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Abstract

This study seeks to make a contribution to the development of an educational linguistics by drawing upon systemic linguistic theory. The discussion owes most to the systemic functional grammar as proposed by M.A.K. Halliday, and to the models of genre and register as these are proposed by J.R. Martin. The study grew out of an interest in early writing development in young children. This interest led eventually to an interest in the patterns of spoken discourse in which written genres are generated. Close investigation of the spoken language caused the researcher to propose the notion of a "curriculum genre", where the term refers to the staged, patterned ways in which the goals and processes of school learning are achieved.

A group of 50-55 children were followed for the first three years of their schooling from the preparatory year to the end of year 2. All written texts produced by the children in the period were collected. In addition, lessons were regularly recorded for two of the three years of the study. The researcher sought to trace the relationship of the spoken and written language. Two curriculum genres were identified for detailed study. The researcher came to argue that in addressing questions of how the curriculum genres were constructed, she was also addressing issues to do with the ideology of early childhood literacy. Contemporary traditions of the integrated curriculum, like contemporary models of "wholistic" and/or "language experience" approaches to early literacy often tend to underestimate what young children can do.

The two curriculum genres selected for close study are the morning news genre and the writing planning genre. It is argued that in the former, many of the genres of early writing development are rehearsed, though this is not consciously realised either by teachers or children, while in the latter genre, writing development is an overt object of interest.

Whether the genres of writing are learned in the morning news genre or the writing planning genre, it is argued that their linguistic character remains implicit to the context of situation and as such, not subject to overt teaching. The effect is that children are left to deduce the types of written genres they must produce in order to be successful in their school learning.

That this is the case is not to be explained in terms of any failure on the part of the teachers. On the contrary, it is to be explained in terms of the problems created by some well established traditions of thinking in early childhood literacy education. These traditions have tended in recent years to focus teachers' attention upon such things as the children's personal language experience, or upon the processes of learning of language, where these are regularly dissociated from the patterns of language in which significant meanings are built up, and socially useful purposes are achieved. An educational linguistics of the kind advocated will do much towards the development of a generation of teachers who are sensitive to matters of language, and hence skilled in guiding their students into an appropriate engagement with both the appropriate genre and register choices for writing.
Acknowledgements

In the writing of this thesis I have been indebted to many people. I am grateful first of all, to Dr. J.R. Martin, who supervised me in the course of undertaking the study and writing up the findings. He was at all times supportive and encouraging. I am grateful too, to Dr. Christian Matthiessen, who, at the suggestion of Professor Foley of the Department of Linguistics, assumed the role of a second supervisor, and read the final draft of the thesis. He was generous with his time and also most supportive and helpful in his comments. Thanks too are due to Professor Michael Halliday, who made possible my entry to the doctoral program within the Department of Linguistics. He has been a good friend to me over the years.

I must record my thanks to several friends who read drafts of various chapters and responded in helpful ways. They have included Guenter Plum, Brian Gray, Clare Painter and John Hodgens. Apart from these people, I must record my thanks to a number of others with whom I have had long talks about many matters dealt with in this thesis. Their conversations have always been stimulating and helpful. They include Joan Rothery, John Carr, Ruqaiya Hasan, David Butt, Linda Gerot, Jennifer Hammond and Barbara Kamler. I am grateful to them all for their support, advice and encouragement.

I owe a special debt of thanks to the staff and children of "Normanbury" school in Geelong. I spent three years working closely with these people, and I made many good friends during that time. Without their help this study would not have been possible at all.

Finally, thanks are due to several people at Deakin University, where I work. Indeed, thanks are due to the University itself, for granting me leave so that I could complete this dissertation. I must in this context
record my thanks as well to Professor Les Lomas, who was Dean of the School of Education when I commenced the study, and to Professor Richard Bates who held that position when the study was finished. In varying ways, both were generous in the institutional support they made available to me. Two of my colleagues, Chris Bigum and Peter Evans, who are specialists in computer education, proved helpful and patient in giving advice to me as I learned to use the computer. Thanks are also due to Angela Bloomer who took over my computer disks and did a final check of the various documents before I actually submitted the thesis.
Contents

Volume 1:
1 Towards an educational linguistics ................................. 1
   1.1 Introduction .................................................................. 1
   1.2 Language as a social institution ................................. 9
   1.3 A systemic functional grammar ................................. 33
   1.4 Register and genre .................................................. 60
   1.5 Pointing some directions ........................................ 77

