculum.

5.1.1.2 Moffett: "Discourse" in the curriculum
While Dixon virtually equated "English" with "language", Moffett’s equivalent terms were "discourse" and "English". Nevertheless, Moffett’s book is permeated with the sense that "discourse" is, ultimately, the total curriculum - a notion reflected in the very title of his seminal work. At one level, Moffett presents a detailed argument that "English" is of a different symbolic order to most of the curriculum:

I don’t see how we can justify giving priority to the content specialties of English over those of other subjects, or teaching these specialties before students have thoroughly mastered the large English skills....

English, mathematics, and foreign languages are not about anything in the sense that history, biology, physics...are about something. English, French, and mathematics are symbol systems, into which the phenomenal data of empirical subjects are cast and by means of which we think about them. Symbol systems are not primarily about themselves; they are about other subjects (Moffett, 1968: 4-6)

Yet Moffett’s continuum of abstraction (“I-I”), in particular when it reaches into the more abstract levels of the “non-fictive mode”, has to reach beyond "English" for its curriculum exemplars. In Moffett’s schema, a fourth column represents those recognisable areas of the curriculum which may exemplify the abstractions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior dialogue</th>
<th>Correspondence</th>
<th>Personal Journal</th>
<th>Autobiography</th>
<th>Memoir</th>
<th>What happened</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Chronicle</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>What happens</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Generalising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
<td>What may happen</td>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Theorising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Moffett, 1968: 47)

Though continually referring to "English" as his curricular concern, it is, I believe, more than suggestive from this table that Moffett's universe easily "slides" into becoming a structure for the whole curriculum. This tension in his thought may also explain one of the oddities of the text - why, after the strong theoretical underpinning, he goes on to elaborate only two of the four discourse "types", viz. Drama and Narrative - those which might typically be perceived as being the province of "English". Moffett goes on from this table structure to immediately elaborate his theory of growth in the "fictive mode", which also effectively marks out an area that is typically "English", viz plays, fiction, essays, poetry (Moffett, 1968: 47-53). It is almost as if, in emphasising a traditional territory for "English", he pulls back from the position to which his theory was leading him: that "English" and "discourse" were interchangeable as concepts and that the latter constituted the total curriculum.

5.1.1.3 The 1971 Syllabus: English in the total curriculum

While the 1971 Syllabus did mark out specific "contexts" that were "English" - literature, media, personal expression and everyday communication - there is the sense of English as taking on the central role in the education of the child:
The competence sought is no mere utilitarian skill, but involves essentially human qualities of thought and feeling, because it is by language that we organise our human experience.

The competence sought...necessarily involve(s) mental and emotional processes of great importance to personal development.

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971a: 2)

"English" certainly carved out a territory of its own in the 60s and 70s - territory different from previous conceptions of the subject. In the Syllabus, that territory consists of literature, media, personal expression and everyday communication; in Moffett, it consists of discourse, as well as areas of traditional literary study (narrative, drama, essays, poetry), and for Dixon, it consisted of "literature" and "experience". But, at the same time, the implicit equivalence of "English" with "language" (the latter often the dominant term in the Syllabus), or with "discourse" - and the former's own equation with "learning" - made an implicit claim that English both had its own "territory" and also activated not just linguistic skills but "learning" in a way that placed it at the centre of the whole curriculum. The latter point is a key one. Clearly, the skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening "serve", in an obvious way, the rest of the curriculum, but the claims being made of English were that these skills did not just enable the content of subjects to be expressed, but that they enabled the very "learning" of any subject ("the writing may be the act of perceiving the shape of experience, - not the evidence that it has [once] been perceived" Britton in Dixon, 1975: 45"). "English" may have its "territory", but it also equates generally with "learning" in an abstract sense that, presumably, is not seen to be true of any other school subject in the same way. The following sections will argue that therefore, English lay claim to all three paradigms of language study that were to be popularised by Michael Halliday.

5.1.2 The Hallidayan language triad
I have argued in Chapter 4 that Moffett's schema and Little's Syllabus triangle reflected the structuralist tendencies that characterised 60s and early 70s curriculum-making. Another important schema that should be considered here was that set of distinctions later to be popularised by Halliday as "learning language", "learning through language" and "learning about language". Given the way it was later to be taken up in Australia by the Language Development Project, it is perhaps surprising to recall that Halliday's best-known statement

---

1While it is true that Britton is referring here to an example of "imaginative" language, it is clear from the rest of the text that the same claims can be made for writing outside "English" - see Dixon, p. 44, for example: "a sense of the social system of writing has so inhibited and overawed many teachers that they have never given a pupil the feeling that what he writes is his own"

2 See, for example, the articles in English in Australia, 58.
of this division is in an article describing early child language acquisition (Halliday 1980b). Though Halliday's was popularised a short while after the publication of the 1971 Syllabus, it is worth exploring Little's and Halliday's particular triads for any light they may throw on each other.

5.1.3 The Hallidayan triad in the Language Development Project
In Australia, Halliday's formulation gained its most prominent public manifestation in the national Language Development Project, which came into being in 1977. It is important in terms of the present argument to recall that the LDP began as a purely "English" project and is another example of the way "English" and "language" were synonymous at the time, but also of the way in which "English" was thus becoming "larger" - of what could happen to the subject "English" when it became synonymous with "language" in a time when "language across the curriculum" was a key concept. Christie's own account of the origins of the LDP is instructive in just these terms:

The need for a national curriculum activity devoted to English language teaching was first raised in 1970 by the various state directors-general of education and it was those who gave support to the holding of a UNESCO seminar in 1972 at Sydney University on The Teaching of English. That seminar recommended the creation of a national committee devoted to English teaching, and in 1974 the National Committee on English Teaching (NCET) came into being. It was in 1976 that the NCET and the Curriculum Development Centre jointly planned the Language Development Project...

The original statement proposing the mounting of a 'National Curriculum Project in English for Australia' had read in part, ...'English is the basic field of communication. It involves fundamental relationships between language and thought'. And a little later it read, 'Language development and effective communication are central to all other communication processes'. It was an important statement for several reasons. Firstly, it used the term 'language development', a considerable advance upon the older concept 'English teaching'. It acknowledged the role of language in learning, and by implication suggested that the development of English language capabilities was a matter of 'across the curriculum interest' (Christie, 1981a: 3)

Here is one account of how, in Australia, "English" became "language", though "language" was at the same time broader than "English" in the thinking of the time. The LDP envisaged its own "subject" as the triad, "learning language", "learning about language" and "learning through language":

3 See also Davis and Watson, p.160
Halliday may have been using these terms to refer to individual language development, but now they were conceptualised as classroom curricula. The terms were defined by the LDP as follows:

- learning through language - the use of such strategies as questioning, classroom discussion, groupwork which use language to "clarify" and "develop" understandings in a subject. As well as these activities, the LDP included in this definition the subject's content: the information, skills and concepts of the subject itself. Ideally, this aspect draws as much as possible on the students' own knowledge, experience and language (Savage et al, 1981: 67-73)
- learning language - such skills as reading, writing, the mastery of vocabulary and the social conventions of language, such as register (Savage et al, 1981: 68-73)
- learning about language - such skills as spelling, punctuation and the stylistic conventions of the subject (Savage et al, 1981: 69-73).

The circle structure also of course indicates the interconnectedness of the three areas with "learning through language" being the most inclusive concept.

All of this, of course, well known, but this triad also provides a device against which can be placed to place the English Syllabus of 1971 (and, indeed, as will be seen, later Syllabuses and later conceptions of both "language" and "literacy) and also against which, other conceptions of "language across the curriculum" can be measured.
As a lens through which to view the 1971 Syllabus, the LDP definitions might be represented thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDP view</th>
<th>Learning through language</th>
<th>Learning language</th>
<th>Learning about language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Skills:</strong> reading, writing, the mastery of vocabulary and the social conventions of language, such as register</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge:</strong> spelling, punctuation and the stylistic conventions of the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questioning, discussion, etc</td>
<td><strong>Skills:</strong> reading, writing, the mastery of vocabulary and the social conventions of language, such as register</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge:</strong> spelling, punctuation and the stylistic conventions of the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content:</strong> information, skills and concepts of the subject, using as much as possible the students' own knowledge, experience and language</td>
<td><strong>Skills:</strong> reading, writing, the mastery of vocabulary and the social conventions of language, such as register</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge:</strong> spelling, punctuation and the stylistic conventions of the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1971 English Syllabus</th>
<th><strong>USE:</strong> writing, speaking, reading and listening</th>
<th><strong>LANGUAGE:</strong> understanding and control of usage, vocabulary, structure and style.</th>
<th><strong>LANGUAGE:</strong> understanding and control of usage, vocabulary, structure and style.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTEXT:</strong> literature, media, personal expression and everyday communication (keeping in mind that the objectives of the 1971 Syllabus are always expressed as ability to do something)</td>
<td><strong>USE:</strong> writing, speaking, reading and listening</td>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE:</strong> understanding and control of usage, vocabulary, structure and style.</td>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE:</strong> understanding and control of usage, vocabulary, structure and style.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearly, in the terms defined by the LDP's view of the Halliday triad, English in NSW in 1971 was indeed conceptualised as "doing" what "language" in all areas of the total curriculum was "doing". Of course, it could be argued that "English" was only "doing language" in terms of its peculiar contexts (literature, media, personal expression and everyday communication), but it is useful at this point to introduce another influential conception of the role of language in learning: that of Douglas Barnes - and, in particular, Barnes' rather different conception of "learning through language".

5.1.4 Barnes and "learning through language"

In 1976, in From Communication to Curriculum, Barnes' classroom research showed the problems that resulted for children's learning when the style of language that was regarded by teachers as "appropriate" for a subject was in fact given more weight than the learner's attempts to formulate meaning. Teachers who emphasised the "appropriate" language of the subject were seen as often preventing learners from constructing knowledge. Barnes argued that use of the language forms was considered an "entrance fee" (Barnes, 1976:129) to knowledge and that students who were expected to leap straight to the specialist language of a subject were being asked "to arrive without having travelled" (p.118). Barnes showed that lack of specialist language was indeed a way of excluding pupils who nevertheless made valuable contributions. The problem was not lack of student knowledge but the teacher's failure to recognise the knowledge when not contained in stylishly appropriate language. Barnes drew on Eland's distinction between "world-receivers" and "world-makers" to describe the difference between those who had "transmitted" to them the language forms of the subject and those given the opportunity to "interpret" in a broadly "constructivist" sense. "World-makers" grasp underlying principles and structures (p.115) because of this opportunity. "World-receivers" memorise knowledge and master standard skills (p.157).

Barnes' research with Shemilt led to their postulating the well-known Transmission/ Interpretation model of teaching and learning styles. Transmission teachers value "the learners' performances insofar as they conform to the criteria of the discipline" (Barnes, 1976:144). In terms of writing pedagogy, for example, Transmission teachers were those who saw writing "as a means of recording or memorizing... at the expense of writing as a means of learning. Such writing fails to co-opt the learner's existing purposes and understandings; it has no part in the real world, but is merely an exchange of writing for numerical marks" (Barnes, 1976:145).

Language, according to Barnes, should not be seen simply as a means of earning social approval but a means by which students make sense out of what they are learning. Patterns of classroom communication that gave pupils the time and encouragement to explore the
relationship between new and already existing knowledge needed to be more widespread, he argued. The efficacy of group exploration, experiment and interpretation was particularly explored, though not recommended as any panacea:

...If children are asked to write in a specialist style ... before it has any meaning for them, they will be reduced to copying the model presented by the teacher or textbook. Their writing, instead of being part of grappling with the subject matter is directed by the desire to 'make the right noises', to sound like a chemist or a historian. This leads to ... 'empty verbalism' ... Instead of using language to shape new meanings which link the new scientific or historical knowledge with what they know ... the pupils have been reduced to mere imitation. Every secondary school teacher would recognise the result: blocks of technical language thrust together without coherence or sense....

...Before the pupils can write up the new knowledge for themselves rather than merely as imitators, they must go through the complex process of relating the new knowledge to what they know already, and using it in various ways. They will do this most readily through talking and writing of a much more groping kind: using the new ideas to solve problems will help them make sense of it. To move directly to final draft stage is to omit the essential part of learning, and to expect pupils to arrive without having travelled (Barnes, 1973: 46-49)

Much of From Communication to Curriculum was a re-statement of ideas which Barnes had been exploring for some time. Nor, of course, were the details of this view of language and learning confined to Barnes. They were reflected in Britton's notion of spectator role language (Britton, 1970), and Britton characteristically called on English teachers to, in a sense, take their subject across the curriculum, "to initiate the kind of discussion of language among their colleagues that will lead to a fuller understanding of the role of language in learning" (Britton, 1972). Dixon exactly echoed Britton's notion in his statement about "the intellectual organizing of experience" (Dixon, 1975: 7) and that "at the level of language...we make for ourselves a representational world....making it afresh, reshaping it, and bringing into new relationships all the old elements" (Dixon, 1975: 9). Dixon's challenge in Growth through English is certainly to value both the lived experience of the student as curriculum "content" in English, and the notion of "experience" itself as a constructivist learning "strategy" in Barnes-Britton terms, but not to confuse these ideas. For present purposes, what is important here is whether the 1971 Syllabus embodied one or both of these views of experience. Clearly, the lived experience of the child is central to the Syllabus, but the Syllabus also touches on the notion of "experience" in terms strongly approaching the constructivist-learning terms used by Dixon, Barnes and Britton.
it is by language that we organize our human experience

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 2)

Ability to use all the modes of expression dealt with in the syllabus to explore and to communicate personal experience, thought and feeling

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 15)

Barnes' view of "learning through language" is essentially a learning theory - a view of the use of language in classrooms that goes beyond simply seeing language as a tool for communicating the ideas of the subject. Barnes makes problematic the traditional language of the subject itself as a vehicle for learning and, at the same time, valorises the essentially constructivist notion that students may use language to "talk or write themselves into understanding" by connecting new knowledge to current experience.

I would argue that the 1971 Syllabus approaches the Barnesian view of "learning through language". In effect, the 1971 Syllabus in these terms defines itself as about "learning" in way that takes it beyond the traditional concerns of English alone. Green argues that the key opposition in defining the "new English" was not to be found in "English-as-literature"/"English-as-language", or even "initiation"/creativity", but rather in "transmission"/"interpretation" (Green, 1995b: 397). The "new English" was as much about pedagogy as about curriculum. Green is, in effect, arguing for Barnes as a central theoriser of the "new English" - yet Barnes' opposition of "transmission" and "interpretation" is created in the context of the whole curriculum. Proponents of a literature-centred English feared the loss of the subject's specific identity on such grounds:

Some statements about what subject English should be are, in effect, really statements about what language should be in the total curriculum of the school (Smith, 1977: 145)

Others, like Moffett, were quite accepting of the notion that English might, in a sense, "colonise" the total curriculum:

Basic processes like group discussion, sensory recording, textual comprehension, data gathering, inference making, and verbal composition are critical for virtually all subjects, but none of these receives adequate attention and some are treated only incidentally if at all. The reason for this is that a given process is considered the province of one subject...Learning the native language entails virtually all the problems encountered in any other subject, and yet there is neither the time nor the means to teach for these
problems in an isolated English course....The current organization of the curriculum features inessentials of content difference and slight the essentials of human symbolization (Moffett, 1968: 214)

5.2 The literacy crises of the 1970s

Apart from the context of "official" curriculum concerns, another major context in which the 1971 Syllabus was implemented was the particularly robust series of literacy crises in the 1970s. These were enacted especially by the mainstream print media of the period, but also, on a more "academic" level, by the Australian Council for Educational Standards. Both sources blamed an alleged decline in literacy standards in NSW on, among other things, the 1971 Syllabus.

5.2.1 The media and literacy

Green, Hodgens and Luke's study of the postwar history of media perceptions of literacy in Australia characterise the period from 1972 as one in which "literacy had become a focal issue of media and public 'concern'" (Green, Hodgens and Luke, 1994: Vol.II'). The key theme they identify in media coverage about literacy in the period from 1972 to 1979 is a general sense of decline and declining standards. Employers were claiming that schools were producing an unemployable generation and adult illiteracy began to become a public issue. The term "literacy" itself came into media prominence, though usually in the context of complaints about "illiteracy". The following brief selection of extracts reflects only the NSW press, but the sense of decline is reflected in the national press generally:

More than 30,000 NSW high school students have a reading level of nine years and under, education experts said this week. (Sunday Telegraph, 17/3/74: 43)

In New South Wales, a survey involving 40 private high schools found that all had students at least a year behind in reading standard. At three of the schools, pupils with reading disabilities totalled between 45 and 50 per cent, (Sunday Telegraph, 24/3/1974:5)

No thorough research has been done into the area, but various authorities estimate:

UP TO 20 PER CENT of first-year university students, fresh from school, have a low standard of literacy.

ABOVE 5 PER CENT of first-year university students have severe literacy problems.

1 The reader should note that pages in Green, Hodgens and Luke (1994) are not numbered.
MORE THAN 20 PER CENT of school-leavers attending trade courses at technical colleges are unable to cope with even fairly simple levels of reading and writing for their courses.
MORE THAN 10 PER CENT of school-leavers attempting management and commerce courses at techs cannot handle the reading and writing required.
UP TO 30 PER CENT of school-leavers seeking jobs as factory workers or labourers are virtually unable to read and fill in application forms for the jobs.
ALMOST ALL girls seeking secretarial work after leaving school are not sufficiently literate to take up the level of job they want to do.
All these figures refer to English-speaking people (not migrants among whom such difficulties might be expected).

(The Sydney Morning Herald, 3/6/1975: 6.)

This year remedial classes in English expression are being conducted at Macquarie University. We are not the first Australian university to establish such classes; and it would appear, from the increasing number of complaints in the press about standards of written English, that we shall not be the last. (The National Times, Sept 29 to Oct 4, 1975:13.)

A recent study by the council indicated that one child in a classroom of 10-year-olds was virtually unable to read and one child in every three or four classrooms of 14-year-olds was still unable to read independently. The study also found low-performance levels in formal writing. (Daily Mirror, 20/10/1976: 6.)

A shock government report has shown that up to 5 per cent of metropolitan schoolchildren cannot cope with basic reading, writing and arithmetic. (Daily Telegraph, 23/11/1976:3.)

More than 60,000 Australian 14-year-olds are unable to effectively read a paragraph of words, a survey has found. (Sunday Telegraph, 3/7/1977: 35.)

About 220,000 people in Sydney cannot read or write English well enough to survive in society, a survey has found. Of these 65,000 are Australian/English—born and 155,000 come from non-English speaking countries. (Sunday Telegraph, 8/5/1977:13.)

It’s the problem that shouldn’t exist in the lucky country. It’s the tragedy that most people don’t know exists. But it is fact. Too many Australians can’t read or write as well as a 10-year-old school kid. (Australian Womens Weekly, 24/9/1977:16-17.)
People reading this newspaper today may consider that activity as much a part of their
daily routine as cleaning their teeth. But for 217,000 people in Sydney with average and
above average intelligence, it is an impossibility. They are the “functionally illiterate,”
those who lack basic reading skills. (The Sydney Morning Herald, 12/9/1978:1)

Hundreds of thousands of young Australian now at school may find themselves
unemployable—because they are grossly deficient in language skills. (The Sydney
Morning Herald, 21/8/1979:11)

As Green, Hodgens and Luke also point out, this period saw the widespread use of the survey
to support these claims of illiteracy. Many of these were “independent”, but two which were
conducted by academic researchers in this field make a particularly clear case study in media
treatment of research statistics and the literacy issue. These were the Australian studies in
school performance (Bourke and Keeves, 1977), carried out largely in 1975, and a study by
Judith Goyen carried out over 1974-75.

5.2.1.1 Bourke and Keeves/ Australian studies in school performance (ASSP) 1975

The nature of the study
In October, 1975, the Australian Council for Educational Research undertook sampling across
Australia of approximately 6,000 students aged from 10 to 10.11 years, and another
(approximately) 6,000 aged from 14 to 14.11 years. Students were drawn from government,
Catholic and independent systems. Being tested were “the attainment of skills in
...literacy...that were regarded as being essential for continuing with education beyond the
most elementary level and for living in Australian society” (Bourke and Keeves, 1977: 6).

Students were given a reading test designed to test a variety of reading skills and a writing
test designed to test the ability to write in a range of forms. (A number of the reading
comprehension tasks were taken from a previous study by the International Education
Association [IEA], in order to also enable cross-national comparisons on those tasks). Results
were to be reported item-by-item simply in terms of the number of students who completed
the task successfully. This was regarded as a fairer representation of the aims of the research
than any “global” score of achievement. However, in order to compare the performances of
groups, a cut-off score for reading “mastery” was determined. This score
was 80%.

Results
• Reading:
  - 3% of 10-year-olds and 0.8% of 14-year-olds were unable to read simple sentences
- in exercises involving comprehension of continuous prose, approximately 25% - 30%
in both age groups were unable to provide correct answers
- 14-year-olds were more competent at reading newspapers than 10-year-olds
- on every item, 10-year-old girls scored higher than 10 year-old boys
- on the great majority of items, 14-year-old girls scored higher than 14 year-old boys
- in general, for 14 -year-olds, students from an English-speaking background scored
  higher than students from a non-English-speaking background (NESB)
- among 10-year-olds, NESB students scored significantly worse than their English
  background peers
- for 10 year-olds, scores for different categories of reading-skills ranged from 27%
  achieving “mastery” to 84% achieving “mastery”. Mastery of the whole test was
  achieved by 53% of 10-year-olds and by 41% of 10-year-olds from NESB
- for 14 -year-olds, scores for different categories of reading-skills ranged from 64%
  achieving “mastery” to 92% achieving “mastery”. Mastery of the whole test was
  achieved by 72% of 14-year olds, and by 57% of 14-year-olds from NESB
- sub-groups of students with higher absences from school had smaller proportions of
  students achieving mastery of reading
- the performance of Aboriginal students was much lower than Australian students
  overall

* Writing:
  - the performance of 14-year-olds was much higher than that of 10-year-olds
  - the writing of formal letters was "poorly done", with 50% of 14-year-olds unable to
    meet the requirements of a letter applying for employment
  - 14-year-old students made far fewer spelling errors in proportion to the amount
    written than 10-year-old students
  - female students out-performed males at both age levels on every task except giving
    directions
  - there was compelling evidence of a clear relationship between performance in reading
    and performance in writing

Conclusions
The report concluded that:
* in reading,
  "There was little evidence... to disparage the work of Australian schools and the general level
  of achievement in reading within those schools...performance levels for some reading tasks
  would appear to be relatively high...Nevertheless, there was a small but significant proportion
of students in our schools at both the 10 and 14-year-old age levels who were clearly having difficulty in mastering the skills of reading" (Bourke and Keeves, 1977:11).

- in writing,

though it was more difficult to present general results, the researchers' general impression was that, "while some students were clearly having difficulties with their writing, the level of performance was generally satisfactory" (Bourke and Keeves, 1977:11). The researchers further believed that the numbers "handicapped" in writing were greater than those who had difficulties in reading.

The study included a comparison of reading comprehension with a number of English-speaking countries who had participated in a 1970 International Education Association (IEA) study of reading comprehension. This was possible because a number of test items in the 1975 ASSP study were taken from the 1970 IEA study. This showed for 1975 that "Australian 10 year-old students are little different in performance on a reading comprehension from their coevals in England and Scotland, and perhaps slightly superior to their age mates in the United States" (Bourke and Keeves, 1977: 297).

In terms of 14-year-olds, the study concluded that "the Australian students...have performed on a par with students in Britain but were marginally below the students in New Zealand" (they were also slightly below the USA, but this was not regarded as statistically significant). New Zealand itself was consistently higher across the whole 14-year-old test than anywhere else in the English-speaking world (Bourke and Keeves, 1977: 297).

5.2.1.2 Goyen's study, 1974-75

The nature of the study

In 1974-75, Judith Goyen of Macquarie University surveyed the literacy levels of almost 1000 adults in Sydney. An adult was defined as someone over 16 years. The tests were tests of "survival" literacy: respondents were to answer questions based on reading telephone dialling instructions, classified housing ads, classified employment ads and an application form.

"Illiteracy" on this test was defined as scoring less than 75%.

Results

- the mean score for all respondents was 39.4 out of 44, ie most respondents obtained near maximum scores
- among Australian/English-born adults, illiteracy was 3.7% overall
- among Australian/English-born adults, illiteracy was 1.6% among the under 30s, and 11.9% among the over 60s
- among migrants of NESB, 59.4% were classed as "illiterate"
• of these "illiterate" NESB migrants, 95.1% had been wholly educated in a non-English-speaking country; 72.1% were unskilled manual workers and 49.2% had not been educated beyond primary school

Conclusions
One could conclude from these results that:
• the more recently one was educated, the greater one's chances of being "survival" literate
• that one's home language is a crucial factor in literacy success in the dominant language

5.2.1.3 Media responses to these two studies
These studies, despite the caution with which they were presented, and despite the fact that Australian schools were reported as performing at least comparably to those of other nations, were two of those which received strongest media attention. Headlines on the release of the two studies included:

- for the 1975 ASSP study:

  Australia's Education Scandal: We're turning out millions of dunces
  *The Bulletin*

  Australia's $2,000 million-a-year education system is turning out a generation of idiots
  *Sydney Mirror*

  Australia's school system is producing a crop of illiterates
  *Newcastle Sun*

  Illiteracy - the Crisis in our Classrooms: The forgotten art of the Three Rs
  *The Australian*

  Australia's Faltering Children
  *The Age, Melbourne*

- for Goyen's study:

  A Nation of Illiterates: 225,000 adults cannot read this headline
  *The Australian*

  220,000 in Sydney Illiterate, Says Survey
  *Sunday Telegraph*

  217,000 Illiterate People in Sydney
  *The Sydney Morning Herald*
5.2.1.4 Who is to blame?

Blame for the alleged decline in reading skills was placed on many factors. One was the influence of television (The Sydney Morning Herald, 5/6/1975: 13; The National Times, Sept 29 to Oct 4, 1975: 13; The Australian 2/8/1976: 3; The Sydney Morning Herald, 21/12/1976: 3; The Australian Women's Weekly, 24/9/1977: 16-17; The Australian, 10/7/1980). Blame for illiteracy was also placed firmly on progressive educators, both in schools and in teacher education:

"The tone of very many submissions has been highly critical of teacher education and there is a good deal of concurrence in their demands for more time and effort in teacher education courses to be directed to acquiring basic competence in teaching the skills of literacy and numeracy..." (The Australian, 10/7/1980)

"There's too much emphasis on 'self-creativity' copied from the American education system—too much play, action and drama and not enough reading and writing, too many kids leaving school semi-literate who needn't be..." (Sunday Telegraph, 17/3/74: 43)

"I find that many teachers themselves have doubts on this score. In teacher training institutions the amount of time given over to teaching students how to teach seems to be falling off. It is certainly inadequate.

The teacher colleges have gone overboard on options. They have changed the emphasis from teacher training to teacher education. I am not saying the teachers should not be educated people. I am saying they must also be trained people." (The Age, 28/4/76)

There has also been a move away from proper testing and examination procedures and a lack of adequate training of teachers in the three basic areas. (The Australian, 3/3/1975: 3.)

It is not part of the basic training of primary teachers to learn how to teach reading. (The Sydney Morning Herald, 5/6/1975: 6.)

One progressive teacher with whom I was speaking recently announced with a fearful joy that none of her pupils would know what a noun was (The National Times, Sept 29 to Oct 4, 1975: 13.)
Calls for reform tended to centre not only on making changes that would reform those agents who were to blame, but on the need for more remedial teachers and, above all, on the need for national testing (The Age, 10/4/1975: 3; The Age, 28/4/76; The Australian, 2/8/1976: 3; The Australian, 29/6/1978; The Australian, 15/1/1980).

The above summary and brief commentary on those who were to blame for the decline is taken largely from the primary material supplied in Green, Hodgens and Luke (VolI). One of the things, however, which Green, Hodgens and Luke do not stress, since theirs is a national study, is the degree to which in NSW, the new English Syllabus of 1971 was also blamed for the alleged decline. Such criticism ties in strongly with the blame on progressive education:

Amusingly, in comparison with the English secondary syllabus, the mathematics syllabus for first-year high school students loads the 13-year-old with at least 50 technical terms and the manner of their application. The English syllabus requires none. (The National Times, Sept 29 to Oct 4, 1975: 13)

Prescriptive courses are out, and the only guidelines teachers have are the broad ones laid down in the English primary schools' language curriculum and in the English syllabus for secondary schools. These are so general that, as one teacher put it, "every teacher can go his own way and do his own thing." (The Sydney Morning Herald, 21/8/1979: 11)

He claimed illiteracy has been helped by the new English syllabus of 1971. The syllabus meant teachers were supposed to stress the four skills of reading, writing, listening and speech—in that order.

"Whereas what has actually happened is the order has been reversed and reading and writing are very often ignored."

He said the problem could be traced back to a theory endorsed 10 years ago by a chairman of the English Syllabus Committee. (Sunday Telegraph, 17/3/74: 43)

"I don't think the problem lies in class sizes or school's physical resources, but in changes in school syllabuses which were not sufficiently tested before they were introduced. (The Australian, 3/3/1975: 3)

Ironically, however, as discussed in Chapter 2, study of the actual classroom implementation of the 1971 Syllabus, carried out after these ASSP and Goyen reports were released, and published as late as 1978, concluded that actual implementation of the Syllabus was not widespread:
... in most classrooms there has been only partial implementation of the Syllabus
(Watson, 1978: 350)

...in schools, where there is this commitment (to change), the 'new English' is succeeding;
but, taken as a whole, it seems that teachers are so modifying the Syllabus that relatively
little change is occurring (Watson, 1978: 365)

The "decline theories" which dominated media discussion of literacy during the first decade of
implementation of the 1971 Syllabus were a strong over-reaction to the relevant surveys and
were inappropriate in laying any blame for the alleged decline on the Syllabus itself.

5.2.2 ACES Review
Not all of the decline theory which formed part of the background against which the 1971
Syllabus was implemented was developed in the popular media. One group claiming
academic expertise, and, indeed, comprising a number of prominent academic figures, which
also "fed" the decline theory strongly in the 1970s, was the Australian Council for Educational
Standards, through its journal, ACES Review.

Marginson characterises the role of both ACES and the media in these terms:

Beginning in the mid-1970s, The Bulletin and The Australian allowed themselves to
function as the Black Papers of Australia...the standards debate was hardly a debate at
all...it took the form of a binary interaction between the media as the 'primary definers', a
select group of institutional heads, university experts, industry leaders and politicians
led by the cultural conservative educators in the Australian Council of Educational
Standards...The primary definers used the media to legitimate their position, while the
media used their statements to frame the debate...In this manner the primary definers
pre-constructed a consensus, and appealed to that consensus as the standard...Their
definition of the issues was rendered universal (Marginson, 1997:131)

The alliance of business figures, culturally conservative academics and conservative
politicians that formed the Australian Council for Educational Standards were relentless
throughout the 70s in their attack on educational standards and on levels of literacy through
ACES Review. Davis and Watson, in fact, place primary responsibility onto the "back to
basics" movement, as led by the Australian Council for Educational Standards, for the merely
partial implementation of the spirit of the "new English" Syllabuses in Australia (Davis and
The ACES journal was a national one, and thus the philosophies espoused were not presented solely in terms of NSW education. Nevertheless, the curriculum in NSW was included in discussion of ACES' dominant themes.

Perhaps remarkable among the discussions of literacy in ACES Review during his period was a lack of explicit definition of the word itself. Alone among contributors during the decade did Leonie Kramer attempt a definition and that quite idiosyncratic (it contained three aspects: "knowledge... of the cultural history of the human race"; clear expression and breadth of vocabulary [Kramer, 1976]). This seems further evidence of the unquestioned nature and "given-ness" of the term itself. It is not difficult to infer from the ACES articles the parameters of "literacy" as perceived by its contributors - and these were consistently represented in their writings (as "the basics"). First, of course, was performance in reading ability, which was in decline (Badcock, 1974; Hasluck, 1974; Just, 1974a; Rees, 1974; Boyson, 1975a, 1975b; Hunt, 1976) and then performance in writing ability, which was also in decline (Just, 1974a; Badcock, 1974; Hasluck, 1974; Rees, 1974; Boyson, 1975b; Hunt, 1976; Kramer, 1976). Yet the lament for falling standards of literacy from ACES was couched just as often in terms of falling standards in spoken English (Hasluck, 1974; Badcock, 1974; Just, 1974a; Firkins, 1977), or of a neglect of those "sub-sets" of writing skill: spelling, punctuation, and even handwriting (Boyson, 1975b; Bailey, 1976; Firkins, 1977; Akhurst, 1978).

Above all, however, the decline of literacy standards could be seen in the neglect of the study of grammar (Badcock, 1974; Hasluck, 1974; Just, 1974a; Dunn, 1975; Bailey, 1976; Firkins, 1977; Akhurst, 1977; Akhurst, 1978; Overman, 1978). Some of these writers (Just, 1974a; Dunn, 1975; Bailey, 1976) were aware of the research of those like Harris discussed in Chapter 4 above, or of arguments such as Moffett's about the lack of relationship between a conscious knowledge of grammar and correct grammatical usage, but such research was simply dismissed:

Do not think that I am not aware of the absurd proposition...that "English" is the one subject known to man in which analysis of a phenomenon does not lead to knowledge of such phenomenon. I take it for what it is, an absurd proposition...Because some researcher finds out that certain individuals do not practise the grammar they have been taught when they are back in their own ungrammatical environment, he is willing, in spite of all the evidence in the world, to advance the remarkable proposition I have just mentioned (Just, 1974a: 10)

5 To be fair, Dunn's rejection of research such as Harris' was based on his own research conducted on students at a CAE (Dunn, 1975)
A consistent theme in discussions of the neglect of grammar is that too much emphasis is being placed on "self-expression" (Badcock, 1974; Hasluck, 1974) and, hence, blame for decline is to be placed on "creative writing" (Badcock, 1974; Just, 1974a; Boyson, 1975b).

In reading, decline is blamed on the neglect of phonics and on the advocacy of "whole word" or "look-and-say" ("look-and-guess") approaches (Just, 1974b; Williams, 1977), or on the concept of reading readiness (Boyson, 1975b).

Above all else, however, the enemies of 'standards' are seen as progressivism and Romanticism. Rousseau and Dewey (or others' mis-readings of Dewey) are seen as the seed-beds of "inquiry methods" or "discovery learning", which have done so much to contribute to declining standards (Badcock, 1974; Conway, 1974; Just, 1974a, 1974b; Boyson, 1975b; Hackett, 1976; Scott, 1977; Williams, 1977; Akhurst, 1978).

Alongside these complaints was a continuing theme that great literature was being neglected and replaced in classrooms by mediocre "popular" texts, all in the name of "relevance" (Kramer, 1976; Hunt, 1977a; Hunt, 1977b; Hunt, 1978). Hunt placed the blame for this development squarely at the feet of John Dixon (Hunt, 1977a).

Other scapegoats for the alleged decline in literacy standards also ran consistently in ACES Review. These included complaints about the crowded curriculum, which was tending to push out room for the "basics" (Boyson, 1975b; Williams, 1977; Akhurst, 1978); the tendency to sacrifice excellence of standards for equality of opportunity (Boyson, 1975b; Hunt, 1977b; Firkins, 1977; Russell, 1979) and, finally, the poor quality of the teaching service itself - a result of either the low academic standards of those entering the service, or of poor training (Just, 1974b; Boyson, 1975a; Dunn, 1975; Kramer, 1976; Firkins, 1977; O'Donnell, 1977; Scott, 1977; Williams, 1977). 6

Equally importantly for the present study, English Syllabuses in NSW, both the 1971 Years 7-10 Syllabus, and the newer Primary Language Syllabus, were often directly blamed for the decline:

The coincidence of illiteracy in the lower forms of certain secondary schools and new approaches to curricula already implemented at both primary and secondary levels of schooling seems to warrant investigation...English teaching restricted to self-imposed

---

6 One writer even blamed "the very narrow lives teachers experience in relation to the rest of the community" (Firkins, 1977, p.5).
personal writing and literature...is leaving significant gaps in the required skills of a large school population (Badcock, 1974: 6-8)

the subject still called English has degenerated into a mess of pop culture, film-making and the examination of topical (that is to say ephemeral) journalism. Pop song lyrics of repetitive banality and the comments of columnists provide the comfort of the familiar, but neither the sustaining nourishment nor the challenge and example of best writing. How can one expect a discriminating use of language from students who are increasingly being required to read and discuss material limited in itself and therefore bound to stunt their linguistic and mental development? (Kramer, 1976: 7).

The general effect of (the 1974 NSW Primary Language Curriculum) is one of sugar-coated shallowness...Children are now reaching Year 6 who have never heard of a noun or a verb. Punctuation is an unsolved mystery (Akhurst, 1977: 5-7).

Grammar is now the dirtiest seven letter word in the language...in comparison with the (NSW) English secondary syllabus, the mathematics syllabus for first year high school students loads the thirteen year old with at least fifty technical terms and the manner of their application. The English syllabus requires none. (Thea Astley, quoted in Akhurst, 1977: 7)

the statement in the new English Syllabus for New South Wales Primary Schools on the inadvisability of teaching grammar must be treated with extreme caution (Dunn, 1975: 1).

It was against this background of curricular concern for "language-across-the-curriculum" and of concern for an alleged decline in literacy standards that the 1971 Syllabus was implemented. Thus, Chapters 4 and 5 have attempted to provide a "written curriculum" context, as well as a broader context of curriculum discussion and something of a social context for the next chapter - which is to be the first of Medway's "slices of time" in which a definition of English is to be considered in terms of the Christie thesis.
CHAPTER 6
CONSTRUCTIONS OF "ENGLISH" IN NSW
IN 1977

As already discussed in Chapter 3, Medway (1990) has provided a precedent for an interesting variant on curriculum-history methodology. In his own study of the period 1958-1968 in the UK, he set "to account for aspects of English as practised today, to throw light both on what is distinctive about English in relation to other school subjects, and, more generally, to provide a case study of how curriculum is made in England and Wales" (p. 3). Unusually, he chose to pursue these aims by foregoing a continuous narrative of the ten-year period in favour of the in-depth study of the two years which constituted the beginning and end years of his study. His methodology is, effectively, to "cut slices" through the period and to attempt to illuminate it by an in-depth examination of the "slices". While such a methodology sacrifices breadth and continuity, it allows for consideration of greater depth.

One advantage of taking particular years as "slices of time", despite the risks of partiality and the potential for their being atypical, is the possibility of examining all published sources. Medway's procedure is to seek to examine all the books and articles which were published in Britain about the teaching of English as a first language in the years 1958 and 1968, with the exception of material which fell outside his chosen age group. He argues that this allows him to infer reasonably about (a) what was taken as normal practice and (b) what bids for changes were being made.

I have also discussed in Chapter 3 the advantages of Medway's methodology for the present study. The issue of how English is defined is a broad one and coverage over a continuous period, even one of sixteen years, between the publication of the 1971 Syllabus and that which succeeded it, could easily lead to problems of superficial generalisation. However, an in-depth study of two points in that period has the potential to make some considered statements about how complex the issues of definition may have been at the time, rather than to accept glib assumptions about the general tenor and influences of a period.

My first relevant date for a study of how subject English was conceptualised by the profession is 1977. In that year, the NSW English Teachers' Association published a substantial "method book" (to use Medway's term), English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow. Hence, my sources for this part of the study will be firstly, those sites of curriculum discussion in which the subject is likely to be defined through intellectual debate – English in secondary...
schools: Today and tomorrow and the relevant ETA journals from 1977 in NSW. Those key local journals were the Newsletter of the NSW English Teachers' Association; its journal, The teaching of English and the national journal, English in Australia. The latter is not of course confined to NSW alone, but as it is automatically available in NSW as part of membership of that state's professional body, it is important to include it as part of this study, since it is potentially an important forum for curriculum discussion in every state. It is worth noting at this point that, like Medway, Hodgson's (1974) history of English teaching in the UK relies heavily on content analysis of The use of English from 1949 to 1962 as a visible longitudinal indicator of how English teaching reacted to his identified dimensions of change (p. 282ff).

My choice of 'method' book and school textbooks is made by selecting those which were both published in Australia in 1977 and also reviewed in these journals. Again, it is reasonable to assume that, if reviewed in these journals, they are likely to be representing a perspective on the subject in this state. Of course, international material is also of great relevance, but in order to make the scope of the study manageable, I will confine myself to those journals and books produced on the Australian scene. Thus international influences, which were of course central, will be studied as they are represented in local material.

Adapting Medway's methodology, then, I will investigate in this section:

- the locally produced material which contained the professional, intellectual discussion of the subject English in 1977.

- the subject as represented in school textbooks of the time—those textbooks reviewed in the professional journals.

I will also supplement Medway's sources by:

- including as part of my study an analysis of the interpretation of English as embodied in relevant systems-wide official examinations. As stated in Chapter 3, Barnes and Seed have argued that "a public examination is ... a message about curriculum priorities" (Barnes and Seed, 1984). For NSW in 1977 the relevant examination was the School Certificate Reference test in English.

- interviews with relevant personnel, viz.
  - the editors of the relevant journals in 1977
  - an editor of the key "method book" released by the ETA in that year.
6.1 How subject "English" was being defined in the professional literature of NSW English teachers

A summary of all chapters and articles from the relevant professional literature is contained in Tables 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4. What follows is a discussion of that series of summaries.

The professional literature of 1977 certainly reflects the spirit contained in the 1971 Syllabus of active language production. There is an emphasis on spoken language (Crocker, 1977; Robinson, 1977; Britton, 1977; Williams, 1977), though writing pedagogy itself undergoes a paradigm shift when Walshe asks the question, "How do real writers write?" (1977a). The study of drama strongly advocates an approach based on performance, with particular emphasis being placed on improvisation (Lewis, 1977; Ward, 1977a; Mallick, 1977; Shepherd, 1977; Arnold, 1977b, 1977c). Wide reading schemes are seen as important (Carroll et al, 1977; Stratford, 1977d). Mass media is important, including the use of video and film, though the degree of advocacy involved suggests media production, at least, is still not widespread in practice (Turner, 1977; Dwyer, 1977; Stratford, 1977a; Field, 1977; Mackinlay, 1977) - in fact, "converting TV viewers" is still seen as an aim of English by some (Smith, 1977). Group discussion is strongly favoured for all areas of English (Christie, 1977; Carroll et al, 1977; Rothery, 1977; Williams, 1977)

6.1.1 The place of literature

The relationship between Cambridge and London "schools" on the question of language-centred/literature-centred curriculum during the 60s and 70s constitutes one of the central debates about the history of English curriculum (Hamley, 1979; Ball, 1982, 1985; Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990; Mathieson, 1975; Medway, 1990; Green, 1990). Essentially the position of the "London school" vis-a-vis the "Cambridge school" over the issue of "language" and "literature" is represented in curriculum histories of English in two very different scenarios. In one, the history of English in the UK throughout that period is viewed as basically the triumph of London (English as the pupil's language) over Cambridge (English as great literature) (Ball, 1987). In a quite different scenario, Cambridge and "growth" are seen as essentially issuing out of the same origins in Romanticism and progressivism. Romantic values are seen as standing behind both the literature-centred and "growth" positions in giving primacy to individual response and to "experience" (Hamley, 1979; Medway, 1990; Green 1995b). It is this very scenario - the effective combining of London ("personal growth") and Cambridge ("personal response") views - that is behind Christie's argument about the

---

1 For a fuller discussion of this issue, see the Review of Literature above.
neglect of the study of language-as-social-semiotic in this country (Christie, 1993; Christie et al, 1991; also Patterson, 1993).

However, as I have argued in Chapter 4, emphasising the commonalities between "cultural heritage" and "personal growth" on the grounds that they both value individual voices when so much of the work of "growth model" advocates like Dixon had been to distance themselves from the view of curriculum represented by the Leavis/Cambridge School seems a difficult case to sustain. Indeed, the notion of "personal response", which Christie and others see as almost equivalent to "personal growth", has a quite different origin and meaning in the "new English" as represented by Dixon from what it had for Leavis (Dixon, 1975: 56). Both Britton and Dixon "placed" literature through its inclusion on the Transactional- Poetic-Expressive continuum in a way that Leavis would clearly reject - literature not as "selected tradition", but as "elaborated form" (Burgess, 1993: 109).

Moreover, Christie and others neglect the complexity that overlay both "growth" and the London-Cambridge relationship. Hodgson (Chs 11-12), for example, writing contemporaneously with many of these developments, sees the important dichotomy as "growth-transmission", with the former term of this binary including Halliday, Dixon and Barnes, and also Holbrook, but he also argues that growth itself had both "radical" and "reformist strands" - a position re-affirmed by Ball (1987) and Ball, Kenny and Gardiner (1990). Also writing contemporaneously, Mathieson (Chs 9-10) sees the key convergence of progressive theories with modern linguistics via Halliday, and a consequent opposition to the elitism of Leavis and Cambridge. Finally, Ball has produced a series of complex two-dimensional models to take account of the number and complexity of models operating from the mid-1960s (1982, 1985 and Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990).