2 Developing a case study in early literacy ....................... 84
   2.1 Recognising the relationship of spoken .................... 85
       and written discourse
   2.2 Some background considerations ............................. 85
   2.3 The children at "Normanbury" school ....................... 92
   2.4 Methodological considerations ............................. 96
   2.5 The aim of the study .............................................. 109

3 The morning news genre ............................................. 111
   3.1 The importance of the morning news ....................... 111
       genre, both as an instance of a curriculum
       genre, and as a context for rehearsing
       writing ...........................................................................
   3.2 The educational objectives of morning ....................... 114
       news activities................................................................
   3.3 The morning news genre: its cultural ....................... 120
       significance and its schematic structure
       potential........................................................................
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Morning News Nomination</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Morning News Greeting</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>Morning News Giving</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4</td>
<td>Lesson Closure</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Register in the morning news genre</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>The linguistic realisation of the morning news genre</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>The text of an instance of the morning news genre</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td>The schematic structure of Text 1</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3</td>
<td>Theme in the Lesson Initiation and the Control elements</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.4</td>
<td>Transitivity in the Lesson Initiation and the Control elements</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.5</td>
<td>Theme and Transitivity in the Lesson Closure</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.6</td>
<td>The Morning News Nomination and Morning News Greeting</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.7</td>
<td>Aaron's Morning News Giving element: some preliminary considerations</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.8</td>
<td>Theme in Aaron's Morning News Giving element</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.9</td>
<td>Transitivity in Aaron's Morning News Giving element</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.10</td>
<td>The Morning News Finish in Aaron's activity</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.11</td>
<td>Susy's Morning News Giving</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.12</td>
<td>Theme in Susy's Morning News Giving element</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.13</td>
<td>Transitivity in Susy's Morning News Giving element</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 The writing program in context: theory and practice in the school

4.1 Introduction .................................................. 239
4.2 Planning the curriculum: background theories .................................................. 244
4.3 The junior curriculum at Normanbury school, and the place of language development within it .................................................. 273
4.4 The early reading program at Normanbury school .................................................. 297
4.5 Summary .................................................. 300

5 Schematic structure potential and register in the writing planning genre

5.1 Introduction .................................................. 303
5.2 The schematic structure potential of the writing planning genre .................................................. 308
5.3 The principal elements in the writing planning genre explained .................................................. 314
5.3.1 The Task Orientation .................................................. 320
5.3.2 The "middle" elements of the schematic structure potential: the Task Specification .................................................. 325
5.3.3 The "middle" elements of the schematic structure potential: the Task Respecification .................................................. 328
5.3.4 The Task element in the schematic structure potential .................................................. 333
5.4 Register in the writing planning genre .................................................. 335
5.5 Summary .................................................. 349
Volume 2

6 Theme in the writing planning genre....349

6.1 Introduction ................................................................. 349
6.2 Three instances of the writing planning
genre: some preliminiry observations .......... 355
6.3 Theme patterns in the writing planning
genre: general trends .................................................... 359
6.4 Theme in Text A, the "uniform text" ............... 369
6.4.1 The Task Orientation of Text A .................. 371
6.4.2 The Task Specification in Text A .................. 388
6.4.3 The Task in Text A .............................................. 393
6.5 Theme in Text B, the "my lunch" text ............... 395
6.5.1 The Task Orientation in Text B .................. 397
6.5.2 Theme in the Task Reorientation of
Text B ................................................................. 407
6.5.3 Theme in the Task Specification 1/Control
1 of Text B ............................................................... 413
6.5.4 Theme in the Task Specification 2/ Control
2 of Text B ............................................................... 425
6.5.5 Theme in the Task of Text B ...................... 433
6.6 Theme in Text C, the "chicken text" ............... 439
6.6.1 Theme in the Task Orientation/Controls
1 and 2 of Text C .............................................................. 442
6.6.2 Theme in the Task Specification/Control 3
of Text C ................................................................. 465
6.6.3 Theme in the Task Respecification/Control
4 of Text C ............................................................... 479
6.6.4 Theme in the Task of Text C ...................... 485
6.7 Summary ................................................................. 487
7 Transitivity in the writing planning genre

7.1 Introduction ............................................. 496
7.2 Texts A, B and C: the principal arguments .... 503
7.3 Transitivity in the two registers in the writing planning genre ...................................... 509
7.4 Transitivity in Text A ..................................... 519
7.4.1 Transitivity in the Task Orientation of Text A ......................................................... 519
7.4.2 Transitivity in the Task Specification of Text A ......................................................... 538
7.4.3 Transitivity in the Task of Text A ............... 542
7.5 Transitivity in Text B ...................................... 543
7.5.1 Transitivity in the Task Orientation of Text B ......................................................... 544
7.5.2 Transitivity in the Task Reorientation of Text B ......................................................... 549
7.5.3 Transitivity in the Task Specification 1/
Control 1 of Text B .............................................. 553
7.5.4 Transitivity in the Task Specification 2/
Control 2 of Text B .............................................. 560
7.5.4 Transitivity in the Task of Text B ............... 564
7.6 Transitivity in Text C ...................................... 567
7.6.1 Transitivity in the Task Orientation/
Controls 1 & 2 of Text C ..................................... 568
7.6.2 Transitivity in the Task Specification/
Control 3 of Text C ........................................... 598
7.6.3 Transitivity in the Task Respecification/
Control 4 of Text C ........................................... 607
7.6.4 Transitivity in the Task of Text C ............... 609
7.7 Summary ...................................................... 609
8 Conversation structure in the writing planning genre .................................................. 617

8.1 Introduction .......................................................................................... 617

8.2 Some background trends in the study of classroom discourse ......................... 621

8.3 Conversation structure explained ......................................................... 634

8.4 Conversation structure in the writing planning genre: general trends in the operation of the two registers ............................... 652

8.5 Conversation structure in Text A ....................................................... 656

8.5.1 Conversation structure in the Task Orientation of Text A ....................................................... 657

8.5.2 Conversation structure in the Task Specification and Task of Text A ............... 665

8.6 Conversation structure in Text B ....................................................... 667

8.6.1 Conversation structure in the Task Orientation of Text B ....................................................... 668

8.6.2 Conversation structure in the Task Reorientation of Text B ............................... 671

8.6.3 Conversation structure in the Task Specification 1/ Control 1 of Text B .............. 674

8.6.4 Conversation structure in the Task Specification 2/ Control 2 of Text B .............. 677

8.6.5 Conversation structure in the Task of Text B ....................................................... 681

8.7 Conversation structure in Text C ....................................................... 685

8.7.1 Conversation structure in the Task Orientation/Controls 1 & 2 of Text C .............. 685

8.7.2 Conversation structure in the Task Specification/ Control 3 of Text C .............. 700

8.7.3 Conversation structure in the Task Respecification/ Control 4 of Text C .............. 705
8.7.4 Conversation structure in the Task of Text C.......................................................... 709
8.8 Summary....................................................................................................................... 711
8.9 Bringing the three analyses together................................................................. 715

9 The children's writing...................................................................................... 735

9.1 Introduction............................................................................................................. 735
9.2 The impact on the children's early writing development of the initial reading program and the morning news genre ............................................................................... 741
9.3 Some general considerations with respect to the writing program............... 757
9.4 Writing developed out of Text A............................................................... 759
9.5 Writing developed out of Text B............................................................... 774
9.6 Writing developed out of Text C............................................................... 785
9.7 Bringing the study to a close ........................................................................ 789
Bibliography........................................................................................................ 796

Volume 3:

Appendix 1..................................................................................................................... 821
Appendix 2..................................................................................................................... 831
Appendix 3..................................................................................................................... 929
Appendix 4..................................................................................................................... 1010
Tables