Despite the perception of contemporaneous critics such as Inglis (1975), Whitehead (1976,1978) and Allen (1980) that "growth" represented a down-grading of literature, it needs to be noted that the value of "literature" as a central pillar of English - though one among four - is not contested in the 1971 Syllabus itself. Of the four nominated "contexts" - everyday communication, media, personal expression and literature, the latter receives by far the longest section of discussion and detail in the Syllabus, with the document stressing relevance, breadth and depth of experience, as well as variety of response (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 13-14).

Nevertheless, the value of "literature" as the organising centre of English is the subject of lively debate in NSW in 1977 - and such debate revolves around the binary structure of "literature-centred" vs. "language-centred" curriculum. Robinson, then editor of The teaching of English, recalls that "it seemed to be felt there was some dichotomy between the study of
language and literature”. He believes that “some people saw literature study as peripheral, that the real game was the study of language” (Robinson, 2001). *English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow* sets up such a dichotomy in which Walshe (1977c) draws on the arguments of Britton to argue the case for an “English” based on using language in relation to the child’s experience: the shaping of identity, of self. “Literature” needs to sit alongside other experiences, and needs to include in its definition the children’s own writing. The latter point, of course, is also the position of Dixon. On the other hand, Smith (1977) argues that in centring on “language” or “experience”, English is losing its distinctive identity. In the former, English is indistinguishable from what the whole curriculum should be doing, and in the latter, the distinctive texts of “English” - literature - are relegated to just other “voices” in the classroom “conversation”. Literature, argues Smith, extends the range of student experience and, indeed, by stimulating writing and drama, involves direct student experience.

Much of the argument in favour of a “literature-centred” approach - and, hence, “against” a “language-centred approach” focuses on the coursebooks of the time, which are attacked by the former school as taking an approach which debases literature. (The traditional genres of poetry and novel constitute the definition of “literature” in the professional debates, though drama is becoming something more of a contested area, as discussed below). Homer (1977), for example, is critical of these sourcebooks and some “growth” teaching in taking the context away from particular pieces of literature and replacing these with thematic work. He argues that even post- Sampson-Newbolt-Leavis, literature remains the “something” which is talked or written about in “English”. He fears the loss of literature as linguistic artefact and advocates a sociolinguistic approach to literature which accepts the work of Britton and Moffett by emphasising the relationship between the language of literature and the language of life. A course in literature that stresses sociolinguistics would break out of the “Language/Literature” dichotomy that bedevils English by treating literature in terms of speech situations and communicative acts. Packer (1977) also attacks inter-disciplinary and thematic approaches to English, because, he argues, they are based on false assumptions about the analogies between different contexts (“situations”) and because linguistics and literature are lost sight of and programming in schools becomes purely arbitrary rather than sequential. Kramer (1977) decries the separation of language and literature because she wishes “English” to focus on the study of “grammar, vocabulary and areas of reference” as used in literature.

The Leavissite “preachers of culture” (Mathieson, 1975) view is not prominent in the debate in NSW. Smith sees literature as the key voice stimulating writing, Kramer as providing a focus for language study, and Homer’s whole approach to literature is a linguistic-based one which wishes to see an approach to literature in terms of Hallidayan sociolinguistic study. In fact, a common call from the “literature-centred” side of these debates is for the integration of
language and literature. Case (1977a) advocates language-based close study of poetry and
English in secondary schools contains five pages of teaching ideas based on the integration of
language and literature in popular novels of the time (Harkin and Carleberg, 1977a). Eagleson
(1977b) discusses the implications of the study of dialects for the study of literature.
Boardman (1977) tries to break out of the debate by naming the specific content of English as
the two poles of literature and the study of language -as-sociolinguistic system. Even Smith's
argument that literature is to find its validity as a key site for student writing highlights the
very notion of "authorship" that Green (1990) sees as one of the radicalising tendencies of the
"Growth Model project" (pp.148-50). While the latter point might indeed suggest the very
alliance between literature and "growth" for which Christie argues, the key issue is that
literature in these debates is not conceived of in terms of cultural heritage or the Leavisite
version of "personal response", but as a linguistic enterprise. Indeed, it had been conceived as
such by Dixon, who saw linguistics as central to the study of literature (Dixon, 1975: 79-80).

6.1.2 The teaching of literature

In addition to the previous arguments about integrating literature with close language study,
and accompanying teaching ideas, the dominant teaching ideas for literature in Years 7-10
advocated in the professional reading revolve around:
• class and group discussion
• improvisation and dramatic re-enactment
• the validating of personal reaction, especially through writing and
• imaginative re-creation activities in the manner of Stratta, Dixon and Wilkinson's Patterns
  of language (1973).
There is, however, a lone voice in 1977 favouring traditional literary criticism (Murison,
1977b) and a Leavisite-oriented "values" approach (Murison, 1977a).

6.1.3 Language

6.1.3.1 Learning language

As in the Syllabus itself, "language" is the preferred term for "English" in curriculum debate at
this time. Language development in the secondary school years, and even earlier, is the
subject of some discussion in the literature. Halliday has articles on early language
development (1977a) and language development in the middle school years (1977b), while
Watson (1977) too addresses language development from 5-18. Spoken language receives the
due place accorded it in the Syllabus (Watson, 1977; Stratta and Wilkinson, 1977; Crocker,
1977; Boardman, 1977; Rothery, 1977; Britton, 1977; Carroll et al, 1977) and the professional
literature of the time stresses teaching ideas for reading, writing, speaking and listening.
Language is seen as best learnt "in use", and this notion is usually discussed in terms that
distinguish it from learning a set of rules about language (Judy, 1977; Boardman, 1977; Carroll

6.1.3.2 Learning about language

So far we have seen that, in terms of the Hallidayan triad - learning language, learning through language and learning about language - that learning about language had at least some emphasis on the study of language-as-system in the context of literature. More will be said about this aspect of language below in the section on "Grammar". However, it can be said that discussions of learning about language are firmly centred in a sociolinguistic rhetorical mode.

Halliday (1977b) appears in English in Australia advocating use of the Language in Use materials because they take an approach to language as "resource" as opposed to the approach of American structuralism to language as "rule". (In fact, much discussion in the selected literature refers to the former as the preferred term in the Hallidayan binary structure of "rule/resource"). As well as the general approach to the study of language in social contexts (see, for example, Gough, 1977), Halliday's specific call for the Language in use materials is echoed in the literature (Boardman, 1977; Harkin and Carleberg, 1977b). In a description of a specialist speech course at his school, Robinson (1977) describes the contents of the course focusing on the use of language in society. There is an emphasis on the live audience and live performance and the whole course is set in the general context of communication, and is again seen as putting into practice Halliday's notion of language-as-resource over language-as-rule. Thus, it is seen as operating in a context of rhetoric. Even Dixon himself, in an article with Gill (1977), advocates for senior English an alternative view of the subject which approximates what would come to be known as "cultural studies": a curriculum which includes study of media, everyday language, workplace language, songs, social and political issues - language study which is to issue from language in use in real situations.

6.1.3.3 Learning through language

In Chapter 4 it was argued that in being conceptualised as "language", "English" in the 1971 Syllabus was overlapping with the concerns of the total curriculum. This was because of the twin influences of the London School and of Moffett, both of whom were conceptualising "English" in ways that took it beyond the traditional concerns of the single subject itself. Barnes, Britton and Dixon were seeing "language" as a tool of cognition and as the tool of constructivist learning and Moffett was seeing it as the realm of a whole "universe of discourse". In Chapter 5, it was pointed out that the Syllabus was, in fact, being implemented in a context that included the spread of the "language across the curriculum" movement. Moreover, in terms of Halliday's triad, "English" in the Syllabus was taking a view of "learning through language" in a context in which Barnes was making problematic the language of subjects as vehicles for learning and, at the same time, valorising the essentially
constructivist notion that students may use language to "talk or write themselves into understanding" by connecting new knowledge to current experience.

This view of "English" - as going beyond the traditional concerns of the single subject itself, and as concerned with essentially cognitive-constructivist notions of learning in general - saturates the professional literature of 1977. The British theorists most often referred to are Britton and Barnes. The role of talk and writing in learning is discussed precisely in the terms formulated by Britton, such as "talking oneself into understanding", "representing experience" or "attaching new knowledge to old" (Annells et al, 1977; Boardman, 1977; Stratta and Wilkinson, 1977; Britton, 1977; Rothery, 1977; Williams, 1977; Ashworth, 1977; Keford, 1977; Carroll et al, 1977; Goodman and Goodman, 1977). Writing is discussed and analysed in terms of Britton's transactional-expressive-poetic functions (Annells et al, 1977; Latham, Judith, 1977; Walshe, 1977d; Lee, 1977). Boardman (1977) also reflects Barnes' concern with
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2 The international literature on conceptualising the subject "English" and on teaching methodology which is reviewed in the three relevant journals is also overwhelmingly British, rather than American. For example, apart from English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow itself, five other books on "Teaching principles and practice" were reviewed in the 1977 AATE Guide to English books and all were British (Arnold, 1977a: 7-10). These were:
- Douglas Barnes, From communication to curriculum, pub.1976 ("a very useful book", p.7)
- Michael Stubbs, Language, schools and classrooms: Contemporary sociology of the school, pub.1976 ("an important, inspiring book", p.9)
- Sara Delamont, Interaction in the classroom: Contemporary sociology of the school, pub.1976 ("will add new dimensions to the perceptions of classroom teachers", p.9)
- Michael Saunders, Developments in English teaching, pub.1976 ("an excellent introduction to current problems and issues in English teaching", p.10)
- Peter Abbs, Root and blossom: Essays on the philosophy, practice and politics of English teaching, pub. 1976 ("concerned to stimulate reflection and evaluation of one's aims and practices", p.10)

The extent to which this British influence is concerned with language across the curriculum is even more evident in the 1978 AATE Guide to English books (Arnold, 1978), where those international books actually published in 1977 were reviewed. Apart from three titles by the NSW ETA, the books reviewed in this collection were:
- Margaret Mallett and Bernard Newsome, Talking, writing and learning, pub 1977 ("order a copy of this splendid book for your staff", p.5)
- Roger Gurney, Language, learning and remedial teaching, pub 1976 ("provide[s]...long-term development of the teacher's competence based on reflection and further study", p.6)
- David Crystal, Child language, learning and linguistics: An overview for the therapeutic professions, pub.1976 ("the book is a useful one", p.7)
- Jon Cook, 32 Voices from Bunbury to Perth with the language and learning project, pub. 1977 ("an excellent resource book", p.7)
- Michael Marland, Language across the curriculum, pub. 1977 ("required reading", p.9)
- NATE, Language across the curriculum: Guidelines for schools, pub 1976 ("I would order copies for the whole staff", p.9)
- Joan Tough, Talking and learning, pub. 1977 ("very valuable indeed", p.10)
- West Sussex County Council, Children and language, pub. 1976 ("an excellent starting point", p.10)
- G. Riddell and D. Guilland, Teaching active or passive, pub. 1977 ("soundly based research", p.10)
- Cedric Culliford, Teaching children English: A language policy for primary and middle schools, pub. 1977 ("Many of the ideas are very good", p.10).

Nine of these ten titles are British, and all ten are concerned with "language", mostly in the sense of "across the curriculum".
the language of subjects being a foreign language to many children, who ought to be allowed to use their own language to grapple with subject content.

Moreover, language "across the curriculum" is written about in a way that seems to reflect the consciousness of subject English as at least being the basis of the total curriculum. Boomer (1977: 8) calls on English teachers to show the importance of language to their colleagues in other curriculum areas and "invite them to come with us". Ward (1977b) argues that language development is a whole-school responsibility and dramatic method is seen as applicable across the curriculum, "since a teacher teaches people, not subjects" (Lewis, 1977). Research on writing across the curriculum appears in English journals (Anells et al, 1977; Walshe, 1977d), and Boardman's (1977: 366) particular slant on this theme is that "every teacher is a teacher of English" - highlighting the extent to which "English" has become synonymous with "language":

we need an experience-centred English - or better still an integrated experience-centred curriculum (Walshe, 1977b:161)
in practice it is likely to be the English teacher who carries the banner when it comes to asserting the important place of language in education (Collerson, 1977: 8)

Thus the professional literature of the time, in terms of Halliday's triad conceptualises English on all three arms of that triad - "English" is about "learning language"; it is concerned with "learning about language" in ways that are specifically within a "rhetorical tradition": a study of language as a sociolinguistic system concerned with audiences and purposes; and, finally, English is concerned with "learning through language" in ways that reflect cognitive-constructivist view of learning across subject areas. As I have shown in Chapters 4 and 5, the totality with which the professional literature of the time reflected this triad echoes the nature of the Syllabus itself.

6.1.4 "Non-Standard-ness"
One trend in histories of English which has come to be led by Ian Hunter (1988) sees "growth" as not so much a result of ideas that began with Newbolt, or Dixon or even Arnold, but rather, especially in its manifestation as "personal response pedagogy", as a pragmatic response to a climate of greater student numbers, a more diversified population with greater management problems, and the need for enhanced methods of observation and correction. "Response" in the 70s is seen by this school of thought as the public expression of personal experience enriched by the action of looking within the self - revealing the "inner self" to a teacher who is both friend and judge becomes a form of observation and management (Patterson, 1993). Whatever one's view of this, it is certainly true that the professional literature of this period is frequently concerned with the issues created by "non-Standard"
dialect students, especially working class and migrant students. Yule (1977) writes, for example, of children from inner and poorer outer suburbs being more likely than middle-class children to have limited language skills compared to children from more highly educated homes. There is concern for "remedial/retarded" readers (Carozzi, 1977, Stratford, 1977c). This is placed in the context of the underachievement of working-class children, based on the belief that schools are not hospitable to these children (Carozzi, 1977). Horvath (1977), relying heavily on the work of Roger Shuy on dialect bias in American language testing, writes of the need for standardised testing to take account of dialect, culture and value systems. Eagleson (1977a, 1977b) is particularly concerned to broaden teachers' perceptions of correctness - to abandon the attempt to eliminate the "errors" of non-Standard dialect and to adopt a model that favours extending the range of the child's language types, rather than eliminating non-Standard. The stress is on Standard English as a dialect, albeit the dialect of power, and the model becomes one of "supplementation" rather than elimination (see also Carroll et al, 1977).

Whitton (1977) advocates the introduction into teacher training of core courses in multicultural education, because of what he sees as essentially assimilationist practices that result in educational failure for migrant children, while Phillips (1977) calls for migrant children not to be mistakenly placed in "remedial reading" classes, when their real problems are often to do with spoken language and such withdrawal will remove them from mainstream ESL assistance.

6.2 The place of "literacy" in the professional literature of NSW English teachers

6.2.1 References to "literacy"

Just as in the Syllabus itself, the key point to make about the concept of "literacy" in the professional literature of 1977 is that, again, it is an unproblematic "given". Watson, joint editor of English in secondary schools recalls it as such (Watson, 2000), as does Robinson, then editor of The teaching of English ("I do not recall literacy being the issue that it is now" - Robinson, 2001). Again, just as in the Syllabus, there is an uncontested sense in 1977 that "literacy" is within the province of "English" in NSW secondary education, and that the word itself simply refers to the skills of reading and writing. (Phillips, 1977; Parker, 1977a, 1977b; Little, 1977a, 1977b; Judy, 1977). In fact, the extract from Bullock contained in English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow deplores any separation of "Reading" from "English", such as is manifested in the USA (Bullock Report extract, 1977), while Judy's essay in that volume effectively equates "English" with "literacy" (Judy, 1977). Watson recalls that literacy "was assumed to be the English teacher's job" (Watson, 2000).
Nevertheless, the concept of literacy does come under much conscious discussion in the context of contemporary discussion of the literacy crises and calls for "back-to-basics" (see Chapter 5 above), rather than in any sense of needing to be defined. Parker (1977a) argues that the question of "standards" is one that cannot be separated from one's view of education and of literacy and that as a society adopts increasingly narrow, mechanistic views of testing, so too does its very definition of literacy become narrower, tighter and increasingly minimalist - an argument strongly reinforced by Little's (1977a) then recent experience in the USA. The sense of reaction to the literacy crisis of the time that comes from the contemporary literature is not one of being under siege, but rather one of attacking the past failure of the very methods to which journals like ACES Review are advocating a return. Judy (1977), for example, argues that historically English teachers have taught little else other than "basic skills" in the sense of grammar drill, workbook exercises and spelling and that it manifestly has not worked in changing language behaviour. Little (1977b) expresses a similar view and goes further by using Goyen's study \(^5\) to show that recency of schooling is a factor in improved literacy.

6.2.2 Reading in the 1977 literature

All of the Syllabus' macro-skills areas receive discrete sections\(^6\) in the text English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow (Watson and Eagleson, 1977). Reading thus receives a substantial section of that "method" text, quite apart from its discussion in the relevant journals. Concern with reading specifically in the 1977 professional literature is manifested in a very specific set of themes.

The first of these is in the detail of the process of reading. This had not been detailed in the Syllabus, and its prominence in 1977 pre-figures one of the main areas of supplementation that was to be included in the succeeding NSW Syllabus for Years 7-10. The approach to reading processes is firmly within the psycholinguistic view of the reading process popularised by Frank Smith (1971) and the Goodmans (Gollasch, 1982). Emphasis is on meaning-comprehension, downplaying the visual system and on prediction. Phonics is seen as a factor, but not the central one. The reader brings meaning to the text; meaning is just not on the page. The consequences of this process for teaching include: the notion that children "learn to read by reading"; using a minimum of word drills and identification exercises and assessment based on the quality of "meaning-getting" (Latham, Ross, 1977; Goodman and Goodman, 1977).

\(^5\) See Chapter 5 above.

\(^6\) Talking and listening, though named, are combined in the one section of the text.
The importance of wide reading - one of the Syllabus' key concerns about reading - is another clear theme. Smith (1977), Carroll et al. (1977) and Stratford (1977d) each advocate wide reading and/or silent reading time in class, with specific suggestions about implementation, while Stratford (1977b) also sees its value for students' spelling.

The third theme to emerge from the literature on reading is the concern for backward/remedial readers (for example, Carozzi, 1977; Stratford, 1977c; Moore and Eltis, 1977) and a common thread running through this concern is one of seeing poor reading as a symptom of other issues - it both picks up the Syllabus' refusal to accept deficit models and looks forward to the later notion of literacy as a social phenomenon. Carozzi (1977), for example, sees the contemporary "remedial orthodoxy" as putting testing before issues such as: how to make schools more hospitable to working class children; how to encourage teachers to respect, celebrate and build on the language and experience children bring to school and how to stop organisational procedures such as streaming from undermining the confidence and self-worth of such children. Similarly, Phillips (1977) demonstrates a kind of spoken equivalent of the "running record" which enables teachers to detect spoken and written language errors and shows that "migrant" children's errors occur more in spoken language. Her piece is a plea not to mistakenly place NESB students into "remedial reading" and away from mainstream ESL assistance.

English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow (Watson and Eagleson, 1977), a "method book" for English teachers, also contains a substantial extract from the Bullock Report (p.260-71) discussing strategies for reading among older students in curriculum areas - confirming again that "language across the curriculum" was seen, at least by some at the leading edge of the profession, as synonymous with "English across the curriculum".

6.2.3 Writing in the 1977 literature

The models and theories most frequently cited for writing pedagogy in the 1977 literature are those of Britton, Martin and the London Institute team. Britton's function categories are almost universally accepted as underlying models for a variety of approaches to writing. Ashworth (1977), for example, simply summarises the work of Britton in terms of language functions and participant/spectator roles. Others, also citing Martin and Britton, argue that the writer's purpose is the central issue in writing (Kefford, 1977; Lee, 1977). A Tasmanian "Language across the curriculum" project almost replicates Britton's Schools Council Research Project (Britton et al, 1975) by surveying the amount and kind of teacher-initiated writing produced by students in one day in Grades 7-10 in Tasmanian high schools and by surveying

---

5 The only critique - and that based on misunderstanding - is provided by Gough (1977).
teachers' opinions about the role of writing in learning (Annells et al, 1977). The results also echoed Britton's: virtually no continuous writing outside English and Social Sciences; very little "poetic" and "expressive" writing; a predominance of "transactional" writing classified as "exercises" and few examples of generalising, theorising or speculating. Lists of topics and ideas for programming writing are also heavily influenced by Britton's function categories (Latham, Judith, 1977; Walshe, 1977d).

A different approach to writing based on American influences such as Donald Murray, and one that was to be profoundly significant in NSW in later years, is introduced by Walshe in 1977, when he begins to discuss writing processes. In introducing audience-response and in asking the question, "How do real writers write?", Walshe initiates a genuine paradigm shift that was to be widely taken up in the 80s, and was to be influential in the framing of the succeeding Syllabus. His model in 1977 was that of "Experience/Pre-Writing/ Draft Writing/Re-Writing/ Publication/Response" (Walshe, 1977a, 1977d).

Finally, in other areas, spelling is conceptualised in the context of writing (Stratford, 1977b) and journal writing begins to be advocated (Payne, 1977).

I have argued in Chapter 4 that the Syllabus itself, in the Writing section, stressed individual experience, but in the context of conventional forms and purposes such as description, narration, argument, exposition. Certainly the literature of 1977 echoes the Britton-Dixon concern with the individual's "representation of experience". Ashworth sees this as the real pedagogical function of writing and deems expressive writing "central". For Walshe, individualising the writing program (1977d) and emphasising Britton's shaping of identity, of "self" is the key element in writing (1977c). No emphasis is given to those writing forms suggested by the Syllabus (narration, exposition, description etc.), but neither is there any particular emphasis on student choice - if there is any refrain on this issue, it is simply to stress breadth of experience: a range of forms and a range of audiences (Judy, 1977; Dixon and Gill, 1977; Walshe, 1977b; Edwards, 1977; Harkin and Carleberg, 1977c).

6.2.4 Grammar in the 1977 literature

It will be remembered that the "Introduction" to the 1971 Syllabus effectively removed the conscious study of grammar from being an objective of subject English, although I have argued that the Syllabus was not so much "proscribing" (Nay-Brock, 1984: 243) the study of grammar as arguing that competence in its use was a more fundamental objective than its conscious analysis, and that the one did not necessarily depend on the other. In general, this is also the theme of the 1977 professional literature. Ashworth (1977: 292), for example, in discussing the triad of learning language, learning through language and learning about language argues that the latter is regarded as "not helpful" in "acquiring language ability".
Watson (1977) reviews research on language development during the years of schooling and argues that syntactic development itself has been shown to develop with least deliberate intervention - the implied conclusion being that whatever its merits as an object of study, the study of grammar is irrelevant to improved language use.

This argument is often placed in the context of the 70s literacy crisis. English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow reproduces an article by Judy (1977) on current US debates on "basic skills". His argument is that historically English teachers have taught little else other than "basic skills" in the sense of grammar drill, workbook exercises, spelling etc. and that, if standards are indeed falling, then it is precisely these "basics" that have failed. In asking the question, "What is a 'basic skill' anyway?" (the ability to converse and write successfully for one's own purposes and in a range of situation), he is able to re-define traditional "grammar" study as a "frill" which is learned naturally and intuitively to a great degree. Such "frills" as grammar, he argues, are best developed in the context of the "basics" of articulateness. Little, too (1977a), against the background of the 70s literacy crisis, warns against the American route of focusing on grammar, as manifested in small mastery steps, fill-in-the-blanks exercises and a generally pre-packaged US curriculum.

6.3 How subject "English" was being defined in school textbooks

While distinctions were sometimes drawn through the 1970s and 1980s between "course books" and "source books" (Sawyer, Adams and Watson, 1989: 88), for the present purposes, those books (and resource kits) produced for in-class use directly by students will be termed "textbooks". Those textbooks published in Australia in 1977 and reviewed in one or more of the three relevant journals (over 1977-78) were:

- Burton, A. et al (1977). Whywords: The shapes of shadows. Sydney: Reed Education. Whywords is a series of four books on the study of the purposes for which everyday language is used. The set is based on Halliday’s (1975) seven functions of language, with activities and units based on a Hallidayan function, or combination of functions. The shapes of shadows is the book in the series based on Halliday’s imaginative function. It contains extracts, cartoons, photographs, artwork, poetry, based largely around myth, science fiction and the visual arts. The past and the future are key themes. Students discuss and write responses to the stimulus material.

---

4 The American experience is echoed in Lee's small research study, which showed pupils in 1972 had inferred from their teachers largely the importance of grammar, paragraphing and the use of writing as punishment (Lee, 1977).

*Wordswork* contains a series of chapters in which students are asked to study and analyse the forms of language used in particular contexts: politics and revolution; humour and satire; dialect and situation; argument and debate; religion; news and comment; literary criticism; sport and recreation; love; work. Each chapter provides a number of examples of the form with accompanying activities, mostly analytical.


*Heuristic adventures* is a series of discrete, individual workcards on a large range of thematic topics such as "guns", "dragons", "crime and punishment", "the big country", "the world of pop" etc. Each card contains a number of open-ended activities related to the theme, rather than to any stimulus material on the card itself. Nevertheless, the cards are colourful, lively and highly varied.


*The meaning machine* has students copying particular sentence structures in each chapter. Students also learn Latinate grammatical terminology.


*Communicate* is a series of three audio-cassettes, with accompanying transcripts and activities in a student's book and an accompanying teacher's book. Fifty-one speech acts in all are included. The activities accompanying each speech are not in identical formats. Students listen to the tapes and complete various activities such as:

- reading and discussing the reactions of other listeners to the same speech acts
- analysing the transcript in terms of its spoken features
- discussion of issues arising from the content of the material
- completing listening-based activities ranging from simple recall to critical judgements, drawing inferences and expressing opinions
- developing their own classroom improvisations from the material.


*Language one* has a traditional "workbook" structure in each chapter which comprises:

- a passage followed by a series of "comprehension" questions
- a number of exercises focusing on identifying a particular part of speech, eg "noun"
- a number of exercises aimed at developing aspects of that particular part of speech, eg making plurals and possessives
- some vocabulary exercises, such as word meanings
- some punctuation exercise, usually involving correction of a non-edited passage
- puzzles etc., such as "find-a-word"
- a list of topics about which to write and/or talk

• Sadler, R.K. and Young, P.A. (1977). Write now: Some stimuli for reading and writing. Sydney: William Brooks. This text is divided into a large number of very short sections, each comprising:
  - a black-and-white photograph followed by a number of writing topics loosely based on the photograph. Some of these tasks are restricted in length to one or two paragraphs.
  - one or two passages followed by a series of "comprehension" questions

• Walters, Barry and Allen, Les (1977). Learning through language. Sydney: Pergamon. Learning through language takes a thematic approach to language. Chapters (units) are based on particular themes such as "Trains and dragons", "Lighthouses", "Heroes". Individual chapters contain not only speaking, reading and writing activities around the theme, but also a section with a specific skills focus: spelling, usage, punctuation, vocabulary, idiom, sentence building. The latter are referred to in the "Introduction" as "literacy skills". The language tasks contained in each chapter are outlined at the beginning of each chapter, as well as how those tasks are related. Chapter one, for example, outlines three reading tasks, a picture study, a note making task and a class discussion - all leading toward a writing task. A specific question to be answered leads outward to a mime activity, a project and the production of pictographs. The writing assignments are seen as the core of each chapter (unit), and the activities and skills-building as leading towards these tasks. Indeed, the core writing tasks are the raison d'etre of the book. Groups of chapters (usually three) are followed by an "interlude" of "creative writing", in which "freer rein" (p.6) is given to the imagination.

In 1980, a group of teachers led by Halliday produced a set of criteria for the evaluation of student textbooks by teachers which are based on premises about language learning. These criteria read very much like a definitive list of criteria for evaluating classroom activities that would/would not support the 1971 Syllabus (for example, "Is language seen as rule, or resource?" "Is language seen as fundamental to the development of thought, feeling and behaviour?"). Because of that, the criteria remain valuable for judging textbooks of the period precisely in terms of whether those textbooks conform to the view of English represented by the Syllabus. These criteria are contained in Table 6.5 below: "Halliday's framework for analysis". This enables a set of matrices to be established in which each of the textbooks published and reviewed in Australia in 1977 can be evaluated. A detailed analysis in such a
set of matrices, according to Halliday’s criteria, is also contained in Table 6.5. What follows is a summary discussion of that analysis.

6.3.1 School textbooks and their rationale(s)
The first point to be made about the Australian textbooks of the era is the almost equal split between “growth model” approaches and what Dixon would call “skills-model” approaches. The shapes of shadows, Wordswork, Heuristic adventures, Communicate and Learning through language are within a growth model.

Heuristic adventures in its avowed rationale stresses concepts such as “activity”, “enjoyment”, “choice”, though it recognises that the latter is ultimately illusory, because teachers will choose units based on their knowledge of students (Field et al, “Teacher’s guide” card). Sixty individual workcards encourage the active use of language in reading, writing, speaking and listening. The rationale of Learning through language is to base units around major writing tasks which are preceded by reading and speaking activities and by specific “literacy” skills building (spelling, usage, punctuation, vocabulary, idiom, sentence building). The authors see the students as “learning” through these activities that lead up to the major “assignment”, but also see students as then “learning through language” - they refer to their “gentle insistence that (students) learn before writing and that they learn through language” (Walters and Allen, 1977: 6)

I have argued in Chapter 4 that the NSW version of “growth” as contained in the 1971 Syllabus, is a version characterised by rhetorical approaches to language. Some of these texts do indeed reflect that version of “growth”. The whole Whywords series, for example, is explicitly modelled on Halliday’s language functions, with texts in the series representing particular functions. The shapes of shadows is designed to enable students to explore the “imaginative” “purposes” of language and classroom activities such as drama, groupwork, personal writing, discussion and visual presentations are the basis of each chapter. The reviewer in English in Australia perceived it explicitly to be a text about language teaching (Peppercorn, 1978: 16). Wordswork emphasises the importance of context, audience and purpose in applied language use. The book supplies literary examples of the language of a variety of contexts, such as politics and revolution, humour and satire etc. These contexts and the language they generate are closely and directly studied as rhetorical devices. Communicate deals with fifty-one speech acts, based on which students complete a variety of activities, ranging from imaginative re-creation to analysing the transcript in terms of its spoken features and reading and discussing the reactions of other listeners to the same speech acts. Clearly the rationale of the text is to introduce students to approaching speech in rhetorical terms.
On the other hand, as Peppercorn recognises "old-style language books seem to be making a comeback" (1978: 6). That "comeback" is represented in the 1977 publications by The meaning machine and Language one (and even, according to its reviewer, by aspects of Learning through language - Ward, 1978: 17). In The meaning machine, Hansen's explicit rationale is that students' writing will be improved by exercises in structuring sentences and being able to identify parts of speech (Hansen, 1977: 2). This, of course, is a conscious rejection of the very premise on which the NSW Syllabus' approach to grammar is based (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1979: 1). All units in the text are either naming sentence parts or copying particular sentence structures. Interestingly, the reviewer in English in Australia saw some basis in sentence-combining research for some of the exercises in Hansen's text, and, though ultimately rejecting the book, did so on grounds that were not so much about language learning as that the particular grammar was inconsistent with modern English structure (Case, 1977b: 45).

The text which reflected above all others this "comeback" was Sadler, Hayllar and Powell's Language one. Language one sees itself quite consciously within the "back to basics/return to grammar" movement's reaction against the "growth model":

In the last ten years there has been a drift away from the study of formal language skills in English....students were completing courses with a fairly thorough grounding, but...with very little interest or enjoyment...

Unfortunately, things went too far. The noun was thrown out with the gerund. A generation of students grew up with little or no understanding of the foundations of English, and, though their interest may have been high, their linguistic competence was...alarmingly low.

It is now time for our whole approach to the teaching of English to be taken back to the drawing board for further assessment. (Sadler, Hayllar and Powell, 1977: "Preface")

Quite widely sold in NSW, the text came to epitomise the mid-70s calls for "back to basics" and a "return to grammar". Davis and Watson use it as their specific example of "the resurgence of the kinds of English texts that had been popular in the 1950s" (1990: 162). Each chapter is organised around a "comprehension' passage, a number of exercises in identifying parts of speech using Latinate terminology, punctuation practice and lists of topics for writing and discussion. I myself was later to use Language one as a model in a Department of Education publication identifying the features of textbooks which did not accord with the 1971 Syllabus (Sawyer and Bernhardt, 1985). Language one was reviewed twice in English in

---

7 See Chapter 5 above.
Australia and again in the ETA Newsletter. The first review simply pointed out the premise on which the text was based that is explicitly rejected by the Syllabus ("appears to assume that by working through the kinds of exercise it provides pupils' ability to use the language will be improved" - Case, 1978: 70). The second review from English in Australia was actually by Christie, who rejected the exercises as not providing competence in use. She argues, in effect, that such exercises are in her "grammatical" tradition and that what is needed instead is "making explicit such knowledge of language that any speaker already has" (Christie, 1978: 16-17). The review in the ETA Newsletter was extremely detailed and dealt with such areas of Language one as: the low-level of understanding required by the "comprehension" activities; the emphasis on "decorating" sentences; arbitrary spelling lists and the huge "anti-Syllabus" emphasis on requiring grammatical knowledge (Stratford, 1978).

6.3.2 School textbooks and language

6.3.2.1 Learning language

In The shapes of shadows and Heuristic adventures, all activities are designed around talking, writing, research and responses to texts in the form of imaginative re-creation. In Learning through language, all activities are designed around talking, writing, research and responses to texts as a lead-up to the major writing tasks. In Communicate, all activities are designed around extended talking and listening. In all four texts, there is a very large range of extended discourse required of students in which the language modes of reading, writing, listening and speaking are integrated and interdependent. It is also noteworthy that all four texts attempt to exploit student language used outside the classroom.

On the other hand, Language one and The meaning machine contain virtually no opportunity for extended language use by the students. In the former, apart from "composition" topics, all language use is in the form of short written answers, while in the latter, there is no extended discourse in the form of speaking or writing originating from the student. In addition, all units are discrete exercises entirely self-contained and independent of any language use the student might themselves bring to the classroom - hence, a strong emphasis on "standard-ness" and "correctness".

One particularly marked contrast between these two very different sets of textbooks is in the area of reading. Wordswork, Heuristic adventures and The shapes of shadows encourage open-ended responses to reading through activities such as imaginative re-creation. On the other hand, in Language one, every chapter opens with, and revolves around, a traditional "comprehension" passage - an extract followed by short answer questions on the text. Half of each "unit" in Write now is also such a comprehension exercise. In both texts, only one answer is regarded as correct to each of these comprehension questions. By 1977, the objections to this model of "comprehension" based on research from the 1960s and 1970s were well canvassed.
in the literature. The key arguments, summarised in a number of contemporary and later texts, included:

- a reliable test of differential comprehension skills based on a hierarchy of questions cannot be designed
- while useful measures of comprehension can be constructed, these should not be used as the sole means of improving reading
- knowledge does not exist independently of learners - meaning resides not just in texts, but also in the students themselves

(Lunzer, Waite and Dolan, 1979; Moy and Raleigh, 1984 [1981])

6.3.2.2 Learning about language

"Learning about language" falls clearly into the two camps described by Christie: the emphasis on sentence-based grammar represented by Language one and The meaning machine, and a strong rhetorical emphasis from Wordswork and Communicate.

Though it should not be considered simplistically, the degree to which grammatical knowledge was to become explicit knowledge was, of course, something of a marker between those texts which accorded with the Syllabus and those which did not. In the Shapes of shadows, Write now and Wordswork, there is no overt teaching of grammatical terms and while Heuristic adventures also eschews overt teaching of grammar, the teacher is instructed to use any problems revealed in the completion of the units as the basis for class teaching of particular concepts, including grammatical concepts. Learning through language, on the other hand, includes grammar, along with other "literacy" skills. These are ostensibly taught as part of the scaffolding - along with lead-up activities - for the major writing tasks in each unit, though, in reality, they are out of context with the rest of the unit.

The meaning machine and Language one are both based heavily on the teaching of grammar and in both there is an explicit argument that this teaching forms the basis of linguistic competence (Hansen, 1977: 2; Sadler, Hayllar and Powell, 1977: "Preface"). "Correctness" of usage in both books is treated in terms of absolutes regardless of context, though the former sees these absolutes in usage more in terms of "effect" than "correctness".

On the other hand, though Wordswork is overwhelmingly oriented towards textual analysis rather than towards student creation of text, there is a large range of discourse provided as stimuli and students are expected to both discuss and write in extended ways. Wordswork strongly and consciously represents an approach to language as rhetoric. Similarly, in Communicate, features of spoken language are studied closely in terms of rhetorical devices and used as models for discussion and improvisation. All activities involve the extended production of language by the student or the extended analysis of that language in rhetorical
terms. All language is analysed in terms of its rhetorical effects and applied through extensive spoken activities.

6.4 How subject "English" was being defined in relevant public examinations

Barnes and Seed, as quoted in the opening of this chapter, have argued that "a public examination is ...a message about curriculum priorities. Examination papers...offer to teacher and taught the most persuasive arguments about what model of the subject is appropriate" (Barnes and Seed, 1984). For NSW in 1977 the relevant examination was the School Certificate Reference tests in English.

Soon after the introduction of the 1971 Syllabus, the NSW School Certificate (Year 10) public examination ceased and, in English, was replaced by an annual "Reference Test". The intent of the Reference Test was to act as a moderating device between schools. Schools were informed on the basis of the Reference Test what grades - from "1" to "5" (later "A" to "E") - they could allocate among students for English. Individual students were then awarded those grades on the basis of internal assessment. Similar moderation was conducted for Mathematics and, later, Science. No externally influenced assessment was used for other subjects.

The Reference Test was divided into three sections:
Part A consisted of a series of multiple-choice comprehension passages.
Part B was a piece of writing based on a series of stimuli. Generally, Part B asked students to complete a very-open-ended piece of writing in response to the given stimuli.
Part C contained a piece of literature or a media text, to which students were to write a response.

Little (2000) has stated that the form of the Reference Test was intended to be based on the three apexes of the Syllabus triangle. Hence, the examination represented a particular view of:
- "language" - the "usage, vocabulary, structure and style" of the Syllabus (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 8-9) was to be assessed through questions in multiple-choice comprehension passages.
- "in use" - the writing section of the Syllabus was to be assessed through open-ended writing tasks based on given stimuli.
- "in context" - students were to respond to literary or media texts.

In 1977, the particular questions were:

Part A: three comprehension passages based on sharks - one an information extract, one a poem by E J Pratt, "The shark", and one an adapted Bulletin review of Peter Benchley's Jaws.
There are very few "literal" questions based on the recount of events in the passages. The vast majority of questions are based on language use: definitions in context, effects of particular words and phrases and style.

**Part B:** a range of visual stimulus material and a short poem based on the moon, with the instruction, "Choose one idea, your own or one presented here, and write about it". Fifty lines are provided for writing.

**Part C:** a scene from a drama script which appears to be set in an Eastern European town prior to the twentieth century; the town is about to be attacked by a group of soldiers. Students are asked to write in response to the following questions:

What is happening in the scene?
Why do the characters in this scene behave in the way they do?
How would such things as movement, ways of speaking, sound and lighting effects be used to make a successful performance of this scene?

Discussion of this examination is contained in the following section in which the Christie thesis is discussed in terms of the broader professional literature of 1977.

### 6.5 "English" in 1977 and the Christie thesis

Once again, the central elements of the Christie thesis of the history of English in Australia are:

- the more or less wholesale transfer into Australia of the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon
- the rejection of teaching about sentence-level grammar leading to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general - indeed, active resistance to teaching about language, leading to a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
- the abandonment of the study of literature in terms of analysis of language

At this point, the analysis of the relevant literature of 1977 represented in this chapter so far will be extended to compare its essential elements to those of the Christie thesis.

#### 6.5.1 "Growth" in 1977

Watson argues that the editorial position on *English in secondary schools* was that it was to be comprehensive, but that inevitably he recruited people to write for the book whose views were similar to his own. The book, he argues, is a "growth model" book in a general sense,
though the two editors did not share a coherent or crystallised view of English (Watson, 2000). Arnold, who was editor of the English Teachers’ Association Newsletter during this period, recalls "a sense of broadly shared ideologies" and her sense that English at the time was a mix of Dixon’s two strands of “cultural heritage” and “growth”, but that it was “growth” which excited teachers because “it matched the sense we had of students rightly being at the centre of our teaching... psychology and linguistic research was feeding this enthusiasm” (Arnold, 2001). Robinson agrees with Arnold’s view of English at the time. He saw himself, for example, as adopting “aspects of the growth model which would suggest English as fostering the growth of the whole person, not just a functional command of language”, but he also subscribed to views of literature at the time which suggested its humanising effects on persons and its fostering of their imaginations” (Robinson, 2001). He saw himself in editing The teaching of English as representing “a range of views in the journal, not just a party line” (Robinson, 2001). Arnold goes even further and argues against any simple equation of “English” with “language”, believing that “language can function as a concept without any particular critical judgement... I think of English as a study of a very complex area of experience, including psychological, cultural, political, sociological etc. influences. The serious study of English would include the development of critical judgement, an awareness of important historical dimensions and texts etc... I saw English as providing the literary texts which students would not necessarily encounter in Halliday’s triad” (Arnold, 2001). These recollected descriptions of English at the time would seem to confirm Christie’s view about the coming together of literature study and growth - though that of course does not confirm a consequent neglect of the study of language. In fact, Watson rejects outright the notion of the alliance between "growth" and "cultural heritage models of English":

Growth and cultural heritage were at odds. But at any one time, there is a dominant, residual and emergent culture There was some residual notion of cultural heritage around - lots of teachers remained as cultural heritage teachers - for example, no one would challenge the idea that all kids experience Shakespeare. Growth was the dominant model and the selection of texts in junior schools rejected cultural heritage... - with the interests of the kids becoming THE point of English, the beginning point. This is why the two can’t come together - one begins with the heritage, the other with the kids.

At senior level, definitely a cultural heritage model; so growth could only flourish in the junior school (Watson, 2000).

As I have argued previously, to the extent that the 1971 Syllabus reflected the main ideas of Dixon, Christie is undoubtedly correct in her view that "growth" was transported to NSW - and the professional literature of the time, in turn, largely supported the thrusts of the
Syllabus itself. The literature, as shown in 6.1 above, reflects strong support of ideas that one would consider characteristic of “growth” and of the 1971 Syllabus: the active production of language by students; imaginative re-creation of literature, class and group discussion, improvisation and dramatic re-enactment and the validation of personal reaction, especially through writing. School textbooks support this trend to some extent in a number of works, though there is no doubt that texts such as The meaning machine and Language one represent a conscious backlash against a “growth” paradigm and are firmly within the 1970s “back to basics” call. Reference test examinations are designed to reflect the central tenets of the Syllabus as best they can within the administrative constraints that allow only reading and writing to be examined, and within the constraints of a timed, only individually-answered set of structures.

6.5.2 Views of language in 1977
Like the Syllabus itself, far from neglecting the “rhetorical” aspect of language, it would appear that “English” in 1977 in NSW as represented in the professional literature, textbooks and examinations is actually steeped in rhetoric in the sense in which Christie defines that term (the inter-relationship of audience, purpose and meaning). The strong theme of the professional literature of 1977 echoed that of the 1971 Syllabus towards grammatical study: that competence in language use was a more fundamental objective than conscious grammatical analysis, and that the one did not necessarily depend on the other. In general, as I have argued above in 6.1.3.2, discussions of learning about language in the professional literature are firmly centred in a sociolinguistic rhetorical mode. Halliday (1977b) appears in English in Australia advocating use of the Language in Use materials because they take an approach to language as “resource” as opposed to the approach of American structuralism to language as “rule”. As well as the general approach to the study of language in social contexts (see, for example, Gough, 1977; Robinson, 1977), Halliday’s specific call for the Language in use materials and the study of language as system is echoed in the literature (Boardman, 1977; Harkin and Carleberg, 1977b). Watson recalls that even though he and his fellow editor of English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow shared no “crystallised view of English between us, Rob... was a linguist and we were both determined that there was to be a strong language component” (Watson, 2000). Dixon himself (1977) advocates for senior English a curriculum which includes study of media, everyday language, workplace language, songs, social and political issues - language study which is to issue from language in use in real situations.

As far as school textbooks are concerned, and as shown in 6.3.2.2 above, Halliday’s notion of “learning about language” falls clearly into the two camps described by Christie: the emphasis on sentence-based grammar represented by Language one and The meaning machine, and a strong rhetorical emphasis from Wordswork and Communicate. The meaning machine and
Language one are both based heavily on teaching of sentence-level grammar and in both there is an explicit argument that this teaching forms the basis of linguistic competence (Hansen, 1977: 2; Sadler, Hayllar and Powell, 1977: Preface). "Correctness" of usage in both books is treated in terms of absolutes regardless of context, though the former sees these absolutes in usage more in terms of "effect" than "correctness".

On the other hand, Wordswork strongly and consciously represents an approach to language as rhetoric. Similarly, in Communicate, features of spoken language are studied closely in terms of rhetorical devices and used as models for discussion and improvisation. All activities involve the extended production of language by the student or the extended analysis of that language in rhetorical terms. All language is analysed in terms of its rhetorical effects and applied through extensive spoken activities.