3.1 Field in the morning news genre .................. 147
3.2 Tenor in the morning news genre .................. 151
3.3 Mode in the morning news genre .................. 154
3.4 Theme in the Lesson Initiation and
Control of Text 1 ........................................ 168
3.5 Transitivity in the Lesson Initiation
and Control of Text 1 ..................................... 177
3.6 Textual and experiential Themes in Aaron's
Morning News Giving element ....................... 188
3.7 Textual Themes & Transitivity processes in
Aaron's Morning News Giving element ............ 196
3.8 Textual Themes in Susy's show & tell &
anecdote genres ........................................... 205
3.9 Transitivity choices in Susy's two
embedded genres ........................................... 230
3.10 Theme and Transitivity choices in Susy's
show & tell genre ........................................... 230
3.11 Textual Theme and Transitivity processes
in Susy's anecdote genre ................................ 232
5.1 Field in the writing planning genre ................ 336
5.2 Tenor in the writing planning genre .............. 342
5.3 Mode in the writing planning genre ............... 345
6.1 Theme in the opening of the Task
Orientation of Text A ..................................... 375
6.2 Summary of Theme choices in the Task
Orientation of Text A ..................................... 381
6.3 Summary of Theme choices in the Task
Specification of Text A ................................... 389
6.4 Summary of Theme choices in the Task
Orientation of Text B ..................................... 400
6.5 Summary of Theme choices in the Task
Reorientation of Text B .................................. 409
6.6 Summary of Theme choices in the Task
6.7 Summary of Theme choices in the Task Specification 2/Control 2 of Text B .................................. 426

6.8 Summary of Theme choices in the Task of Text B .................................................................... 435

6.9 Summary of Theme choices in the Task Orientation/Controls 1 & 2 of Text C .................. 450

6.10 Summary of Theme choices in the Task Specification/Control 3 of Text C .................. 467

6.11 Summary of Theme choices in the Task Specification/Control 4 of Text C .................. 481

7.1 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task Orientation of Text A .................................. 520

7.2 Identifying and attributive processes in the teacher's talk in the Task Orientation of Text A ................................................................. 529

7.3 Identifying and attributive processes in the children's talk in the Task Orientation of Text A ................................................................. 535

7.4 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task Specification of Text A .................................. 539

7.4 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task element of Text A ........................................ 542

7.5 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task Orientation of Text B .................................. 544

7.6 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task Reorientation of Text B .................................. 549

7.7 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task Specification 1/Control 1 of Text B ............ 553

7.8 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task Specification 2/Control 2 of Text B ............ 560

7.9 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task of Text B ......................................................... 564

7.10 Summary of transitivity choices in the Task
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>Attributive and identifying processes in the Task Orientation of Text C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>Classification of chickens according to the international code of nomenclature of taxonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>Attributive and identifying processes in the book <em>Egg to Chick</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>Summary of transitivity choices in the Task Specification/Control 3 of Text C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>Summary of transitivity choices in the Task Respecification/Control 4 of Text C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Exemplifications of the logical relationships between paratactic clauses (Halliday, 1985a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Speech functions &amp; responses (Halliday, 1985a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task Orientation of Text A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task Specification &amp; Task of Text A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task Orientation of Text B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task Reorientation of Text B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task Specification 1/ Control 1 of Text B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task Specification 2/ Control 2 of Text B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task of Text B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task Orientation/ Controls 1 &amp; 2 of Text C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>Summary of moves taken up in the Task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.12 Summary of moves taken up in the Task

8.13 The writing planning genre: a summary of
major systems & their manner of realisation
of (i) the pedagogical & "content" registers,
& (ii) the principal particulate elements of
schematic structure ............................................ 720
### Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Relation of the text to the context of situation</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The English MOOD SYSTEM</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Three sets of simultaneous choices made within the clause</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>The TRANSITIVITY SYSTEM in English</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>CIRCUMSTANCE in English</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Martin and Poynton's revised register categories</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Language, register and genre</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Outline of a tristratal systemic functional grammar with central systems on each stratum noted</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Relational processes</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>The morning news genre: schematic structure &amp; associated registers</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The overall curriculum framework at Normanbury</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Curriculum themes taken up in years 1 and 2</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>A curriculum theme on toys</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>A curriculum theme at Traeger Park</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>A page from Egg to Chick</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>&quot;How a chicken grows&quot;</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Ordering experience through relational processes</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Levels &amp; ranks in Sinclair &amp; Coulthard's system of classroom discourse analysis</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Outline of a tri-stratal systemic functional grammar with central systems on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 Language in relation to its connotative semiotics: register and genre .................. 633
8.4 The EXCHANGE system network .......... 635
8.5 Possible sequencing moves in exchange structures generated by the EXCHANGE system network .................................................. 639
8.6 The schematic structure potential of the writing planning genre: from language for reflection on experience towards language for action ........................................... 719
9.1 A Page from the Initial Reading Program at Normanbury ................................................. 743
A note on notational conventions