6.5.3 "English" and literary study in 1977

The kind of literature study which is explicitly advocated in the professional literature - alongside and including imaginative re-creation - is overwhelmingly skewed towards study of the literary uses of language, and much of this is conceptualised in a rhetorical framework. The examples from 6.1.1 are worth re-iterating at this point. Homer (1977) advocates a sociolinguistic approach to literature which treats literature in terms of speech situations and communicative acts. Kramer (1977) decries the separation of language and literature because she believes that the study of the latter should be based on a study of the former. The case for the integration of language and literature is commonly put forward by the "literature" side of the perceived "language"/"literature" dichotomy. Case (1977a) advocates language-based close study of poetry and English in secondary schools contains five pages of teaching ideas based on the integration of language and literature in popular novels of the time (Harkin and Carleberg, 1977a). Eagleson (1977b) discusses the implications of the study of dialects for the study of literature. Boardman (1977) names the specific content of English as the two poles of literature and the study of language -as-sociolinguistic system. Robinson, editor of The teaching of English, sought to address any perceived dichotomy between language and literature by "encouraging a view of literature which would see it as involving the most powerful and helpful exploration in and through language. I saw literature as having a key, even central, place in the English curriculum precisely because it was the greatest resource for studying language". In fact, recalls Robinson, the "main debates were about the parameters for the study of language and the consequences of studying it in a certain way" (Robinson, 2001).

In the School Certificate Reference Test also, the two-thirds of the examination which is about textual response and analysis similarly reflects an approach to literature based in close study of language of a kind Christie would call "rhetorical". In Part A, for example, students are asked to respond to such multiple-choice items on the semantic effects of language as:
13. The words *tubular* and *tapered* give the impression of the shark's....

14. Which word in lines 10-20 best signals a change of behaviour in the shark?...

15. The repeated use of the word *and* in lines 10-20....

16. *Part vulture, part wolf;*

    *Part neither* (lines 29-30). In these lines the poet is stressing that the shark is...

17. In his description the poet stresses most of all the shark's...

18. The division of the poem into three sections suggests...

19. The poet's attitude towards the shark is one of... (NSW Department of Education, 1977, Part A: 9)

Similarly, in Part C, analysis of the play extract includes the study of how "movement, ways of speaking, sound and lighting effects (could) be used to make a successful performance of this scene" (p. 3). If one perceives such elements as sound and lighting effects as being the "language" of theatre, then, again, the stress is on a "rhetorical" approach to literary study.

It would seem clear that literary study in 1977 is not debated or realised in terms of cultural heritage or the Leavisite version of "personal response", but as a linguistic enterprise. Dixon had already seen linguistics as central to the study of literature (Dixon, 1975: 79-80). In NSW in 1977, the very same professional literature which advocated the "growth" model also contained the most compelling evidence that "growth" in Australia was not tantamount to neglecting the rhetorical study of language, as defined by Christie.
TABLE 6.1

SUMMARY OF ARTICLES IN 1977 FROM ENGLISH IN AUSTRALIA

English in Australia, 39: February, 1977

Parker, Robert B. "Literacy and the English teacher" pp.5-22.
Parker's article is an account of his work with teachers in helping them to improve their teaching of literacy, particularly of writing. The article falls into two distinct parts: a section dealing with teachers' own personal literacy practices, followed by a section dealing with the application of learning theory in their classrooms. He examines the extent to which their own personal literacy practices informed their classroom practice. Parker finds important discrepancies between teachers' personal literacy practices and their teaching practices. He reports on a writing program that attempted to effect a "re-integration" of personal and professional behaviour - one which created a context for teacher writing that was self-initiating, self-directing and involved collaboration with others.

Eagleson, Robert D. "Disadvantaged English" pp.23-47.
In this article, Eagleson is centrally concerned with the educational and social situation of those who are users of non-standard English and discusses the plight of native speakers of English whose dialect is non-Standard, and whose English is thus regarded as inferior and who themselves are regarded as dull-witted or uneducable. The first false assumption on which such a view is based, he argues, is that there can be only one dialect of English - and the related assumption is that non-Standard dialect is a result of poor learning of this Standard dialect and reflects stray, random errors. His manifesto is for teachers to abandon this attempt in favour of an attitude of extending the child's range of language types. The model thus becomes one of supplementation rather than conflict.

Crocker's article recognises the "revolution" occurring in contemporary Syllabuses giving "prime importance" to speaking and listening - an importance underpinned by a belief in the role of speaking and listening in the individual's social and psychological development and in academic success. The article is intended to provide a "conceptual framework" for English department planning in these areas. The teacher's role is to widen the range of speech situations to which students are exposed. Sensitivity to situational awareness, purpose and audience is stressed and, importantly, talk is evaluated in terms of whether it fulfils its functions rather than in terms of "correct" attributes.
Parker, Robert B. "Are our standards slipping?" pp.5-19.
Parker begins by presenting a constructivist view of learning to serve as introduction to the question, "What about standards?" - demonstrating that the answer depends on one's view of education. Parker describes three views of education - Romantic/cultural transmission/progressive - and then goes on to argue that what is happening in curriculum at this time is a paradigm conflict in which the cultural transmission model is challenging the progressive and each is vying for dominance. His specific point in this context is that each contesting view has different consequences for one's view of standards and hence of assessment. In the context of the 70s debate over literacy standards, Parker then argues for the social consequences of mechanistic, objective testing of, in this case, literacy - viz. that a society's very definition of literacy becomes narrower, tighter and increasingly minimal.

Little, Graham "Back to basics in the USA" pp.20-24.
Little's article reports on the rise of the back-to-basics movement in the USA. Basic drills have come to dominate the US sense of "English" - the quest is for order such as in a fascination for grammar. To attain order, curriculum is pre-packaged. Thus workbooks dominate and these latter teach the subject in a series of small mastery steps, such as fill-in-the-blanks and the separation of aspects such as reading and literature. Testing dominates and minimal-competency becomes the measure of accountability. Accountability means the reporting of test results in the press. Test results appear to be declining since 1965 and this fuels even further the cry for "back-to-basics".

This is an article about a specialist speech course at MLC, Kew. The contents of the course focus on the use of language in society. There is an emphasis on the live audience and live performance and the whole course is set in the general context of communication. It attempts to break down the boundary between in-school and out-of-school uses of language and Robinson argues that the students see its relevance. Assessment is by peers and the course is seen as putting into practice Halliday's notion of language-as-resource over language-as-system.

Whitton, David I. "What is multicultural education?" pp.35-41
This article is a 1997 attempt to define "multicultural education". Whitton characterises a multicultural society as one in which all have access to advantages but are still able to maintain a unique ethnic identity. Mutual tolerance is also key. But Whitton argues that in practice, schools are practising Anglo-conformism because migrant parents are not welcomed and home background is minimised in order to "Australianise" the child. This results in
educational failure and reduced job expectations for migrant children. Whitton proposes that teacher training include core courses in multi-cultural education in the core curriculum.

English in Australia, 42: November, 1977

Halliday, M.A.K. "Some thoughts on language in the middle school years" pp.3-15.
Halliday here discusses the characteristics of language development in the middle school years. He discusses the student's continuing mastery of language as system (grammar, vocabulary) and as institution (dialect and register). For Halliday, the teacher's job is "expanding the child's horizons, which means adding to the experiential and interpersonal demands that are made on his language." He advocates use of the Language in Use materials because they take an approach to language as "resource" as opposed to the approach of American structuralism to language as "rule". In this latter approach, the student sees the classroom as a centre of linguistic research.

This piece is a case study of one child's responses to a series of novels based in a concern over the use of violent and sensational novels in schools. Murison asks, "What effect could these novels be having if they are not being followed by discussion?". The case study concludes that students' long-term values are affected by reading and thus teachers have an obligation to choose with care and to discuss during reading.

Walshe, R.D. "A model to clarify the writing process" pp.28-31.
Showing an early Gravesian influence from the NCTE, Walshe presents a three-stage model for writing: Pre-Writing/Draft Writing/Re-Writing. His model is based on question: "How do real writers write?". Walshe adds to the three-stage model of the NCTE the factor of audience, because he believes that students are kids unmotivated to re-write. Walshe's new model becomes:
Experience/Pre-Writing/Draft Writing/Re-Writing/Publication/Response

Yule, V. "A child's garden of WISCs and WPSSS" pp.51-59.
Yule studies social class differences in intelligence test responses collected by one clinical psychologist over 5-6 years. Yule concludes that children from inner and poorer outer suburbs are more likely than middle-class children to have limited language skills compared to children from more highly educated homes.
TABLE 6.2

SUMMARY OF ARTICLES IN 1977 FROM
THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

The Teaching of English, 32: May, 1977

Gough, I. "A critique of James Britton's 'Functions' of Language" pp.4-12
Gough argues that Britton's function categories are presented as offering a "solution" to the mis-match between students' oral and written language abilities. He critiques Britton's function categories as definitionally flawed, especially in terms of their relationship to "context". Gough uses the distinctions of David Brazil between spoken and written language to demonstrate that Britton's categories offer less precision, with consequent implications for any transference between oral and written language. Essentially, argues Gough, Britton neither proves the importance of spoken language to education (students gain as much from reading as listening), nor does he show how "expressive" can become "transactional" or "poetic". Gough's solution is more conscious classroom study of the forms of written and spoken language.

Eagleson, Robert D. "Narrative modes: some linguistic features" pp.13-22
Mezger, Ross "Changes in direction of the poetry of Judith Wright" pp.24-30
Mezger, Ross "Jacobean drama- a note on critical assumptions" pp.37-39
These articles are straightforward literary criticism. The Teaching of English tended to be the vehicle for such material, usually directed at texts which were on that year's Higher School Certificate examination.

Murison, D.M. "Five approaches to teaching literature" pp.32-35
Murison simply lists five contemporary approaches to teaching literature. These are, in effect, literary criticism, thematic study, imaginative recreation (Stratta, Dixon and Wilkinson, 1973), writing literature oneself and wide reading. The nature of her commentary implies a preference for a literary-critical approach, despite her admission that "it appears to make many adolescents hate literature".

By far the longest article in this journal, Packer is essentially attacking inter-disciplinary and thematic approaches to English, because:
a) they are based on false assumptions about the analogies between different contexts ("situations")
b) linguistics and literature are lost sight of

c) programming in schools becomes purely arbitrary rather than sequential

The Teaching of English, 33: September, 1977

Robinson, Dennis "The literary mode of Catch-22" pp. 3-16

Sneddon, Helen "The success of excess! Joseph Heller's Catch-22" pp. 17-22

Hourihan, Margery "The Elizabethan world picture and the humanism of King Lear" pp. 33-44

Again, these articles are straightforward literary criticism on then current Higher School Certificate texts.


Kefford replies to Gough's critiques of Britton in the previous journal by arguing that Gough has missed the most essential point about Britton's functions, viz. that they are intended to define the purposes of writers, not readers. He argues that Brazil does not offer any more to the teacher than Britton in terms of how writing is to be improved, stating that it is the teacher's job to create the conditions for improvement. Moreover, states Kefford, Gough has missed the point that Britton is discussing pupil talk, not the talk of a teacher to whom students listen.

Lee, S.E. "The horse's mouth or Writing- why?: what the pupil thinks" pp. 28-32

In picking up on Nancy Martin's research into writing across the curriculum, Lee sees purpose as the key element in writing. Lee reports on 1972 research in which first formers (Year 7) were asked to answer the questions, "Why do you write compositions?" and "Why do you think teachers give compositions?" The answers suggest that pupils in 1972 had inferred from their teachers largely the importance of grammar, paragraphing and the use of writing as punishment.

Lewis, Rosemary "Reflections on drama as a teaching method" pp. 45-48

Lewis reports on her recent experience of completing Dorothy Heathcote's Drama in Education course, emphasising Heathcote's view of the teacher as artist, as well as the notion that dramatic method is applicable across the curriculum, "since a teacher teaches people, not subjects". Nevertheless, she argues, it has special application to English in allowing interesting approaches to texts, and in making room for a variety of language uses. Lewis stresses the figure of the teacher in this article - teachers reflecting and gaining the "self-awareness that may lead to learning and growth" and says that she herself does this with respect to her own teacher education classes. She relates the experience of her examination in the Heathcote course, which involved artistic representation of a self-analysis in terms of
learning. Heathcote herself is characterised as a highly active teacher and "learning by doing" is a pervasive theme for teachers and students.
TABLE 6.3

SUMMARY OF ARTICLES IN 1977 FROM
THE NSW ENGLISH TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER

ETA Newsletter, February, 1977

Phillips, J. "Migrant children and remedial programs" pp. 6-11
Phillips argues that migrant students' literacy problems are usually problems that can be traced to their lack of knowledge in spoken language. Teachers do not necessarily notice errors is speech when speech errors are unstressed, but these same items are glaringly obvious in written language, though they are the same errors. Phillips demonstrates a kind of 1977 equivalent of a "running record" for teachers to detect spoken and written language errors and shows that "migrant" children's errors occur more in spoken language. The piece is a plea not to mistakenly place NESB students into "remedial reading" and away from mainstream ESL assistance.

Shepherd, Cathy "An approach to Under Milkwood by Dylan Thomas" pp.11-18
This piece is a unit of work on the play in two sections:
a) dramatic improvisation of sections of the play, and of situations parallel to the play. Group discussion and some imaginative recreation are emphasised.
b) a study-guide to the play, focused on background, setting, characters, issues, language, form and an essay question. Most questions are of the type which imply one correct answer ("What does Nogood Boyo mean by saying '.....'?"

ETA Newsletter, March, 1977

Horvath, Barbara M. "The effect of dialect on test performance" pp. 4-6
Horvath makes a plea for standardised testing to take account of dialect, culture, value systems, and the test situation itself as a social event. She refers heavily to the sociolinguistic work of Roger Shuy on dialect bias in American language testing.

McVitty, Walter "World War 2 told like it was" pp. 7-12
This piece reviews a number of novels for children and young adults which revolve around experiences of World War II, such as Carrie's war, Summer of my German soldier etc.
Turner, W.A. "Video literacy" pp. 14-22
This is an account of two video-making programs in which the author was involved, one primary and one secondary. In each case the project involved formal training and "licensing" of students to be creators of documentary video material. Turner emphasises:
• the value of this work for "under-achievers, slow learners and 'discipline problems"
• its role as an adjunct to, rather than substitute for, "traditional literacy"
• the importance of video material as text for interpretation, as well as material to be created by the students.

ETA Newsletter, April, 1977

Annells, John et al "What Tasmanian kids write" pp.4-8
This article reproduces 1975 Tasmanian research from the Tasmanian Dept of Education Language across the curriculum project. The research consisted of two surveys on:
a) the amount and kind of teacher-initiated writing produced by students in one day in Grades 7-10 in Tasmanian high schools
b) teachers' opinions about the role of writing in learning
The survey analysed the results in terms of Britton's functions. Results showed: virtually no continuous writing outside English and Social Sciences; very little poetic and expressive writing and a predominance of transactional writing classified as "exercises". Few examples of generalising, theorising or speculating existed.

Latham, Judith "Written expression: years 7-10" pp. 9-12
This is a list of topics for writing and ideas for programming writing. Again, it is heavily influenced by Britton's function categories.

Moore, Margaret "Teaching non-fiction" pp. 13-17
This is a list of ideas for teaching non-fiction. It is a mixture of imaginative recreation and having students imitate style or themes in their own writing.

Little, Margaret "Using cloze procedure" pp.18-22.
This is an account of a teacher's experiment with a cloze exercise in a range of English classes. The only theoretical reference is to the Bullock Report.

ETA Newsletter, September, 1977 ("Focus on Australian literature")

Ward, John "Surviving as a young English teacher" pp. 7-10
This account of talks by young teachers at an ETA "Surviving" conference reported on a number of themes, which included: reminders that language development is a whole-school
responsibility; teaching ideas; statements about teachers as actors and entertainers and, above all, the need to use students' interests in the classroom.

**Brisbane, Katharine “True to the life” pp. 11-14.**

This article is a justification of the use of Australian drama in English classes. Drama is separated from "literature". Australian drama is said to be a better historical record of life in Australia than other literature. The reality that drama emphasises the spoken word takes it out of the realm of traditional literary study. Brisbane also justifies the need for playwrights like David Williamson to use realistic language.

**Christie, Fran “Les Murray's poetry - and Year 11” pp. 15-18.**

This is a discussion of Murray's poetry and its suitability for Year 11. Ideas for teaching include writing instant reactions, group discussion, students raising questions, class discussion and a study guide with a predominant emphasis on "Why...?" and "How...?" questions.

**Whitfield, Neil “Thoughts on The tree of man and language through literature” pp.19-22.**

This article largely presents an exercise in close language study based on The tree of man.

**Hubbard, Nigel “The merry-go-round in the sea”**

This piece is a study guide on the novel: bibliography, biography, questions that lead from factual recall to opinion and "big picture" thematic considerations and an essay question.

**de Groen, Francis “Some thoughts on the teaching of Australian literature in schools” pp. 25-27.**

This article is a plea for more Australian literature to be used in schools, including primary schools, and - by extension - for teachers to supply contextual knowledge when any poem is being studied so that students can judge the reality of the poetry (say, about "seasons") against their own experience.

**ETA Newsletter, November, 1977 (“Focus: The new teacher”)**

**Carroll, Chris et al “Teaching English - comments on everyday issues” pp. 3-16**

Again based on the ETA's "Surviving" conference, this very extended piece contains advice from selected teachers on very specific areas of day-to-day teaching. Individual topics are:

- Classroom discussion

Justification for classroom discussion is based on Britton's view of talk as the organising of experience, because through talk new knowledge is related to old. Learning through language is explicitly stressed. The teacher must "frame" the situations for this to occur.
Small groups or informal talk in large groups are ideal. Dixon and Stratta are also quoted and advice is given on successfully running class discussion and on organising and running groupwork.

- Language
  Stress is laid on the notion that language is learnt by use, not through grammatical exercises. Students are to be seen as already competent users of language. Deficit views of language are to be avoided and teachers should see themselves as extending pupils’ registers, including moving them towards mastery of the socially valued standard dialect.

- Groupwork
  Guidelines for the successful management of groupwork are directed at the teacher, based on assumptions about the value of its frequent use.

- Wide reading schemes
  This involves suggestions for running wide reading schemes, including suggestions for titles, student activities and ideas for teachers to use to stimulate interest.

- Approaching the novel
  For juniors, this largely involves imaginative recreation activities, with a "more formal literary approach" with seniors, involving discussion of issues and key passages, as well as the (judicious) use of study guides.

- Film libraries
  A simple list of available sources of film lending in Sydney.

- Planning a sequence of lessons in junior English
  This article stresses integration, but points out the pitfalls of thematic study as the only approach to integration. A general novel unit is used as an exemplar of programming, with the emphasis on imaginative recreation. Another unit on punctuation is demonstrated to show how a skills-based unit might include literature, writing and groupwork.

- Retaining control in the English classroom
  This is a list of suggestions for classroom management.

- Homework in English
  This contains a list of the variety of possibilities for homework that parents may not be familiar with. The stress is on relevance and purposefulness, as well as teacher follow-up.

- Assessing English - Years 7-10
  This discusses general principles of assessment, which are presented as an on-going problem for those implementing the Syllabus, especially in terms of the balance between assessing individual progress and assessing students against external standards. The suggestion for the former is to find out the students' "beginning" abilities from their former teachers. The suggestion for comparative assessment is to confine it to "teachable skills", i.e. punctuation, sentence structure, spelling etc.
This argues for students being given poems in folders in groups to use as readers' theatre and then to arrange in some order according to selected criteria (before answering "many questions about one poem we ought to give them practice in answering one question about many poems").
TABLE 6.4

SUMMARY OF ARTICLES FROM
Watson, K.D. and Eagleson, R.D. (eds)
ENGLISH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: TODAY AND
TOMORROW
(ETANSW, 1977)

The book is divided into a number of sections, each of which is sub-divided into chapters, though the latter are numbered continuously. Section headings are represented below in bold.

1. Boomer, Garth "Secondary English- yesterday, today and tomorrow" pp. 1-17
Boomer’s essay which opens the collection is a history of the subject in Australia since 1966. His history is essentially based on the curriculum as represented in textbooks, Syllabuses and the important contemporary theorists. The contemporary period, 1972-1976, he calls “The making of the maps” and the important figures in this time are Britton, Barnes, Rosen, Halliday, Dixon, Martin, with the key event in this country being the 1972 UNESCO Seminar. Boomer sees a key distinction in discussions of in this era being between studying language and using language - the former represented by the disciples of Halliday, and the latter represented by Barnes and Rosen. Boomer feels, however, that these names are not known amongst the bulk of teachers. Grammar remains a key issue of debate in curriculum discussion, and he sees that it is imperative for English teachers to show the importance of language to their colleagues in other curriculum areas and “invite them to come with us” (p.8)

What English teachers need to know about language

Halliday’s article is an explanation of early language development and an overview of the field of developmental linguistics. With respect to the latter, Halliday is concerned to stress linguistics as interested in both the expression of the individual and of the social - the structure of human interaction. Modern research has returned to the social perspective on language and tended to stress language as a resource, rather than a set of rules. When he himself lays emphasis on “learning how to mean”, he emphasises the social aspect of this process, as well as the ways in which individual language development is about “creating” language in partnership with others.

Britton begins by discussing the narrative mode as a basic way of “handling meaning”. He then stresses the role of talk in learning using a constructivist view of learning itself ("In order
to accept new information...we have to have somewhere to put it...the normal procedure is to draw out connexions by talking about the new information"). He re-iterates his theory of talking oneself into understanding - in order to enable us to make sense of experience by storing in memory not the experience, but its meaning. As with Halliday, early language acquisition is used as illustration, this time for the point that the structure of language has developed to reflect the nature of cognitive processes.

4. Watson, Ken "Language development. 5-18", pp. 50-62
Watson then addresses the issue of describing language development during the years of schooling: syntactic development, for example, has been shown to develop with least deliberate intervention, but variations in social context and degrees of abstraction seem to be the key areas of development in these years. (The last of these is reflected in the work of Britton and Moffett). Based on Loban's work, there seems to be evidence also for the idea that competence in spoken language is a necessary base for competence in reading and writing.

5. Eagleson, Robert D. "Variation in language" pp. 63-77
Eagleson explains register and dialect and discusses the concept of "appropriateness" in terms of the concept of "quality". Dialects are seen as equally valuable and complex. Eagleson argues that the teacher's job is to make the standard dialect (to be regarded as a dialect, albeit the dialect of the powerful) accessible to all, but that this should be seen as supplementation, not repression of the student's own dialect. He then discusses some of the implications of dialect study for the study of literature.

Cattell outlines transformational grammar "not as fare for classroom consumption, but rather as knowledge which it would be useful for the teacher to have" (p.79).

Current Issues

Judy places his essay in the context of current debates on "basic skills". His argument is that historically English teachers have taught little else other than "basic skills" in the sense of grammar drill, workbook exercises, spelling etc. and that it manifestly has not worked in changing language behaviour. He then asks the question, "What is a 'basic skill' anyway?". His answer is that a person has truly mastered the 'basics' if they can converse and write successfully for his or her own purposes, and is fully comfortable in a wide range of speaking and writing situations. Further, 'fundamentals' such as grammar are learned naturally and intuitively to a great degree. The 'frills' of literacy - surface correctness - are best mastered in a context of a literacy program that values fundamental articulateness.
This begins by examining the disparity between the student's culture and the culture of the texts offered to senior students. They implicitly offer an alternative view of the subject which they label "cultural studies" (in 1977) and which bears a close resemblance to current understandings of that notion. Student interpretation, student choice and relevance are stressed. Curriculum should include study of media, everyday language, workplace language, songs, social and political issues. Language study should issue from language in use in real situations, and what should be studied are "authentic cultures" in action. Accompanying this should be writing, speaking and producing for real audiences.

9. Little, Graham "Meaning and maturation in English" pp.130-144.
A particular examination-based version of curriculum in English is analysed by Little and found wanting in terms of meaning, and in terms of allowing for maturation. His is an historical discussion of English, especially in terms of the doctrine of elements (such as phonics in reading, or spelling in writing) - which, when shown to fail, leads to outcries not about the doctrine, but about poor teaching. Little refers to these earlier curricula as "elementarist". Mildly reformed curricula followed, and Little uses Goyen's study to show that recency of schooling is a factor in improved literacy. Future curricula must account for personal background and experience, and the "ability to mean". Little sketches his own version of the curriculum strongly based on the work of Moffett and strongly developmental. Britton, the Goodmans, Halliday and Barnes are also cited.

Smith argues that in centring on "language" or "experience", English is losing its distinctive identity. In the former, English is indistinguishable from what the whole curriculum should be doing, and in the latter, the distinctive texts of "English" - literature - are relegated to just other "voices" in the classroom "conversation". Literature, argues Smith, extends the range of student experience and, by stimulating writing and drama, involves direct student experience. Literature should be at the centre of teaching children to read. The class novel, as well as wide reading and silent reading are stressed, as is "converting TV viewers" (p.148).

Walshe draws on the arguments of Britton to argue the case for an "English" based on using language in relation to the child's experience: the shaping of identity, of self. "Literature" needs to sit alongside other experiences, and needs to include in its definition the children's own writing.
Drawing on Carl Rogers and Piaget, Tucker makes the case for "open systems" with an emphasis on process and interpersonal relations. The article then describes the workings of the English Workshop open classrooms at his school, supported by a grant from the Australian Schools Commission.

Rothery uses the work of Dixon and Halliday, as well as the Bullock Report, to argue for the value of group work in terms of "talking to learn". Barnes' research and consequent arguments about relating knowledge to what is already known - using language to learn, the value of exploratory talk - are basic to her arguments. The bulk of her article deals with the logistics of successfully organising group work. Tape recordings of pupil talk are analysed.

14. **Moss, Peter** "Assessment" pp. 188-94.
Moss discusses a number of general issues of assessment: the issue of external standards, of "private" in-class assessment and of the language of assessment. He argues that assessment is, and should be, a public process and rejects the idea that the individual teacher should be the sole arbiter of assessment - rather, teachers should set up faculty-based moderation procedures. "Valuing" is a key concept for Moss.

15. **Watson, Ken** "To stream or not to stream?" pp. 195-99.
Watson discusses current research on mixed-ability teaching, recognising that it tends to favour mixed-ability, albeit lightly, and under specific conditions. He stresses the importance of not "over-individualising".

**Talking and listening**

"Talk remains the primary means by which learning is assumed to take place in classrooms" - Williams begins with the Barnes/Britton concept of learning through talk, but discusses the nature and quality of talk about literature in groups. His argues that the phenomenon of "leapfrogging" in group talk indicates pupil reflection on a topic and that anecdotes in group talk tend to be the means whereby pupils connect "prior experience and the new material or problem". Tape recordings of pupil talk on literature are analysed.

This article describes the tests of listening developed by the Oracy Research Unit at Birmingham University. They see English as a place where pupils explore aspects of the human condition, especially human relationships. Widening the view of appropriate texts, including the students' own work, is part of their definition, as is using language for a variety
of purposes. Exploring experience and "talking themselves into understanding" is central to English, hence small group work and the importance of respectful and understanding listening. Tape recordings of pupil talk are analysed.

Reading

Latham develops the psycholinguistic view of the reading process in the terms popularised by Smith and the Goodmans. Emphasis is on meaning-comprehension and de-stressing the visual system. Phonics is seen as important, but not central. The reader brings meaning to the text; meaning is just not on the page. Consequences of his process for teaching include: children learning to read by reading; using a minimum of word drills and identification exercises; assessment based on the quality of "meaning-getting".

The Goodmans posit four findings from their research on miscue analysis:
- reading is a receptive, information-seeking process
- accuracy in reproducing the text's message is not the reader's goal, but rather re-construing the text's meaning by searching for meaning
- the only purpose of reading is understanding
- language-centred curriculum is the most compatible way for students to expand their learning. This involves sampling, predicting, confirming predictions and relating the significance of what is being understood to what is already known.

Classroom implications include: reading aloud by the teacher; reading and writing going hand in hand; providing time for reading in class; providing classroom experiences which children can respond to through reading and writing.

This extract from The Bullock Report looks at reading for older students, stressing that subject teachers need to go beyond the belief that their students simply need to read and to recognise that techniques of efficient reading can be taught and that subject material needs to be assessed in terms of readability. Bullock rejects separate reading lessons and reading laboratories as answers to these issues. Students should be explicitly taught to: identify their purposes for reading; locate, evaluate, select and organise their reading material; read at literal, inferential and evaluative levels; assess their own achievement.
In this discussion of adolescent remedial readers, the featured writers are Kohl, Holbrook, Freire and Britton. Their work on language and its implications for reading is contrasted to the "remedial orthodoxy" represented by diagnostic testing, individualisation, graded readers and instruction in phonics. He sees this a failed orthodoxy that needs to be replaced by new issues: how to make schools more hospitable to working class children; how to encourage teachers to respect, celebrate and build on the language and experience children bring to school; how to stop organisational procedures such as streaming from undermining the confidence and self-worth of such children.

The “Reading” section concludes with three pages of ideas on “Using tapes in remedial reading” and “Ways to promote reading”

Writing
This article simply summarises the work of Britton in terms of language functions and participant/spectator roles. Incidentally, Ashworth mentions the triad of learning language, learning through language and learning about language, with the latter regarded as "not helpful" in "acquiring language ability". The ultimate function of language is the Brittonian "representation of experience". Expressive writing is deemed "central".

This article is a manifesto of Walshe’s beliefs about writing. Among its emphases are: integration; the importance of writing; individualisation; audience; the importance of quantity; breadth of range; balance of tasks in terms of Britton’s functions; the place of mechanics and writing across the curriculum. Walshe here presents the model of pre-writing/draft-writing/re-writing/publication and response that was to become so influential in the 1980s.

Payne discusses his use of the journal in class to encourage quantity of writing.

25. Jerabek, Ross and Dieterich, Daniel "Composition evaluation: the state of the art" pp. 317-321
This article surveys research into selected areas of writing evaluation
• should we evaluate (revision is of more use than written comments)?
• what kinds of written response should we give (only taped commentary and peer evaluation seem justified by research)?
The "Writing" section includes twenty-seven pages on classroom ideas for writing: "Top Ten-Topics..."; "Ten ways to publish your students' writing"; "Magazine workshop"; "Speaking, listening, writing, survival reading for less able pupils".

Language and literature

26. Homer, David "The teaching of literature" pp.342-360
Even post- Sampson-Newbolt-Leavis, literature (however defined) remains the "something" which is talked or written about in "English". Homer is critical of the sourcebooks of the sixties and of some "growth" teaching in taking the context away from particular pieces of literature and replacing it with thematic work. He fears the loss of literature as linguistic artefact. Homer advocates a sociolinguistic approach to literature which accepts the work of Britton and Moffett by emphasising the relationship between the language of literature and the language of life. A course in literature that stresses sociolinguistics would break out of the "Language/Literature" dichotomy that bedevils English by treating literature in terms of speech situations and communicative acts. Homer's analytical approach relies heavily on students themselves writing fiction from various viewpoints. This gives some sense of the structures of storytelling.

Boardman reports that teachers are not sure how to apply the term "language in use" from the Syllabus, or what "language study" should now be. He distinguishes knowledge of from knowledge about and sees the teacher's role as providing contexts for use and then analyses of transcripts. Which competences to develop? He refers to Halliday's functions, exercised through role play, writing and "the teacher disappearing from the dais". He also relies on the notion of talking oneself into understanding and of the importance of small group discussion in enacting "the complex relationship between language and experience". Boardman also reflects Barnes' concern with the language of subjects being a foreign language to many children, who ought to be allowed to use their own language to grapple with subject content: "every teacher is a teacher of English" (p.366). Boardman thus raises the basic and central question: what is the content, then, of English? He answers:

a) literature and

b) the study of language as a system.

The latter is to be in the vein of Language in Use, Postman's The New English series and the Australian Language studies for first form.

28. Kramer, Leonie "Integration of language and literature" pp.379-386
Kramer decries the separation of language and literature and the debasement of language. She believes good criticism is rare and should not be expected of students, though an ability to analyse and describe should. She believes study of literature should be based on a study of
language: basic structures, etymology, vocabulary. "(A)bsolute priority should be given to exact reading of the text through a close inspection of its grammar, vocabulary and areas of reference".

29. Ward, John "Involvement with literature" pp.392-397
Ward canvasses a number of issues, especially the importance of :
- relevant texts
- personal reactions
- group discussion
- imaginative recreation of texts
- acting out of scripted drama
Patterns of language is a significant influence in this article.

30. Bryant, George W. "Teaching the novel humanely" pp.400-407
This piece argues that novels should be taught in order to change students' values or attitudes about the world. Bryant assumes the existence of an "organising centre", "the theme" and "the meaning". Novels should be studied in self-contained units.

This article advocates a close study of the language of poetry to discover the precision of expression.

32. Stratford Dick "Spelling" pp.416-422
Stratford's approach is that spelling should be neither neglected nor over-emphasised. It should be a whole-school responsibility and should be seen in the context of written expression. Pre-set spelling lists are discouraged and, in the belief that most spelling knowledge is acquired unconsciously, Stratford suggests: wide reading; speaking; exercises in visual discrimination; listening exercises; varied language activities and proof-reading. Personal spelling lists and personal "demons" with paired testing are encouraged.

The "Language and literature" section contains sixteen pages of ideas on language and/or literature teaching: "The language of humour"; "Ideas for the integration of language and literature" which concentrates on popular junior novels; "Imaginative re-creation of literature"; a list of "Novels for Years 7-10" and "Mass media activities"

Drama
33. Mallick, David "Scripted drama" pp.428-34
This is an account of some teaching sessions Mallick had with high school classes in which active presentation of scripts was encouraged with the teacher as director.
34. Arnold, Roslyn "Improvisation in the classroom" pp.435-45
Arnold discusses methods for the successful use of improvisation in the classroom. Her only quoted source is the Bullock Report. Pupils' interests, experience and needs are stressed.

The "Drama" section contains two pages of "Some ideas for drama sessions".

Film and video
35. Stratford, Dick "Film and film-making in English" pp.450-69
Dixon's views on "encounters with life" underlie Stratford's justification for inclusion of film in English. He discusses the study of feature film, as well as the creating of students' own films.

36. Field, Barbara "Film-making in English - another view" pp.470-73
This is an account of the integration of film-making into each year of English at Armidale High.

37. Mackinlay, Ian "The use of videotape in the English classroom" pp.474-76
This is an account of the integration of video at Auckland Grammar School.

Resources
A number of currently used resource books are analysed according to whether text-based activities/questions are factual/interpretative/conceptual/expressive/practical. The general orientation of the books are then analysed in terms of the polarities "critical" - "imaginative". The books lack teacher-directiveness and this is seen as a weakness - indeed, it is seen as a weakness in the whole "growth" model. The books are also said to lack an underlying theory, and to lack a sense of sequence.

There follows two pages consisting of "A select list of resources for English teaching".

Teacher education
Schools need to think of themselves as training institutions along with colleges and universities. Students need to learn by doing - for example, learning to teach reading by teaching someone to read. The strong emphasis of the discussion is on practicum experience. Boardman advocates team teaching at school. For the college, students must: read Britton, Dixon, Moffett; read adolescent literature; read the key works on teaching reading and writing; take part in drama and film-making; take part in rich and varied activities for their own growth.
TABLE 6.5

ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS PUBLISHED IN AUSTRALIA IN 1977 AND REVIEWED IN ENGLISH IN AUSTRALIA THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH THE NSW ENGLISH TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER

Halliday's framework for analysis of textbooks
1) What premises about language learning underlie the text? Do these premises accord with my beliefs about language learning?

2) What premises about language underlie the text? Do they accord with my understanding of what language is?

3) What premises about "subject English" underlie the text? Do they fit in with my philosophy about beliefs about language learning?

From these the following series of questions can be applied:

1. Rationale

a) Is the underlying rationale made clear?
b) Is the professed rationale the real rationale?
c) Is language shown as independent of the user (ie divorced from meaning and context)?
d) Is language seen as rule, or resource?
e) Is language seen as fundamental to the development of thought, feeling and behaviour?
f) What assumptions about individual differences underlie the text?
g) What attitude towards usage is revealed in the textbook (prescriptive; socially determined)?

2. Pedagogy

a) What relationship is assumed between teacher and textbook?
b) What relationship is assumed between teacher and pupil?
c) What relationship is assumed between textbook and pupil?
d) What relationship is assumed between pupil and pupil?
e) To what degree are pupil interest and motivation considered?
f) Are questions open (ie encouraging thought and discussion) or closed (demanding the one "right" answer)?

3. Language activities

a) If there is overt teaching of grammar, what is its purpose (eg, humanistic; to improve writing)?
b) Are exercises presented in terms of meeting individual needs, or seen as appropriate to the whole class?
c) Are there opportunities for "real languaging"?
d) Does the textbook present a range of extended discourse, or is the emphasis on words and sentences? Is the language real or artificial?
e) Are speaking, listening, reading and writing seen as interdependent?
f) Is there implicit or explicit sequencing of activities? If so, upon what basis?
g) Is a range of stimuli provided?
h) Is there an attempt to link language and literature?
i) Is there an exploitation of the language learning that goes on outside the classroom?
j) Is there an attempt to teach comprehension through passages and exercises? If so:
   • What proportion of the questions can be answered without reference to the
     passage?
   • What proportion of the questions relates to that passage and that passage alone?
   • What proportion could be said to be training pupils in transferable skills of
     comprehension, should such exist?

4. Provision for Assessment of Pupil’s Development

a) Is there provision for self-assessment by pupils?
b) Is the implied assessment procedure a formative one (i.e., the child against himself) or
   against some abstract standard?

(Halliday, 1980a: 81-83)

Halliday's framework applied to the relevant textbooks

1. Rationale

a) Is the underlying rationale made clear?

| The shapes of shadows | The teacher is told that the book is designed to enable students to explore the
|                       | “purposes” of language use based explicitly on Halliday’s “imaginative” function.
|                       | Classroom activities such as drama, groupwork, personal writing, discussion etc.
|                       | are to be encouraged. |

| Wordswork            | The underlying rationale is the importance of context, audience and purpose in
|                      | applied language use. The book supplies examples from literature of the language
|                      | of: politics and revolution/humour and satire/dialect and situation/argument and
|                      | debate/religion/news and comment/literary criticism/sport and
|                      | recreation/love/work. |

| Heuristic adventures | “It is important that pupils have choice in the work that they do and that this
|                      | choice must be closely structured... It is possible for pupils to respond to the tasks
|                      | at their own level...Students who are motivated by interest are likely to be
|                      | committed to a chosen task and to enjoy it. They will respond more if they are
|                      | active in the process”. There is a recognition that freedom is “ultimately illusory” in
|                      | the sense that every unit contains the skills of reading, writing, listening,
|                      | speaking and in the sense that teachers will make decisions about units based on
|                      | their knowledge of students. (Field et al, 1977: “Teacher’s guide”) |
The meaning machine

The rationale is an explicit statement that students’ writing will be improved by exercises in structuring sentences and being able to identify parts of speech: “Giving young people practice in the deliberate use of specific forms of language is at least one way to help increase their sophistication in using language” (Hansen, 1977: 2).

Communicate

The avowed aim of the collection is simply to “stir interest in the speaking that we hear about us as we communicate with one another in our ordinary, everyday affairs” (Hoffman, 1977: 1). Clearly the rationale is also to introduce students to features of speech acts in a rhetorical way.

Language one

“In the last ten years there has been a drift away from the study of formal language skills in English....students were completing courses with a fairly thorough grounding, but...with very little interest or enjoyment... Unfortunately, things went too far. The noun was thrown out with the gerund. A generation of students grew up with little or no understanding of the foundations of English, and, though their interest may have been high, their linguistic competence was...alarmingly low” (Sadler, Haylar and Powell, 1977: “Preface”).

Write now

The avowed aim is “to stimulate junior secondary students to write creatively”. The comprehension passages are meant to provide practice in “thoughtful, intensive reading” (Sadler and Young, 1977: “Preface”).

Learning through language

The rationale of the book is to base units around major writing tasks which are built up to by reading and speaking activities and by specific “literacy” skills building (spelling, usage, punctuation, vocabulary, idiom, sentence building). The authors see the students as “learning” through these activities that lead up to the major “assignment”, but also see students as then “learning through language” - they refer to their “gentle insistence that (students) learn before writing and that they learn through language” (p.6)

b) Is the professed rationale the real rationale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>YES: classroom activities such as drama, groupwork, personal writing, discussion, visual presentations are the basis of each chapter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>YES: features of language in each form are studied closely in terms of rhetorical dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>YES: There is a choice of activities through 60 individual workcards. A contract system is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>YES: all units are either naming sentence parts or copying particular sentence struct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>YES: features of spoken language are studied closely in terms of rhetorical devices and used as models for discussion and improvisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>YES: All units are based around study of a part of speech and a punctuation mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>YES: All &quot;units&quot; contain writing topics based on photographic stimulus followed by a &quot;passage + questions&quot; comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>YES: All units are organised around the central writing assignment, which is built up to through language activities and work on &quot;literacy skills&quot;. &quot;Learning&quot; before writing and &quot;learning through language&quot; is practised consistently throughout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Is language shown as independent of the user?

| The shapes of shadows | NO: All activities involve the extended production of language by the student |
| Wordswork | NO: all depends on context. As far as student language use is concerned, it is largely confined to analysis of language products. |
| Heuristic Adventures | NO: All activities involve the extended production of language by the student |
| The meaning machine | To a large extent, NO. There is a sense in which the effects of different sentence structures are always the primary concern, so that the models are discussed for their effects. There is a rhetorical sense about the second half of the book. |
| Communicate | NO: All activities involve the extended production of language by the student or the extended analysis of that language in rhetorical terms. |
| Language one | YES: Apart from a small number of topics on writing and talk at the end of each chapter, and a separate chapter which is a list of "composition" topics, no language is generated by the students themselves |
| Write now | NO: All writing activities involve the extended production of language by the student. |
| Learning through language | NO: All activities involve the extended production of language by the student, supplemented by the focus in each unit on "literacy skills". |

d) Is language seen as rule or resource?

| The shapes of shadows | RESOURCE: activities involve the extended production of language by the student |
| Wordswork | RESOURCE: all language is analysed and studied in terms of its rhetorical effects. |
| Heuristic adventures | RESOURCE: activities involve the extended production of language by the student |
| The meaning machine | Largely RULE, though as the effects of different language uses are discussed, the sense of RESOURCE is still there. It does not allow for the construction of the students' own sentences, so much as playing with the effects of others' sentences. |
| Communicate | RESOURCE: all language is analysed in terms of its rhetorical effects and applied through extensive spoken activities. |
| Language one | RULE: All chapters revolve around exercises applying rules of grammar and punctuation |
| Write now | RESOURCE: activities involve the extended production of language by the student |
| Learning through language | RESOURCE: activities involve the extended production of language by the student, though these are supplemented by skills activities in spelling, punctuation, usage. |

e) Is language seen as fundamental to the development of thought, feeling and behaviour?

| The shapes of shadows | YES: students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings |
| Wordswork | YES: in the sense of “in the audience”. Little language is generated by the student. |
| Heuristic adventures | YES: students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings |
| The meaning machine | NO: the generation of any original language by students is to come after the exercises are completed. |
| Communicate | YES: students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings. |
| Language one | NO: apart from a small number of topics on writing and talk at the end of each chapter, no language is generated by the students themselves |
| Write now | YES: in writing activities, students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings |
| Learning through language | YES: students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings |

f) What assumptions about individual differences underlie the text?

<p>| The shapes of shadows | There is no explicit allowance for individual differences within the text. |
| Wordswork | There is no allowance for individual differences within the text. |
| Heuristic adventures | Cards are graded for ability |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The meaning machine</th>
<th>There is no allowance for individual differences within the text, though the &quot;Introduction&quot; does state that the text is for &quot;average and above average students&quot; (p.1).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>The teacher's book directs the teacher explicitly to a number of ways in which individual abilities in speech need to be allowed for in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>There is no allowance for individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>There is no allowance for individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>There is no explicit allowance for individual differences within the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) What attitude towards usage is revealed in the textbook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>Usage is not an issue. No abstract &quot;absolutes&quot; of correctness are imposed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>All usage is discussed in terms of &quot;effect&quot;. Non-judgemental attitudes to &quot;correctness&quot; are especially evident in the chapter on &quot;Dialect&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>Usage &quot;correctness&quot; is related to context, genre and style. No abstract &quot;absolutes&quot; of correctness are imposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>&quot;Correctness&quot; of usage is based on a sense of absolutes regardless of context, though the sense is more about &quot;effect&quot; than &quot;correctness&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>Usage is a key issue and is analysed and discussed in terms of context, register etc. - ie in a rhetorical sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>&quot;Correctness&quot; of usage is based on a sense of absolutes regardless of context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>Usage is not an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>&quot;Literacy&quot; skills - spelling, usage, punctuation, vocabulary, idiom, sentence building - are seen part of what students &quot;learn&quot; in order to complete the major writing tasks, to &quot;learn through language&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Pedagogy

a) What relationship is assumed between teacher and textbook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>The teacher is encouraged to incorporate their own ideas and interests, as well as those of their students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>Activities are independent of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That the teacher is familiar with the content, and that certain units are reserved for appropriate ages and abilities. Active supervision is encouraged, as is replacement of suggested stimuli by other appropriate materials. Suggestions are made for use in "traditional, structured" classrooms and "open-area teaching units."

- **The meaning machine**: Activities are largely independent of the teacher, though students are instructed to “Ask your teacher if you need to”.
- **Communicate**: The teacher is strongly guided in the use of the material.
- **Language one**: Activities are independent of the teacher.
- **Write now**: The teacher is instructed in the “Preface” to be highly selective in choosing material and encouraged to incorporate the material into thematic units. The activities themselves are explicitly directed at the students.
- **Learning through language**: The teacher is “taken into confidence” in the “Introduction” and the unit plans at the beginning of each chapter are largely for the benefit of the teacher, but the activities are explicitly directed at the students.

b) What relationship is assumed between teacher and pupil?

- **The shapes of shadows**: Activities are independent of the teacher.
- **Wordswork**: Activities are independent of the teacher.
- **Heuristic adventures**: Active supervision is encouraged.
- **The meaning machine**: Activities are largely independent of the teacher, though students are instructed to “Ask your teacher if you need to”.
- **Communicate**: Active supervision is encouraged.
- **Language one**: Activities are independent of the teacher.
- **Write now**: Activities are addressed to the student independently of the teacher.
- **Learning through language**: Activities are addressed to the student independently of the teacher.

c) What relationship is assumed between textbook and pupil?

- **The shapes of shadows**: There is a direct, friendly, second person address.
- **Wordswork**: There is a direct, friendly, second person address.
- **Heuristic adventures**: Pupils are addressed in the "imperative second person": "Try to find a difference between a legend and a myth"
### d) What relationship is assumed between pupil and pupil?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>There is some explicit provision in the activities for group work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>There is no explicit provision in the activities for group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>There is no explicit provision in the activities for group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>There is no provision in the activities for anything other than individual work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>There is some explicit provision in the activities for group work. In addition, there is explicit discussion of attitudes to other speakers in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>There is no provision in the activities for anything other than individual work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>There is no provision in the activities for anything other than individual work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>There is some explicit provision in the activities for group work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e) To what degree are pupil interest and motivation considered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>There is an attempt to provide topics of potential interest. Layout is colourful, and includes much visual material.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>There is an attempt to provide variety and topics such as &quot;humour&quot;, &quot;sport&quot;, &quot;love&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>To a large extent - students are asked to find materials for topics with a large degree of open-endedness about the material. In some units, they are asked to pursue topics they &quot;have a special interest in&quot;. Presentation and design are interesting and colourful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>There is no provision for choice. Exercises are the authors' design only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>There is an attempt to provide topics of potential interest and a very wide variety of material on the tapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>There is no provision for choice. Topics are the authors' concepts of what might interest students: &quot;surf&quot;, &quot;future&quot;, &quot;letter writing&quot;, &quot;fish&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>There is no provision for choice. Topics are the authors' concepts of what might interest students. In addition, one photograph is provided for 10-12 writing tasks per &quot;unit&quot;. There is often only a tangential relationship between the photograph and any particular task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>There is an attempt to provide topics of potential interest. Layout includes much visual material, including black-and-white photographs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Are questions open (ie encouraging thought and discussion) or closed (demanding the one "right" answer)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>All questions are open.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>All questions are open. There are, however, directions to &quot;notice&quot; which imply correct answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>All questions are open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>While students are invited to consider effects, there is a strong sense of &quot;the one right answer&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>All questions are open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>There is no only one right answer to all questions, other than writing topics at the end of chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>There is no only one right answer to all comprehension questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>Most questions are open, though some based on reading passages clearly point to a correct answer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Language activities

a) If there is overt teaching of grammar, what is its purpose (eg, humanistic; to improve writing)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>There is no overt teaching of grammar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>There is no overt teaching of grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>There is no overt teaching of grammar, though the teacher is instructed to use any problems revealed in the completion of the units as the basis for class teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>All units are based heavily on overt teaching of grammar. There is an explicit assumption that this teaching forms the basis of linguistic competence: “Giving young people practice in the deliberate use of specific forms of language is at least one way to help increase their sophistication in using language” (Hansen, 1977: 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>There is no overt teaching of grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>All units are based heavily on overt teaching of grammar. There is an explicit assumption that this teaching forms the basis of linguistic competence: “A generation of students grew up with little or no understanding of the foundations of English, and, their linguistic competence was... alarmingly low... designed to teach the basics necessary for skillful use of the English language”” (Sadler, Hayllar and Powell, 1977: “Preface”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>There is no overt teaching of grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>There is overt teaching of grammar, along with other “literacy” skills. These are taught as scaffolding - along with lead-up activities - for the major writing task in each unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Are exercises presented in terms of meeting individual needs, or seen as appropriate to the whole class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>There is no distinction made between individuals and the class.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>There is no distinction made between individuals and the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>The teacher is advised to be discriminating about who receives particular units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>There is no distinction made between individuals and the class. All units are assumed to be for whole-class use, though the class is considered to be “average and above average” (p.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>There is no explicit distinction made between individuals and the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>There is no distinction made between individuals and the class. All units are assumed to be for whole-class use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>There is no distinction made between individuals and the class. All units are assumed to be for whole-class use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>There is no distinction made between individuals and the class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Are there opportunities for "real languaging"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>All activities are designed around talking, writing, research and responses to text in the form of imaginative re-creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>Activities are overwhelmingly oriented to analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>All activities are designed around talking, writing, research, responses to text in the form of imaginative re-creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>There are no opportunities for any extended discourse originating from the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>All activities are designed around extended talking and listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>There are topics at the end of chapters for writing and one chapter which is a list of &quot;composition&quot; topics. Otherwise, all language use is in the form of short answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>All writing activities are opportunities for extended discourse. However, there is no provision for discussion of topics - simply the command to &quot;Write...&quot;, &quot;Describe...&quot;, &quot;Reconstruct...&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>All activities are designed around talking, writing, research and responses to text as a lead-up to the major writing tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Does the textbook present a range of extended discourse, or is the emphasis on words and sentences? Is the language real or artificial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>There is a very large range of extended discourse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>There is a very large range of extended discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>All activities are designed around talking, writing, research, responses to text in the form of imaginative re-creation. Thus, extended discourse is required of students. Units themselves have as source material specific texts to be supplied by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>All language use is in the form of short passages being re-arranged. The text itself presents short extracts as stimulus material. No real student language use is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>There is a very large range of extended oral discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>There are topics at the end of chapters for writing and one chapter which is a list of &quot;composition&quot; topics represent extended discourse. Otherwise, all language use is in the form of short answers. The text itself presents short extracts as stimulus material. No real language use is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Write now
All writing activities are opportunities for extended discourse. However, there is no provision for discussion of topics - simply the command to "Write...", "Describe...", "Reconstruct..." etc.

### Learning through language
There is a very large range of extended discourse.

e) Are speaking, listening, reading and writing seen as interdependent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>YES: Activities are largely based on responses to texts either viewed or read.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>Activities are largely reading and written analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>YES: Activities are largely based on responses to texts either heard or read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>While there is reading of the exercises themselves, there is no real opportunity provided for speaking, listening or extended writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>YES: oral language modes are explicitly treated as interdependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>While there is reading of the exercises themselves, and of &quot;comprehension&quot; passages, there is no real opportunity provided for speaking, listening and writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>NO: writing tasks are not embedded in any discussion or even lead-in. While there is reading of the &quot;comprehension&quot; passages, there is no real opportunity provided for speaking, listening and writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>YES: The major, core writing activity is based on responses to texts heard, read and discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Is there implicit or explicit sequencing of activities? If so, upon what basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>Cards are graded to ability levels, but there is no sequence of units within these levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>Units are sequenced on an implied hierarchy of sentence manipulation skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>Units are sequenced on an implied hierarchy of grammar and punctuation knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Write now
Learning through language
NO.
Only within the units to some extent - some reading and speaking activities need to be completed prior to the major writing task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) Is a range of stimuli provided?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The shapes of shadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES: extracts, cartoons, news items in the original format, photographs, poems etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES: extracts, cartoons, news items in the original format, photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cards themselves are colourful and well designed, but most stimulus material is outside the kit itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtually none, except very short paragraphs as demonstration of a point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a very wide variety of material on the tapes and &quot;chapter&quot; formats are not identical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension passages, and occasional black-and-white photographs, are the only stimulus material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: there is one photograph per &quot;unit&quot;, often only tangentially related to the task. Comprehension exercises are based on one passage only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES: extracts, maps, timetables, news items in the original format, photographs, short stories etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) Is there an attempt to link language and literature?

| The shapes of shadows             |
| Units and the talk and writing and research that are integral to them, are usually based on one or two texts. |
| Wordswork                         |
| The whole text is based on using literature and other extracts as the basis of "rhetorical" analysis. |
| Heuristic adventures              |
| Units and the talk and writing and research that are integral to them, are usually based on a suggested text. |
| The meaning machine               |
| NO.                               |
| Communicate                       |
| YES: though language and spoken text |
| Language one                      |
| Comprehension passages, and occasional black-and-white photographs, are the only stimulus material |
i) Is there an exploitation of the language learning that goes on outside the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>Many activities are heavily dependent on language used outside the classroom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>Many units are based on language only used outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>Every unit depends in differing degrees on knowledge brought to the unit, or on language used outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>NO: all units are discrete exercises entirely self-contained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>Many activities are heavily dependent on language used outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>NO: all units are discrete exercises entirely self-contained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>In the sense that the &quot;writing half&quot; of all units are basically topic lists, they Make potential use of the language used outside class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>Every unit depends in differing degrees on knowledge brought to the unit, or on language used outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j) Is there an attempt to teach comprehension through passages and exercises? If so:
   - What proportion of the questions can be answered without reference to the passage?
   - What proportion of the questions relates to that passage and that passage alone?
   - What proportion could be said to be training pupils in transferable skills of comprehension, should such exist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>There is no use of traditional comprehension passages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>There is no use of traditional comprehension passages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>There is no use of traditional comprehension passages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>There is no use of traditional comprehension passages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>There is some use of traditional comprehension passages in a listening mode, though all are presented as rhetorical analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>Every chapter opens with, and revolves around, a &quot;comprehension&quot; passage. No questions can be answered without reference to the passage. All questions relate to that passage and that passage alone. In a sense, all questions could be said to be training pupils in the transferable skills of answering such comprehension passages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>Every unit contains, a &quot;comprehension&quot; passage. No questions can be answered without reference to the passage. All questions relate to that passage and that passage alone. In a sense, all questions could be said to be training pupils in the transferable skills of answering such comprehension passages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>There is some limited use of traditional comprehension passages. Within these passages most questions are only answerable by direct reference to the passage. However, they are designed to lead outwards to discussion which underpins the major writing task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Provision for Assessment of Pupil's Development**

a) Is there provision for self-assessment by pupils?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The shapes of shadows</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wordswork</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic adventures</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning machine</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>YES: there are extended sections of discussion of assessment in both the teacher's book and the students' book. These include extended discussions of peer and self-assessment in speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language one</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write now</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through language</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Is the implied assessment procedure a formative one (ie the child against himself) or against some abstract standard?

| The shapes of shadows | Implied assessment is formative, since activities are open-ended. |
| Wordswork | Implied assessment is formative, since activities other than direct questions are open-ended: "Collect examples of..."
| Heuristic adventures | Implied assessment is formative, since active teacher supervision is encouraged, and active intervention when problems are seen.
| The meaning machine | As absolute standards of correctness are involved, all implied assessment is summative only.
| Communicate | Implied assessment is formative, since activities are open-ended. However, a summative assessment scheme for speaking is used, based on criterion-referencing for grades of "S", "S-" and "S+"
| Language one | As absolute standards of correctness are involved, all implied assessment is summative only.
| Write now | Implied assessment of the comprehension passages is summative, since absolute standards of correctness are involved.
| Learning through language | Implied assessment is formative, since activities other than direct questions are open-ended: "Collect examples of..."
CHAPTER 7

THE CONTEXT OF THE "WRITTEN CURRICULUM":
THE 1987 NSW SYLLABUS IN ENGLISH
YEARS 7-10

7.1 The 1987 Syllabus

If the 1971 Syllabus can be thought of as "laying the ground" for the coming of the 'growth' model to NSW, the Syllabus that came after it could be considered to some extent as "fulfilling the promise":

1. Growth in language is integral to the student's personal growth as a thinking, feeling person.

2. It is mainly through language that human beings explore their public and private worlds, organise their experience and form their values.

(NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 5)

In a general and fundamental sense, the later document espoused the key principles of the earlier one, while providing for teachers much more detail about implementation. Unlike its predecessor, the 1987 Syllabus did not have to take account of "levels" (such as Advanced, Ordinary, Modified) in any sense, since these had already been done away with for English by the Secondary Schools Board. The Syllabus itself, in its complete originally published form, expanded the 1971 document from seventeen to sixty-seven pages, largely because of the inclusion of suggested classroom activities in each section of the document.

A more detailed outline of aspects of the 1987 Syllabus follows, with comparisons to the 1971 document.

7.1.1 Rationale

Just as the statement of principles contained in the "Introduction" to the 1971 document stresses the active use of language, so too does the "Rationale" of the 1987 Syllabus. The "English as activity" model is confirmed:
3. Language is best developed by having all students engage in an abundance of purposeful language activities that are appropriate to their needs, interests and capacities.

1. Language learning needs to be a STUDENT-CENTRED activity in which students are called upon to take an active part in and responsibility for their own learning.

3. Language learning occurs during the process of students USING LANGUAGE, not simply through their consideration of finished language products or by their accumulating abstract theoretical knowledge about language.

(NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 5-7)

The latter of these three principles also echoes the earlier document in eschewing "systematic knowledge of (linguistic or literary topics)" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 2). A further key article of the Rationale is respect for individual differences. While the 1971 document had stressed that curriculum content was to be school-based according to pupil need, the 1987 Syllabus drew out the implications of this further in terms of dialect, defining "standard dialect" as the "prestige form of the language" (p.6), and stressing that each "student's language should be the starting point for further language learning" (p.6). As English is concerned with a wide variety of contexts, appropriate register and growth in the range of registers becomes a criterion of "quality" and processes of usage become as important as the language products themselves (p.7). Thus context and individualisation were especially taken from the 1971 Syllabus and highlighted in 1987.

7.1.2 The aim of English

The aim of English in 1971 was "to develop in pupils the utmost personal competence in using the language" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 4). By 1987, the aim had become "to enable students to strive towards personal excellence in using language" (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 5-7). The differences are somewhat telling. "Develop" becomes "enable students to strive towards" - this shift to some extent puts the teacher rather more in the role of a facilitator of a natural development - the very criticism that Christie and others of the "genre" schools were soon to level at the growth model in general. Moreover, "striving towards" contains more of an explicit sense that language development is not confined only to Years 7-10, or, indeed, to the years of schooling. "Personal competence" becomes "personal excellence", reflecting an attempt to re-capture the notion of excellence that had been taken as their own by groups such as ACES in the "declining standards" debate that had been.
continuing from the 1970s. The notion of "personal" in "personal excellence" continued the 1971 implication that language development was not easily subject to external, verifiable ideals of "correctness" which students must attain - thus the stress on concepts like "context" and "register".

"Growth" is measured in terms of students growing in their ability to "make meaning in a widening range of language situations". The limits of "meaning" ("what is said"; "how it is said"; "why it is said"; "the worth of what is said" - NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 11) are taken directly from the 1971 document (p.4), however the 1987 Syllabus adds the notion of "meaning" as the outcome of "an interaction between what is said or written and the person who is listening, reading or observing" (p.11). The influence of reader response theorists such as Rosenblatt and Iser had become much stronger in the "leading edge" of English theory in Australia by 1987.

The contexts peculiar to English are again everyday communication, personal expression, literature and mass media - and the "Aim" ends with a note on assessment to enshrine the principle that "the skills students require can neither be achieved nor demonstrated in situations isolated from their use of language in context" (p.11).

7.1.3 Objectives
There are only two specified objectives in 1987, and each of these is expressed in the form of experience opportunities: students to have the opportunity to develop their competence in oral language, reading, writing, responding to literature and the mass media; teachers to plan and shape integrated learning experiences to develop these "modes" (talking, listening, reading, writing) in these "contexts" of everyday communication, personal expression, literature and the mass media (p.15).

The Syllabus extends the 1971 document by more directly insisting on integration by basing planning on the notion of "units of work" (p.18) and by defining the role of the teachers...

---

1 I myself was a member of the Committee that wrote the 1987 Syllabus from 1984-1986 as the NSW Universities representative and some (small) amount of what is in this chapter is based on personal records and recollections.

2 For example, 1987 itself saw the publication of two key texts by Australians based heavily on reader-response theory: Corcoran and Evans, Readers, texts, teachers and Thomson's Understanding teenagers' reading. Ken Watson's influential English teaching in perspective was also published in the Open University Press in 1987. This revised edition included a section on the reader-response theory of Iser and Rosenblatt. O'Neill says of her time as editor of English in Australia (1984-1988) that "Iser's work appears to have had a strong influence on the ways in which we constructed the relationship between the reader, the text and the writer" (O'Neill, 1992: 36).
themselves in a way that the 1971 Syllabus had not done directly (as variously "an initiator, a facilitator, a respondent to students' work, an instructor, a co-ordinator, but always one who enjoys students' trust and shares with them their language learning experiences" - p. 18)

7.1.4 Modes and contexts
The rest of the Syllabus is divided into the Modes of Talking and Listening; Reading; Writing, and the Contexts of Literature and Mass Media, with a section on Assessment and Reporting. Each area is sub-divided into a number of Assumptions and Implications, with the former stating principles and the latter classroom practices.

The Context of Literature shows the strong influence of reader-response theorists such as Rosenblatt (1978) and of Stratta, Dixon and Wilkinson's (1973) concept of "imaginative re-creation". This particular Context highlights a number of principles that extend the approaches to teaching being advocated in 1977:

• a variety of genres and breadth of experience
• small-group and whole-class discussion
• relevant literature
• a strong advocacy of Young Adult and Australian literature
• the use of class libraries
• individual silent reading
• a strong advocacy of imaginative re-creation activities
• the treatment of drama as scripted performance

The Context of Mass Media shows the influence of writers such as Masterman (1980, 1985), who, in the early 80s had increasingly popularised a move away from a Leavisite "inoculation" approach to the media, to an approach based on the deconstruction of media products. The Context gives equal emphasis to student analysis of media and to student production of media.

7.2 The 1987 Syllabus and "literacy"

The 1987 Syllabus lacks the elegant simplicity of its 1971 counterpart. In part this is because it does provide the kind of detail about recommended classroom practice that was lacking in the earlier Syllabus, which confined itself to statements of objectives. But in part, it is also because the unifying overall vision of "language" that had been represented by the conjunction of Moffett with the ideals of Dixon and the London School, had become complicated by a series of different influences on various sub-sets of the Syllabus. If Dixon and Moffett had driven "language" in 1971, it was influences such as Smith, the Goodmans, Masterman and Graves
that more clearly "drove" specific Modes and Contexts in 1987. (Little [2000] has said that he still hadn’t read anything by Smith or the Goodmans prior to the release of the 1971 Syllabus). As the "Rationale" and "Aim" show, the unifying vision is still there and "language development" remains the central concept, but the particulars of each Mode and Context, and its particular intellectual influences, shift the focus into specific areas not necessarily, or not obviously, closely related.

As in 1971, the concept of "literacy" in the 1987 Syllabus is an unproblematic "given". There remains the uncontested sense in 1987 that "literacy" is still within the province of "English" in NSW secondary education. The word "literacy" is not central to the Syllabus document itself— as already stated, the synonym for "English" in this document is "language", though, as in 1971, if asked to identify those areas of the 1987 Syllabus that were specifically about "literacy", the framers of the document would no doubt again have referred to the sections on "Reading" and "Writing" for the same reasons discussed in Chapter 4.

7.2.1 "Reading" in the 1987 Syllabus

Reading is one of the "Modes" and, hence, one of the four-macro-skills to be developed in 7-10 English. The objective of the 1987 Syllabus with respect to reading is "that students understand, enjoy and respond perceptively to what they read in a wide range of contexts" (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 29).

The influence of Yetta and Kenneth Goodman (Goodman and Goodman, 1977; Gollasch, 1982) and of Frank Smith (1971, 1973, 1978) is pervasive. The document defines reading processes in terms of the Goodmans’ well-known division of semantic, syntactic and grapho-phonemic cueing systems; it puts comprehension at the centre of the process, warns against over-reliance on grapho-phonemic cues, encourages teacher analysis of miscues and adopts Smith’s slogan, "Students learn to read mainly by reading" (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 30; Smith, 1978: Ch. 5). From these basic principles, a number of teaching practices are seen to follow:

- breadth of reading experience
- the teacher’s reading aloud to students

---

1 An early draft of the "Writing" section of the Syllabus has as the first "Assumption" on writing the statement that, "Writing is a productive side of literacy...." (English Syllabus Committee, Years 7-10, nd).

2 In many ways it is simplistic to just link Smith and the Goodmans as representing identical notions - Smith, for example, had been generally more extreme in his rejection of phonics. Moreover, it is also simplistic to discuss the Goodmans themselves as having a view of the reading process, since their model of reading had undergone continual and substantial revision - see Gollasch, 1982. Nevertheless, in certain essentials, the Goodmans’ view of reading had remained consistent and these essentials they shared with Smith.
• avoidance of isolated comprehension exercises.

The other detectable influences are Lunzer and Gardiner (1984), whose activities which have come to be known as DARTS form the basis of recommended comprehension activities, such as prediction, selective substitution and sequencing.

The key point to be made in the present context is, however, that reading is presented as unequivocally and unproblematically part of the province of "English". Just as in 1971, "English" and "literacy" would seem to be equated and the latter would seem to be considered a "sub-set" of "English".

7.2.2 "Writing" in the 1987 Syllabus

The objective of the "Writing" section of the 1987 Syllabus echoes the equivalent section of the 1971 document almost verbatim:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1971 Syllabus</th>
<th>1987 Syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The objective is development of pupil's ability to express themselves in writing, which is closely related to their pleasure and developing competence and confidence in writing. This involves:</td>
<td>The objective is that students write with pleasure, confidence and competence over a wide range of registers. This involves students in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) <strong>Something to say.</strong> Ability to express observation, thought, feeling and imagination.</td>
<td>* having something to say, the ability to express observation, thought, feeling and imagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) <strong>A sense of the situation in which it is said.</strong></td>
<td>* writing frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Ability to write to a purpose, to describe, narrate, reflect, inform, persuade, argue, make an exposition...</td>
<td>• having a sense of the appropriate register for the situation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Ability to write to an audience: the class, the teacher, other persons, imagined persons or groups, the general reader, oneself...</td>
<td>- ability to write to a purpose: to describe, narrate, reflect, inform, persuade, argue, make an exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Ability to write in various forms: personal records, stories, poems, plays, articles, letters, news items, items for use in various media...</td>
<td>- ability to write to an audience: the class, the teacher, other persons, imagined persons or groups, the general reader, oneself...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ability to write in various forms: personal records, stories, novels, poems, plays, articles, letters, news items, items for use in various media...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed in Chapter 4 already, this remains Moffett's structure of discourse echoed exactly:

- messenger, message, audience ("a first person, a second person, and a third person; a speaker, listener and subject; informer, informed and information; narrator, auditor and story; transmitter, receiver and message...somebody-talking-to-somebody-about-something" - Moffett, 1968: 10)

- purpose and an appropriate form ("Generalizing.../what happens.../History;

The influence of Britton and the London School is also stamped on the "Writing" section of the Syllabus ("Possible audiences include: ...self;...peer;...a younger person;...trusted adult;...teacher as assessor;...wider audience, known and unknown, real and imagined" - Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 37; Britton et al, 1975). One important difference, however, between the 1971 Syllabus and that of 1987 with regard to writing pedagogy is the influence of the Americans Donald Graves and Donald Murray.

For the purposes of attending the Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, Graves had visited Australia in 1980 under the auspices of the then recently formed Primary English Teachers' Association (PETA). Graves' research on writing development in the younger ages influenced PETA hugely (Collerson, 1992: 17) and by 1983 PETA had produced four books on teaching writing which were entirely based on Graves' approaches to writing development (Turbill, 1982, 1983; Walshe, 1981a, 1981b). Two of these were written by R.D. Walshe, who was himself publications editor of PETA and was profoundly influenced by Graves and Murray.

Murray in many ways had reflected the kind of thinking about writing that had been professed by Barnes and Britton, especially in the notion of using writing for the ordering of experience and hence "writing oneself into understanding". His particular version of this idea is his definition of a writer as "an individual who uses language to discover meaning in
experience and communicate it” (Murray, 1982: 8). Murray also advocated the notion of
classroom writers "doing what real writers do", and hence "drafting" and "publishing" and the
"process" of writing became central ideas. Graves' own research (1982) was also based on
approaches to the processes of writing and it was this aspect of the Americans’ influence that
found its way into the 1987 Syllabus. The "Writing" section takes as its very first assumption
the idea that "Writing is both a process and a product" (p.36). The implications that follow
include the Graves-Murray model of writing processes ("thinking, talking, drafting, listening,
editing, reading, researching, polishing, publishing, rehearsing and responding to the works
of others" [p. 36]) and the Gravesian emphasis on "conferencing”.

7.2.3 Grammar in the 1987 Syllabus

Much of the 1987 document either directly or by implication echoes its predecessor's removal
of the conscious study of grammar as an objective of subject English. This is especially so
because of the distinction again drawn between what one can consciously describe in
language and the knowledge that one demonstrates through "use":

Language learning occurs during the process of students USING LANGUAGE, not
simply through their consideration of finished language products or by their
accumulating abstract theoretical knowledge about language. (NSW Board of Secondary
Education, 1987: 7)

The skills students require can neither be achieved nor demonstrated in situations
isolated from their use of language in context (NSW Board of Secondary Education,
1987:11)

Students will need to demonstrate their competence in writing tasks across a wide range
of registers. Fill-in-the-blank exercises and dummy runs with phrases and sentences
taken out of context are not good indicators of such competence because they cannot
demonstrate students' ability to sustain a register. (NSW Board of Secondary Education,
1987: 41)

Assessment should identify students' ability to use all the language modes in a range of
contexts. It should not be restricted to those aspects of language which are easily
measurable or observable (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 63)

However, the document was issued just prior to a coming state election, and the Opposition
had revived the standards debate in terms of an alleged lack of grammar teaching.
Consequently the Syllabus underwent a last-minute recall by the Minister for Education and
the most explicit statement about grammar teaching in the Syllabus underwent something of a reversal when the extra sentence "Teaching particular grammatical concepts can improve students' writing if undertaken in context and at the time of need" was placed before the earlier "Assumption 6", which had simply stated that "Teaching an isolated course in grammar does not necessarily improve students' ability to write." Though the Syllabus had accepted the research about grammar on which its predecessor had been based, political priorities had led to its most explicit view on grammar being "watered down" in relation to the 1971 document. Watson recalls:

This was my fault - the grammar statement was too negative. Greiner denounced it on TV by quoting the statement out of context and Cavalier recalled it for the paste-over. I had put it too bluntly and Greiner saw an opportunity. (Watson, 2000)

### 7.3 The 1987 Syllabus and the Christie thesis

Once again, the central elements of the Christie thesis of the history of English in Australia are:

- the more or less wholesale transfer into Australia of the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon
- the rejection of teaching about sentence-level grammar leading to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general - indeed, active resistance to teaching about language, leading to a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
- the abandonment of the study of literature in terms of analysis of language

#### 7.3.1 The 1987 Syllabus, growth, language and rhetoric

To the extent that the 1987 Syllabus reinforced and strengthened the main ideas of its 1971 counterpart it is correct that "growth" became further entrenched in NSW official curriculum. The structure of the 1987 Syllabus into "Language Modes" and "Language Contexts" echoed two of the three arms of the 1971 Syllabus, viz: "IN USE" and "IN CONTEXT". There is no direct counterpart to that arm of the 1971 triad entitled "THE LANGUAGE", with no correspondingly direct or highlighted discussion of "usage", "vocabulary", "structure" or "style". The statement in the 1987 Syllabus which draws the key distinction between language use and language analysis ("Language learning occurs during the process of students USING LANGUAGE, not simply through their consideration of finished language products or by their accumulating abstract theoretical knowledge about language" - Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 7), unlike its 1971 counterpart, is not
accompanying a section of the Syllabus which places that statement within a context that is ultimately rhetorical. Watson blames the lack of a section on language study for the Ministerial recall of the document over the grammar issue and believes that not having such a section corresponding to 1971 was a mistake:

The original intention in the 1985 (sic) Syllabus was to have a language document. There was a sub-committee - I chaired it, and it included Joan Rothery... The language document never surfaced because it was decided that the WHOLE document was about language. I objected to that position. I wasn't sure that it was absolutely true - this other document was to be on learning ABOUT language (Watson, 2000).

Hence, the extent to which the 1987 Syllabus was concerned with a primarily "rhetorical" view of English as was its 1971 predecessor - issuing in turn, as I have argued in Chapter 4, directly out of the work of Moffett and Dixon - would at first appear to be problematic.

On the one hand, the lack of a section of the Syllabus which directly corresponds to that arm of 1971 entitled "LANGUAGE" does tend to mute the sense of direct discussion about language that arises from the contexts of usage. To some extent, the degree to which one sees this Syllabus as displaying a "rhetorical" model of English depends largely on an awareness of the connections with 1971, and of that document's direct links with Dixon and Moffett and of the degree to which these theorists themselves represent direct study of language in a rhetorical mode. Outside of the "Aims" and "Rationale" the document itself does not readily proclaim those links. In part, this is a result of the document's sheer size. As argued in 7.2 above, the 1987 Syllabus lacks the elegant simplicity of its 1971 counterpart. This is because it does provide the kind of detail about recommended classroom practice that was lacking in the earlier Syllabus, which had to confine itself to statements of objectives. But, it is also partly because the unifying overall vision of "language" that had been represented by the conjunction of Moffett with the ideals of Dixon and the London School, had become complicated by that series of different influences on various sub-sets of the Syllabus: Smith, the Goodmans, Masterman, Rosenblatt, Stratta, Dixon and Wilkinson, Murray and Graves. As the "Rationale" and "Aim" show, the unifying vision is still there and "language development" remains the central concept, but the particulars of each mode and context, and its particular intellectual influences, shift the focus into specific areas not always obviously related to each other.

5 "The fact that there was no full section on language meant that the full argument wasn't there" - Watson, 2000.
6 Later a strong "genre" advocate and supporter of the Christie thesis.
On the other hand, those Modes of the Syllabus concerned with direct language production by students - "Talking and Listening" and "Writing" - continually highlight concern for language use in relation to "situation", "audience" and "purpose". Moreover, as seen in 7.2.2 above, the "Writing" section, in particular, echoes 1971 directly and issues directly out of Moffett's view of rhetoric. The section on Assessment stresses the assessing of students' ability to "use appropriately a wide range of registers" and this requires assessing their ability to "use language with an awareness of purpose, situation and audience" (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 66). Similarly, those sections of the Syllabus expressing its "Rationale" and "Aim" are, as we have seen, steeped in the rhetorical approaches that underlie the 1971 document. The limits of "meaning", for example, ("what is said"; "how it is said"; "why it is said"; "the worth of what is said" - NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 11) are rhetorically oriented and taken directly from the 1971 document (p.4).

Similarly, the Context of Mass Media is exhaustive in its listing of those aspects of direct language study which are relevant. The "grammar" of the media is at the forefront of that Context's concerns. Moreover, these are always expressed in a form that is "rhetorical" in Christie's sense:

Students should be provided with opportunities to deconstruct media products in order to identify the visual and aural, verbal and non-verbal language used and to consider how the particular combination of these forms of language shapes meaning....

.......Students should examine how and why meaning is shaped by particular combinations of the visual, verbal and aural language of the media, and evaluate the meanings thereby conveyed (p.55)

Students should discover the effects on meaning of stereotyping, bias, choice of detail, allocation of space and time to programs.

Students should learn through direct observation to recognise the ways in which the media shape reality (p.56)

Students should be provided with opportunities to identify the particular ways in which the media are shaped by purpose, audience and situation...

\[^{7}\text{See, for example, "Talking and Listening": Objective and Assumptions # 3 and 5. See also "Writing": Objective and Assumption # 2}\]
Students should create media products to suit particular purposes, audiences and situations (p.57)

Students should explore whether ownership and intended audience affect the point of view and mode of discourse adopted by the various media (p.58)

Teachers should encourage students to observe the creation of new words, changes in the meaning of current words, changes in spelling conventions, punctuation and expression in the media

Students should engage in structured language activities based on observed usage peculiar to the media...

Students could relate media formats to literary forms and engage in language activities drawing connections between them (p.59).

7.3.2 The 1987 Syllabus and Literature

It will be remembered that Christie's view on the study of literature - issuing from her view of Leavis - is that its nature discouraged the close study of texts - encouraging not close language analysis, but simply "admiration". She further claims that this tendency in the teaching of literature existed more or less alongside "growth", with the combined effect on the "English" curriculum of rendering language "invisible" (Christie et al, 1991: 18; Christie, 1993: 76-77; 94-98; 101-102).

Like its 1971 counterpart, the Syllabus is unapologetic in the prominence given to literature, which "provides a unique context for language growth through expansion of the student's individual world" (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 45). Also like its 1971 counterpart, and in keeping with its roots in "growth", the Syllabus includes as "literature" "the literature created by the students themselves" (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 45). The pedagogical principles stressed in the 1987 document are:

- breadth of experience
- relevance
- individual response
- enjoyment

However, this Syllabus contains no equivalent to the 1971 document's direction to respond to "the form of a work, its structure and style; its parts and their relations to one another and the whole " (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 13). It is much more an act of faith in the
"Literature" Context that such discussion about language will arise as a result of particular classroom activities than it had been in 1971:

Deeper and more subtle understandings can be encouraged by using the technique known as "imaginative re-creation of literature" (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 48).

An effective working vocabulary (of literary terms) will arise naturally when literature is discussed and responded to within the spirit of this syllabus (p.49)

However, as we have seen, the Syllabus' other detailed Context of "Mass Media" is exhaustive in its listing of those aspects of language study that are to be explicitly dealt with. The Literature Context may have made the study of language relatively inexplicit simply because it was taken as a "given" that English teachers would address language in the context of literary study. It needs to be noted that, in 1987, based on their undergraduate backgrounds, which were still dominated by the study of literature, "Mass Media" was a relatively unfamiliar area for English teachers. (Indeed, during the 1980s and early 1990s the NSW Secondary Schools Board and it successors, the Board of Secondary Education and the Board of Studies, produced an independent draft Syllabus in Media Studies which was never eventually implemented). Hence, the exhaustive list of aspects of language to be dealt with in the Mass Media Context may partly be catering for that lack of familiarity. A belief that English teachers would be familiar with those aspects of language to be dealt with in the Context of Literature - and hence not producing a list of topics for such study - would indeed give the appearance of a neglect of such study in this Context.

Evidence that this is a reasonable interpretation of the invisibility of language topics within Literature is provided by the fact that in two areas of Literature where again English teachers were relatively inexperienced, the relevant language topics are named and the emphasis is on a rhetorical approach to the study of language. Those areas of Literature were performance drama and film:

In responding to the (drama) text through workshop and improvisation, they will be exploring the motivation of characters both from the viewpoint of actor and of producer/director and will also consider such matters as groupings, movement, stage-lighting, set design, background music and sound effects (p.51)

(In film), An awareness of editing, lighting, sound effects, background music and setting can be provided through both class discussion and small-group activity (p.51)
This evidence would appear to run absolutely against any suggestion that the Syllabus as a whole was attempting to avoid direct and explicit study of language as a central concern of its Contexts.

7.4 Summary

The 1987 Syllabus for Years 7-10 in NSW did represent a continuation of the principles of "growth" introduced into the state through the 1971 Syllabus. Key defining points remained:

- English as activity
- curriculum content to become school-based, according to pupil need
- speaking to be seen as equal in importance to writing
- "self-expression" and "perception" being regarded equally
- the encouragement of an integrated curriculum

To these could be added an emphasis on personal excellence.

The flavour given to "growth" in NSW from its roots in the work of Moffett and Dixon is perhaps not as obvious in 1987, where separate and divergent influences are more evident in each section of the document. Some things are less "visible" in 1987 than 1971, chief among these being the language-based rhetorically-oriented approach to literary study. However, this cannot simply be read as supporting the Christie view of literary study in this country. The evidence suggests that close study of language in a rhetorical mode remains a key concern of the Syllabus, despite its lack of an equivalent to the 1971 "Language". Finally, with respect to "literacy", it is probably true to say that in 1987 the concept was still regarded as unproblematically the province of "English" in NSW.
CHAPTER 8

ASPECTS OF THE CONTEXT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1987 SYLLABUS:

STATE AND NATIONAL POLICY, THE GENRE
DEBATE AND CRITICAL LITERACY

Chapter 5 contained a discussion of the "language across the curriculum" movement as forming an important context of curriculum theory and policy for the implementation of the 1971 Syllabus. In fact, Department of Education policy in NSW from the late 1970s to the late 1980s took very seriously the concept of "language across the curriculum" - and culminated in the release in the late 70s in NSW of the document Reading K-12 and in the late 80s with the document Writing K-12. These documents formed an important background to the devising and early implementation of the 1987 Syllabus. The debate over "genre" approaches to writing also formed part of the context of the later implementation of this Syllabus and, as Chapter 10 will argue, created a context for a narrowing of the definition of "literacy" in this state, and of the separation of "English" from "literacy"1. Development of the National Statement and Profiles in English and a K-6 English Syllabus was also part of the context of this later implementation. In addition, the period between the release of the 1987 Syllabus and this study's next "key year" - 1992 - saw the rise of critical literacy as a challenge to "growth".

8.1 Reading K-12

The Department of Education in NSW, through its Directorate of Studies, released the Curriculum Policy Statement, Reading K-12 in 1979. Hence it stands about halfway between the two Years 7-10 Syllabuses under discussion here, developed during the implementation of the first and itself being implemented during the gestation and writing of the 1987 document. In fact, the Mode, "Reading", in the later Syllabus and the Reading K-12 policy reflect identical approaches to reading. Like the later Syllabus, Reading K-12 emphasises understanding through a process of interaction between the reader and the text:

---

1 Corcoran, in reflecting on his years as editor of English in Australia, saw the period 1990-1996 as characterised nationally by four key issues:
* the progressivism- critical literacy divide
* variations on the genre debate
* reader-response vs poststructuralist approaches
* the politics of access, gender and sexuality  (Corcoran, 1998: 105)
READING IS A PROCESS OF BRINGING MEANING TO AND EXTRACTING MEANING FROM PRINT

(Directorate of Studies, ndB: 13).

As in the later Syllabus, the influence of the Goodmans (Goodman and Goodman, 1977; Gollasch, 1982), Frank Smith (1971, 1973, 1978) and those advocating a psycholinguistic approach to reading is pervasive. The document explicitly advocates a "language experience approach" based on a psycholinguistic model of reading (Directorate of Studies, ndA: 27ff). Like the 1987 Syllabus, Reading K-12 also defines reading processes in terms of the Goodmans' division of semantic, syntactic and grapho-phonic cuing systems and warns against over-reliance on grapho-phonic cues. The diagrammatic representation of reading processes in the two documents is identical (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 32; Directorate of Studies, ndB: 15). Much emphasis is placed on what the reader brings to text and on processes of predicting, sampling and confirming. In 1981, the Secondary Schools Board issued a memorandum which set out the relationship of Reading K-12 to the 1971 Syllabus. This document stressed the commonality of learning assumptions and the importance of a rich language experience to reading success (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1981). Its more detailed statements about reading were taken up and elaborated even further in the 1987 Syllabus. The three documents, then, were closely related in their view of reading and of language in general.

Reading K-12 is an across-the-curriculum policy, and reflects the central ideas of "language across the curriculum" that were influencing English in NSW, as discussed in Chapter 5. In terms of the Hallidayan triad, it is clearly a policy which is aimed at "learning language", but it is also a policy which reflects the more cognitive and constructivist view of "learning through language" discussed in Chapter 5 as emanating from Barnes and Britton:

All teachers at all levels are involved in the teaching of language and reading as these are the avenues through which a large percentage of learning occurs...

(Directorate of Studies, ndC: 5).

It is largely through language that we make new information our own. We need to talk and write ourselves into understanding. Reading and listening also involve a kind of conversation in our heads as we relate what is new to what we already know

(Directorate of Studies, ndC: 15).

Government policy was supported throughout 1979-80 by teams of consultants throughout NSW providing "in-service" courses on the application of the policy across the curriculum,
though Reading K-12 was not supported by on-going follow-up from outside the schools and eventually simply disappeared from the policy context.

### 8.2 Writing K-12

During the writing of the 1987 Syllabus, the NSW Department of Education was simultaneously developing a policy for Writing K-12, which was published in late 1987. This document contained the compulsory Writing syllabus for K-6, including spelling and handwriting, but also contained detailed statements of principles about writing in the curriculum areas for Years 7-12. Like the English Syllabus itself, the document had had a long gestation period. Early statements of principles for Writing K-12 had tended to stress the value of writing for learning in terms reminiscent of Barnes and Britton, especially the latter's emphasis on organising experience through language:

> Through writing, the learner can reflect on experience. Once new thoughts are written down, the writer has the opportunity to re-order and re-think them to create new knowledge. Through writing, the learner can find a way of explaining the relationship between the new and the known. Through writing, the student can create new insights, and help to extend understandings by forming relationships between previously unconnected thoughts. When they write, students can order and apply information and clarify and expand what has been learned. (Directorate of Studies, NSW Dept of Education, 1984: 6)

The final document strengthened this principle by re-emphasising Britton's shaping of experience and directly overlaying it with Barnes' principle that the learning of new knowledge can be dependent on the opportunity for students to express that knowledge in a familiar language:

6.1 Writing can be a powerful means of learning in all years, K-12, and in all curriculum areas....

6.2 Through writing, students can reflect on experience, re-order ideas to create new knowledge, and find relationships between the known and the new.

6.3 Until students can shape their new knowledge in their own words, it is likely that what is being learnt will remain remote. Conversely, weaknesses in a piece of writing often reflect a lack of understanding of the ideas being written about. (NSW Department of Education, 1987: 7)
In conceptualising Writing K-12 through Halliday’s triad, then, it can be seen to contain both the notion of “learning language” (writing) and “learning through language”, with the latter heavily reflecting that cognitive and constructivist view of Barnes and Britton. In terms of “learning about language”, the policy deals explicitly with spelling and report writing and essay writing structures across the curriculum areas. It does not, however, confine the production of writing in subject areas to a small range of forms or genres. Rather, in keeping with Barnes’ views on the need to interpret knowledge in the language forms one best understands (and also in keeping with Britton’s transactional-expressive-poetic continuum) the non-English subject areas are directed to use play scripts, persuasive speeches, timelines, advertisements, reviews, scripts, dialogues, letter writing, news articles, brochures, posters and a large range of other forms (pp. 93-130). A page of cartoon-heads with speech bubbles has a “Languages teacher” saying, “I tried writing ideas that I’d always associated with other subjects. They made my lessons more interesting”, while two “Year 7 students” declare, “If I can write it out of my own head I can remember it better” and “Writing helps me know what I think” (p.71).

In addition to this strong emphasis on writing for learning, there is also an emphasis, again reflecting the 1987 English Syllabus, on process. The document describes in detail how teachers across the curriculum can apply the Graves-Murray-Walshe process of preparing-drafting-revising-editing-publishing (pp. 72-79).

8.3 The genre debate

The debate over "genre" approaches to writing probably first came to the national attention of teachers with the 1987 publication of Ian Reid’s The place of genre in learning. In NSW, the key work in genre theory had been coming from research in Sydney primary schools by Rothery and Martin since the early 80s (Rothery, 1984, 1985; Martin, 1984; Martin and Rothery, 1981).

8.3.1 The "Sydney School"

It is, of course, important not to over-simplify this debate by discussing genre-based approaches to writing as if they constituted a single "school". It has long been clear, for example, that the "Sydney" (Richardson, 1998; Green, 1995a; Freedman and Medway, 1994) approach to genre studies, rooted in Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics, differs considerably from North American New Rhetoric studies as represented by Freedman and Medway (Freedman and Medway, 1994, 1995). Essentially, as Richardson (1998) shows, these North American studies approach genres as evolving, situated in contexts and adjusting with
those contexts according to need - that is, as essentially "rhetorical" structures. Richardson contrasts these approaches with the stability and rigidity that the "Sydney School" sees in curriculum genres (1998: 232ff). Moreover, in Australia itself, those linguists who research in genre theory, but are more influenced by British Critical Linguistics, have distanced themselves from this "Sydney School" by concentrating on the processes that form texts rather than the structures that classify "types" of texts (Knapp, 1995). Similarly, post-structuralist genre-oriented linguists, especially feminists, have also strongly critiqued the ideology of the "Sydney School", especially the idea that there is an exact correspondence between types of texts and particular contexts (Lee, 1993; Threadgold, 1994). This group is also critical of any approach that fails to allow students to critique the ideological bases of texts (Cranney-Francis, 1992; Gilbert, 1992; Kamler, 1995).