1) Wherever a technical term is introduced for the first time it is indicated by using the upper case e.g. REGISTER.
2) Wherever a system is referred to the upper case is also used e.g. TRANSITIVITY SYSTEM.
3) Elements of schematic structure of a genre are always written with a capital letter e.g. Morning News Nomination.
4) The notations [] indicate that a clause is embedded.
4) Various symbols employed to indicate the manner of operation of the schematic structures of different genres are explained in the research paper at the points where they are used.
1 Towards an educational linguistics

1.1 Introduction

The study reported here attempts to make a contribution to the development of an educational linguistics by drawing upon systemic linguistic theory to address educational questions. In one sense such an enterprise might be described as an exercise in applied linguistics, though for a number of important reasons, we will reject such a description. In fact, our object is to argue for the recognition of a new study in teacher education - one in which language and its role in the structuring and maintenance of human experience becomes a major focus of study, informing the professional preparation of teachers in a number of ways, and providing principled bases upon which teachers may intervene in promoting the growth of their students in language and hence in learning generally.

In a sense, interest in language in education has had quite a long history, and while acknowledging this fact, we wish to argue that in proposing the development of a new educational linguistics, we seek to adopt somewhat different perspectives from many of the perspectives of the past. In the immediately recent past - say, over the last 20 - 30 years - interest among English language educators in all English-speaking countries has caused a veritable upsurge of research, writing and teaching about language and its role in personal development and learning, much of which has been useful in that it has served to heighten teachers' awareness of language, and of its importance in their students' learning. However, the recent movements of interest in language have been limited in at least two important senses. Firstly, they have not on the whole developed a suitably functional and rigorous grasp of grammar with which both to guide teaching practice and to teach students about language.
Secondly, recent developments in language education have too often failed to take seriously the nature of language as a social phenomenon, fundamentally involved in the collective shaping of experience in many ways. While in this chapter we shall have something more to say about these matters, we shall also take them up again in chapter 4, where we intend to address some major themes in language education and curriculum theory generally, especially since the 1960's.

In the more distant past, certainly back to the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, provision of an education in what had once been called the "vernacular," but had slowly become identified as English, became more commonplace. The nineteenth century elementary schools of England, like those of North America and the Australian colonies, were intended to teach basic literacy as well as numeracy and a little "general knowledge" of a kind useful for working people. Teacher training became better established and regularised as the nineteenth century proceeded. The principles it proposed with respect to developing competence in the English language found expression both in the many teacher training manuals of the period, and in the many school grammars, readers, spelling books and aids to composition produced as well (See Christie, 1976, 1981, for detailed discussion of these developments; also Christie, in press).

While a great deal might be said about the shortcomings and limitations of the principles of English teaching involved and about the view of literacy adopted in particular, such matters are really outside the scope of this study, and we will confine ourselves here to making two general observations about the older practices of the past, in particular as they found expression in the nineteenth century. Firstly, we shall note that the older tradition did, first of all, identify "English" as of concern, not "language," and that in our view, the late twentieth century adoption of the latter term is most
desirable, linked as its use tends to be to an enhanced appreciation of language and its role in human development. Secondly, we shall note that in a manner consistent with an extremely old tendency in western intellectual traditions, ability in the English language was seen as something apart from ability in other areas of human growth, most notably in thinking and cognitive growth generally. In this tradition, language was important for "communication", where the notion involved was that language "gave expression" to the thoughts and meanings one might have, and which one had developed by means independent of the processes of using language. In this tradition of thinking, language is a "conduit" (Reddy, 1979), and hence an essentially neutral phenomenon which merely "carries meanings" of various kinds. It is a tradition which is with us yet in many quarters, not uniquely educational ones, though it has had particularly unfortunate consequences for educational practices.