Nevertheless, it was this "Sydney School", led by Martin, Rothery and Christie, with an approach to genre-based pedagogy and claiming derivation from Hallidayan functional-systemics, that was to eventually have the most influence on policy in NSW. In summary, the arguments of the "Sydney School" in the 1980s highlighted the following:

- genres of writing are identifiable and fixed and boundaries can be established around them
- subject-based knowledge is constructed by, and in turn, constructs, particular generic forms ("genres make meaning")
- learning to write is primarily a matter of learning to control genres
- in schools, genres ought to be consciously chosen by writers and their writing conform to the particular genre's structure
- there needs to be direct teaching of generic forms
- this direct teaching needs to begin in infants' school
- primary-level schooling ought to prepare students for the kinds of subject-based writing they will meet in secondary school
- there is too much emphasis on narrative forms and this is poor preparation for the writing of secondary schools (Christie, 1985a, 1985b, 1985c, 1985d, 1987; Martin, 1984; Rothery, 1984, 1985; Martin and Rothery, 1981; Martin, Christie and Rothery, 1987a, 1987b; Christie and Rothery, 1989; Christie, Martin and Rothery, 1989).

---

2 Richardson argues that "The influence and impact of the Sydney genre school in dislodging expressivist process pedagogy in primary and secondary schooling in Australia has been profound. English literacy curriculum documents in all States and Territories treat genres as unproblematic" (1998: 235).
Demonised in the theory of the "Sydney School" were what they referred to as "process writing classroom(s)". The key demons were Graves and his Australian followers such as Walsh and Turbill. According to Martin, Christie and Rothery, the problem with "process writing" classrooms were primarily the Gravesian concepts of "choice" and "ownership". These, they argued, were concepts that essentially "imprisoned" most children in "their own words", because only bright, middle class children had the backgrounds to take advantage of the choices. Working class, ESL and Aboriginal children had no such choices from their background and "process" pedagogy did not give it to them because teachers were trained to "bite (their) tongues in conferences". (Martin, Christie and Rothery, 1987a, 1987b; Christie, 1987; Christie and Rothery, 1989). Hence, "process" pedagogy is seen as essentially dis-abling for most children - a form of benign neglect, rooted in the Romantic progressivism of those like Dixon who were seen to be behind the emphasis on individualising at the expense of a social-construction orientation (see, for example, Christie, 1987). In fact, one of the great ironies of the genre debate is that, while delineating a pedagogy that "married" "English" with "language" and with learning across the curriculum, Dixon in Growth through English had made the very critique of "process" that the "Sydney School" were later to make:

...the swing to process has its own dangers. The first is over-rejection. If the conventions and systems of written English do not come in the centre of the map, where do they come at all? The answer is obviously complicated, so there is a temptation to ignore the question...But though we can fight to modify conventions and systems, we cannot ignore them. Language remains a social instrument by which we share, fully or imperfectly, our preoccupations and interests. When deviance from the system becomes too great, interference may swamp and blot out the message (Dixon, 1975: 12).

Finally, as Christie was later to re-iterate in reviewing the history of English pedagogy in Australia, the "Sydney School" claimed that under "process" pedagogy, knowledge about language was regarded as "taboo" (Martin, Christie and Rothery, 1987a [esp. pp. 73-74, 77-78], 1987b; Christie, 1987; Christie and Rothery, 1989).

8.3.2 LERN and Writing K-12

A state election in March 1988 saw a new Education Minister, Dr Terry Metherell, replace his Labor counterpart just as both Writing K-12 and the new English Syllabus were beginning to be implemented. At this time, the "Sydney School" had joined with Gunther Kress at the University of Technology, Sydney, and with the Centre for Multicultural Studies at Wollongong University and others to form the Literacy and Education Research Network (LERN). Though LERN and the "Sydney School" were very strong critics of Writing K-12, in April, 1988, LERN announced through the newspaper of the NSW Teachers' Federation that
they had been commissioned by the Department of Education, in conjunction with the Department's own Directorate of Studies, to develop curriculum support materials for *Writing K-12*, "introducing an up-to-date, functional grammar; ways of teaching different types (or 'genres') of writing; and evaluation methods" (Cope, 1988). The article, "Fundamentals of literacy", as well as the title of the broader group, Literacy Education Research Network, were among the earliest examples of two phenomena that were to become dominant in NSW:

- the identification of "literacy" with what had been formerly called "language across the curriculum" and, in turn,
- the identification of "literacy" with genre-based approaches to writing

While "English" in NSW had formerly included the notion of "literacy", and had also been synonymous with the concept "language", "literacy" from 1988, in official state curriculum documents, became both separated from "English" and narrowed, at least as far as writing was concerned, into "genre-based" approaches ostensibly derived from the "Sydney School".

As Richardson argues (1998: 233ff), the early primary school research of Rothery and Martin became coupled with the development of a model of pedagogy and a typology of genres appropriate to particular school subjects. The model of pedagogy developed for the Directorate of Studies/LERN project to support *Writing K-12* consisted of three tightly sequenced phases, each of which had identifiable and equally tightly sequenced internal stages:

a) modelling - consisting of questions asked around a particular context, followed by study of model texts in a particular genre
b) joint negotiation of text - in which students decide how information is to be gathered and then the teacher acts as scribe for the class to shape student contributions into a text which approximates the genre under focus
c) independent construction of a new text - in which students draft in the genre, followed by conferencing with peers and the teacher and then editing and publishing (Literacy and Education Research Network and Studies Directorate, ndA: 9-12).

The typology of genres developed out of the project was also strictly defined. In Years 3-6, for example, texts were divided into "story" genres and "factual" genres. The former were then sub-divided into "narrative", "news story", "exemplum", "anecdote" and "recount", and the latter into "procedure", "explanation", "report", "exposition" and "discussion". In turn, each genre was given defined structural characteristics. "Reports", for example, were to be structured as follows:

- a general classification, followed by
- description, in terms of
  - types
  - parts (and their functions)
  - qualities
  - habits/behaviours

Language features are:
- a focus on generic participants
- use of simple present tense
- no temporal sequencing and
- the use of "being" and "having" clauses (Literacy and Education Research Network and Studies Directorate, ndB).

It is important to note that under this approach, tense and clause structure become an important part of what it is that students are required to know in writing "reports", just as exclamatives, intensifiers, temporal and continuative conjunctions and the distinction between material and relational processes are among what they are required to know in constructing anecdotes (Literacy and Education Research Network/Studies Directorate, ndA: 28). Rather than being regarded as "taboo", "learning about language" in terms of schematic structures and the language features of genres is absolutely central to the LERN approach.

The Writing K-12 LERN support project was focused, and the materials trialed, in the NSW Department of Education's Metropolitan East and South-West regions, though other areas soon followed, not always in an identical vein. In 1992, for example, the Metropolitan West Region produced its Literacy and learning program resource book. Here, "genres" are not so much texts as processes. Thus genres are described as verbs, the school genres being: "describing", "explaining", "instructing", "arguing" and "narrating". Each of these are again sub-divided into those texts in which they most commonly appear - "arguing", for example, appears in essays, expositions, discussions, debates, reviews, interpretations and evaluations. The language features of each genre and its corresponding texts are again classified, and model texts are provided (Knapp, 1992). Despite the difference in orientation, once again, "learning about language" in terms of schematic structures and language features of genres is absolutely central to the genre-based project.

8.3.3 Re-conceptualising the genre debate

From the point of view of the current argument, what is really key is the debate in which genre-based approaches generally (though represented in NSW largely by the "Sydney School") are opposed to other pedagogical approaches to writing - and, particularly, the way in which that debate is itself conceptualised. In fact, the debate is uniformly conceptualised in
this country as one of "process versus genre". Corcoran's 1992 retrospect refers to the "process/genre debate" (1992a: 6) and the phrase and/or concept are virtually universal in discussions of writing pedagogy (Martin, Christie and Rothery, 1987b: 77; Green, 1987: 84; Richardson, 1991: 171; Collerson, 1992:18; O'Neill, 1992:39; Wyatt-Smith, 1997).

But of course, there are other ways in which any debate can be analysed and a key concept in the current context arises from the question, "What is writing for across the curriculum?" A leading assumption of the "Sydney School" is that school subjects are essentially about an apprenticeship into the textual-generic-language forms of the subject, but a question never addressed is whether the textual-generic-language forms of the subject might actually constitute a problem for the student in terms of their learning of that subject. I am not arguing that this is necessarily the case, but simply arguing that that is a legitimate way of conceptualising the debate\(^1\). When conceived in this way, what opposes a "genre approach" is not Graves, or "process", but rather Barnes and the notion that the language of the subject can be problematic in terms of student learning - hence the emphasis of Writing K-12 on a number of language forms being used in all subject areas. It is worth repeating Barnes' key point here from Chapter 5 above:

...If children are asked to write in a specialist style ... before it has any meaning for them, they will be reduced to copying the model presented by the teacher or textbook. Their writing, instead of being part of grappling with the subject matter is directed by the desire to 'make the right noises', to sound like a chemist or a historian. This leads to ... 'empty verbalism' ... Instead of using language to shape new meanings which link the new scientific or historical knowledge with what they know ... the pupils have been reduced to mere imitation. Every secondary school teacher would recognise the result: blocks of technical language thrust together without coherence or sense....

...Before the pupils can write up the new knowledge for themselves rather than merely as imitators, they must go through the complex process of relating the new knowledge to what they know already, and using it in various ways. They will do this most readily through talking and writing of a much more groping kind: using the new ideas to solve problems will help them make sense of it. To move directly to final draft stage is to omit the essential part of learning, and to expect pupils to arrive without having travelled (Barnes, 1973: 46-49)

Barnes may or may not be correct about this, but it is a radically different view of the role that writing is to play in learning itself - one that casts a more profound challenge to the "Sydney

\(^1\) A version of this argument has previously appeared in Sawyer and Watson, 1995.
School" than "process" notions of "freedom". In following this kind of conceptualisation, another way of viewing the debate in the terms set up by this argument, is to see the "Sydney School" as arguing for "learning language" and primarily for "learning about language", while the English Syllabus and Writing K-12 argue for "learning language", "learning about language", but also, and perhaps primarily, for "learning through language".

To understand the notion of bodies of subject knowledge actually being expressed in a limited range of textual-generic-language forms it is necessary to understand the belief of the "Sydney School" that knowledge is intimately connected to the forms of language in which it is embodied. Knowledge and language are "profoundly indivisible" (Hammond, 1987: 171-2); "language makes meaning" (Martin, Christie and Rothery, 1987b: 64); "Geographers mean what they do because of the language they use" (Martin, Christie and Rothery, 1987a:9) - these are basic tenets of that version of "genre" theory represented by the "Sydney school". About Science, for example, Christie has argued that "Scientific language ... functions to construct a different understanding of the world" and she argues that specifically scientific understandings are shaped by such generic features as the use of impersonal forms, of the universal present tense, of generalisations which are asserted rather than offered tentatively and by verbs describing experiential processes (Christie, 1985c; 1987). Of course, from a pedagogical point of view, this only matters if one operates on the assumption that the teacher's role is largely that of offering the student an apprenticeship into the public forms of the discipline.

A contrary view is that the language forms of a subject traditionally reserved for expert-to-expert may be the least satisfactory language for many high school students - and certainly for primary aged students. The "Sydney School" argue strongly that genres arise from social contexts, and yet the social contexts of schools is not the context of expert-to-expert, but rather, the context of those being initiated into scientific understanding. Halliday himself, at the end of a paper which itself defines the language of physical science argues:

> Because it is a language for the expert, it can often be problematic for a learner. This is partly a developmental matter: as we have seen, scientific English is highly metaphorical, in the sense of grammatical metaphor, and children find it hard to deal with grammatical metaphor until they reach about secondary school age. So for children learning science the patterns we have been investigating present a problem in their own right. Apart from this, however, they are faced with a form of language which, while they must use it to construe a whole new realm of experience, tends to leave implicit precisely the experiential meanings that they most depend on for its construction. (Halliday, 1988)
The re-conceptualisation I am proposing is partly a question of learning theory. The view of learning popularised by Barnes sees new knowledge as being incorporated into an already existing set of learnings - knowledge is a "series of systems for interpreting the world (and) learning a matter of changing the system by which interpretation is carried out" (Barnes, 1976: 22). He sees this "interpretation" as similar to Piaget's (1960) "assimilation" and "accommodation", Bruner's (1966) "recoding" and Kelly's (1963) "system construction".

Barnes' classroom research showed the problems that resulted for children's learning when the style of language that was regarded by teachers as "appropriate" for a subject was in fact given more weight than the learner's attempts to formulate meaning. Teachers who emphasised the "appropriate" language of the subject -in a way that the "Sydney School" see as absolutely necessary to holding knowledge in that subject- were seen as often preventing learners from constructing knowledge. Barnes showed that use of the language forms was considered an "entrance fee" (1976:129) to knowledge and that students who were expected to work too early in the specialist language of a subject were being asked "to arrive without having travelled" (1976:118). The Reading K-12 policy, which puts its learning assumptions consciously forward, itself repeats the argument that "Because of (the) need to interpret new information for ourselves, teaching which seeks prematurely to filter out...personal language probably jeopardizes the quality of learning" (Directorate of Studies ndC: 15).

Interestingly, while the "Sydney School" lay claim to be providing social power by providing the appropriate subject-specific language forms, Barnes showed that emphasis on specialist language was indeed a way of excluding pupils who nevertheless made valuable contributions. The problem was not lack of student knowledge but the teacher's failure to recognise the knowledge when not contained in stylistically appropriate language. In his well-known Transmission/ Interpretation model of teaching and learning styles, Transmission teachers are seen to value "the learners' performances insofar as they conform to the criteria of the discipline" (1976:144). It is perhaps worth noting in entirety the characteristics of the Interpretation and Transmission teachers in order to see the extent to which the "Sydney School" can be conceptualised as representing not just an opposition to "process", but to a particular view of "learning through language" across the curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Transmission teacher...</th>
<th>The Interpretation teacher...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Believes knowledge to exist in the form of public disciplines which include content and criteria of performance</td>
<td>Believes knowledge to exist in the knower's ability to organize thought and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values the learner’s performances insofar as they conform to the criteria of the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Perceives the teacher’s task to be the evaluation and correction of the learner’s performance, according to the criteria of which he is the guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Perceives the learner as an uninformed acolyte for whom access to knowledge will be difficult since he must qualify himself through tests of appropriate performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Barnes, 1976: 144-45).

The general theme is re-visited in a chapter on “Scientific Language” in Sheeran and Barnes’ *School Writing* (1991). Sheeran and Barnes base their argument in this chapter on the epistemological issue of whether “thought and language are inextricably linked”, arguing that “subjective and informal language will actively assist children’s learning” (p.18).

In questioning Science teachers about their attitudes, Sheeran and Barnes found that those teachers who were concerned with inculcating particular linguistic forms - viz. the traditional experimental “report” - used the very tradition itself partly as their justification. Such a “tradition” in scientific report writing in schools of course assumes a need to treat all pupils as if they are already - or at least are going to be - practising scientists (and even then only within a particular tradition). Sheeran and Barnes ask whether students are actually being excluded from knowledge by this emphasis. Another justification given by teachers was that particular traditional ways of “writing science” helped develop logical scientific thinking. The authors show that some students are able to understand subject content without the particular linguistic form and that for many others it is this linguistic form itself that gets in the way of their understanding. Their empirical research into the learning of Science and its relation to language forms leads them to conclude “that the ability to think scientifically does not depend on using impersonal language to describe the learning that is taking place....It seems that there is... no good reason why children should not tell us simply and directly what they did, rather than hobbling about in the stilted language of the passive transformation”(pp. 36-37).
While Sheeran and Barnes do not directly address issues of genre, their characterisation of the different views about how subject content should be taught is identical to the distinction I have been making in seeking to re-conceptualise the genre debate. Some writers, they argue, see "subject knowledge as a 'public domain': an established set of rules and practices...The task of the subject teacher is to 'socialize' the new learner into its rules and practices." Others see knowledge in terms of "the process the learner goes through as he constructs new meanings for himself" (p.54). While Sheeran and Barnes do argue for an approach to teaching Science which could include critical discussion of different genres and of the conventional frameworks that writers operate in, their key pedagogical issue is that while "public scientific debate is conventionally couched in impersonal 'transactional' language...that does not make it an inevitable or necessary part of scientific learning in school" (p. 55). That this is an issue of "learning through language" that stands in conceptual opposition to the particular view of, and central emphasis upon, "learning about language" expressed by the "Sydney School" can be seen simply by returning again to the document that helped tie "English" to "learning through language" (Dixon is actually quoting Harold Rosen):

"each school subject seems to operate within its own sub-language encrusted with linguistic conventions...School textbooks show us these sub-languages at their worst...The verbalization of concepts within different subjects has a complex history; it is probably not a simple matter of perfectly evolved language that embodies one kind of rational thought. The models that we look at are social institutions and the differences between say the language of geology and the language of history must be in part due to the different history of these two subjects...In all events we should set about distinguishing between the linguistic-conventional and the linguistic-intellectual, so that we can understand that traditional formulations are not sacrosanct (Is there only one possible statement of Boyle's Law?)" (Dixon, 1975: 67)

8.4 Critical literacy

In her reflections on her years as editor of English in Australia during the 1980s, Gill argues that "The accelerated pace of social and economic change gave an increasingly socially critical edge to the profession's thinking and writing about English and English teaching. What's English for? rather than What's English about? became the key question in debating the curriculum in English."(1992: 27). From the mid-1980s, the "growth model" began to come under attack from "critical literacy", based largely on insights gained from neo-Marxism via feminism, postcolonialism, critical discourse analysis (Morgan, 1997: Ch.1) and, above all, on insights from post-structuralist literary theory:
Critical literacy responds to the cultural capital of a specific group or class and looks at the way in which it can be confirmed, and also at the ways in which the dominant society disconfirms students... The unit of analysis here is social, and the key concern is not individual interests but with the individual and collective empowerment.(Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985: 133)

Under this orientation, "growth" pedagogy is seen as "individualist", "liberal", "progressive" "naturalising" and "expressive"; critical literacy is "social", "radical", "problematising" "cultural" and, of course, "critical" (McCormick, 1994; Peim, 1993; Griffith, 1992; Patterson, 1992; Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990; Boomer, 1989). As with genre-oriented approaches, it would be simplistic to characterise all writers on critical literacy as a single "school" and Morgan has discussed in some detail the differences between approaches in this country (Morgan, 1997: Ch.1). Nevertheless, there are two key characteristics which all approaches would seem to hold in order to be perceived as critical literacy and it is these characteristics that I wish to discuss.

8.4.1 The social

The opposition of "personal" and "social" of course constitutes the most fundamental distinction between the "growth" model and critical literacy - at least as perceived by adherents of the latter. Critical literacy celebrates the social and its advocates argue that "growth" model curricula place too much emphasis on the notion of the individual, without recognising that language users are socially constructed. McCormick points to an application of this theme when she argues that "... students must become able to analyse how they themselves are culturally constructed as subjects-in-history " (p.16). Moreover, the logic of the post-structuralist position in which all things are text underpins the theme of constructing an oppositional and resistant curriculum. Thus curricula are suggested with variations on themes such as:

* making explicit the ways in which readers are positioned by texts so that those positionings can be "resisted" (Mellor and Patterson, 1994; Griffith, 1992) - "resistance" being usually located in anti-sexist or anti-racist readings
* making the classroom itself and its curriculum into the "text" which is explicitly open to discussion and change (Griffith, 1992; Boomer, 1989)
* the "institutional conditions" of English becoming the curriculum (Peim, 1993; Patterson, 1990)
* favouring an explicitly political curriculum such as a working class curriculum in opposition to the dominant culture (Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990: 61)
"Personal growth", so goes the argument, puts too much emphasis on "personal" and leaves students in no position to analyse or critique the institutional parameters of "subject English"; it does not provide for students questioning the curriculum and thus, ultimately, the basis of the dominant and valued culture:

...while response pedagogy appears to give students a voice, it can also leave them unaware of the determinants of that voice, and therefore powerless either to develop or interrogate it. (McCormick, 1994: 40)

A particular variant on this argument is the genre-related argument that emphasis on personal writing favours those most literate and hence disenfranchises those not from the dominant culture. Hence it favours white, middle-class masculine values and is thus essentially socially conservative (see, for example, Patterson, 1992). This approach sees writing as a social act in which the writer's language originates with the community and is used to join communities to which he/she does not yet belong. (The "Sydney School" see themselves as part of the critical literacy paradigm, despite one of the underlying principles of their approach to genre theory being induction of excluded groups into the dominant culture. This would seem to be an ideology which sits very uneasily with the idea that "(t)he radical view moves beyond the celebration of working-class culture into an analysis of the political and economic conditions that produce inequality; it is a critical rather than a celebratory stance. It involves the construction of a working-class curriculum, often taught in a traditional authoritarian manner" [Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990: 61]).

Because of its emphasis on the social, rather than on individual cognition, critical literacy allows little room for recognition of developmental issues. One of Thomson's points (1987) about his notion of reflexivity, which is similar to the kind of self-awareness of constructedness for which critical literacy calls, is that it is largely a matter of maturity and reading experience. Similarly, Scholes, who distinguishes between "reading", "interpretation" and "criticism", sees these as related, but essentially sequentially ordered, activities. The last of these, "criticism", is that aspect of his triad which corresponds most closely to the kind of "reading against the grain" advocated by post-structuralism and he argues that this ability, though the great aim of liberal education, cannot be assumed to be already developed in those starting college (1985: 63).

If I am correct in arguing in the previous section (8.3) that the "Sydney School" approach to writing essentially ignores a constructivist view of knowledge and learning, then a similar argument can be made of critical literacy advocates, who while having a sense of how individuals themselves are "constructed", rarely consider how knowledge is "constructed" by
individuals. No doubt the critical literacy reply to this would be that all knowledge is a social and linguistic construct anyway, so that the view of knowledge I have called "constructivist" above is no more than another "individualist" notion. Certainly, however, in the terms used by Barnes, adherents of critical literacy, have a view of their own pedagogy as essentially "transmission".

8.4.2 The teacher: "transmitter"?/ "interpreter"?

In general, critical literacy schools take a view of the teacher's role as "overtly didactic" (Boomer, 1989) and "authoritarian" (Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, 1990) and the more "radical" and overtly political the curriculum, the more authoritarian is the teacher's role. The overt aim of creating a politically aware student population seems to be accompanied by a "transmission" model of pedagogy. Patterson (1992) defends this by arguing that post-structuralist approaches are simply more honest in the explicitness about their didacticism than is "growth" pedagogy. This overtly doctrinaire approach can be seen in particular classroom materials⁴ - for example, it is difficult to work one's way through the activities in a book like Reading stories. (Mellor, O'Neill and Patterson, 1987) without taking up the various resistant reading positions which the authors desire one to take up. About Ray Bradbury's short story, "The Whole Town's Sleeping", for example, which focuses on the potential stalking of a woman by a serial killer, the writers argue in the text (with the students as audience) that Bradbury "does not explore the murderer's motive or explain why the heroine is the victim: it is accepted as a 'natural', believable situation that readers will recognise and simply accept" (p.69). There are of course a number of other "positionings" being ignored here. One kind of resistant reading can easily preclude another and the textbook writers' own political stance becomes the effective curriculum. Resisting their political position is very difficult without being positioned oneself as (in this case) "sexist". The activities in Reading stories and similar "Chalkface" publications leave little room for "resisting " the textbook writers' (read "teacher's") intentions.

8.5 K-6 English in NSW

In 1994, a new K-6 English Syllabus was published in NSW. It divided the subject into four broad categories: Language, Texts, Text Organisation and Language Learning. The latter stresses the importance of interaction between students as the basis of language learning. The other sections are discussed below.

⁴ This is certainly, however, a case where one would want to make distinctions - Wendy Morgan's material, for example, in the "Ned Kelly" series takes a very different pedagogical approach - see Morgan, 1992b, 1994
8.5.1 Language

The underlying principles of this section were that:

- language is a social phenomenon
- language is a resource for making meaning
- language influences, and is influenced by, context. The key contexts are context of culture (values, attitudes, belief systems) and context of situation (field, tenor and mode).

Furthermore, language can be divided into spoken and written forms.

It can be seen that the influence of Hallidayan grammar was pervasive. The view of language which pervaded the document was labelled "functional", and was said to be concerned with "relationships between context, language structure and meaning" (Board of Studies, NSW, 1994: 2). An accompanying Handbook of grammar was published to explain Hallidayan functional-systemics.

8.5.2 Texts

Texts were divided into "Literary" (which "explore and interpret human experience in such a way as to evoke in the reader or listener a reflective, imaginative and/or emotional response") and "Factual" (which present "information, ideas or opinions in such a way as to inform, enlighten or persuade the reader or listener"). This division was used as the basis of introducing into the official curricula of NSW the notion of "text types". Different "types" of texts were constructed in different social situations. The "literary" text types were narrative, drama and poetry, while "factual" text types were discussion, explanation, exposition, information report, procedure and recount (p. 101).

Narrative texts for example, are structured as: orientation, complication, sequence of events, resolution, comment or coda. Grammatical features of narratives were the use of:

- specific participants to describe characters
- intricate noun groups to build detailed images of participants
- circumstances of place and time to locate events
- temporal connectives to sequence events
- material processes to indicate actions
- verbal and mental processes to indicate what characters are feeling, thinking or saying.

Again, the influence of Hallidayan functional-systemics is pervasive and the approach to genre that is reflected in the adoption of "text types" also reflects the influence of the approach to genre of the "Sydney school". Text types were fixed, definable and to be taught as having specific characteristics.
8.5.3 Text Organisation

Text Organisation is sub-divided into sections on: The Language System; Grammar and Grammatical Terminology. The learning of functional grammar (a modified version of functional-systemics) is said to enable "students to think about how texts hold together and what makes them effective or ineffective" (p. 6). The dominant grammatical terminology is drawn from functional-systemics with "participants", "processes", "circumstances" complementing "nouns", "verbs", "adjectives/adverbs". Mood and modality, field and tenor are also factors.

8.5.4 Support document

The Syllabus was published under the same cover as the support document. The latter includes a section entitled "Dictionary of classroom practices" which details many of the classroom practices that had, in fact, become mainstream in the then recent 7-10 Syllabuses, and were, in fact, mainstream K-6 practice. Thus, imaginative recreation-type activities, reading and writing conferences, DARTS-type activities, drafting, editing and publishing in writing and the use of drama are all carefully detailed (pp. 171-229). However, the support document also included a section on "Teaching about texts" that describes in great detail the grammatical features and larger textual structures of each of the nominated Syllabus text types.

In essence, the K-6 Syllabus re-introduced grammar as a central feature of NSW English Syllabuses in a way that had not been done since the Syllabuses of the 1960s. "Learning about language" became a central feature of the Syllabuses in quite a narrow sense of that phrase. All of the research into grammatical knowledge that had been influential in the 1971 7-10 Syllabus (see Section 4.3.3 above) was effectively set aside for the introduction of the notion of text types into NSW, along with a re-introduction of a view of "learning about language" that depended heavily on knowledge of grammar.

8.6 The National Statement and Profile in English

K-6 English was also the first syllabus in NSW - indeed, the first in Australia (Hardage, 1996) - to incorporate the then recent national initiative on curriculum profiles. In 1989 the Australian Education Council released from Hobart the Common and agreed national goals for schooling in Australia (the "Hobart Declaration"), which provided the impetus for the development of statements and profiles for Australian schools in the curriculum areas.

5 The 1994 K-6 English Syllabus in NSW was replaced in 1998, following recommendations of the Eltis Review into NSW Syllabuses and the National Profiles. Grammar remained central to the Syllabus, but the terminology of functional linguistics was replaced by traditional Latinate grammar.
Among the goals of this development was the development of skills in "English literacy" in the four traditional skill areas of reading, writing, listening and speaking. The Statement and Profiles in English were published by 1994, yet by 1995 the Eltis Review of outcomes and profiles in NSW led to the NSW Board of Studies no longer being required to incorporate the National Profiles directly into NSW English Syllabuses (Eltis also recommended, again successfully, that functional grammar terminology be dropped from the Syllabus). Thus, while the impact on curriculum in NSW of the Statement and Profiles was minimal, it is important to consider them in some brief detail in order to gauge the national agenda that, by the mid-90s, NSW was to move away from - especially in terms of how that national perspective was defining the relationship between "English" and "literacy".

In A statement on English for Australian schools, "English" itself is defined as "that area of the curriculum where students study and use English language and literature" (Curriculum Corporation, 1994b: 3) and the goals of English are to develop:

1. The ability to speak, listen, read, view and write with purpose, effect and confidence in a range of contexts.
2. A knowledge of the ways in which language varies according to context, purpose, audience and content, and the ability to apply this knowledge.
3. A sound grasp of the linguistic structures and features of standard Australian English...and the capacity to apply these, especially in writing.
4. A broad knowledge of a range of literature, including Australian literature, and a capacity to relate this literature to aspects of contemporary society and personal experience.
5. The capacity to discuss and analyse texts and language critically and with appreciation.
6. A knowledge of the ways in which textual interpretation and understanding may vary according to cultural, social and personal differences, and the capacity to develop reasoned arguments about interpretation and meaning (Curriculum Corporation, 1994b: 3)

The 1987 English Syllabus in Years 7-10 links easily with Goals # 1, 2, 4 and 6 of the Statement. Goal #3 posits an explicit connection between "knowledge" and "use" that does not sit easily with that Syllabus, but is certainly reflected in the NSW K-6 document. Goal #5 probably places too much emphasis on "analysis" to reflect the NSW 7-10 Syllabus - and, of course, the term "critical" by 1994 has become laden with the very specific ideology of "critical literacy" that is not explicitly dealt with in the NSW 7-10 document.
Adapting the definition from the then relatively recent *Australian language and literacy policy* (DEET, 1991), the *Statement* also defines "literacy" and, significantly, separates it from "English". "Literacy" is "the ability to read and use written information and to write appropriately in a range of contexts. It also involves the integration of speaking, listening and critical thinking with reading and writing...and includes the cultural knowledge which enables a speaker, writer or reader to recognise and use language appropriate to different social situations" (p.3). The definition would not be out of place with "English" in NSW, based on the 1987 7-10 Syllabus, but "English" in the *Statement* on English is to be distinguished from "literacy":

Teachers of English ...have a special role since they focus on knowledge about language and how it works. They teach students to use, think about and analyse language and to develop strategies for composing, comprehending and responding to texts (Curriculum Corporation, 1994b: 4)

Under this set of definitions, English is a kind of subset, however specialised and privileged, of "literacy" - a situation which would seem to be the reverse of the situation which had held in NSW English syllabuses since the 1970s. Moreover, the special role of "English" is seen to be particularly "learning about language". In NSW, under the influence of LERN and their reaction to the *Writing K-12* document, that specialised area had, in fact, become the province of "literacy" itself.

The "Strands" into which the *National Statement* is divided are "Texts" and "Language". The former is sub-divided into "Literature" (itself sub-divided into "Classic literature", "Contemporary literature" and "Popular literature"), "Mass media" and "Everyday texts". "Language" is sub-divided into "Contextual understanding", "Linguistic structures and features" and "Strategies". In the *National Profiles*, of course, each of these is then mapped onto levels of achievement and outcomes (Curriculum Corporation, 1994a). The sub-strand, "Linguistic structures and features" is of most immediate interest to the present argument. Just as the *English K-6 Syllabus* re-introduced grammar as a central feature of NSW English Syllabuses in a way that had not been done since the Syllabuses of the 1960s, so too did the contemporaneous *National Statement* for Australia generally - and, again, in a way that reflected a "text type" approach to genre. The linguistic structures and features that Australian students were to "develop knowledge and skills in using" included:

- patterns of text structure and organisation (selection, sequence and organisation according to purpose, text type, etc.)
- textual cohesion (pronoun reference, conjunction, ellipsis)
- grammar (tense, agreement, passive and active voice, nominalisation)
In 1992, O'Neill was already able to write, "I do not think there is widespread acceptance of the genre position amongst English teachers. It is of concern to me that the genre school appear to have influenced drafting of the National Curriculum framework to the extent that they have (p.41)", and by 1998, Richardson was able to look back onto this period of the early-mid 90s and declare that "The influence and impact of the Sydney genre school in dislodging expressivist process pedagogy in primary and secondary schooling in Australia has been profound. English literacy documents in all States and Territories unilaterally treat genres as unproblematic "(p.235). Even an advocate of genre-based approaches such as Watkins was to declare, "in Australia... in the realm of syllabus formulation and curriculum design structuralist approaches to text based upon systemic functional theory clearly dominate" (1999: 119). It is in the context of these debates that the 1987 Syllabus functioned. However, more importantly for this study, it is in the contexts of the debates that were eventually to produce the NSW K-6 English Syllabus and the national Statements and Profiles that the professional literature of the second key year of this study - 1992 - was presented.
CHAPTER 9

CONSTRUCTIONS OF "ENGLISH" IN NSW IN 1992

In determining how English might be conceived at a particular point in time, it will be recalled from Chapter 6 that this study adapts a methodology used by Medway (1990), who chose to forego a continuous narrative in favour of an in-depth study of two years in a particular period. The methodology is, in a sense, to "cut slices" through the period and attempt to illuminate it by an in-depth examination of the "slices". Such a methodology allows for consideration of greater depth. I have discussed in Chapter 6 the advantages of such a methodology for the present study.

My relevant date for a study of how "English" was conceptualised by the profession during the implementation of the 1987 Syllabus is 1992. This choice is partly one of simple symmetry - the 1971 Syllabus was implemented in from 1972 and 1977 was the sixth year of that implementation. The 1987 Syllabus was published and implemented in the same year, thus 1992 was the equivalent sixth year of implementation. Usefully, in that year, the Australian Association for the Teaching of English also published a substantial, though partial "method book" (to use Medway's term), Reconstructing literature teaching. Hence, my sources for this part of the study will be firstly, as in Chapter 6, those sites of curriculum discussion in which the subject is likely to be defined through intellectual debate – Reconstructing literature teaching and the relevant ETA journals from 1992 in NSW. Those key local journals were the NSW English Teachers' Association's journal, The teaching of English (now incorporating the Newsletter of the NSW ETA) and the national journal, English in Australia.

My choice of "method" book and school textbooks is again made by selecting those which were both published in Australia in 1992 and also reviewed in these journals. Again, it is reasonable to assume that, if reviewed in these journals, they are likely to be representing a perspective on the subject in this state. Again, while international material is also of great relevance, in order to keep the scope of the study manageable, I am confining the study to those journals and books produced on the Australian scene. Thus international influences will be studied as they are represented in local material.

In again adapting Medway's methodology, then, I will investigate in this section:
• the locally produced material which contained the professional, intellectual discussion of the subject English in 1992
• the subject as represented in school textbooks of the time—those textbooks reviewed in the professional journals.

I will also again supplement Medway's sources by including as part of my study an analysis of the interpretation of English as embodied in relevant systems-wide official examinations. For NSW in 1992 the relevant examination was, once again, the School Certificate Reference test in English. Reflections on this period by Bill Corcoran, the then editor of English in Australia, have already been referred to in the previous chapter and will be dealt with further here.

9.1 How subject "English" was being defined in the professional literature of NSW English teachers

The first comment one might make on the professional literature of this period, compared to 1977 is the distance that has grown between the state and national journals. A brief consideration of Tables 6.2 and 6.3 will reveal the extensiveness of debate in both The Teaching of English and the ETA Newsletter in 1977. There are debates on contemporary curriculum theorising (Gough; Packer; Kefford); discussions of contemporary curriculum content (Murison, 1977b; Brisbane; de Groen); reports on research (Lee; Annels); general reflections on pedagogy (Lewis); discussion of assessment instruments (Phillips; Horvath; Little, Margaret), as well as specific accounts of practice (Turner; Ward, 1977b) and lists of teaching ideas (Latham, Judith; Moore; Christie; Carroll et al; Johnson). These were also the kinds of issues being taken up in English in Australia. In 1992, however, The teaching of English ran sixty-one articles relevant to this study (ie not specifically concerned with Years 11-12), of which twenty-six were exclusively devoted to single units of work, eighteen of which were on literary texts. This is not meant by way of criticism of either period, but is a notable trend in the relative concerns of the local and national journals. As with Chapter 6, the following discussion is based on the analysis contained in Tables 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 appended to this chapter.

9.1.1 Literature and literary theory

Surprisingly, perhaps, in 1992 there is quite a lot of defence of literature in what might be regarded as traditional Leavisite terms. In response to what they see as the vocational skills orientation of the drafts of National statement, for example, McCann and Hiller (1992) argue for the importance of the classics being retained in schooling, since these deal with morality and aesthetics, matters of "perennial interest". They, in fact, produce a list of their "great works", with suggested discussion themes. In a closely related argument, Mallick (1992) rejects "extreme" reader response theory for the idea that some readings are better than others.
because they are more informed. In a statement consciously reminiscent of Leavis, he condemns the coarsening effect of popular culture and advocates strong teacher intervention. Devlin (1992) and Donnelly (1992) also place literature and a cultural literacy at the centre of English, the latter rejecting contemporary concern with literary theory.

Arguing from a different standpoint, in a comprehensive article, the then President of AATE, Claire Woods (1992) also addressed the key issue, "What indeed is the core or centre of English?", this time in the context of the national agenda: the White Paper, Australia's language: the draft National Statement and Profile on English and the Mayer competencies. For Woods, re-thinking "English" means challenging the role of "literature" as a category and explicating the concept of literacy and formulating the place of language study in the curriculum. Woods is influenced by the mood of the 1987 American conference "What is English?", which suggested that "English" should not be about "literature", but "reading", "texts", "discourse", "language" - thus not privileging certain texts or certain readings. She argues that English should be about creating culture, not simply about acquiring knowledge, and should involve students in critical enquiry and understanding of how they as language users are immersed in cultural production as makers and receivers. Teachers ought to be aware of contemporary literary theory and take their students beyond language competence to reflect on Australian culture:

subject English should recognize the way fictions are made and remade by people with particular cultural identities in different social and cultural contexts and the way that individuals produce texts and are themselves culturally produced by the myths, institutions, texts, discourses in which they are enmeshed (p,93).

Essentially this debate presented in 1992 appears as a debate between traditional Leavisite approaches and a broad critical literacy. On the other hand, Woods' article indicates the extent to which literary theory by 1992 had become a widely debated topic in English education in Australia generally. The influence of critical literacy, developing out of post-structuralism, as discussed in Chapter 8, is the immediate impetus for this discussion. The kind of opposition to "theory" offered by Mallick (1992), which in any case seems to confuse post-structuralism with response theory, is overwhelmed in the professional literature by the advocacy of versions of a post-structuralism-critical literacy-resistant reading alliance. A number of articles in 1992 set out to explain contemporary literary theory and its implications for teaching (Threadgold, 1992; Hardage, 1992c; Mellor, O'Neill and Patterson, 1992; Thomson, 1992). O'Neill's (1992) resistance of genre-based approaches, for example, is rooted in her worries about the authoritarianism and institutionalisation of selected genres and in a reaction against simply adopting institutionalised structures without a culturally critical
approach to the construction of texts, and how meanings are produced from those texts. The NSW Joint Council of Professional Associations stresses the importance of students being able to "read" their culture critically (JCPTA, 1992). Many articles are concerned with a curriculum aimed at creating a resistant readership in schools (Mellor, O'Neill and Patterson, 1992; Thomson, 1992; Corcoran, 1992b; Parker, 1992). Morgan, whose approach to critical literacy is not as centrally focused on resistant reading, deals with the issue of reconciling simple enjoyment with the issue of teaching students "how to read texts" (Morgan, 1992a). Her concern with the "unconventional text" as the key to this dilemma reflects another, albeit smaller, trend to re-define the traditional boundaries of literature suitable for use in secondary schools. For Johnston and Parker, picture books are a valid form for the secondary school, Parker seeing them as a door into literary theory for secondary students (Johnston, 1992; Parker, 1992). Reid also discusses the issue of all genres - traditional or otherwise - being problematic because of being governed by various forms of framing (Reid, 1992a, 1992b).

Yet, despite this concern with critical literacy and with new forms of "literature", largely emanating from English in Australia and Reconstructing literature teaching - itself published by AATE - the NSW state journal itself mostly remained immersed in an unproblematic view of literature and in an "imaginative recreation" pedagogy unchanged from the 1977 editions of the journal, though clearly reflecting the contemporary NSW Syllabus itself (Tomlin, 1992; Grover, 1992; Casey, 1992; English Faculty, Strathfield Girls' High School, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c; Cochrane, 1992; Barnott-Clement et al, 1992; Alembakis et al, 1992; Zouroudis and Doherty, 1992)\footnote{The editor of The Teaching of English in 1992 has stated that she felt she was operating a "holding pattern" in 1992 and was not consciously pursuing any innovative editorial policy (Hough, 2001).}.

9.1.2 The policy environment

It is probably fair to say that, given the environment described in Chapter 8, philosophical-paradigmatic discussions in the professional literature of 1992 were more rooted in overt policy concerns than they had been in 1977. In 1992, the NSW Joint Council of Professional Associations issued position statements on issues such as Mayer and the formation of a National Teaching Council (JCPTA, 1992; McRae, 1992). In English specifically, bureaucrats and their explanations and advocacy of current policy such as outcomes-based curricula (O'Sullivan, 1992b), the draft National Statement and Profiles and Mayer competencies (O'Sullivan, 1992a; Hardage, 1992b) were part of the professional debate in a way that had not been true in 1977.

Similarly, McCann and Hiller's defence of the classics discussed in the previous section (9.1.1) issued out of their rejection of the assumptions behind the draft National Statement.
Particularly, they reject the belief that a discourse of "skills" can adequately describe all aspects of human endeavour - the choice of appropriate skills being a more important issue, and that itself being a matter of values and feelings. They also reject the belief that it is possible to describe the sequence in which skills are acquired and argue that, ultimately, the draft Statement is driven by commercial ideology - for example, the exemplar letters in the draft Statements are always, tellingly, letters of application for jobs. Their fear is that the Statement will ignore the education of emotions or the acquisition of "webs of cultural literacy" (p.18), arguing that the commercial ideology hides a desire to withdraw humanities from schooling. They argue for a balance between what they refer to as "individualism" and "cultural literacy", thus leading to their argument for the classics to be retained in schooling.

Woods' comprehensive review of English discussed in the previous section (9.1.1), was also rooted in reaction to the draft National Statements and Profiles, as well as to the government White Paper, Australia's language and to the Mayer competencies. Like McCann and Hiller, she objects to the fundamentals of the White Paper, which focus on English competence as an economic imperative and which implies that the role of the teacher is as a deliverer of functional literacy - since the document does not mention literature, texts or new technologies (Woods, 1992). O'Neill (1992) is also critical of the National Profiles, believing that they run against teacher's normal practice - grade related descriptors, accountability and functional English not "sitting" well with teachers' desires to read student work using criteria pertinent to prose fiction. She also argues that the Profiles inhibit what she sees as the more desirable practice of critical literacy, arguing that English teachers construct themselves almost exclusively as teachers of "literature", which, she argues, does not necessarily teach students anything useful about reading texts, particularly non-fiction texts. The Profiles fail to acknowledge contemporary literary theory - for example, students are not encouraged to read gender roles as representing anything other than real life. Rather than promote genre-based approaches, which simply institutionalise class and gender dominance, she advocates a culturally critical approach to the construction of informational text, and the production of meanings from those texts.

9.1.3 Genre

Variations on the genre debate continued to have a prominent place in the professional literature of 1992. As argued in Chapter 8, this debate was almost entirely conceptualised in terms of "genre vs. process" (Corcoran, 1992a: 6; Collerson, 1992: 18; O'Neill, 1992: 39; Hardage, 1992a: 21). I have argued for a re-conceptualisation of the genre debate in terms that see it as essentially a debate about subject learning. In these terms, the key polarities are not "genre"/"process", but "writing as reflecting the language of expert practitioners"/ "writing as aiding understanding of concepts". In this conceptualisation, the key protagonists of the genre
schools are not Graves and his followers, but those like Barnes, who allowed in the 70s for more tentative, exploratory, even imaginative writing in the subject areas in the belief that this might aid the content learning of non-experts. In the professional literature of 1992, the notion of using language for "talking oneself into understanding" or for making sense of experience is still accepted by some as an important notion in curriculum development (Howe, 1992; Davies, 1992; Maher, 1992).

In this view, "language across the curriculum" as a concept means quite different things to each side in this debate. For those like the "Sydney School" of genrists, the phrase connotes apprenticeship into the traditional language forms of the subject areas; for those like Barnes, "language across the curriculum" means the opportunity to write in a range of forms in subject areas in order to aid learning. For the genrists, the privileged phrase in Halliday's triad is "learning about language", while from the Barnes point of view, the privileged phrase is "learning through language". It is this particular conceptualisation of the debate which Collerson hints at in 1992 (pp.22ff) when he uses the Hallidayan triad to stress the importance of "learning through language", but argues that the "language across the curriculum" movement is not about "any language for anything", and goes on to reject, for example, the use of poems in Science, though without discussing his reasons. He argues instead for studying the language demands of each subject - "learning about language" - and having a language for talking about language. Collerson further argues for studying a grammar of whole texts, as well as levels of grammar within texts. "Learning through language", he says, ought not to be mutually exclusive from "learning about language". Further, allowing the former to rely on immersion favours students from a background of rich language experience, hence the necessity of the latter. Collerson argues for a perspective on grammar that can be related to the functions and meanings being expressed. He also argues to retain the "process" approaches (and the right to engage non-specialist audiences) with commitment to craft, alongside an approach based on functional grammar. He finally supplies a theoretical rationale for an alternative view of "language across the curriculum" based in "learning about language".

By 1992, however, genre-based approaches to writing were also being questioned on grounds other than "process"-oriented ones, particularly in terms of the conservative political ideology represented by the "Sydney School". The "Sydney School" itself had always claimed to be offering empowerment to the working classes, to Aboriginal students and to NESB students, by offering explicit study of grammar:

Conferencing is used not to teach but to obscure. This kind of refusal to teach helps reinforce the success of ruling-class children in education...Liberalism as it is
currently practised in these forms is the major enemy of children, women, working class migrants, and Aboriginal children in Australian education (Martin, 1985: 61).

Explicitness gives the writer a conscious awareness of texts and their purposes that enables her to choose how she will use these for her own purposes to gain the means for a voice in society (Callaghan and Rothery, 1988: 51)

McGregor has recently argued that dominant classes in Australian society simply “absorb” opposition (1997: 62ff). The position that initiation into the dominant power structures was highly unlikely to bring about social change had already been put by protagonists in the genre debate in the 1980s: how would the rule-bound activity represented by the “Sydney School” ever lead to empowerment or liberation (Rosen, 1988; Sawyer, 1993)? The position had also previously been advanced that the “Sydney School” represented a particularly conservative view of education by advocating the further entrenchment of secondary school subject “genres”, rather than considering a normative view based on potentially enhancing student learning in subject areas (Sawyer, 1993). In 1992, this opposition became crystallised in some quarters as an opposition to the failure of particular geniists to make room for critique of the power structures represented by genres themselves. Gilbert (1992), for example, sees value in genre-based approaches, but fears that this will degenerate in official curricula into knowledge about the textual features of genres, or the conventional ordering of particular text-types. She argues that of more interest are issues of:

• place - how genres operate to differentially value social activity
• parameter - how cultural parameters such as “masculinity” and “femininity” affect genres
• play - what is signalled by the breaking of generic conventions.

In a similar vein, Cranny-Francis (1992) discusses the advantages of a post-structuralist approach to genre theory, potentially allowing textual analysis to combine with analysis of the institutional power of the text. She advocates asking questions such as:

• what kinds of readings can be made of this text and what is their (social and political) value and function?
• what are the premises of these readings and how do they function to privilege particular readers and alienate others? (pp.36-7).

Cranny-Francis believes that there is a “useful” genre criticism in which students:

• learn to identify and challenge assumptions implicit in texts and to discuss how texts
  position them as readers

---

2 This article is based on a paper first delivered to the Third Invitational Conference of Teacher Educators at the University of Sydney, on 23 September 1989, ie prior to 1992.
• might examine literature and literary criticism as social practice - how it works to perpetuate particular discourses by positioning readers

• might examine semiotic practice - how a text constructs meaning(s) - and recognise the ways texts operate on readers in the way they are written, not just as finished products

• can write within the genres and make decisions about whether to use them or not (p.43).

This version of a genre-based approach means that texts could be seen as strategic processes, actively positioning readers in relation to a range of meaning-potentials. This, she argues, unlike the form of genre theory advocated by such as the “Sydney School”, allows the reading-writing subject to become aware of their power to intervene in the way they are positioned, and thus to intervene in the discursive practices of society. Similar arguments are put by O’Neill (1992), while other opponents of genre approaches in the relevant professional literature reject the validity of even identifying subject-based typologies (Eagleson, 1992), or condemn the tendency of genre-based approaches to emphasise similarity over context-based differences (Reid, 1992b).

Effectively, the views of O’Neill, Gilbert and Cranny-Francis above are advocating the replacement of a structuralist approach to "genre" by a post-structuralist approach. An approach which argues for students learning and practising the formal properties of a genre can be conceived as essentially "structuralist", while one which critiques the ideology behind such structures is, of course, essentially post-structuralist. Cranny-Francis (1992:34-38) is most explicit about this.

In 4.2.3 above I have referred to the manifestation of "growth" in the 1971 Syllabus as "modernist" in that its totalising structuralist tendencies strongly reflect Lyotard’s defining characteristic of modernism - the "grand narrative" - a view based especially on the influence of Moffett. In the re-conceptualisation I have been suggesting with regards to the genre debate, genreist criticisms of the "growth model" as manifested in the 1971 Syllabus, and suggestions about the importance of an approach based on text-types can be seen as essentially the replacement of one totalising view of curriculum with another.

9.2 The place of "literacy" in the professional literature of NSW English teachers

9.2.1 References to "literacy"

Given the context outlined in the previous chapter, it is no surprise that the concept of "literacy" was no longer an unproblematic "given" in the professional literature of 1992. Australia's language had produced a definition of "effective literacy", which had been
adopted by the National statement on English. Meanwhile, in NSW, as shown in Chapter 8, 'literacy' in Department of Education documentation was becoming synonymous - as far as writing was concerned - with certain genre-based, 'text-type' approaches. These in turn also became reflected in the 'Linguistic structure and features' sections of the National statement. In terms of reading, 'critical literacy' was becoming important under the influence of post-structuralist literary theory.

'Literacy' is presented in a number of contexts in the professional literature. McCann and Hiller (1992) and Donnelly (1992) present a Hirschian notion of 'cultural literacy', while Devlin (1992) touches on the consequences of literacy for the individual as allowing one to have an impact in a complex democratic society (p.71). Woods (1992) also sees the equation of literacy with active citizenship, though for her, the crucial issue is the creation of a critical citizenship. Woods too, in listing a series of 'literacies', such as 'workplace literacy', thus implies a key concept of the 1992 literature - that literacies are indeed to be seen as multiple. Nevertheless, despite there being a plurality of literacies, the word itself basically refers to 'language competence' in the sense in which she uses it (p.84). Those competencies are, indeed, to be multiple, but are conceived in policy documents as, basically, 'functional' and Woods wants 'English' to go beyond 'literacy' for that reason. 'English', she argues, should consist of a tripartite alliance of literacy, the study of language and the study of literature, and she wants to resist any policy direction that makes the teacher of 'English' a deliverer of functional literacy only.

9.2.2 Reading in the 1992 literature

While a number of writers simply refer to 'reading' in an unproblematic way (see, for example, Eade, 1992; Mullen, 1992b; O'Sullivan, 1992; Reid, 1992), for those dealing with fundamental conceptualisations of the subject, the notion of 'reading' has also become the plural 'readings'. Again, this is very much in the context of 'critical' literacy. Cranney-Francis (1992), argues, for example, that readers need to be empowered in order to intervene critically in 'dominant readings' of texts. Morgan (1992a) supports the use of 'unconventional' texts for this very reason: while conventional texts invite conventional reading, unconventional texts are more likely to promote questions about textuality, because readers become aware of how active their role is in constructing meaning, and conscious of how their responses are shaped. O'Neill (1992) questions the conventional construction by English teachers of themselves almost exclusively as teachers of 'literature', asking whether that construction allows them to teach the very useful lesson that readings of texts are problematic.

Woods' report on the 1987 US conference that produced Peter Elbow's What is English? (1990) also highlights the post-structuralist emphasis on plurality. The mood of the conference, she
says, suggested “English” should not be about “literature”, but about “reading” “texts”, “discourse” and “language”. In particular, “English” should be “about” not privileging certain texts or certain readings (Woods, 1992: 88-90).

In a detailed discussion of the opposition between critical literacy and “growth model reading practices”, Mellor, O’Neill and Patterson emphasise the convergence of “growth” with reader response theory via the convergence of Dixon and Rosenblatt. Dixon and Rosenblatt are seen to combine in a transfer of power from cultural heritage practices to a more democratic notion of a community of readers. But, they argue, making reading about shaping primary spontaneous responses results in either an acceptance of plurality of meaning, or modification of minority responses towards a dominant reading. In either case, “growth model’s reading practices produce readers who are unaware of the ways in which they operate to construct meanings and who, thus, are unable to “read” not only in the terms of their own readings but those of others as well. “Such practices”, they argue, “far from being inclusive, disenfranchise those students whose cultural experiences and values are not dominant ones.....What is unlikely to occur in growth model practices, it seems, is an analysis of the construction of divergent readings, the values they support or affirm and the grounds on which any particular reading might be defended.” (1992: 42). Thus, plurality is again the key notion: texts offer reading positions and the point of reading is not to find the “correct” interpretation, but to consider what possible readings of texts might be. The real aims of teaching “reading” thus become to:

- analyse the construction of readings
- “read” other readings or interpretations
- consider what is at stake in the disagreements between readings
- make visible the gaps or silences of texts and readings
- analyse what readings support in terms of the values they affirm
- challenge other, especially dominant readings
- construct new readings (p.45).

Morgan (1992a) also advocates interrogative reading practices and Woods (1992) the idea of more conscious reflection on language use. In addition, both Corcoran (1992b) and Parker (1992) discuss ways of creating resistant readers. Finally, Reid adds another perspective to the idea of plurality by demonstrating the multiplicity of readings that can be created by the ways texts and readers are “framed” (1992b).

All of this is a long way from the consideration of reading in the 1977 literature. There the concerns had been with familiarising teachers with reading processes in a more fundamental sense to do with text-based comprehension, or about advice on implementing reading.
schemes. Perhaps the most notable difference concerns the place given to poor achievers in reading. In 1977, the concern had been with methodology to some extent, but the literature also showed a more complex concern with the underlying social causes of reading failure. In 1992, the concern with "readings" seems to take for granted a certain level of fundamental text-based comprehension among students.

9.2.3 Writing in the 1992 literature

The professional literature of 1992 has gone beyond formulaic "text-type" approaches to writing and the construction of genres. Cranny-Francis, for example, argues that genre has the potential to operate as a tool of politically-informed writing theory and practice (pp.38-39), in which students experiment with their writing in order to produce new or different kinds of writing, hence different kinds of knowledge and discursive practices. The most useful kind of approach to genre, she argues, is one in which texts are finally seen as strategic processes, actively positioning readers in relation to a range of meaning-potentials. Such an approach allows students to become aware of the power to intervene in the way they are positioned, and thus in the discursive practices of society (pp.40ff). Similarly, since he stresses that both readers and writers are the products of particular cultural contexts, Corcoran advocates a pedagogy of re-writing texts to create the kind of resistant reading response he desires (1992b).

Two quite different approaches to writing emerge, however, in the work of Reid and Adams. Reid (1992a), like the "Sydney School" of genrists, is critical of Britton’s notion of writing as primarily about "expressing the self" (p.180), not because of its alleged roots in Romanticism and progressivism, but simply because students have such a variety of selves to express. This is an interesting variant on the notion of plurality by locating the construction of plurality in the individual. He develops two principles:

- the relations between participants in learning will function as a model for the relation between reader and text
- the relation between reader and text will function as a model for whatever writing those readers then do (p.181).

Thus, Reid ultimately locates the success of a plurality of narrative selves in the classroom pedagogy itself.

Adams’ concept of "dependent authorship" (1992) picks up aspects of Reid’s theme. In effect, Adams sees classroom texts as potential sites for many stories, by having students “re-author” those texts from various perspectives. The degree of inter-textual possibility that this practice allows creates another sense of plurality.
9.2.4 Grammar in the 1992 literature

While the 1977 literature argued the case for no necessary connection between knowledge of grammar and writing ability, any such argument is largely missing from the literature of 1992. The most extended discussion of grammar at all is that of Collerson (1992), who uses the Hallidayan triad to stress the importance of "learning through language", but sees the "language across the curriculum" movement as not about "any language for anything". Collerson explicitly rejects the idea that poems, for example, are appropriate in Science. However, despite being one of the few writers to conceptualise the debate in this way, he does not advance an argument about why some language forms are more useful than others in the learning of the subject. He argues instead for studying the language demands of each subject, and that means a strong emphasis on "learning about language" and having a language for talking about language.

In keeping with the thrust of genre-based approaches to writing, Collerson argues for a grammar of whole texts, as well as levels of grammar within texts. "Learning through language" ought not to be mutually exclusive of "learning about language". Nor should "learning language" rely only on "use", otherwise students from a background of rich language experience are favoured. This argument is a mainstream LERN argument and is a measure of the distance between 1977 and 1992, with the former literature largely arguing the lack of connection between knowledge about grammar and ability to write. Collerson argues for a perspective on grammar that can be related to the functions and meanings being expressed - ie for Hallidayan functional-systemics. He argues, however, to retain the process approach (and the right to engage non-specialist audiences) with a commitment to the craft of writing.

9.3 How subject "English" was being defined in the textbooks

In approaching this area, I will use the same technique of selection as in Chapter 6: textbooks for Years 7-10 for classroom use by students published in Australia in 1992 and reviewed in one or more of the three relevant journals (over 1992-93). These textbooks were:


Making meanings consists of a wide range of student activities in discrete, non-sequenced chapters. There is a breadth of imaginative recreation type tasks, complemented by a number of tasks which are aimed at having students reflect on their reading and on how texts are constructed for different readings. There are chapters on fairy tales, plot profiles, family
names, advertising. Students are led carefully through activities and there is a strong emphasis on groupwork.

  *Literary terms*, as the name suggests, is a glossary of terminology of modern literary theory. However, Moon has supplemented this function with activities for each item which demonstrate to students how the item can be used in responding to texts. Thus, there are activities demonstrating "ideology", "genre", "class" etc. in terms of textual analysis.

  *Signposts* is organised around a series of themes. Each theme/chapter is sub-divided into five sections: reading, writing, language, talking and "issues".

  *Speak up* is based on speaking activities for individuals and groups: small group and whole-class discussions, role-plays, monologues, speeches, re-tellings radio plays etc. - as well as work on body language. Students are led "gently" to these projects by word games and short exercises.

  *Ways of telling* consists of a series of short stories, largely by well-known "canonical" authors, with activities revolving largely around such DARTS activities (Lunzer and Gardiner, 1984) as prediction, as well as a strong emphasis on imaginative recreation.

(Michael Holland's *Crafts of English* was also reviewed, but as it is explicitly aimed at the Victorian Certificate of Education, it is excluded from this study).

In Chapter 6, the framework for analysis of textbooks was that provided by Halliday and others (Halliday, 1980a: 81-83). That framework was seen as particularly applicable to the 1971 Syllabus. The framework is worth using again in the present context, not only for consistency, but also because the 1987 Syllabus in NSW was based on similar general principles to that of 1971 and NSW teachers using these books in 1992 would be doing so in the context of that Syllabus. Halliday's criteria are repeated in Table 9.4 below: "Halliday's framework for analysis". Again, a set of marices have been established in which each of the textbooks published in 1992 and reviewed in the relevant journals is evaluated. This evaluation is also contained in Table 9.4. What follows is a summary discussion of that analysis.
9.3.1 School textbooks and their rationale(s)

The first thing that needs to be said of the textbooks of 1992 is that the "skills-based" approach of decontextualised exercises on traditional grammar and comprehension is not evident. If there is a split, it would seem to be between those taking the "growth" orientation of the Syllabus, and others having a more directly self-conscious awareness of literary and critical theory. Corcoran's reflections on this period characterise it as split, predictably, between "progressive"/"critical literacy" and "reader-response"/"poststructuralist" manifestations of Boomer's more general binary, "the progressive vs. the pragmatic radical" (Corcoran, 1998). Nevertheless, the split is not as strong as it was in 1977, with some of the clearly "growth"-oriented texts, such as Making meanings and Ways of telling, also concerned with resistant readings and with others such as Speak up expressing concern for "critical" approaches.

Both Speak up and Making meanings echo the familiar call for breadth of language use - a range of reading, writing, speaking and listening activities, as well as a range of audiences, purposes and forms. Interestingly, both explicitly contain these calls within a general orientation to "learning through language", with Making meanings being explicit about each aspect of the Hallidayan triad (Forrestal et al, 1992: vii). Students are required to be consciously aware of audience and purpose continually throughout the units in Speak up, which is thus given something of a rhetorical edge, compounded by the reflection activities after each unit. These "reflection" activities - which have students consciously reflect on their learning - also characterise Ways of telling. These texts seem to be influenced by the work of those such as Thomson (1987), who argue for the importance of such "reflexiveness" on one's learning and one's reading processes. Indeed, in Speak up such activities seem to be the manifestation of the authors' sense of "critical", as opposed to any explicit deconstructing of ideology.

Making meanings, however, in the context of a generally growth orientation (manifested in such characteristic activities as writing for a range of audiences, purposes and forms, imaginative recreation of literature, group discussion of literary texts) emphasises the constructedness of texts and encourages resistant readings. The importance of analysing how particular readings are constructed is, indeed, a strong theme of the text. Similarly, Ways of telling - again a text characterised by such traditional "growth" activities as DARTS and imaginative recreation - explicitly draws on post-structuralist theory and claims to draw students' attention to the ways they are constructed as readers by prior experiences. While the text itself is not as saturated with this notion as the "Introduction" would suggest, students are often given a number of possible constructions of a text to consider.
By 1992 - as mentioned in Chapter 8 - Chalkface Press had become the key publishing house for critical literacy pedagogy in Australia. Brian Moon’s *Literary terms* epitomises such a pedagogy. It is based solely on introducing recent literary theory, with special emphasis on the role of reading practices in the production of literary meanings. It sees literature not as a body of objective knowledge, but as a field of social practices in which people “struggle” to make meanings and exert influence. The important skills to give students, Moon argues, are the skills not just to absorb literature, but to interrogate it, and to consider the social functions of literary knowledge. The glossary aims to “assist in the development of a democratic, active approach to the study of literary texts: an approach that will enable students to question the perspectives offered by ... literary and critical texts” (Moon, 1992: vii).

### 9.3.2 School textbooks, language and pedagogy

With the single exception of *Literary terms*, which has an agenda of analysis and the study of language, each textbook involves the extended production of language by students: group discussion, text response, speaking projects. Students are encouraged to express opinions, thoughts and feelings. While *Signposts* does include a number of right-wrong question-answer activities, these do not overwhelm the rest of the text’s opportunities for extended language production.

Furthermore, in Hallidayan terms, language is seen as “resource” in all texts, though with, again, some emphasis on “rule” in *Signposts* (“correct” usage, for example, is an explicit issue and there are separate sections on grammar and punctuation). In *Making meanings* and *Ways of telling*, the approach to language as resource means that all analysis is in terms of rhetorical effect, while in *Literary terms*, this rhetorical emphasis is complemented by the analysis of ideology. Language as rhetorical “resource” does not exclude a “rule-based” pedagogy, however, in the milieu of critical literacy. *Literary terms*’ analysis of the effects of language is largely couched in sets of questions which demand one correct answer, usually implying a belief that particular groups read texts in particular ways. Thus, while only *Signposts* among the other texts includes traditional “comprehension” passages, *Literary terms* contains many multiple choice activities around how particular readings are constructed.

In a similar vein, and in the sense that “radical” critical literacy rejects “indirectness” in teaching (see 8.4.2), the ways in which previous knowledge of language is important differs between *Literary terms* and the other textbooks. Each unit in *Speak up*, *Making meanings* and *Signposts* depends to some degree on knowledge brought to the unit, or on language used outside the classroom, and exploits that knowledge. *Literary terms*, on the other hand, begins each unit with an activity that has the students actively question previous knowledge and beliefs about language and texts. By its nature, it tends to create an enclosed world of
definitions, and allows little space for students to simply exercise previous knowledge about language.

9.4 How subject "English" was being defined in relevant public examinations

As in 1977, the relevant examination in 1992 was the School Certificate Reference Test in English. Only minor changes had occurred since 1977. In a simple reversal, the Writing section had become Part C and the Response to Literature/Mass Media section had become Part B. In addition, Part A, Reading, was now split into two sub-sections, with A1 containing multiple-choice comprehension, while A2 consisted of an "extended" (15 lines) analysis of a text. With only minor variation, Little's 1972 triangle apexes ("language", "in use", "in context" remained intact).

In 1992, the Reference Test revolved around a specially created teen magazine entitled 15Plus! which came with the test and provided all the stimulus material. Part A1 questions were based on three articles and a cartoon from the magazine. Part A2 asked students to study an advertisement for apples in the magazine (in fact a real advertisement originating from the Australian Horticultural Corporation) and to discuss advertising techniques. Part B - Response to Literature/Mass Media - asked students to discuss two poems from the magazine, choose a favourite and to write to the editor telling "...why you prefer it". Prompts suggest that students "may" consider "ideas, attitudes and feelings... the way it is written (and)... some features of the other poem to show why you chose the one you did" (Board of Studies, NSW, 1992: 19). Part C - Writing - asks students to write a short story for a magazine competition based on three pictures from the magazine itself. As in Chapter 6, further discussion of this examination is contained in the following section in which the Christie thesis is discussed in terms of the broader professional literature of 1992.

9.5 "English" in 1992 and the Christie thesis

Once again, the central elements of the Christie thesis of the history of English in Australia are:

- the more or less wholesale transfer into Australia of the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon
• the rejection of teaching about sentence-level grammar leading to the abandonment of the
notion of teaching about language in general—indeed, active resistance to teaching about
language, leading to a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
• the abandonment of the study of literature in terms of analysis of language

At this point, the analysis of the relevant literature of 1992 represented in this chapter so far
will be extended to compare its essential elements to those of the Christie thesis.

9.5.1 "Growth" and conceptualisations of subject "English" in 1992

Debates about genre-oriented approaches to curriculum were prominent in the professional
literature of 1992. The effect of conceptualising these debates in terms of "genre vs. process"
was to equate the latter with "growth" approaches to English. Documents such as the 1987
Syllabus, with its reflection of both Gravesian approaches to writing and of the "growth"
principles of its 1971 counterpart would no doubt have aided such an equation. It is, of
course, partly such an equation that is ultimately behind Christie's views on "growth".

But, as I have attempted to show in 9.1.3 above, by 1992, genre-based approaches to writing
were also increasingly being questioned on grounds other than "process" orientation,
particularly in terms of the conservative political ideology represented by the "Sydney
School". Gilbert (1992), Cranny-Francis (1992), O'Neill (1992) and others go beyond the
position of the "Sydney School" to argue for a pedagogy that allows the reading-writing
subject to become aware of their power to intervene in the way they are positioned, and thus
to intervene in the discursive practices of society. Otherwise, argues Gilbert, somewhat
prophetically, genre theory will simply degenerate in official curricula into knowledge about
the textual features of genres, or the conventional ordering of particular "text-types".

In advocating the replacement of a structuralist approach to "genre" by such a post-
structuralist approach, O'Neill, Gilbert and Cranny-Francis effectively leave behind any
"growth"-"genre" debate as traditionally conceived. Watkins -herself a strong advocate of
genre approaches to writing (Knapp and Watkins, 1994) - later echoes these writers in
arguing that documents such as the 1994 K-6 English Syllabus, reflect an essentially
structuralist view of language and genre in which the precision of neat taxonomies such as
the division into "Literary"/ "Factual" and their respective sub-divisions of "type" and "form"
has led to generic schemas being presented in classrooms as sets of rules to be followed

As I have argued throughout, "growth" itself in NSW was always characterised in much more
language-oriented terms than Christie allows. Indeed, even the 1992 concern with textual
ideology had already been represented in NSW Syllabuses as far back as the 1971 document - such concern being expressed in the context of concern for language:

English is inextricably bound up with value-judgments. Its task is not to impose on pupils any absolute system of values, but to help them explore their own and other people's values, in the context of language in all its uses. In this context, judgments about such matters as truth or falsity to experience, and appropriateness or inappropriateness of language to its situation become crucial. The competence that English seeks to develop goes beyond mere information or skills to involve personal and social value-judgments of these kinds at all times. Such value-judgments involve both meaning and form: what is said, as the product of precisely how it is said. (NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndA: 6).

However, in any case, by 1992 the professional literature was moving beyond those debates represented by Christie (and others) which conceived of English itself as having to privilege either "growth" or the study of functional grammar as represented by the "Sydney" approach to "genre" theory.

9.5.2 Language and literary study in 1992

It is perhaps remarkable that as late as 1992, in the face of post-structuralist theory and critical literacy, there was a kind of Leavisite revival in the professional literature of secondary English. As we have seen, McCann and Hiller (1992) argue for the retention of "classics" in schooling, on the grounds of their universality. Mallick (1992) reacts against "extreme" reader response theory in favour of "more informed" readings. In a statement consciously reminiscent of Leavis, he also condemns the coarsening effect of popular culture. Devlin (1992) and Donnelly (1992) also place literature and a cultural literacy at the centre of English, the latter rejecting contemporary concern with literary theory. In fact, Donnelly's position echoes a general rejection of "Theory" (Misson, 1994) among these writers. Against such a position are writers such as Woods (1992) who were making the whole category of "literature" problematic in itself and problematic as the centre of "English". Indeed Woods argues for a re-formulation of the place of language study in the curriculum. Taking a post-structuralist perspective, she suggests that "English" should not be about "literature" as such at all, but about "reading", "texts", "discourse", "language" - thus not privileging certain texts or certain readings.

In effect, with professional debate adopting positions such as this, by 1992, it becomes very difficult to separate discussions of language from discussions about the place of literature. In arguing that English should involve students in critical enquiry and understanding of how
they as language users are immersed in cultural production as makers and receivers, Woods is, perhaps going beyond even Christie's position on language study - beyond analysis to evaluation and critique. Similarly, O'Neill's (1992) resistance of the kind of genre-based approaches advocated by the "Sydney school" actually issues from a rejection of the authoritarianism and institutionalisation of such selected genres and from a reaction against simply adopting institutionalised structures without a culturally critical approach to the construction of texts, and how meanings are produced from those texts. The discussions in the professional literature revolved around such need to read the culture critically (O'Neill, 1992; Woods, 1992; JCPTA, 1992), by creating a resistant readership (Mellor, O'Neill and Patterson, 1992; Thomson, 1992; Corcoran, 1992b; Parker, 1992). A related theme was the use of unconventional texts to teach "how to read texts" (Morgan, 1992a; Johnston, 1992; Parker, 1992).

In fact, this problematisation of the category "literature" which dominated the professional discussions of 1992 overwhelmed the neo-Leavisite reaction of Mallick and others and, far from leading to a neglect of language study, placed such study at the centre of approaches to literature. The textbooks of the period reflected this position in varying degrees. Moon's Literary terms epitomises the pedagogy which problematises categories such as "literature". It entirely emphasises the role of reading practices in the production of literary meanings, seeing "literature" not as a body of objective knowledge, but as a field of social practices in which people "struggle" to make meanings and exert influence. The important skills to give students, Moon argues, are the skills not just to absorb literature, but to interrogate it, and to consider the social functions of literary knowledge (p.vii). Making meanings and Ways of telling also emphasise the constructedness of texts and encourage varied readings within the context of a characteristically "growth" orientation. In fact, in Christie's terms, Making meanings and Ways of telling approach all analysis is in terms of rhetorical effect. Similarly, the "Resources" section of English in Australia #99 contains only teaching ideas that focus on the effects of language use in spoken and written situations. The written activities all focus on audience.

It is true, nevertheless, that the Reference Test itself did not directly reflect such concern with the centrality of language, with Part B only gently suggesting that "the way it is written" "may" be one of the approaches students take to their discussion of a poem (Board of Studies, NSW, 1992: 19). In the terms set up by this study, the 1992 Reference Test may be the one case in which Christie's characterisation of post-Dartmouth English is borne out.
### TABLE 9.1

**SUMMARY OF ARTICLES IN 1992 FROM ENGLISH IN AUSTRALIA**

*English in Australia, 99: March, 1992*

**McCann, Hugo and Hiller, Claire** "Statements within statements: a commentary on the current state of statements on English in Australia" pp.4-18.

The article critiques the statements on English being produced at a national level on a number of grounds:

- the belief that discourse of skills can adequately describe all aspects of human endeavour - the choice of appropriate skills is a more important issue, and that is a matter of values and feelings
- the belief that it is possible to describe the sequence in which skills are acquired
- that they are driven by commercial ideology - exemplar letters in the *Statement* are always, tellingly, letters of application for jobs.

Current Statements ignore the education of emotions or the acquisition of ‘webs of cultural literacy’ (p.18) They ask whether this represents a desire to withdraw humanities from schooling. They further argue that the choices of skills and of sequences is like the choices of ‘cultural literacy’ items made by Hirsch and others - where will the useful networks of knowledge be found? They advocate a balance between individualism and cultural literacy, and thus argue for the classics to be retained in schooling because these deal with morality and aesthetics, matters of “perennial interest”: “We are seeking to establish ways of developing and justifying a program of significant works through which the lists of skills in language to be found in many of the proposals for state and national guidelines can be realised - a selection of themes expressed through the works of authors which seem a particularly appropriate means of introducing the young to a vivid and widening cultural literacy” (p.10). They list their great works, with suggested discussion themes. They then list teaching strategies, which tend to favour imaginative re-creation, and stress a range of audiences for these, in order to deal with cohesion, spelling and punctuation.

**Gilbert, Pam** “On place, parameter and play: exploring the cultural possibilities of genre work” pp. 19-26.

Gilbert sees value in genre approaches, but fears that this will degenerate in official curricula into knowledge about the textual features of genres, or the conventional ordering of particular text-types. She looks at:
• place: how different social sites draw differently from discourses, eg Dolly, The Bulletin and local newspapers discussing soap operas construct different readers and use a range of different genres or text-types. The study of genre has to find ways to consider how genres operate to differentially value social activity.

• parameter: how do cultural parameters affect genres? "Narrative" is not an empty slot, but a form which raises different cultural assumptions in different stories - for example, about "masculinity" and "femininity".

• play: breaking generic conventions - What does rule-breaking signal? Who is authorised to break rules and who isn't and what needs to be in place for rule-breaking to be recognisable?

Cranny-Francis, Anne "The value of 'genre' in English literature teaching" pp. 27-48.
Cranny-Francis begins by debunking the claims of traditional literary criticism (New Criticism/Leavivism) to be non-ideological, objective, sensitive and searching for universal truths. Her approach is historical and she sees these claims as debunked by the 1960s, when the canon was shown to be ethnocentric, patriarchal and bourgeois. Hence, the dominant critical readings were also ethnocentric, patriarchal and bourgeois, and success in the system also favoured the dominant groups. One could argue that English literary studies function as a guardian of the values of the dominant classes. Traditional genre theory simply judged the value of a text by its conformity to the genre. Cranny-Francis discusses the problems with this approach (pp.34-36). She then discusses the advantages of a post-structuralist approach to genre theory: it allows textual analysis to combine with analysis of institutional power of the text and asks the questions, "What discourses are enacted in this text? How does it figure within the institutional contexts for its readings? What kinds of readings can be made of this text and what is their (social and political) value and function? What are the premises of these readings and how do they function to privilege particular readers and alienate others?" (pp.36-7). Feminist writers also revealed the gender-laden-ness of genres, and worked to subvert these. Cranny-Francis also discusses how genres can operate as a tool of politically-informed writing theory and practice (pp.38-39).

How do we counteract the conservatism of the "objective" approach to literary criticism and produce informed writers and readers? Students:
1) need to write in institutionally prescribed ways, to gain access to the institution
2) need to understand that they are fulfilling institutional expectations by doing so, not contributing to "objective" or "universal" knowledge
3) need to be able to experiment with their writing to produce new or different kinds of writing, hence knowledge, hence discursive practices.
She posits two worst-case scenarios:

- the student learns to write genres uncritically - this at least gives some access to powerful discourses.
- pedagogy is "invisible", leaving socially powerful groups ignorant of the premises of their theoretical practice and the powerless as failures. "Invisible" pedagogy's objection to explicit teaching is based on a paternalistic view of the subject as mindless and unable to resist their positioning. This latter scenario is the "most invidious position" (p. 42).

She lists the characteristics of a useful genre criticism (p. 43). What has this criticism to offer?

- the student learns to identify and challenge assumptions implicit in the text and to discuss how the text positions them as readers
- students might examine literature and literary criticism as social practice and how it works to perpetuate particular discourses by positioning readers
- students might examine semiotic practice: how a text constructs meaning(s) and recognise the way texts operate on readers in the way they are written, not just as finished products.
- students can write within the genres and make decisions about whether to use them or not.

She analyses Dead Poet's Society as about the Romantic consciousness of "feelings" that leaves students powerless (pp. 44-46)

A genre approach means that texts are finally seen as strategic processes, actively positioning readers in relation to a range of meaning-potentials. This allows the reading/writing subject to become aware of their power to intervene in the way they are positioned, and thus in the discursive practices of society.

RESOURCES SECTION

Teaching ideas all focus on the effects of language use in spoken and written situations. The written activities all focus on audience.


Mallick rejects modern literary theory as simply leading away from the text. He sees this theory as essentially extreme reader-response and Iser and Rosenblatt are invoked to present the less extreme reader-response position. Mallick argues for close reading, for the idea that some readings are better than others because they are more informed. He also rejects stock responses as ill-informed ("I don't like sad poems"). He is also against popular culture as coarsening. His position is essentially that of Leavis (whom he defends): "The role of the teacher...becomes even more important when you realise how much our students read and see will coarsen the sensibility and make them much less able to respond to the complex demands of fine writing. At times we must all feel defeated in our attempts to compete with
the **crude**, false or over-simplified pictures of human behaviour presented by the mass media and **cheap paperbacks** (p.60). Interestingly, the classroom which he advocates to "resist" **cheap writing** is one that would presumably be approved by Cranny-Francis (pp.60-61). Also, along with those influenced by the post-structuralists, he is advocating strong teacher intervention.

**Donnelly, Kevin.** "The new orthodoxy in English teaching: a critique" pp. 63-77.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donnelly outlines the &quot;new orthodoxy&quot; in English. He argues that historically, it has:</th>
<th>Donnelly critiques the &quot;new orthodoxy&quot; in English on the grounds that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* focused on a child-centred 'growth model' since Dartmouth, based on * the unique nature of the child * adopting a model for language learning that comes from early language acquisition * ties to reader response theories from Rosenblatt to deconstruction texts no longer have referential meanings</td>
<td>* curriculum must embrace &quot;cultural heritage&quot; and &quot;skills&quot; as well. It is education’s role to challenge and extend, not just celebrate the world of the child. Teachers must intervene, because learning is not &quot;natural&quot;. Child-centredness is also inherently narcissistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* highlighted &quot;relevance&quot;, eg in &quot;creative writing&quot; and favouring the contemporary and the local in literature.</td>
<td>* &quot;relevance&quot; does not take the child beyond their world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* favoured school-based curriculum</td>
<td>* school-based curriculum does not account for education’s responsibility to the whole community in creating values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* favoured &quot;process&quot;, &quot;discovery&quot; and &quot;enquiry&quot; over content, eg in &quot;process writing&quot;</td>
<td>* Bruner himself has argued that qualitative distinctions must be made about what constitutes worthwhile learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* attacked the liberal-humanist approach to English, especially through attacks on the elitism of &quot;standard English&quot; as an instrument of class control. Cultural studies is the most recent manifestation of this trend - literature has disappeared for &quot;text&quot;</td>
<td>* all students should have equal access to the type of education represented by the traditional disciplines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

225
| • adopted a subjectivist view of knowledge and understanding in which the child is a creator of his/her own world | • there is an external world which predates the individual and the systems of which the child must learn |
| • become politicised - sees the Western liberal tradition as just another discourse with no right to be privileged, and represents simply the dominant groups in society | • If all beliefs are the products of contexts are there any meaningful dialogues to be had? Why should English be about the socialist utopia? Education should be "disinterested", "dispassionate" and rational. |

Donnelly argues for the study of English within a liberal education and agreement on a core curriculum based in the disciplines. Literature must be the centre of English, which must also strive for a cultural literacy. English should also study language so that all students can master standard English. This cannot be done otherwise than by teacher intervention - he draws on the genre school for support here. Rhetoric and logic should also be studied. Reading and writing need to be seen as superior to talking and listening.

**English in Australia, 100: June, 1992**

**Curtain, John** "English in Australia' retrospective" pp.7-9
Contains reminiscences of the early days of the journal.

Contains the early history of AATE.

**Collerson, John** "Saving the baby and recycling the bathwater" pp. 16-26.
Collerson argues that the genrists make too much play with the differences between speech and writing. Much writing which is highly nominalised and far removed from speech is difficult to read, and readable writing can be close to speech. On "language across the curriculum", Collerson uses the Hallidayan triad to stress the importance of "learning through language", but sees the "language across the curriculum" movement as not about "any language for anything", and rejects poems etc in Science, though he doesn't say why. He argues instead for studying the language demands of each subject, and that means "learning about language" and having a language for talking about language.

Collerson argues for a grammar of whole texts, as well of levels grammar within texts. "Learning through language" ought not to be mutually exclusive with "learning about language", nor should the former rely on use only, otherwise it favours students from a
background of rich language experience. Collerson argues for a perspective on grammar that can be related to the functions and meanings being expressed. He argues to retain the process approach (and the right to engage non-specialist audiences) with a commitment to craft, along with an approach based on functional grammar.

Gill, Margaret. “Reflections on the 1980s” pp. 27-33. Contains reflections on the Gill years as editor during the 1980s. She argues that “The accelerated pace of social and economic change gave an increasingly socially critical edge to the profession’s thinking and writing about English and English teaching. What’s English for? rather than What’s English about? became the key question in debating the curriculum in English.” (p.27).

O’Neill, Marnie. “An editor looks back: re-reading and re-writing” pp.33-44. Contains reflections on her years as editor during the 1980s. O’Neill is critical of the National Profiles in English, particularly in terms of not acknowledging more recent literary theory - for example, students are not encouraged to read gender roles as representing anything other than real life. Grade related descriptors, accountability and functional English do not sit well with teachers’ desires to read student work using criteria pertinent to prose fiction. She also argues that English teachers construct themselves almost exclusively as teachers of “literature” and asks whether this teaches students anything useful about reading texts, particularly non-fiction texts. She would now promote a culturally critical approach to the construction of informational texts, and the production of meanings from those texts. On genre, O’Neill worries about the authoritarianism and institutionalisation of selected genres, and about the only liberation being the liberation to play established roles in established games. Such approaches simply institutionalise class and gender dominance. Also, prescribing genres to be tested as measures of student and teacher competence and of accountability measures for schools or whole systems, simply invites de-contextualised drilling of forms. Yet genre theorists have influenced the National Curriculum framework greatly, even if teachers do not accept their position.


Eagleson, Robert. “Freedom through English” pp.60-67. This article is a reflection on poor quality writing in the post-school adult world. Eagleson is critical of:
• the pattern of beginning-middle-end in most documents where people want to see conclusions first, and thus should adopt a conclusion-evidence pattern
• impersonality of tone
• cant
This is used to warn against the teaching of genres as anything other than convention and tradition: Science students are still told to avoid the personal when science editors are encouraging it.

Devlin, Barney "A classroom retrospect (with a hint of prospect)" pp.68-71.
Borthwick, Jill "A reply to an invitation" pp.72-74.
Leonarder, Rod "A note on the guide to books and resources" pp.75-76
These articles are each about the role of the AATE Guide to Books. In his article, Devlin defines English teaching as about "the central role of literature" and about "Literacy skills that will enable (students) to make their impact upon the complex democratic society they will soon inherit" (p.71).

Woods, Claire "English- a 'pedagogical porcupine'?" pp.77-95
This article addresses the key issue, "What indeed is the core or centre of English?". It considers the current national agenda: the White Paper, Australia's language; the National Statement on English; National English Profiles. Mayer Competencies - a well as literary theory. She quotes (p.84) the White Paper definition of literacy. She argues that the White Paper focuses on English competence as an economic imperative, from which one could infer the role of the teacher as a deliverer of functional literacy. It does not mention literature, texts, new technologies. On literary theory, she believes that most teachers see "literature" as unproblematic and by their training identify as teachers of literature. Rethinking English means challenging the role of "literature" as a category and explicating the concept of literacy and formulating the place of language study in the curriculum.
Her comments on the AATE National Position Paper are that it:
• focuses on children as effective language users from a diversity of backgrounds
• structures English around composing and comprehending
• focuses on texts broadly
• English as workshop environment
The 1987 US Conference, "What is English?" concluded that English was to be about:
• using language actively in a diversity of ways and settings
• reflecting on language use... examining the processes of talking, listening, writing and reading
• conditions of active learning
The mood of the conference suggested "English" should not be "literature", but "reading", "texts", "discourse", "language", ie not privileging certain texts or certain readings.

Woods' own view of English is that:

• it should be culture creating, not about knowledge acquisition alone
• it should involve students in critical enquiry and understanding of how they as language users are immersed in cultural production as makers and receivers
• teachers are aware of recent literary theory
• it teaches students how society works
• it sees literacy as about language competence, but also about ability to reflect on Australian culture
• there is more than one English, and that literacy in one language is linked to literacy in another
• it recognises that language (eg Standard English) is linked to culture
• it validates voices from the margin, including our students' own cultures ("subject English should recognize the way fictions are made and remade by people with particular cultural identities in different social an cultural contexts and the way that individuals produce texts and are themselves culturally produced by the myths, institutions, texts, discourses in which they are enmeshed" [p,93]).

Woods' agenda is for:

• building a culturally responsive curriculum
• sustaining a multi-lingual perspective
• extending students as readers, writers, thinkers
• explicitness about language as an object
• extending students' understanding of language and texts in social and cultural contexts
• extending students' capacity to reflect on and critique the way they and texts interact in cultural contexts
• making explicit information about the processes of making texts
• enabling students' understanding of the role and function of workplace literacy and language
• enabling students' understanding of how readers and writers develop

English in Australia, 102: December, 1992

Haynes, Jennifer "From the guest editor" pp. 2-7

Haynes begins by detailing the lack of Australian theoretical work on oracy, despite it being valued in every state Syllabus. She also recognises that even where it is required for Year 12
assessment, it is moderated by a written exam, and thus does not reflect students' ability; moreover, assessed oral work tends to be individual formal presentation.

Howe, Alan "Direct exchange - multiplying the contributing voices" pp. 8-15
Howe discusses the conditions for optimising useful talk in the classroom, including assessment. With regard to assessment, he argues for cumulative evidence rather than snapshots, and for the quality of thinking as the chief criterion. Howe draws on Barnes as his rationale, and on the notion of students talking their way into understanding, ie of learning through talk.

Maher, Janet "Reaction and interaction: shaping the conditions" pp. 16-19
This supports Howe's call for speaking activities which are about learning through talk.

Travers, Molly Murison "Gender differences: adolescent girls' and boys' fear of speaking in class: an Australian American comparison" pp. 20-36
this looks at research, and reports her own research, into gender difference in speaking and in attitudes to speaking.

Meiers, Marion "More than might be expected: assessing oral communication" pp. 37-43
This tells the story of what two Year 12 students learnt over a year while working together in English on CAT 3: Oral Communication. Their work is a response to a novel.

Davies, Glyn Allen "Of cabbages and kings: a survey of oral English activities in the secondary school and their assessment" pp. 44 - 58
Davies discusses the history of oral assessment in the Queensland Syllabuses. He advocates the importance of oracy and its assessment, and also of a variety of contexts, purposes, audiences, forms. He uses Britton's continuum to argue that all speaking should not be "transactional"(pp.46-50). He also discusses the importance of talk for making sense of experience (p.48), and uses the triad of learning to talk, learning about talk and talking to learn (p.50) as the basis for one form of programming. His key message is the importance of breadth and variety. He suggests a number of examples of oral activity, both in-class and out-of-class (pp.52-54), and presents a set of criteria for awarding levels of achievement in speaking.

Reid, Jo-Anne "Is there 'English' in the primary school?" pp. 65-76
Reid argues that primary schools are still obsessed with the notion of "language arts", such as spelling and handwriting etc. that are integrated into the rest of the curriculum. She argues that programming for English language instruction needs to be reconceptualised as a subject in its own right, and less as a set of cross-curricular language arts. She writes in reply to an
earlier article by Emmitt, which had claimed that primary integration existed. Emmitt had written that primary programs traditionally placed the emphasis on "language" rather than "English" - and achievement of the aims of "language" were best achieved by integrated cross-curricular units, though Reid recognises that "reading" and "writing" are to still stand separately (pp.72-73). Reid implies in her final sentence that a unit in "English" has "the use of language as its focus"
TABLE 9.2

SUMMARY OF ARTICLES IN 1992 FROM THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH (incorporating THE NSW ENGLISH TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER)

Articles on aspects of the Higher School Certificate (Years 11-12) are excluded from this summary.

The Teaching of English, 1/92: April, 1992

O'Sullivan, Mary "The big picture" p.5
O'Sullivan outlines the development of two key national priorities: the development of a National English Statement, and the development of a set of national competencies in training via the Mayer Committee on employment-related key competencies. She argues that the latter committee's emphasis on "Communication" should be seen not as English, but as Language across the curriculum.

McGrath, Greg "Parents choosing novels: a committee that really works" p.6
Eade, Alison "Yeoval Central School reading tutors" p.7
Wallace, Jan "Identifying learning outcomes in English programs" pp.22-25
These articles report on programs from three schools: one which involves parents in book selection for English, one which has Year 11 students as tutors for poorer readers in K-10 and one which identifies minimum classroom study for Years 7-10.

Tomlin, David "Some manageable strategies" pp.9-17
This article is a series of units designed for mixed-ability teaching. They combine "mandatory common tasks with the opportunity for students to develop at their own pace" (p.9). "Core plus extension" is the structure, and assessment is through profile reporting, with students also keeping records. Activities are strongly oriented to imaginative re-creation.

Kitson, Janine "Strategies for assisting listening by teaching the necessary vocabulary whilst introducing Shakespeare to ESL students" p.18
The article describes a unit in which the teacher of an ESL class introduced Shakespeare to her group through a series of listening activities based on vocabulary she had selected.
Grover, Paul "Shakespeare's virtual reality" pp.19-21
This article is an extended review of the HBJ Shakespeare series, the activities in which, Grover emphasises, have a strong basis in imaginative re-creation.

Wauchope High School English Faculty "Gender performance in English" pp.27-28
This reports on a piece of research at Wauchope High School in which girls were confirmed as out-scoring boys in English regardless of the assessment task.

Stuart, John "Keats - an overall perspective" pp.30-31
Anon. "Frankenstein" pp.32-33
Symonds, Kerry "The mosquito coast" pp.35-37
Lynch, Susan "So far from the bamboo grove" pp.38-39
Casey, Maureen "From the mixed up files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler" pp.40-41.
These articles each deal with a particular text (or texts) for the classroom. The first two are literary criticism, the latter three classroom units which mix imaginative re-creation with "old model comprehension" (Moy and Raleigh, 1984).

Stephens, Elizabeth "Bell Shakespeare Company - a report" p.34
Kestle, Anne-Marie Letter to editor p.46
Both of these pieces deal with the value of professional actors in workshopping Shakespeare, for either students or teachers.

Taylor, J.P. "The ghost in the cellar" p.42
Cutler, Barbara "The world of poetry" pp.43-45.
These describe two units: one on radio plays an one on poetry. Each is based entirely on recall type "old model comprehension" (Moy and Raleigh, 1984).

This details School Certificate Assessment at one high school, to be based on class work and two writing, one speaking, one listening task. Written pieces are an essay and a piece of imaginative re-creation response to literature, with edited drafts to be included.

The Teaching of English, 2/92: July, 1992

This edition of the journal presents reports from sessions run at the ETA Annual Conference of that year.
O'Sullivan, Mary "Now that we've got outcomes, what do we do with them?" pp. 12-13.
O'Sullivan, then Board of Studies Officer, outlines the introduction of outcomes to 7-10 English. She differentiates these from objectives by seeing the latter as a bureaucratic device and the former as "instruments or tools" for teachers to "specify their hopes for (their students)" (p.12). In addition, Syllabuses now also have objectives in terms of knowledge, skills and values. "Stages" is another key concept that allows English to have an identifiable sequence. She adds ideas for programming from outcomes.

Hardage attempts to explain contemporary literary theory, especially deconstruction, using the metaphor of "play".

O'Sullivan, Colleen "Creativity, craft and discipline: Robert Cormier and his writing." pp. 16-17.
This piece is a report on a talk given by Cormier on his writing.

Edwards, Lynne "Workshop overview: clever and creative- challenging talented students in English" p18.
This reports on a workshop on Gifted and Talented students in English. Suggested activities for a text are heavily imaginative re-creation oriented.

Hardage outlines aspects of the forthcoming National Statement and National Profiles for English. He argues for the value of a national curriculum on the grounds of the negative effects of regional decisions in areas such as the USA.

Edwards, Grant "Course books in English" p. 27
Edwards advocates on pragmatic grounds the value of coursebooks, and reviews two he considers worthwhile.

Grimes, Richard "Ideas for junior drama" pp. 39-40
Pinkerton, Debbie "Politics in cartoons" pp. 44-46.
Cran, Sue "Creating a video interview" pp.55-56.
These are lists of classroom activities - one in drama, one in the use of political cartoons and the third is a Year 10 unit based on students interviewing other students about their views on literature.
Smith, Phil and Gorrie, Kim "Environmental education in English" pp. 41-43.
Hargrave, David "Our environment - unit outline" p.43
Both articles deal with the use of the environment as a theme in English: English is seen as the ideal medium for teaching about, investigating issues in and developing care for the environment.

Noonan, Michael and Curran, Jane "McKenzie's boots" p.47.
This is a unit of work on the novel with a total emphasis on imaginative re-creation.

OSullivan, Colleen "Wide reading and beyond: replacing the 'set text'" pp.51-54.
This article promotes reading for pleasure, as well as the development of creative and critical readers. She outlines the use of wide reading contracts at her school - that include goal-setting, booktastings, group evaluations.

The Teaching of English, 3/92: September, 1992

Joint Council of NSW Professional Teachers' Associations "Part of the Joint Council of NSW Professional Teachers' Associations' response to the Mayer Committee's second paper for consultation on employment-related key competencies - 22 July, 1992" pp.3-4
In responding to the Mayer Committee, the JCPTA (of which ETA was a member) was generally positive, but particularly stressed the need to:
  • avoid a split between academic and vocational education
  • address Cultural Understanding, so that students can "read" their culture critically
  • write credible descriptors for each performance level
  • address LOTE and bi-lingualism
  • set clear assessment and reporting guidelines
  • address professional development for teachers
  • ensure the key competencies do not replace existing curricula.

McPherson, Deb "Reciprocal teaching methods and report writing" pp.5-11.
This reports on a research project carried out in a Year 8 English class, involving an experimental and control group, with the former receiving an intensive course on study skills and then using reciprocal peer teaching techniques to help in the task of writing a report. The report was on how computers work and how they can be used by students, using only selected sources. The results showed that students need demonstrations of the study strategies and that they enjoy learning from other students.
Mason, Lindsay "Developing essay skills is not a one-night stand" pp.14-15.
This presents a unit on the development of essay writing skills using modelling techniques.

McRae, David "National teaching council consultation document" pp.18-22.
The NSW JCPTA combined with a number of other teacher associations to propose the formation of the National Teaching Council of Australia. This article suggests the principles that should govern the craft of teaching itself within such a body. It stresses:

* defining the teacher's task

* values and attitudes:
  - a belief that their students can learn
  - an understanding of how students develop and learn
  - recognising and responding to individual differences
  - just treatment of students
  - equitable treatment
  - a belief in, and justification of, their values

* content:
  - teachers' thorough grasp of content
  - a belief that the process and content of learning are inextricably woven
  - adapting content to context

* methodology:
  - a wide repertoire of teaching strategies
  - effective structuring of learning tasks

* assessment and reporting:
  - regular assessment of individual pieces of work
  - consistent monitoring of progress
  - being informed about a variety of assessment strategies
  - reporting effectively on students' progress
  - making teaching practice explicit

* in the school:
  - collaboration with other staff
  - a positive contribution to the school environment

* in the wider community:
  - effective interaction with parents etc.

* in the profession:
  - being familiar with the framework of law and regulation which affects their work
  - being familiar with current educational issues
McFarlane, Peter "Making and writing 'The Flea and Other Stories'" pp.22-23.
This is the author's account of the creation of a short story based on two of his students.

Campbell, Leo and Mc Pherson, Deb "'Eva': a unit of work for Year 10 at Lisarow high school"
pp.27-29
English Faculty, Strathfield Girls' High School "Two weeks with the queen" p.31
English Faculty, Strathfield Girls' High School "The lake at the end of the world" p.32
English Faculty, Strathfield Girls' High School "Lodie's journey" p.37
Each of these presents units of work on junior novels with a strong emphasis on imaginative re-creation.

Fishlock, K. "Film study - 'Who framed Roger Rabbit?'" p.33
Fishlock, K. "Film study - 'The princess bride'" p.34
These film studies are largely a combination of some low-level analysis with recall type "old model comprehension" (Moy and Raleigh, 1984). There is little real emphasis on the specifics of the medium.

Cochrane, Peter "Adolescence - a unit on 'Lockie Leonard, human torpedo'" p.35
This unit places the study of the novel within a theme-based unit. The emphasis is on group work and imaginative re-creation activities.

The Teaching of English, 4/92: December, 1992

Curtis, Therese "'Merry of the stones' - a personal response" pp.8-10
This piece is one teacher's analysis and explanation of why she found this novel "hypnotic".

Threadgold, Terry "Poststructuralist theory and the teaching of English" pp.18-19
Threadgold's theme is that "English" and "literature" no longer can be equated and each is becoming problematic as the stress is placed on the constructed-ness of texts.

Hardage, Paul "Literacies: reading the culture" pp.20-21
Hardage discusses his reading of the big issues at the joint national AATE/ARA conference of 1992. The issue of literacy standards was contested between journalists and curriculum experts. Geoff Fox covered issues of intensity of engagement that draws readers back to the text itself, while Martin and Rothery discussed issues of invisible pedagogy in "personal response". Reid, Street and Weaver supported the concept of multiplicity, cultural diversity and seeing the whole culture as text.
Tucker, Ernie "Realism reconsidered: the fiction of Janni Howker and the adolescent reader" pp.22-26
Tucker reviews the literature of Janni Howker in terms of the need to supply realistic fiction to junior students. An example of a reader's journal is appended.

Gribble, Jim. "Branagh's 'Henry V' in the classroom" pp.27-28
Gribble studies the background of Branagh's version of this play, has some suggestions for classroom use, and makes comparisons with the earlier Olivier version.

Spies, Peter and Murray, Michael "Introducing mixed ability at Engadine High School" pp.29-31
As the title suggests, this piece recounts the process of introduction of mixed-ability classes in English at Engadine High School along with unsuccessful attempts to persuade non-English staff to move the same way.

Mullen, C.J. “English week 1991” p.32
Mullen describes a unit of work which entails many aspects of English : discussion, groupwork, poetry readings, reading extracts from a favourite novel, developing posters advertising English Week.

Pryce, Megan, Tolhurst, Marie, Gray, Andrew and Couglin, Frank "Crossfire" p.35
This unit of work on the novel focuses on outcomes through discussion, some imaginative re-creation, emphasis on theme, characters and plot and some "old model comprehension" (Moy and Raleigh, 1984).

Barnott-Clement, Louise, Simonsen, Sue, Smith, Glenda and Fischer, Michael "Letters from the inside" pp.36-37
Alembakis, Thespina, Nygryn, Catherine, Andre, Maureen, Marchesin, Carla, Brooklyn, Cheryl, Apostolopoulos, Cathy "Peter" pp.38-39
Brown, Ross, Gibson, Christine, Kendrick, Chris, Tishler, Mark "Memory" pp.40-41
Zouroudis, Nick and Doherty, Barb "The bamboo flute" pp.42-43
These units of work on novels are strongly focused on outcomes and achieving outcomes through imaginative re-creation.

Hough, Lyndall "Marking madness" p.37
Hough discusses ways of lessening marking loads by involving a large component of peer grading, and the use of conferencing while other students are working.
Fowler, Veronica and Kennedy, John "Newsday", p.43
This gives an account of a unit in which students were given a full school day to produce a newspaper in groups, using computers and photocopying.

Tilby, Jennifer "Hijacked" pp.44-45.
This reports a unit in which students are placed in a scenario of being hijacked into space. At various stages of the scenario, they have particular activities, especially writing, to complete.

Mullen, C.J. "Breaking down the barriers" pp.46-47
This is a unit of work on the handicapped, with a central focus on the text, I can jump puddles. Novel activities are largely imaginative re-creation, while the rest of the unit encompasses drama, videos, journal writing and discussion.

Kotselas, Theo "Novel study - 'lust friends'" p.48
This novel unit largely revolves around discussion of students' responses to issues raised in the novel.
TABLE 9.3

SUMMARY OF ARTICLES FROM
Thomson, Jack (ed)
RECONSTRUCTING LITERATURE TEACHING
(AATE, 1992)

1. Thomson, Jack “The significance and uses of contemporary literary theory for the teaching of literature” pp. 3-39

Thomson outlines contemporary literary theory for teachers in the following way:

• firstly by arguing that no practice is un theorised
• outlines and critiques major theories of expressive realism (including Leavis), New Criticism, reception theory, psychoanalytical theory, structuralism, post-structuralism, feminism, political criticism
• applies contemporary theory to a re-reading of Heart of Darkness - also discusses Scholes' theory of reading/interpretation/criticism
• suggests some activities for applying the theory in classrooms, especially, transposing elements of the text - whites to become black etc.

2. Mellor, Bronwyn, O'Neill, Marnie and Patterson, Annette “Re-reading literature teaching” pp. 40-55

Dixon and Rosenblatt are seen to combine here in a transfer of power from cultural heritage practices to a more democratic notion of a community of readers. But making reading about shaping primary spontaneous responses results in either an acceptance of plurality of meaning, or modification of minority responses towards a dominant reading. Thus "growth model's reading practices produce readers who are unaware of the ways in which they operate to construct meanings and who, thus, are unable to 'read' not only in the terms of their own readings but those of others as well. Such practices, far from being inclusive, disenfranchise those students whose cultural experiences and values are not dominant ones....What is unlikely to occur in growth model practices, it seems, is an analysis of the construction of divergent readings, the values they support or affirm and the grounds on which any particular reading might be defended." (p.42). Recent theory is characterised as:

• rejecting the idea that meaning resides in texts and that readers are constructed to support particular values - thus readers construct and choose between interpretations
• rejecting the idea that literature reflects life - rather (following Saussure) language constructs particular versions of reality, i.e texts are partial, though they appear to be "natural"
• texts are partial also in the sense that they are seen as always fragmentary and
contradictory, containing gaps and silences
• texts offer reading positions - the point of reading is not to find the "correct" interpretation,
but to consider what possible readings of texts might be

The aim of teaching, then, becomes:
• to teach that a text is a construction, not a slice of life
• to make possible a greater consciousness of the processes involved in reading and writing
• to make possible a greater consciousness of the ideological nature of texts and readings -
thus to:
  - analyse the construction of readings
  - "read" other readings or interpretations
  - consider what is at stake in the disagreements between readings
  - make visible the gaps or silences of texts and readings
  - analyse what readings support in terms of the values they affirm
  - challenge other, especially dominant, readings
  - construct new readings

They give an example of this in practice with *Hamlet*. Their suggested strategies are:
• predictions
• deletions
• alternative endings
• additions or insertions
• alternative readings
• parallel texts
• role plays
• statements
• swapping
• 'What if...?' questions.

3. Reid, Ian "Who framed the text?" pp. 56-70
Reid argues that the contexts, or "frames" in which texts occur influence their reading:
• *circumtextual* framing: physical elements around a text, eg its position of occurrence in a
  broader text
• *extratextual* framing: what the reader brings to bear on the text
• *intratextual* framing: elements within a text that alert us to significance, eg repeated refrain,
tale-within-a-tale etc
• **intertextual** framing: links to other texts. These are not just "allusions", but signals about similarity to, and difference from, the other text - shows that stories are not told stories, so much as storytellings: "the rules of a genre and the formal properties of a text will not correlate" (p. 64 [Freadman]).

A further problem with the genre approach is that it tends to emphasise similarities between texts, rather than differences. "...the so-called narrative schema, with its dreadfully dull routine of orientation/complication/resolution...is an impoverished extratextual notion posing as an inherent textual quintessence, and it is quite blind to the importance of circumtextual, intratextual and intertextual framing elements" (p.66).

4. **Corcoran, Bill**. "The making and remaking of readers and writers: a retrospect and prospect" pp. 56-70

This piece explores the connections between reader-response and cultural criticism. Three key questions are:
• how do readers make meaning?
• how are both readers and writers the products of particular cultural contexts for reading and writing?
• how do texts instruct their readers on how to read and write them?

Corcoran put forward a series of reading questions aimed at creating resistant readers. Particularly, he advocates the re-writing of texts as a resistant response.

5. **Parker, Judy**. "From picture book to literary theory" pp. 83-87

Parker uses John Brown, Rose and the midnight cat as an example of teaching students about how to read and about how those readings are prompted by our individual and cultural histories.

6. **Morgan, Wendy**. "Changing the face of the body of literature: deviant writing in the secondary classroom" pp. 88-107

Morgan asks the question, how can we help students not to be manipulated by texts, but not destroy their enjoyment in texts? Using unconventional texts is her answer. Questions to ask are:
• what do you know (now) and how do you know it?
• what is going on in your mind as you read?
• how is this text asking to be read?

Conventional texts invite conventional readings. Unconventional texts are more likely to promote these questions, because readers become aware of how active their role is in constructing meaning, and conscious of how their responses are shaped. They also:
• remind us that generic structure are not rules, but "conventions" (genre theory also a
type theory about 'readiness')

• thus, the degree of unconventionality which a young reader encounters will, in turn,
influence the degree to which they themselves will experiment with readers in mind. They
will read like writers and write like readers. Having been exposed to a range of
experiments, they will be less likely to accept any generic form as privileged. They are also
more likely to move from docile to interrogative reading practices.

7. Hayhoe, Mike "Poetry and politics" pp. 108-16
Hayhoe discusses a number of strategies for approaching poems as "quests".

8. Rehn, Rex "Reading and writing poetry" pp. 117-25
Rehn discusses techniques and principles for students to become writers of poems.

Parker discusses techniques and principles for novel study.

10. McGregor, Robert "Imagining realities: values and literature" pp. 136-48
McGregor discusses the role of literature in shaping values. He argues that active exploration
of texts assists students to think reflectively and imaginatively, to clarify their own values,
and to develop a critical stance. He especially concentrates on empathising and on the
strategy of "what you yourself would do in this situation" and a series of imagined scenarios
emanating from different scenes in the novel.

11. Adams, Peter "Dependent authorship: writing from the inside out" pp. 149-67
Adams examines the work of one student as a case study of his work on "dependent
authorship" and suggests a small number of imaginative recreation-type activities for
producing such writing - to bring to light some possibilities unrealised by the text (p.157).
Dependent authorship brings into being a far-reaching inter-textuality.

Johnston discusses some of the uses for picture books in secondary classrooms.

13. Reid, Ian "Remaking literature through narrative" pp. 174-83
Arguing that our pedagogical practice gives lessons to students about our literary theories,
Reid discusses Deakin's course in "Narrative". He is critical of Barnes' and Britton's notion of
writing as primarily about "expressing the self" (p.180), because students have such a variety
of selves to express. He develops (p.181) two principles:
• the relations between participants in learning will function as a model for the relation between reader and text
• the relation between reader and text will function as a model for whatever writing those readers then do.
TABLE 9.4

ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS PUBLISHED IN AUSTRALIA IN 1992 AND REVIEWED IN ENGLISH IN AUSTRALIA and THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Halliday's framework for analysis of textbooks
1) What premises about language learning underlie the text? Do these premises accord with my beliefs about language learning?

2) What premises about language underlie the text? Do they accord with my understanding of what language is?

3) What premises about "subject English" underlie the text? Do they fit in with my philosophy about beliefs about language learning?

From these the following series of questions can be applied:

1. Rationale
   a) Is the underlying rationale made clear?
   b) Is the professed rationale the real rationale?
   c) Is language shown as independent of the user (i.e. divorced from meaning and context)?
   d) Is language seen as rule, or resource?
   e) Is language seen as fundamental to the development of thought, feeling and behaviour?
   f) What assumptions about individual differences underlie the text?
   g) What attitude towards usage is revealed in the textbook (prescriptive; socially determined)?

2. Pedagogy
   a) What relationship is assumed between teacher and textbook?
   b) What relationship is assumed between teacher and pupil?
   c) What relationship is assumed between textbook and pupil?
   d) What relationship is assumed between pupil and pupil?
   e) To what degree are pupil interest and motivation considered?
   f) Are questions open (i.e. encouraging thought and discussion) or closed (demanding the one "right" answer)?

3. Language activities
   a) If there is overt teaching of grammar, what is its purpose (e.g., humanistic; to improve writing)?
   b) Are exercises presented in terms of meeting individual needs, or seen as appropriate to the whole class?
   c) Are there opportunities for "real languaging"?
   d) Does the textbook present a range of extended discourse, or is the emphasis on words and sentences? Is the language real or artificial?
   e) Are speaking, listening, reading and writing seen as interdependent?
f) Is there implicit or explicit sequencing of activities? If so, upon what basis?
g) Is there a range of stimuli provided?
h) Is there an attempt to link language and literature?
i) Is there an exploitation of the language learning that goes on outside the classroom?
j) Is there an attempt to teach comprehension through passages and exercises? If so:
   - What proportion of the questions can be answered without reference to the passage?
   - What proportion of the questions relates to that passage and that passage alone?
   - What proportion could be said to be training pupils in translatable skills of comprehension, should such exist?

4. Provision for Assessment of Pupil’s Development

a) Is there provision for self-assessment by pupils?
b) Is the implied assessment procedure a formative one (ie the child against himself) or against some abstract standard?

(Halliday, 1980a: 81-83)

Halliday’s framework applied to the relevant textbooks

1. Rationale

a) Is the underlying rationale made clear?

| Speak up       | The introduction “To the teacher” contains mainly instructions for implementation. However, it does claim to be sequential, and to acquaint students with a variety of audiences, purposes and forms. A range of reading, writing, speaking and listening activities are provided in each unit. “An introduction to the student”, however, emphasises:
|               | - the importance of speaking for learning
|               | - appropriateness for audience and purpose
|               | - thinking creatively and critically |

| Making meanings | The Introduction states that the book is concerned with “learning language..., learning about language and learning through language” (p.vii).:
|                 | - aims at opportunities to engage students: writing for a range of audiences and purposes and in a range of forms - because this engagement will lead to improvement in ability.
|                 | - rejects the idea that there is a single meaning in a text |

| Ways of telling | The Introduction states that the book aims to make students better readers by “helping them to become increasingly aware of their own reading processes and by presenting them with a range of challenging stories”. Explicitly drawing on post-structuralist theory, it is also meant to draw their attention to the ways they are constructed as readers by prior experiences. |
### Literary terms

*Literary terms* is based on recent literary theory, with special emphasis on the role of reading practices in the production of literary meanings. It sees literature not as a body of objective knowledge, but as a field of social practices in which people "struggle" to make meanings and exert influence. The important thing to give students, Moon argues, are the skills not just to absorb literature, but to interrogate it, and to consider the social functions of literary knowledge. The glossary aims to "assist in the development of a democratic, active approach to the study of literary texts: an approach that will enable students to question the perspectives offered by ... literary and critical texts" (p. vii).

### Signposts

There is no explicitly stated underlying rationale, other than "flexibility".

---

#### b) Is the professed rationale the real rationale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness for audience and purpose are certainly ideas stressed within units. Students are asked to make a large number of decisions throughout the units and to think both creatively and critically - the latter through reflection activities after each unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• students are actively engaged throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• there are writing activities for a range of audiences and purposes and in a range of forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• approaches to texts allow for individual interpretation, and there is discussion of how particular readings are constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• discussing resistant readings is part of the coursework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• knowledge about language features is included in each unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of telling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While activities are largely of the DARTS type or imaginative recreation, there are a number which ask readers to reflect on their reading experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literary terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES: the text places total emphasis on the role of reading practices in the production of literary meanings. Literature is seen as a field of social practices in which people &quot;struggle&quot; to make meanings and exert influence. Students are being trained to interrogate literature, and to consider the social functions of literary knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signposts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no explicit underlying rationale, other than &quot;flexibility&quot; and it is not clear how that flexibility is to be applied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### c) Is language shown as independent of the user?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All activities involve the extended production of language by the student - from text responses to speaking projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost all activities involve the extended production of language by the student.

All activities involve the extended production of language by the student, with emphasis on group discussion.

All activities are analytical, but, given that the text requires students entirely to analyse the texts of others, the underlying philosophy of teaching ABOUT language is that it is never independent of context, and that context includes the user.

"Appropriateness" appears to be less of a criterion in question-answer sections than is correctness, though there is much open-ended activity and opportunities for extended language production.

d) Is language seen as rule or resource?

Activities involve the extended production of language by the student, however, not all reflection or response activities are in terms of rhetorical effects.

RESOURCE: Activities involve the extended production of language by the student. Analysis is in terms of effects and rhetoric, so language is seen as resource to be exploited.

RESOURCE: Activities involve the extended production of language by the student. Analysis is in terms of effects and rhetoric, so language is seen as resource to be exploited.

RESOURCE: while activities involve the extended analysis of language by the student, that analysis is in terms of effects and ideology, so language is seen as resource to be exploited.

"Appropriateness" appears to be less of a criterion in question-answer sections than is correctness, though there is much open-ended activity and opportunities for extended language production. Thus, "rule" and "resource" are equally prevalent.

e) Is language seen as fundamental to the development of thought, feeling and behaviour?

YES: Students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings.

YES: Students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings, but also to go further and look into the construction of their readings.
Ways of telling | YES: Students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings, but also, occasionally, to go further and look into the construction of their readings.  

Literary terms | Again, only in the sense of language analysed, not in the sense of the students' own language use.  

Signposts | YES: Students are encouraged to have opinions and to express thoughts and feelings.

f) What assumptions about individual differences underlie the text?

| Speak up | Both the Introductions to the teacher and to the students stress the idea that the units may be worked through independently. A developmental structure is claimed in the teacher Introduction, and a scope and sequence chart provided, however, it is not entirely clear why the particular sequences are developmental. The units themselves make little allowance for individual differences.  

Making meanings | There is no explicit allowance for individual differences within the text.  

Ways of telling | There is no explicit allowance for individual differences within the text.  

Literary terms | There is no explicit allowance for individual differences within the text.  

Signposts | There is no explicit allowance for individual differences within the text.

g) What attitude towards usage is revealed in the textbook?

| Speak up | Usage is an explicit issue - regional differences of pronunciation are discussed, as is appropriateness to audience and purpose. There is no sense of "correctness" outside these concepts.  

Making meanings | Usage is not an explicit issue in the text.  

Ways of telling | Usage is not an explicit issue in the text.  

Literary terms | Usage is not an explicit issue in the text.  

Signposts | Usage is a explicit issue; there are sections on parts of speech and punctuation. There is a sense of correctness in usage.
2. Pedagogy

a) What relationship is assumed between teacher and textbook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Notes and hints are provided for the teacher (&quot;Teacher’s note&quot;) and teachers are warned that planning and resource-gathering will be necessary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>Activities are independent of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>Activities are independent of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>While activities/&quot;chapters&quot; are independent of the teacher, the Introduction instructs teachers to use the text as a supplement to secondary school courses in Literature and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>Activities are independent of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What relationship is assumed between teacher and pupil?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Teachers are assumed facilitators of activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>Activities are independent of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>Activities are independent of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>While activities/&quot;chapters&quot; are independent of the teacher, the Introduction instructs teachers to use the text as a supplement to secondary school courses in Literature and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>Activities are independent of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) What relationship is assumed between textbook and pupil?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>ALL language in the book is addressed to the student in an encouraging, friendly tone as well as the &quot;second person imperative&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>ALL language in the book is addressed to the student in an encouraging, friendly tone (&quot;You might like to...&quot;) as well as the &quot;second person imperative&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>ALL language in the book is addressed to the student in an encouraging, friendly tone as well as the &quot;second person imperative&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>ALL language in the book is addressed to the student in an encouraging, friendly tone as well as the &quot;second person imperative&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>ALL language in the book is addressed to the student in an encouraging, friendly tone (&quot;You might like to...&quot;) as well as the &quot;second person imperative&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) What relationship is assumed between pupil and pupil?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Groupwork is explicitly encouraged and is the basis of many activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>Activities are explicitly organised around groupwork - in fact, varieties of groupwork are set up at the beginning: home groups, sharing groups and whole class. All of these are explicitly signalled throughout the book. Pair and individual work is also explicitly signalled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>Groupwork is explicitly encouraged and assumed to be the main mode of working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>This is not an issue. All activities/&quot;chapters&quot; delve straight into the relevant term and activities associated with it. Classroom organisation or pedagogy is not an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>A very few activities are explicitly organised around groups, but the vast majority assume individual work; even activities in the &quot;Talking&quot; sub-sections do not discuss audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) To what degree are pupil interest and motivation considered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Topics are of likely interest, though there are few choices of activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>To a large extent- students are provided with optional activities, learning logs and options for wide reading. All of these provide genuine choice. There is also a substantial amount of research. In addition, topics are of likely interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>Through the activities, which are largely discussion and opportunities for interesting writing - the stimulus short stories are themselves, however, often quite old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>This is not an issue. All activities/&quot;chapters&quot; delve straight into the relevant term and activities associated with it. Relevance/interest are not issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>To a large extent in terms of content. Themes include &quot;School days&quot;, &quot;Superheroes&quot;, &quot;Sporting Life&quot;. Nevertheless, there is little or no explicit choice or optional activities. The text itself is highly colourful - glossy, full-colour photographs; glossy reproductions of comics; colour cartoons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Are questions open (ie encouraging thought and discussion) or closed (demanding the one "right" answer)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Project-type activities are all open. Many responses to text are also, though a number are cast in traditional &quot;comprehension exercise&quot; closed mode.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>All questions and activities are open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>All questions and activities are open - deliberately designed so as to encourage maximum discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Literary terms

Some questions are open, but the majority demand one correct answer, implying correct predictions about whether particular groups read texts in particular ways.

Signposts

This depends on the relevant section of the chapter - in "Writing" and "Talking", most questions are open, but in "Language", the majority demand one correct answer.

3. Language activities

a) If there is overt teaching of grammar, what is its purpose (eg, humanistic; to improve writing)?

| Speak up | No teaching of grammar is involved. |
| Making meanings | There is attention drawn to larger generic-type structures: poems, advertisements, structures etc. These are not set up as formulae to be followed. |
| Ways of telling | No teaching of grammar is involved. |
| Literary terms | No teaching of grammar is involved. |
| Signposts | There is overt teaching of grammar. This is isolated from the rest of the chapter, except thematically. |

b) Are exercises presented in terms of meeting individual needs, or seen as appropriate to the whole class?

| Speak up | There is no explicit distinction made between individuals and the class within the units themselves. |
| Making meanings | There is no distinction made between individuals and the class. |
| Ways of telling | There is no distinction made between individuals and the class. |
| Literary terms | There is no distinction made between individuals and the class. |
| Signposts | There is no distinction made between individuals and the class. |

c) Are there opportunities for "real languaging"?

<p>| Speak up | All activities are designed around talking, some research, responses to text which are often &quot;open&quot;. |
| Making meanings | All activities are designed around talking, writing, research, responses to text in the form of imaginative re-creation and discussion around possible constructed readings. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of telling</th>
<th>All activities are designed around talking, writing, responses to text in the form of imaginative re-creation and discussion around possible constructed readings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>There are mostly guided tasks and many short-answer closed questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>In each section of each chapter, apart from &quot;Language&quot;, there are opportunities for extended language production by the student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Does the textbook present a range of extended discourse, or is the emphasis on words and sentences? Is the language real or artificial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>All activities are designed around talking, some research, responses to text which are often &quot;open&quot;. Thus, extended discourse is required of students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>All activities are designed around talking, writing, research, responses to text in the form of imaginative re-creation or analysis of how readings are constructed. Thus, extended discourse is required of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>All activities are designed around talking, writing, responses to short stories in the form of imaginative re-creation or analysis of how readings are constructed. Thus, extended discourse is required of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>Extended discourse is rarely required in writing, though it is implied in the potential for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>In each section of each chapter, apart from &quot;Language&quot;, there are opportunities for extended language production by the student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Are speaking, listening, reading and writing seen as interdependent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>YES: Spoken activities are largely based on responses to texts heard or read.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>YES: Spoken and written activities are largely based on responses to texts heard, viewed or read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>YES: Spoken and written activities are all based on responses to short stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>To the extent that students discuss literature, yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>To a large extent, no. The chapters are divided into separate sections for each of these modes and they are treated largely independently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Is there implicit or explicit sequencing of activities? If so, upon what basis?

<p>| Speak up | The book contains a scope and sequence chart, though no explanation is given of the rationale for the particular sequence. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making meanings</th>
<th>The book contains a scope and sequence chart, though no explanation is given of the rationale for the particular sequence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>There is no sense of sequencing apart from the introductory activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>There is no sense of sequencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>The book contains a scope and sequence chart, though no explanation is given of the rationale for the particular sequence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**g) Is a range of stimuli provided?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>YES: novel extracts, advertising, poetry, visuals, cartoons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>YES: fairy tales, advertisements, wide reading, short stories, poems, cartoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>All stimuli are short stories, some quite dated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>Literary examples of each genre and term are provided. This does not constitute a wide range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>YES: advertisements, short stories, poems, cartoons, comic extracts, colour photographs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**h) Is there an attempt to link language and literature?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Units and the talk that is integral to them is usually based on specific texts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>Units and the talk and writing and research that is integral to them is usually based on suggested texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>This is the total raison d’être of the book. Units and the talk and writing and research that is integral to them is entirely based on the short stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>In a sense, this is the total raison d’être of the book: how language makes us “read” literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>There is no attempt to link the “Language” sections with the other sections of each chapter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**i) Is there an exploitation of the language learning that goes on outside the classroom?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Every unit depends to some degree on knowledge brought to the unit, or on language used outside the classroom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>Every unit depends in differing degrees on knowledge brought to the unit, or on language used outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ways of telling

Only in the sense of "reader response" assumptions about every reading being influenced by one's "knowledge of the world".

Literary terms

Very little. The book tends to create its own enclosed world.

Signposts

Every unit depends in differing degrees on knowledge brought to the unit, or on language used outside the classroom.

j) Is there an attempt to teach comprehension through passages and exercises? If so:

- What proportion of the questions can be answered without reference to the passage?
- What proportion of the questions relates to that passage and that passage alone?
- What proportion could be said to be training pupils in transferable skills of comprehension, should such exist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Some comprehension type tasks are &quot;closed&quot;, but the proportion of the whole book is small. There is no attempt to &quot;teach&quot; comprehension through such exercises.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>There is no use of traditional comprehension passages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>There is no use of traditional comprehension passages. In fact, the use of DARTS activities themselves is a rejection of &quot;old model comprehension&quot; (Moy and Raleigh, 1984).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>There is no use of traditional comprehension passages, though there are equivalent activities in students being given multiple choice activities about how particular readings are constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>Traditional &quot;comprehension&quot; is contained in each &quot;Reading&quot; section, though this mixed with more open responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Provision for Assessment of Pupil's Development

a) Is there provision for self-assessment by pupils?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak up</th>
<th>Chapters have explicit provision for reflection, both at the end of the unit, and throughout the unit in response to texts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>Chapters have explicit provision for reflection. This is usually to be completed in learning logs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>No explicit provision is made for self-assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>No explicit provision is made for self-assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>No explicit provision is made for self-assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Is the implied assessment procedure a formative one (i.e., the child against himself) or against some abstract standard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak up</td>
<td>All implied assessment is formative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making meanings</td>
<td>Implied assessment is formative, since activities are open-ended: &quot;Collect examples of...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of telling</td>
<td>Implied assessment is formative, since activities are open-ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary terms</td>
<td>As notions of correctness are involved, implied assessment is summative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposts</td>
<td>Implied assessment is formative where activities are open-ended; other activities imply a summative approach to assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 10

POST SCRIPT: INTO THE 90s

When Gill wrote in 1992 of the 1980s being a decade of "major transition for English literacy education" (p.27), she was using the two terms "English" and "literacy" as part of an unproblematic phrase pairing. O'Neill referred to the Western Australian experience of the 80s in similar terms (1992: 33), while Woods (1992) advocated explication of the concept "literacy" as a kind of sub-set of "English". All of this marked the extent to which NSW was moving from the rest of Australia in conceptualising "English" and "literacy". As discussed in Chapter 8, by this time, "literacy" in NSW was increasingly synonymous with "across the curriculum" and also with "genre". By 1997, with the publication of the NSW Department of Education's Literacy strategy '97, that identification and separation from English became firm.

10.1 The DSE's "Literacy strategy '97"

In 1997, the Department of School Education1 released a major strategy on literacy in NSW. The aims of the strategy were that students:

- be able to express themselves well and clearly in English, and enjoy doing so
- read widely for pleasure and instruction, with discernment and understanding
- be articulate in speaking
- be good listeners in terms of comprehension and evaluation
- gain an appreciation of that part of the cultural heritage embodied in English (NSW Department of School Education Curriculum Directorate, 1997a: 3).

The first four of these aims, as can be seen from Chapter 6 above, echo the objectives of the "Modes" of the 1987 English Syllabus, though the final aim might be seen as running against the Syllabus' emphasis on Australia literature.

The definition of literacy contained in the document was from The Australian language and literacy policy:

---

1 The department responsible for administering education in NSW has changed its title often throughout the period covered by this study. The labels "Department of Education" (1970s to the late 1980s), "Department of School Education" (late 1980s to late 1990s) and "Department of Education and Training" effectively refer to the same entity.
Literacy is the ability to read and use written information and to write appropriately, in a range of contexts. It is used to develop knowledge and understanding, to achieve personal growth and to function effectively in our society. Literacy also includes the recognition of number and basic mathematical signs and symbols within text.

Literacy involves the integration of speaking, listening and critical thinking with reading and writing. Effective literacy is intrinsically purposeful, flexible and dynamic and continues to develop throughout an individual’s lifetime.

All Australians need to have effective literacy in English, not only for their personal benefit and welfare but also for Australia to reach its social and economic goals (DEET, 1991: 9).

Three main features of the policy were: explicit teaching, systematic teaching and a whole-school focus guided by a School Literacy Support Team. Despite echoing the “Mode” objectives of the 1987 English Syllabus, “literacy” in the policy is totally equated with “across the curriculum”. “Literacy”, in practice, replaces the concept “language across the curriculum” in NSW. Moreover, a particular view of that concept is adopted, which is the opposite of the conceptualisation which I have suggested is rooted in the work of Douglas Barnes beginning in the 1970s. In that view, the language forms of the subject are seen as problematic for student understanding. In the DSE Literacy strategy ’97 the language of the subject areas are not problematic, nor are they considered problematic for student learning. Direct instruction in those forms is the very point of “literacy”:

In the secondary school....All subjects have literacy demands that are specific to the reading and writing needed by students to participate in that subject. It is the responsibility of all teachers of all subjects to teach students explicitly how to address these specific features. (NSW Department of School Education Curriculum Directorate, 1997a: 12).

Drawing on the work of Freebody and Luke (1990), the teaching of reading was divided into four "roles": code-breaker, text-user, text-participant and text-analyst (NSW Department of Education and Training Curriculum Support Directorate, 1999a). In practice, this entailed the use of traditional DARTS-oriented strategies such as prediction, cloze and retelling (NSW Department of School Education Curriculum Directorate, 1997c). In writing, the approach was based strongly on modelling of "genres", or "text types". Specific "text types" were identified for specific Key Learning Areas and these were to be taught on the basis of:

* text processes (social purposes and specific "stages" that relate to overall structure)
• text features (language and organisational features appropriate to specific text types)
• sentence features (grammatical features)
• word features (vocabulary and spelling) (NSW Department of Education and Training Curriculum Support Directorate, 1999a).

A range of literacy consultants covering areas such as "Middle School", "Early literacy" and ESL were placed into each DET/DSE district and schools were provided with large amounts of material to support the mandatory whole-school implementation of the Literacy Strategy.

For secondary schools, DSE /DET produced, over the next two years, documents for each of the secondary Key Learning Areas, each entitled "Teaching literacy in...". The degree to which the language of the subject areas is considered as unproblematic in itself, as well as unproblematic for student learning can be gauged from material produced in order to review school programs- as well as the degree to which "literacy" had become synonymous with "learning about language":

Several schools are using text types as a unifying focus for their school's literacy program. Teachers in all KLAs agree that their students need to be able to interpret and produce texts in the forms and formats that conform to the language conventions of the subject...while teaching particular text types, they uncover other aspects of literacy needing attention, for example, sentence structure, grammar punctuation and spelling (NSW Department of Education and Training Curriculum Support Directorate, 1999b: 37).

With the production of Teaching literacy in English in Year 7 in 1998, the split between the concepts "English" and "literacy" would seem to have become entrenched, at least for government schools.

10.2 ELLA

The centrepiece of the government's literacy strategy for secondary schools is the English language and literacy assessment (ELLA), based on the assessment of literacy as defined in Literacy strategy '97. Using the ELLA instrument, schools are given detailed feedback on the achievement of each student. ELLA was first used for Year 7 in 1997 and was extended into Years 7 and 8 in 1998. The statewide ELLA instrument for government schools is designed to assess:
* reading
  - extracting information
  - sequencing
  - interpreting information
  - inferring
  - interpreting figurative language
  - understanding comparison
  - classifying
  - understanding text purpose
  - identifying text type
  - identifying voice and perspective
  - identifying structural features of texts
  - identifying grammatical features of texts

* language
  - spelling
  - punctuation
  - grammatical features
  - structural features

* writing
  - narrating
  - describing
  - instructing
  - arguing
  - explaining

Writing is assessed in terms of the requisite text processes, text features, sentence features and word features (NSW Department of School Education, 1997a). ELLA is strongly regarded as diagnostic (NSW Department of School Education, 1997a: 34; NSW Department of School Education Curriculum Directorate, 1997b: 41ff), and schools are strongly encouraged to organise literacy programs around their ELLA results.

10.2.1 ELLA '97: a case study
An analysis of the 1997 ELLA can reveal the extent to which "literacy" in NSW has become equated with text types and with knowledge about language. In the context of the diagnostic nature of the test, for example, it has been claimed that:

The ELLA tests confirm their (teachers') worst fears but do it in an objective and diagnostic way... The results of the writing test, for example, provided the following information:
• 58% of students could not write a factual text where all of the sentences have a subject and a main verb;
• 36% of students could not write a factual text where all of the sentences have subject/verb agreement
• 28% of students could not write sentences correctly using plurals and articles;
• 24% of students could not use consistent and appropriate verb tense;
• 22% of students could not write compound sentences;
• 59% of students could not write complex sentences....

From this perspective the ELLA tests are more than useful. (Knapp, 1998: 6)

Following is one of the writing items from the 1997 ELLA:

This is a flow-chart showing the process of re-cycling from the pick up at the suburban home to the processing at the factory and later dispersal as new goods.
The following is the "Quick Reference Marking Guide" which markers of this test used to decide the scoring of a student's writing for this particular piece:

**Quick Reference Marking Guide - Task One (Recycling)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Explanation</th>
<th>The writing explains.</th>
<th>0,1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Theme</td>
<td>The theme is consistent with the task.</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Impersonal Voice</td>
<td>The text uses the correct form of address.</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Text Structure</td>
<td>There is a structure featuring a classification and description first, then an elaborate explanation. The text may include an evaluation.</td>
<td>0,1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  * Does the writing introduce? |
  * Does the explanatory sequence elaborate on the process? |
  * Does the text evaluate? |
| 5. Paragraphs | Paragraphs are used to organise the text coherently. | 0,1 |
| 6. Sentence Structure | Sentence structure is complex, compound or simple. | 0,1, 2, 3 |
  * Does the text have simple sentences? |
  * Does the text have compound sentences? |
  * Does the text have complex sentences? |
| 7. Conjunctions | Text has logical cohesion through correct use of conjunctions. | 0,1, 2 |
  * Does the text use a variety of conjunctions? |
  * Does the use avoid ambiguity and repetition? |
| 8. Sentence Pattern | Sentences have subject-verb-object pattern. | 0,1,2,3 |
  * Do statements have subject and main finite verb in correct order  |
    - sometimes |
    - mostly |
    - always |
| 9. Agreement | There is subject-verb agreement. | 0,1 |
| 10. Tense          | Tense is consistent and appropriate. | 0,1 |
| 11. Prepositions  | Correct prepositions are used with some variety. | 0,1 |
| 12. Plurals/Articles | Use of plurals and articles is correct in every case. | 0,1 |
| 13. Punctuation   | Punctuation may be simple or complex and correct. | 0,1, 2 |
|                   | • Is simple punctuation used correctly? | |
|                   | • Is complex punctuation used appropriately and correctly? | |
| 14. Spelling      | Spelling is mostly correct. | 0,1, 2, 3 |
|                   | • Are some of the simple words spelled correctly? | |
|                   | • Are most simple words spelled correctly? | |
|                   | • Are most words including complicated ones spelled correctly? | |
| 15. Vocabulary    | Vocabulary is appropriate | 0,1, 2 |
|                   | • Does the choice of vocabulary demonstrate an attempt to include suitable technical language? | |
|                   | • Is the vocabulary appropriate without attempting to use less common words? | |

It is worth taking some of the items Knapp lists above and studying the actual assessment of these, according to the above marking guide and the instructions in the 1997 ELLA Writing test marking procedures booklet (NSW Department of School Education, 1997b).

**Subject/verb agreement**

Item #9 on the marking guide scores subject/verb agreement on a “0/1” scale. The marking procedures booklet states that “The verb must agree with the subject in terms of person and number” and if the verb “always agrees”, the student scores “1”, while if the verb is “ever wrong”, the student scores “0” (p. 13). Hence, it is correct that the test can tell how many students “could not write a factual text where all of the sentences have subject/verb agreement”. But the marking does not discriminate between the student who makes one error, for whatever reason, and the student who is in error every time. In effect, ELLA does not discriminate between the student who makes one “typographical” error and the student who totally lacks knowledge of the item.
Plurals and articles

Item #12 on the marking guide scores plurals and articles on a "0/1" scale. The marking procedures booklet states that "Use of plurals and articles must be correct in every instance". If plurals and articles are "always correct", the student scores "1", while if plurals and articles are "ever incorrect", the student scores "0" (p.14). Knapp is actually inaccurate in stating that the test can tell how many students "could not write sentences correctly using plurals and articles". What it can tell is the same information as in the "subject/verb agreement" example - the percentage of students who are not correct every time. Again, however, the marking does not discriminate between the student who makes one error and the student who does not understand the item.

Moreover, this item does not discriminate between plurals and articles. A student may score every plural as correct and misuse one article and he/she scores "0" - putting him/her in the same category as the student who misuses every plural and every article.

Verb tense

Item #10 on the marking guide scores use of verb tense on a "0/1" scale. The marking procedures booklet states that "The choice of tense should be...consistent, and also appropriate". If the use of tense is "consistent", the student scores "1", while if verb tense is "inconsistent at any point", the student scores "0" (p.13). Again, Knapp is somewhat inaccurate in stating that the test can tell how many students could not use "consistent and appropriate verb tense". It gives the same information as in the previous examples - the percentage of students who cannot use totally "consistent and appropriate verb tense". Again, the marking does not discriminate between the student who makes one inconsistent use of tense and the student whose tense usage shows clear lack of understanding.

Compound/complex sentences

Item #6 on the marking guide allows students this time to score 0-3 on the basis of their writing simple, compound or complex sentences. The marking booklet states that if students write only simple sentences, they score "1". The effect of this is to privilege the complex sentence over the simple. There is of course some precedent for this in language development terms, but despite the assumption that the complex sentence is a higher form than the simple, the marking booklet states:

It is assumed that a student who does not demonstrate constructing a simple sentence successfully should not get marks for constructing a compound or complex sentence correctly (p.11).
Thus, if one writes only in complex sentences, one scores a "0", since there are "no or few correct simple sentences" (p.11).

It would seem, then, that there is little warrant for proponents of ELLA to be able to claim that "22% of students could not write compound sentences" or that "59% of students could not write complex sentences" (Knapp, 1998: 6) on the basis of this assessment.

**Text processes**

The first marking feature to be considered in the test is called "Text level-processes" (called "A-TP" in the test booklet). This looks at "the generic function of each text and the specific structural and textual processes making up those texts" (NSW Department of School Education, 1997b: 6). Thus, it is testing whether the piece conforms to a particular definition of "text-type".

The marking booklet states that if a student writes, "Hello. Today I'm going to talk to you about...", or writes, "First you put your glass in a bin. Then you put it out for collection", both are "INAPPROPRIATE" (p. 9), since the test booklet defines a "correct form of address as the use of the "impersonal voice". The given examples are "inappropriate" because they use first or second person. One aspect of the task which markers are to address is "...does the text demonstrate the correct relationship between writer and audience? The most appropriate form of address for this text is third person" (p. 9).

Use of the first or second person in this task thus draws a mark of "0", the marking guide stating that, "the focus of the assessment...is their ability to write an explanation in terms of the language required" (p.8). The unstated assumption is that such a text can only be written in one form, based on the word, "Explain" in the task description, "Explain how glass is recycled".

In 1992, O'Neill had written that "If a set of prescribed genres is listed, and it is known that these are the ones which will be tested as measures of student and teacher competence and used as accountability measures for whole schools or education systems, it seems to me to invite de-contextualised drilling of the forms, irrespective of their substance or use" (p.40). ELLA would seem to have proven O'Neill prophetic.

This rather long excursion into the minutiae of ELLA marking is to demonstrate the extent to which "literacy" in NSW curriculum documents by the mid-1990s had moved from any notion of "literacy" represented by the [1987 English Syllabus for Years 7-10](still current in 1997).
Moreover, it is also meant to demonstrate in some detail the extent to which the DET/DSE had been captured by the idea that “literacy” equates with text types.

10.3 National literacy benchmarks

As stated at the conclusion of Chapter 8, in the early 1990s commentators were already writing of the extent of the influence of genre-based approaches to “literacy”, especially “text type” approaches, as manifested in the National Profiles (O’Neill, 1992: 41). By the late 1990s, commentators were still decrying the extent to which structuralist-text-type approaches, largely based on the influence of the “Sydney School”, had captured curriculum design nationally (Richardson, 1998: 235; Watkins, 1999: 119). Nowhere was this continuing influence more clear than in the Draft National Literacy Benchmarks for Year 7.

In writing of the National Benchmarks project, Gill has referred to “two discourses” operating in the politics of literacy in this country. One is the agenda of the government driving the push for benchmarking based on further allegations of declining standards and crises (see Kemp, 1996; Sawyer, 1997, 1998, 1999). Another is a discourse which stresses “a broad-ranging notion of literacy” (Lo Bianco and Freebody, 1997: xvi) and warns against campaigns based on narrow, functional definitions, but nevertheless recognises that certain social groups consistently under-perform and need to be targeted for particular attention. The details of this latter discourse include:

- a belief that literacy needs to be broadly defined
- an acceptance that benchmarks are useful in identifying minimum acceptable standards of competence, which is itself an innately worthwhile systemic exercise
- assertions that such identification can help target those groups consistently under-performing
- an appeal to research showing that the identification of outcomes can usefully affect classroom practice
- a recognition that benchmarks are for monitoring, not for diagnosis or summative assessment (Gill, 1998).

The aim of Australia’s National Literacy Benchmarks was to identify certain essential elements of literacy and to test whether the skills demonstrated at a particular point in time meet a minimum acceptable standard and are a satisfactory foundation for sufficient progress at school. Again, Gill has pointed to problems with this notion, such as that concepts like “the essential elements of literacy”, “minimum acceptable standard”, “satisfactory foundation” and
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sufficient progress" are problematic and value-laden (Gill, 1998: 120-121). Another is to do with the whole concept of "minimum". The earliest incarnation of the Benchmarks demonstrated the extent to which text-type approaches had captured the national agenda, and raised questions about the whole philosophy of "minimum", because the draft Benchmarks for writing were entirely based, like NSW's ELLA, on conformity to text-types - in fact, one of the sample pieces of writing was taken from the 1998 NSW ELLA (Curriculum Corporation, 1998). Defining a state of "literate-ness" through a device such as conformity to a text-type may be highly problematic in itself, however, there seems a fundamental logical problem with taking a genre-based/text-type approach at all - a problem of definition and of separating "texts" from "standards". If one is attempting to define a "minimum standard", then implied in that is the possibility of a maximum standard - at the very least it implies a continuum of achievement registering degrees from "minimum" to "maximum", from "poor" to "excellent". Yet, by using conformity to the features of a text type as the "minimum", the Benchmarks create a form of assessment which does not allow for any continuum. This approach to benchmarking reduces literacy assessment not to potential degrees of achievement, but to simple absolute judgements of "literate"/"illiterate". One either conforms to the text type, or one doesn't.

In what sense, then, is the concept of "minimum achievement" even relevant? If one conformed to the text-type features and achieved "minimum standard", how would one go on to achieve a "maximum standard" - how does one write a "narrative" that is even more "narrative-like"?

For teachers, a more important issue may be to go beyond distinguishing an "information report" from a "non-information-report", and to be able to tell a sophisticated, relevant, high-quality "information report" from a poor one. This was an issue pointed out by John Dixon in the earliest days of the "genre debate" in this country:

I am not satisfied...with the notion that a genre may properly be authorised by analysing a fairly representative text. I want to raise the problem of defining better and worse forms of generalising, of scientific as against anti-scientific modes of enquiry. It is not enough to assume that practices in educational discourse are to be studied descriptively. (Dixon, 1987:12)

Ultimately, conformity to text-type as a measure of assessment would seem to be largely unable to separate minimum achievement from maximum achievement.
The Benchmarks attempted to get around this logical problem by defining levels of achievement within some text types. The treatment of "narrative", in the Benchmarks, for example, holds as a minimum acceptable standard that "the connection of the plot to the theme/s may not be well developed"; one of the model examples of "achievement at the standard" has a "conclusion that is not a resolution". But this simply creates a logical problem for the text-type approach: a better than minimum standard becomes a text that is simply "more" of the text-type than one that lacks certain features. Why is the "narrative" that does not have a resolution therefore even qualify as a "narrative"? When, then, does a "narrative" actually become a "narrative"? There are no tools provided by a text-type approach for making such a judgement.

Related problems also existed in these Benchmarks in that detail below the level of "whole text" - such as at the sentence-level. The relevant section was entitled, "General text features" (Curriculum Corporation, 1998: 8ff). Here one finds that the Benchmark standard includes "correct use of embedded, finite clauses", allowing only errors in clauses beginning with non-finite verbs. There is no explanation of this as a minimum acceptable standard. Similarly, it is expected that "additive, temporal, causal and comparative conjunctions (are) used correctly and with variety, for particular effect". If this is a minimum acceptable standard, what can the maximum standard be? If "an extensive range of vocabulary" is held to be a minimum acceptable standard, what is the maximum standard to be? Another anomaly here is the demand that a minimum acceptable standard means that "simple punctuation (is) always used correctly". As I have argued above, this directly echoes ELLA, in which there often exists no grey area between "all" or "none" - between totally correct use and one error. The Benchmarks do not claim to be diagnostic, as ELLA does, but such an "all or nothing" approach potentially allows misunderstanding of the numbers achieving "acceptable standards".

By 1997, then, at least in terms of writing "knowledge about language" had become firmly embedded in NSW as the basis of "literacy". That definition, moreover, had already begun to influence early drafts of the benchmarks that were to define literacy standards nationally. Definitions of literacy had moved a long way in NSW since 1971.
CHAPTER 11

CONCLUSION

Calls for increased attention to curriculum histories, particularly subject-specific histories, have been somewhat insistent in the last two decades. According to Goodson, an important emphasis in curriculum history should be the history of the "written curriculum" as represented, for example, in Syllabus documents (1992, 1994a; 1994b). English has been a particular case in the argument for increased attention to history and such arguments often revolve around the issue of defining the subject itself. Moreover, Goodson also argues that these subject-specific histories need to be centred in "detailed local and historical studies" (1992:25). Medway has argued a case for the eccentricity of English being something of a post-war phenomenon (1990), and hence raises the issue of whether the history of quite recent periods ought not to receive particular attention in attempting to define the nature of the subject.

A review of the literature into curriculum history in general, the history of subject English and the specific history of English in Australia reveals the following key issues:

- the need for "specificity and contingency" (Tyler and Johnson, 1991: 4-5) and "postmodernist localised complexity" (Ball, 1993: 10) in curriculum history as an underlying drive in the "genealogical" school
- a great complexity of versions of subject English, which have revolved around such issues as the place of literature in the subject, the centrality or otherwise of grammatical study and what "growth" has actually meant in recent history

In attempting to address the need for recent, localised histories of English, the present study set out to answer the questions:

• How was Years 7-10 English defined from the early 1970s to the early 1990s in NSW?
• What was the relationship between the concepts "English" and "literacy" in NSW in the given period?

This study focused not on classroom practice, but on constructions of English in Syllabus documents, professional journals, textbooks and examinations. The emphasis was on both Goodson's "written curriculum" and other key documents - these latter forming what Lundgren (1977) has called the "curriculum code" - that together form a set of constructions of the subject.
In Australia, a particular view of how subject English in its “preactive” forms has been constructed since the 1960s has been put forward repeatedly by Christie - including in highly influential documents such as the "Christie Report" (Christie et al, 1991) - and could be said to constitute a "thesis" about the recent history of English in Australia. The essential elements of her thesis are that:

- the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon was transferred more or less wholesale into Australia
- teaching about sentence-level grammar was rejected and this led in turn to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general- indeed, there was active resistance against teaching about language, and this meant a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric
- the study of literature in terms of analysis of language was abandoned.

Christie's view of the history of English in Australia has excited much debate. However, Christie's critics have not produced the detailed study of curriculum documents from the history of English in Australia to refute her thesis in a strong and convincing way. The present study, in seeking to examine how Years 7-10 English was actually defined as a school subject during the period from the early 1970s, used the case of NSW to subject the Christie thesis to such detailed examination, via the "written curriculum" and related key "curriculum code" documents which interact to form particular constructions of the subject in its "preactive" forms.

The particular methodology used to address the study questions was an in-depth study of two selected years during the period, viz. 1977 and 1992, accompanied by detailed discussion of contextual aspects of these years, especially in terms of the "written curriculum". Close study of all published sources in particular years has a clear advantage when one is considering the appropriateness of a broad thesis such as Christie's to a particularselected area and time. At each stage of the study, the specific terms of Christie's thesis were addressed.

11.1 The locus of conceptualisation: the Christie thesis

11.1.1 Christie and the context of the "written curriculum": the 1971 NSW Syllabus in English for Forms I-IV.

Before considering the Christie thesis in terms of the key year, 1977, it is worth recalling the context of the "written curriculum" within which the professional literature was operating, viz, the 1971 Syllabus.
The first essential item of the Christie thesis is that the "growth" model as popularised by Dixon was transferred more or less wholesale into Australia. Chapter 4 shows that this is undoubtedly true of the 1971 Syllabus and this is elaborated further in 11.2 below.

The second essential item of the Christie thesis is that teaching about sentence-level grammar was rejected and this led in turn to the abandonment of the notion of teaching about language in general- indeed, there was active resistance against teaching about language, and this meant a lost opportunity to study language in terms of rhetoric. In the sense that the Syllabus argued that competence in language use was a more fundamental objective than the conscious analysis of grammar - and that the one did not necessarily depend on the other - there is some truth in the first part of this proposition. Nevertheless, the rest of the proposition is entirely contradicted by the 1971 Syllabus. With regard to aspects of the conscious study of language, other than grammar, the Syllabus puts forward a number of propositions that would seem to actually reinforce an important role for language study ("It is also clear that all pupils can enlarge their powers of understanding and expression by direct, attentive dealing with language" [NSW Secondary Schools Board, ndA: 5]). In particular, this language study is discussed almost entirely in the Syllabus in terms that Christie would consider "rhetorical".

Rather than neglecting a rhetorical approach to language, it would appear that the 1971 Syllabus in NSW is actually steeped in rhetoric in the sense in which Christie defines that term (the inter-relationship of audience, purpose and meaning). The Syllabus' emphasis on "competence" is one which simultaneously places the emphasis on "meaning". Part II.A.3 of the Syllabus (OBJECTIVES: THE LANGUAGE in use in context: Structure) is "rhetorical" in precisely Christie's sense ("Ability to use varying sentence patterns and to appreciate their influence on meaning..... Ability to arrange sentences in meaningful relationships with one another and to appreciate the effectiveness of such relationships in others' use of language" [NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 9, my emphases). Similarly, in discussing Objective A.1, for example, on "Usage" ("The development of appreciation and control of various kinds and levels of usage..."), the Notes on the Syllabus for "Language" state that "Pupils should at all times be encouraged to evaluate language in its setting" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 1). Objective A.1 (a): ("Ability to recognize and evaluate various kinds of usage in the contexts described by the syllabus") discusses developing usage by examining samples of language "with attention to what is being said, how it is being said and the values (sic) of its being said in that way" and by examining "the nature and effectiveness in context of their uses of language... A wealth of samples of written language is similarly desirable, paralleled(sic) by wealth of experience in using the written language in the ways experienced, and supported by the critical analysis that will have taken place" (NSW
Similarly, Objective 4, "Style", argues that style is best dealt with by "attending to how something is said as part of grasping precisely what is said in particular instances. It involves full attention to context: utterer, audience, intention, occasion, medium, and so on, as relevant" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1976: 8).

The very objectives of the Syllabus with respect to writing particularly are "rhetorical" in Christie's sense. The objectives of writing are defined precisely and explicitly in terms of constructing particular conventional generic forms and the construction of those forms with particular audiences in mind:

(i) Ability to write to a purpose: to describe, narrate, reflect, inform, persuade, argue, make an exposition...

(ii) Ability to write to an audience: the class, the teacher, other persons, imagined persons or groups, the general reader, oneself...

(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 11)

This is not surprising, given the emphasis on rhetoric in the work of Moffett, and Moffett's influence on the Syllabus itself. Moffett's work was self-consciously based on moving "English" from "grammar" to "rhetoric". He discusses the structure of discourse which underlies his curriculum as a question of rhetoric and the description of his task in Teaching the universe of discourse is exactly reflected in the Syllabus section on writing quoted in the previous paragraph (Moffett, 1968: 10-11). The Syllabus' "respect" for conventional forms ("describe, narrate...argue, make an exposition...") would also seem to contradict the Christie claim that Australian versions of "growth" failed to take account of the social construction of language.

This approach to language picks up not only Moffett's overtly rhetorical emphasis, but another theme of Dixon's that is often lost in discussions of Growth through English - the degree to which Dixon himself supported the study of language, provided it went beyond the study of grammar alone. One of Dixon's expressed fears in his book is that interest in "new and superior English grammars" (1975: 75) would simply replace one ineffective body of knowledge with another. The really useful approach to language, he argues, is one that studies "forms of knowledge that affect judgements, choices, and decisions" (1975: 76). The notion of studying the making of rhetorical choices in language use is precisely what underlies Dixon's recognition of "a curiosity about language much wider than that of the grammatical level" (1975: 77), because he feels that the most useful kind of conscious linguistic knowledge is that which potentially affects use, the kind of "(T)eaching which aims
at leading students outward from their sense of language as an artifact, a given, to a sense of themselves as organizers of experience in the act of speaking and writing." (1975: 77). Moreover - and interestingly, given Christie's argument that literary studies dominated over language studies, and that the former ignored close study of language - this "sense of themselves as organizers of experience'... is a matter for linguistic as well as literary insights" (1975: 77). Such an approach would lead to the teacher's introducing abstract frames of reference when necessary and, eventually, to the "study of language, a study which 'would stand among other studies of a socio-scientific nature as an option in the higher grades of High School...' It would study problems... for from such studies a body of knowledge is gradually drawn in, for the sake of its relevance in providing a frame of reference within which the issues can be effectively discussed" (1975: 79, original emphases).

Probably the most important evidence on the issue of Christie's claims about a lack of rhetorical perspective in Australia is in Little's "WH-" schema ("WHO says WHAT to WHOM? WHY? HOW with WHAT EFFECTS [NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 5]), which exactly echoed Moffett's formulation of the totality of discourse and the totality of the concerns of English. A Syllabus which aims at defining English in those terms would seem to be placing rhetoric-in-action at the centre of its concerns. Little, in fact, argues that "Moffett put the rhetorical tradition AND the growth tradition together through his concept of levels of abstraction" (Little, 2000).

Christie argues that the rejection of parsing and analysis by "growth" adherents meant that the opportunity was lost to re-create a rhetorical tradition which connected the study of language to meaning. Certainly, "growth" as expounded by Dixon, and as manifested in the 1971 Syllabus, did reject parsing and analysis as of little use in practical language development, but this did not accompany a rejection of all language study. On the contrary, the inter-relationship of purpose, audience and meaning as the basis of a study of language was advocated as a positive by both Dixon and Moffett and was transported as such into the NSW 1971 Syllabus.

In relation to the third element of the Christie thesis - that the study of literature abandoned close language analysis - one need only point to the Syllabus Objective, the ability to respond to "the form of a work, its structure and style; its parts and their relations to one another and the whole...its narrative and descriptive methods...its management of dialogue, imagery, humour, irony, its control of pace, tone and rhythm" (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 13). Thus, while valuing the "pupil's own response", the Syllabus, far from discouraging a close study of language as contributing to a work's rhetorical effects, would, rather seem to be positively encouraging that very study and urging teachers to lead pupils to recognise "the
contribution of (language) to ...total meaning and value” (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 13).

11.1.2 Christie and English in 1977

The professional literature of 1977 reflects strong support in NSW of the "growth" model and of the 1971 Syllabus: the active production of language by students, imaginative re-creation of literature, class and group discussion, improvisation and dramatic re-enactment and the validation of personal reaction, especially through writing. School textbooks support this trend to some extent in a number of works, though there is no doubt that texts such as The meaning machine and Language one represent a conscious backlash against a "growth" paradigm and are firmly within the 1970s "back to basics" call. Reference test examinations are designed to reflect the central tenets of the Syllabus as best they can within the administrative constraints that allow only reading and writing to be examined, and within the constraints of a timed, only individually-answered set of structures. Once again, the first essential element of the Christie thesis holds up to close examination.

Yet, again, as in the Syllabus itself, the second essential item of the Christie thesis, does not stand up to critical examination in this period. Far from neglecting the "rhetorical" aspect of language, "English" in 1977 in NSW as represented in the professional literature, textbooks and examinations is actually steeped in rhetoric in the sense in Christie's sense.

The strong theme of the professional literature of 1977 echoed that of the 1971 Syllabus towards grammatical study: that competence in language use was a more fundamental objective than conscious grammatical analysis, and that the one did not necessarily depend on the other. In general, discussions of learning about language in the professional literature are firmly centred in a sociolinguistic rhetorical mode. Halliday (1977b) appears in English in Australia advocating use of the Language in Use materials because they take an approach to language as "resource" as opposed to the approach of American structuralism to language as "rule". As well as the general approach to the study of language in social contexts (see, for example, Gough, 1977; Robinson, 1977), Halliday's specific call for the Language in use materials and the study of language as system is echoed in the literature (Boardman, 1977; Harkin and Carleberg, 1977b). Watson - joint editor of English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow - recalls that he and Eagleson were both determined that there was to be a strong language component" (Watson, 2000). As far as school textbooks were concerned, Halliday's notion of "learning about language" falls clearly into the two camps described by Christie: the emphasis on sentence-based grammar represented by Language one and The meaning machine, and a strong rhetorical emphasis from Wordswork and Communicate. The split between "growth" textbooks and "back-to-basics" textbooks in 1977 almost exactly echoes
Christie's "grammar-rhetoric" dichotomy, with the "rhetorical" pole being represented by the "growth" textbooks.

The third item of Christie's thesis also does not stand up to the evidence of the 1977 literature. Dixon himself had already seen linguistics as central to the study of literature (Dixon, 1975: 79-80) and the kind of literature study which is explicitly advocated in the "curriculum code" - along with imaginative re-creation, and often as part of the latter - is overwhelmingly skewed towards study of the literary uses of language, and much of this is conceptualised in a rhetorical framework. Homer (1977) advocates a sociolinguistic approach to literature which treats literature in terms of speech situations and communicative acts. Kramer (1977) decries the separation of language and literature because she believes that the study of the latter should be based on a study of the former. Case (1977a) advocates language-based close study of poetry and English in secondary schools contains five pages of teaching ideas based on the integration of language and literature in popular novels of the time (Harkin and Carleberg, 1977a). Robinson, editor of The teaching of English in 1977, recalls that he "saw literature as having a key, even central, place in the English curriculum precisely because it was the greatest resource for studying language" (Robinson, 2001).

In the School Certificate Reference Test also, the two-thirds of the examination which is about textual response and analysis similarly reflects an approach to literature based in close study of language of a kind Christie would call "rhetorical". In Part A, for example, students are asked to respond to such multiple-choice items on the semantic effects of language. Similarly, in Part C, analysis of the play extract includes the study of the specific "languages" of theatre - movement, speech, sound and lighting. It would seem clear that literary study in 1977 is not debated or realised in terms of cultural heritage or a Leavisite version of "personal response", but as a linguistic enterprise.

11.1.3 Christie and the context of the "written curriculum": the 1987 NSW Syllabus in English for Years 7-10.

Once again, before considering the Christie thesis in terms of the key year, 1992, it is worth recalling the context of the "written curriculum" within which the professional literature was operating in this case, the 1987 Syllabus.

In terms of Christie's argument that the growth model was transferred to Australia, to the extent that the 1987 Syllabus reinforced and strengthened the main ideas of its 1971 counterpart it is correct that "growth" became further entrenched in NSW official curriculum.
Evaluation of Christie’s argument on the rejection of grammar, and hence on the lost opportunity to study language as rhetoric is, perhaps, not as clear-cut as in 1971. The structure of the 1987 Syllabus into "Language Modes" and "Language Contexts" echoed two of the three arms of the 1971 Syllabus. There is no direct counterpart to that arm of the 1971 triad entitled "THE LANGUAGE", with no correspondingly direct or highlighted discussion of "usage", "vocabulary", "structure" or "style". The statement in the 1987 Syllabus which draws the key distinction between language use and language analysis ("Language learning occurs during the process of students USING LANGUAGE, not simply through their consideration of finished language products or by their accumulating abstract theoretical knowledge about language" - Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 7), unlike its 1971 counterpart, is not accompanied by a section of the Syllabus which places that statement within a context that is ultimately rhetorical. Watson believes that the lack of such a section was a mistake. Hence, the extent to which the 1987 Syllabus is concerned with as primarily a rhetorical view of English as its 1971 predecessor would at first appear to be problematic. This relative mutedness of rhetorical approaches to language study is a result largely of the unifying vision about "language" of 1971 becoming complicated by that series of different influences on various sub-sets ("Modes" and "Contexts") of the Syllabus.

On the other hand, those Modes of the Syllabus concerned with direct language production by students - "Talking and Listening" and "Writing" - continually highlight concern for language use in relation to "situation", "audience" and "purpose". The "Writing" section, in particular, echoes 1971 directly and issues directly out of Moffett’s view of rhetoric. The section on Assessment stresses the assessing of students’ ability to “use language with an awareness of purpose, situation and audience” (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 66). Moreover, those sections of the Syllabus expressing its "Rationale" and "Aim" are steeped in the rhetorical approaches that underlie the 1971 document. The limits of "meaning", for example, ("what is said"); "how it is said"); "why it is said"); "the worth of what is said" - NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1987: 11) are rhetorically oriented and taken directly from the 1971 document (p.4). Similarly, the Context of "Mass Media" is exhaustive in its listing of those aspects of direct language study which are relevant. The "grammar" of the media is at the forefront of that Context’s concerns and these are always expressed in a form that is "rhetorical" in Christie’s sense.

Christie’s third key element- the lack of a linguistic analysis of literature - would, again, at first appear to be another area of this Syllabus where her thesis is valid. The 1987 Syllabus contains no equivalent to the 1971 document’s direction to respond to “the form of a work, its structure and style; its parts and their relations to one another and the whole” (NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 13). It is much more an act of faith in the "Literature" Context
that such discussion about language will arise as a result of particular classroom activities than it had been in 1971. However, the Syllabus' other detailed Context of "Mass Media" is exhaustive in listing those aspects of language study that are to be explicitly dealt with. The Literature Context may have made the study of language relatively inexplicit simply because it was taken as a "given" that English teachers would address language in the context of literary study, while the exhaustive list of aspects of language to be dealt with in the Mass Media Context may be more explicit to cater for the relative lack of familiarity with that Context among teachers. Moreover, in those two areas of Literature where again English teachers were relatively inexperienced - film and drama - the relevant language topics are named and the emphasis is on a rhetorical approach to the study of language. This evidence would appear to run absolutely against any suggestion that the Syllabus as a whole was attempting to avoid direct and explicit study of language as a central concern of its Contexts.

11.1.4 Christie and English in 1992

By 1992, the "growth" model was not in the monopolistic position it had held in the professional literature of NSW since the 1970s. The position of "growth" was a complex one. On the one hand, debates about genre-oriented approaches to curriculum were prominent in the professional literature of 1992. The effect of conceptualising these debates in terms of "genre vs. process" was to equate the latter with "growth" approaches to English. By 1992, however, an important proportion of the professional literature was also going beyond this debate as conceptualised in these terms and invoking approaches to writing that allowed the reading-writing subject to become aware of their power to intervene in the way they are positioned, and thus to intervene in the discursive practices of society. Rather than privileging either "growth" or genre approaches a general move towards a critical literacy in the more theoretically oriented literature meant that "growth" itself - as conceived by many authors of the time - was becoming something of an historical artefact, despite underpinning the "written curriculum" of the 1987 Syllabus. At the same time, however, the textbooks of 1992 appear in some ways to be split between those taking the "growth" orientation of the Syllabus, and others having a more directly self-conscious awareness of literary and critical theory. Nevertheless, such a split is not as strong as that manifested in 1977 between "growth" and "grammatical analysis". In 1992, even some of the clearly "growth" oriented texts, such as Making meanings and Ways of telling are also concerned with resistant readings and others such as Speak up express concern for "critical" approaches.

In terms of the second and third of Christie's propositions, it has been noted that as late as 1992, there was a kind of Leavisite revival in the professional literature of secondary English. Along with this, though in a different vein, The teaching of English in that year devoted almost a third of its space to single units of work, the vast majority of which were
straightforward imaginative re-creation. Standing against both the Leavisite position and the reproduction of yet more units on imaginative recreation, however, were other writers who were making the whole category of "literature" problematic in itself and problematic as the centre of "English". These latter discussions revolved around the need to read the culture critically by creating a resistant readership and, in effect, placed language study again at the centre of approaches to literature. Such approaches are reflected in many of the textbooks of that year - even those taking a generally "growth" orientation. Moreover, such texts as Making meanings and Ways of telling approach all such language analysis in terms of rhetorical effect, while the "Resources" section of English in Australia #99 contains only teaching ideas that focus on the effects of language use in spoken and written situations. In the terms set up by this study, the 1992 Reference Test may be the one case in which Christie's characterisation of post-Dartmouth English, with respect to the linguistic study of literature, is borne out.

11.2 Constructions of "English" and "literacy" from the 1970s to the 1990s

11.2.1 Introduction
As the discussion above suggests, for most of the period under discussion, the "growth" model of English dominated the "written curriculum" of Years 7-10 English in NSW, the professional literature of the key "slice" year, 1977, and was only beginning to become problematic in the professional literature of 1992. Yet, as the previous discussion also shows, certain key ideas, certainly present in Dixon's original work, were highlighted in such a way as to give particular "shape" to the "growth model" in NSW. These ideas included the triad, "the language in use in context"; the crucial distinction between studying the forms of English and using them and above all the strongly rhetorical emphasis derived from Moffett's work - summed up in the 1971 Syllabus' stress on "meaning-form-values" and in the important formulation,

\[
\text{WHO} \quad \text{says} \quad \text{WHAT} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{WHOM?} \\
\{ \quad \{ \quad \{ \\
\text{WHY?} \quad \text{HOW} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{WHAT EFFECTS} \\
(NSW Secondary Schools Board, 1971: 5)
\]

"Literacy" as a concept is not mentioned in the Syllabus. The key word is "language". While the specific theoretical underpinnings of writing pedagogy in the Syllabus are Dixon and Moffett, the document is remarkably free of specific theoretical underpinnings for reading pedagogy. The stress is on a specific range of skills, among which is comprehension, but even that concept received little detailed elaboration. In terms of grammar, the Syllabus argued
that competence in its use was a more fundamental objective than its conscious analysis, and that the one did not necessarily depend on the other.

Apart from the "written curriculum" of the 1971 Syllabus itself, constructions of English in the key year 1977 were taking place within a context of media-driven crises of faith in the schooling system to "deliver "literate students - crises which would appear to be unjustified. A further context of the curriculum debates of 1977 was the general concern about language as a pedagogical tool across the curriculum - which was later to culminate in NSW in the release of major Departmental policies on Writing K-12 and Reading K-12. These debates often conceptualised "language" in terms of the triad, "learning language", "learning about language" and "learning through language". In "its widest sense" (Dixon, 1975: 70) "English" was not only about "learning language" and "learning about language", but was also specifically concerned with "learning through language" across the whole curriculum. This sense of English as claiming the totality of Halliday's triad was true not only of Dixon's thinking, but also of Moffett's and was also true of the 1971 Syllabus. Moreover, the 1971 Syllabus also reflected the work of Barnes in terms of learning theory.

11.2.2 English in key year 1977

As argued in 11.1.2 above, the professional literature of 1977 reflects strong support in NSW of the "growth" model and of the 1971 Syllabus. Despite the dominance of "growth" and the perception of contemporaneous critics such as Inglis (1975), Whitehead (1976,1978) and Allen (1980) that "growth" represented a down-grading of literature, the value of literature as a central pillar of English - though one among four - is not contested in the 1971 Syllabus itself.

Nevertheless, the value of "literature" as the organising centre of English is the subject of lively debate in NSW in 1977, with such debate revolving around the binary structure of "literature-centred" vs. "language-centred" curriculum. In the latter view, English was to be based on using language in relation to the child's experience: the shaping of identity, of self. Literature needed to sit alongside other experiences, and needed to include in its definition the children's own writing. Advocates of the "literature-centred" view argued that in centring on "language" or "experience", English was losing its distinctive identity - on the one hand being indistinguishable from what the whole curriculum should be doing, and on the other, relegating the distinctive texts of English - literature - to just other "voices" in the classroom "conversation". As shown in 11.1.2 above, defenders of literature placed strong emphasis on it as a site for sociolinguistic study. Indeed, as 11.1.2 also shows, while some writers did distinguish between learning language in use and learning about language, the latter is firmly centred in a sociolinguistic rhetorical mode. This tended also to be the emphasis in the School Certificate Reference Test of 1977.
In terms of learning through language, the view of "English" as going beyond the traditional concerns of the single subject itself, and as concerned with essentially cognitive-constructivist notions of learning in general saturates the professional literature of 1977. The British theorists most often referred to are Britton and Barnes. The role of talk and writing in learning is discussed precisely in the terms formulated by Britton, such as "talking oneself into understanding", "representing experience" or "attaching new knowledge to old" (Annells et al, 1977; Boardman, 1977; Stratta and Wilkinson, 1977; Britton, 1977; Rothery, 1977; Williams, 1977; Ashworth, 1977; Kefferd, 1977; Carroll et al, 1977; Goodman and Goodman, 1977). Writing is discussed and analysed in terms of Britton's transactional-expressive-poetic functions, while Boardman (1977) also reflects Barnes' concern with the language of subjects being a foreign language to many children, who ought to be allowed to use their own language to grapple with subject content.

Moreover, language "across the curriculum" is written about in a way that seems to reflect the consciousness of subject English as at least being the basis of the total curriculum. Boomer (1977: 8) calls on English teachers to show the importance of language to their colleagues in other curriculum areas and "invite them to come with us". Research on writing across the curriculum appears in English journals (Annells et al, 1977; Walshe, 1977d).

Thus the professional literature of the time, in terms of Halliday's triad conceptualised English on all three arms of that triad - "English" is about "learning language"; it is concerned with "learning about language" in ways that are specifically within a "rhetorical tradition" - a study of language as a sociolinguistic system concerned with audiences and purposes; and, finally, English is concerned with "learning through language" in ways that reflect cognitive-constructivist views of learning across subject areas. The totality with which the professional literature of the time reflected this triad echoes the nature of the 1971 Syllabus itself.

The Australian textbooks of 1977 were split almost equally between "growth model" approaches and what Dixon would call "skills-model" approaches, with a number of the former also reflecting the rhetorical approach to language that characterised "growth" in NSW. Textbooks such as Language one, in reflecting the "skills model", were consciously reacting to mid-70's calls for a move "back-to-basics" and strongly emphasised the analysis of grammar. As argued in 11.1.2 above, Christie's "rhetoric-grammar" dichotomy is almost exactly reflected in the textbooks of 1977, with "growth" texts representing the "rhetorical" end of the polarity.
11.2.3 Literacy in key year 1977

As in the Syllabus itself, the key point to make about the concept of "literacy" in the professional literature of 1977 is that it is an unproblematic "given" - part of that "give-ness" being an uncontested sense that "literacy" is within the province of "English" in NSW secondary education. The extract from Bullock reprinted in English in secondary schools: Today and tomorrow deplores any separation of "Reading" from "English", such as is manifested in the USA (Bullock Report extract, 1977), while Judy's essay in that volume effectively equates "English" with "literacy" (Judy, 1977). Watson recalls that literacy "was assumed to be the English teacher's job" (Watson, 2000). "Literacy" is only consciously discussed in terms of the literacy crises of the time and the key point is to refute "back-to-basics" arguments by pointing out the failure of so-called "basic skills" in the past (Judy, 1977; Little, 1977b).

The main themes about reading specifically in the literature were: to detail reading processes within a psycholinguistic view as popularised by Smith (1971) and the Goodmans (Gollasch, 1982); to emphasise the importance of wide reading and to express issues about backward/remedial readers.

The models and theories most frequently cited for writing pedagogy in the 1977 literature are those of Britton, Martin and the London Institute team. Britton's function categories are almost universally accepted as underlying models for a variety of approaches to writing. Nevertheless, a different approach to writing based on American influences such as Donald Murray, and one that was to be profoundly significant in NSW in later years, was introduced by Walshe in 1977, when he begins to discuss writing processes. In introducing audience-response and in asking the question, "How do real writers write?", Walshe initiates a genuine paradigm shift that was to be widely taken up in the 80s, and was to be influential in the framing of the succeeding Syllabus. His model in 1977 was that of "Experience/Pre-Writing/Draft Writing/Re-Writing/Publication/Response" (Walshe, 1977a, 1977d).

Against the background of the 70s literacy crises, the theme of the 1977 professional literature on the question of grammar is to argue that it is "not helpful" in "acquiring language ability" (Ashworth, 1977: 292). Judy (1977), in asking the question, "What is a 'basic skill' anyway?" (the ability to converse and write successfully for one's own purposes and in a range of situation), is able to re-define traditional "grammar" study as a "frill" which is learned naturally and intuitively to a great degree.

Most fundamentally, in 1977, in NSW, the central term was "language" and the concerns of "literacy" were the concerns of "English".
11.2.4 Contexts for key year 1992

The 1987 Syllabus was firmly grounded in the principles and aims of its predecessor while giving much more detail about implementation. In 1987, the unifying vision of "language" that had been represented by the conjunction of Moffett with the ideals of Dixon and the London School, had become complicated by a series of different influences on various sub-sets of the Syllabus — such as Smith, the Goodmans, Masterman and Graves that more clearly "drove" specific Modes and Contexts in 1987. As in 1971, there remains the uncontested sense in 1987 that "literacy" is still within the province of "English" in NSW secondary education.

During the writing of this Syllabus and in the early years of its implementation, the NSW government released the Reading K-12 and Writing K-12 documents. In reaction to Writing K-12, LERN developed a pedagogy of writing based on a typology of genres appropriate to particular school subjects. The genre debate became conceptualised as one of "process vs. genre", however it could be validly conceptualised as a debate about learning theory in subject areas - the work of Barnes both supporting the 1971 and 1987 Syllabuses and standing as a counter to the views of the "Sydney School" and LERN about subject-area pedagogy.

Under the influence of the genre-based approaches to writing pedagogy developed by LERN, "literacy" from 1988, in official state curriculum documents, became both separated from "English" and narrowed, at least as far as writing was concerned, into the concept of tightly defined "text types" corresponding to particular subject areas. Ironically, while separating "literacy" from being a specifically "English" concern in the secondary school, the particular approach to "literacy" being adopted in NSW became reflected in documents about "English" - the 1994 K-6 English Syllabus in NSW itself and the National Statement and Profiles on English, which drew heavily on NSW precedents such as ELLA. English in the National Statement was becoming viewed as a kind of sub-set of "literacy". Moreover, the special province of "English" in the Statement had become narrowed into "learning about language".

The other significant curriculum debate that formed a context for the key year 1992 was the popularising of critical literacy. Critical literacy advocates celebrated the social and argued that "growth" model curricula place too much emphasis on the notion of the individual, without recognising that language users are socially constructed. The emphasis on personal writing, for example, was said to favour those most literate and hence to disenfranchise those not from the dominant culture. Hence it favours white, middle-class masculine values and is thus essentially socially conservative (see, for example, Patterson, 1992). Critical literacy also challenged "growth" models of English in favouring a heavily "transmission" oriented pedagogy.
11.2.5 English in key year 1992

In 1992, a significant distance had grown between the state and national journals, with the former placing a much stronger emphasis on presenting single units of work than had its 1977 predecessor. The NSW state journal itself mostly remained immersed in an unproblematic view of literature and in an "imaginative recreation" pedagogy, though clearly reflecting the contemporary NSW Syllabus itself.

The national journal was the site of some debate between traditional Leavisite approaches and a broad critical literacy, although it is true that an opposition to "theory" was overwhelmed in the professional literature by the advocacy of versions of a post-structuralism-critical literacy-resistant reading alliance. Given the policy context, it is not surprising that philosophical-paradigmatic discussions in the professional literature of 1992 were also more rooted in overt policy concerns than they had been in 1977. Bureaucrats and their explanations and advocacy of current policy were part of the professional debate in a way that had not been true in 1977.

Also unsurprisingly - given the policy context - variations on the genre debate continued to have a prominent place in the professional literature of 1992. As argued in detail in Chapter 8, and briefly in 11.2.4, this debate had been almost entirely conceptualised in terms of "genre vs. process", but in 1992, other kinds of opposition to genre approaches began to emerge as opposition to the conservative political ideology of "text-type" pedagogy. In 1992, this became crystallised in some quarters as an opposition to the failure of particular genistas to make room for critique of the power structures represented by genres themselves. Gilbert (1992), O'Neill (1992) and Cranny-Francis (1992) represented this viewpoint strongly. Effectively, these were advocating the replacement of structuralist approaches to genre with post-structuralist approaches.

The relevant textbooks in 1992 were somewhat split between those taking the "growth" orientation of the Syllabus, and others having a more directly self-conscious awareness of literary and critical theory. That year, for example, saw the publication of Brian Moon's Literary terms. Nevertheless, the split was not as strong as it had been in 1977 between "skills-based" and "growth" approaches, with some of the clearly "growth"-oriented texts, such as Making meanings and Ways of telling, also concerned with resistant readings. As argued in 11.1.4 above, these texts took a rhetorical orientation to the study of language, as had been the tradition in NSW since the 1970s. The School Certificate Reference Test of 1992 stood almost alone in not foregrounding the study of language as part of what characterised "English".
11.2.6 Literacy in key year 1992

Following the outlined in 11.2.4, the concept of "literacy" was no longer unproblematic - though, as discussed in that section, "literacy" in NSW Department of Education documentation was becoming synonymous - as far as writing was concerned - with certain genre-based, "text-type" approaches. These in turn also became reflected in the "Linguistic structure and features" sections of the National statement. In terms of reading, "critical literacy" was becoming important under the influence of post-structuralist literary theory. The central concept about literacy in 1992 was that of multiplicity. Following this, the notion of "reading" had become transformed into "readings" and "reading positions". Woods' work epitomised this multiplicity and also epitomised a certain negative construction of "English" in arguing that the subject "English" should be "about" not privileging certain texts or certain readings (Woods, 1992: 88-90). Among a diversity of topics on writing pedagogy, reaction against the conservatism of genrist text-type approaches was dominant.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Christie was largely correct about the dominance of "growth" in NSW secondary English since the 1970s. However, a close study of both the "written curriculum" and related literature in two key years in the period from the 1970s to the 1990s has shown that the "growth" model in NSW was characterised by all three arms of Halliday's influential triad - including, most importantly, by rhetorical approaches to the study of language. The close study of language also characterised the approaches to literature study in "growth". Hence, ultimately, Christie's thesis about the development of English in Australia since the early 1970s does not stand up to close examination in the context of NSW. As "growth" became critiqued and "literacy" became problematised throughout the period from the 1970s to the 1990s, there remains little evidence that in defining "English" itself, the rhetorical study of language was neglected. If anything, it was in adopting the text-type approaches to literacy that grew out of the "Sydney School" of genrists, that the "grammar" pole of Christie's "grammar-rhetoric" dichotomy came to be privileged in governmental policy on "literacy" by the 1990s.
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ABSTRACT

Calls for increased attention to subject-specific histories, have been somewhat insistent in the last two decades. An important emphasis in these calls has been for attention to the history of the "preactive curriculum" as represented, for example, in Syllabus documents. English has been a particular case in these arguments - a case which often revolves around defining the subject itself. Others have argued further that subject-specific history is usefully centred in detailed local, historical studies of the recent past.

In attempting to address these issues, the present study set out to answer the questions:

- How was Years 7-10 English defined from the early 1970s to the early 1990s in NSW?
- What was the relationship between the concepts "English" and "literacy" in NSW in the given period?

The study focuses specifically on constructions of English in Syllabus documents, professional journals, textbooks and examinations.

In Australia, a particular view of how subject English has been recently constructed in this "preactive" form has been put forward by Christie and could be said to constitute a thesis about the recent history of English in Australia. The present study, in seeking to examine how Years 7-10 English was actually defined as a school subject during the period from the early 1970s, uses the case of NSW to subject the Christie thesis to detailed examination, in terms of the "written curriculum" and related key "curriculum code" documents which interact to form particular constructions of the subject in its "preactive" forms.

The particular methodology used to address the study questions is an in-depth study of two selected years during the period, viz. 1977 and 1992, accompanied by detailed discussion of contextual aspects of these years. The study argues that while Christie was largely correct about one aspect of her thesis, that ultimately, her view of the development of English in Australia since the early 1970s does not stand up to close examination in the context of NSW.
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