Such a tradition, for example, has encouraged teachers to view abilities in language - especially in literacy - as a matter of so many "skills" to be mastered in the service of "giving expression to" thoughts, meanings and ideas. This has therefore meant that teachers have focussed upon such aspects of the written language as spelling, the parts of speech, the syntax of the written sentence and punctuation, to the exclusion of a concern with meaning. Spelling, punctuation and the organisation of the written English sentence are all of importance to the learner, but they should be understood merely as features of a primary concern with the use of language for the construction of meanings of many kinds. The tradition which dissociates language and meaning has crucially deskilled teachers, for, possessed themselves of no powerful insights into the nature of language and its critical role in the articulation of meaning, they have necessarily lacked appropriate resources with which to guide their students' learning.
As we have noted elsewhere (Christie, 1984A; in press), the tradition by which language on the one hand and thinking on the other are dissociated, is part of the wider tendency in western intellectual practices of creating dichotomies of many kinds, all of them immensely harmful in education: "form" is contrasted with "function" or alternatively with "content", "process" is contrasted with "product", normally with unhappy results. Another, and perhaps less immediately familiar manifestation of the same tendency is the conventional view of the individual, much prized in the western tradition, including the western tradition of education. Much conventional educational wisdom, authorised especially by developments in educational psychology dating from the early years of this century, has made a great deal of the need to respect "individual differences" among students in schools, and of the requirement that educational practices should promote persons as individuals. (See Connell, 1980, passim) Individuality in this tradition is a matter of the expression of innate, inner and privately developed capacities and characteristics, and the usual advice to teachers for the development of such individuality in their students (e.g. Dixon, 1967) focuses considerably more upon respect for such individuality than it does upon the manner in which this individuality is either developed or has its being. In other words, a dichotomy of another kind is advanced in the conventional western view of the individual as "private being" on the one hand, and on the other hand, the "outer world" of affairs in which he or she must participate.

We would suggest while there is a sense in which all persons do have an "inner self" and/or private identity, the relationship between it and the "outer world" is not clearcut and absolute, but fluid and ever changing. As Firth (1968, 199)¹ puts it:

---

¹ A paper originally published in 1957.
The human body is that region of the world which is
the primary field of human experience but it is
continuous with the rest of the world. We are in the
world and the world is in us.

In particular, we would argue that the conventional view of the
individual significantly fails in that it does not address questions of
how persons achieve their individuality through the critical processes
of interaction with others. Personality, like cognition, is not to be
understood as something "within the head", as it were, while social
interaction is understood as of the "outer world" of dealing with
others, so that only a passing relationship between the two is actually
conceived. On the contrary, we would suggest that since persons
achieve individuality in and through complex social processes, it is
upon the latter that we need to focus in educational theory in order
successfully to understand the nature of the individual the
educational processes are concerned to develop.

Any serious attempt to come to terms with the social processes in
which persons engage must come to terms with language. This latter
observation has particular relevance for education, since educational
enterprise as we know it is inconceivable other than as an activity
taking place in language. Like Halliday (1978a) we shall suggest that
language is a "social semiotic" - a primary resource for the
articulation of experience and the realisation of meaning. It is
because of the central role of language in human experience that it is
also central in all aspects of teaching and learning. It is in this sense
that we need in teacher education an educational linguistics, one
which, as we have written elsewhere, "places linguistic study firmly
at the heart of educational enquiry" (Christie, 1989a).

More than one tradition of linguistic research might well contribute
to the development of an educational linguistics, though we shall
argue the particular value of the contribution of systemic linguistics.
Both in the light of having developed programs for working with
teachers using systemic linguistics, and in the light of the particular
study reported here, the researcher would wish to claim the special strengths and values of systemic linguistics to educational enquiry. Indeed, the whole investigation presented in this study represents an attempt to demonstrate the values of systemic linguistic methods of enquiry to education. We undertake such an attempt specifically in the context of examining certain aspects of early childhood education, though by using this particular example, we also wish to argue the relevance of systemic linguistic perspectives to an examination of any area of educational practice.

There are several senses we shall suggest in which systemic linguistics has strengths to offer educational research and practice. Firstly, systemic linguistics focuses attention upon language as a social institution. In this view language is a resource with which we build and shape experience, and it takes the form it does because it has evolved to serve important social goals. The very grammar of a language is itself a tool for meaning-making, for as Halliday (1987, 616) has put it, "the central processing unit of language is grammar." To study grammar in the functional terms he proposes is thus to uncover the ways in which a linguistic system is deployed to build social reality. Secondly, the grammar of a language is to be thought of in terms of system or choice: to use language is to exercise choices - albeit not conscious ones - to realise different kinds of meanings. Thirdly, since language is to be understood as a resource and as an institution, powerfully involved in the building of meanings, an understanding of the manner in which it works opens up the possibilities of intervention in various social processes, including educational ones, with a view to changing them.

Much of the rest of this chapter will be devoted to offering a discussion of systemic linguistic theory and some of the influences upon its emergence from other traditions in the social sciences. While this discussion will necessarily be relatively brief and general, we aim to say enough to explain the theory, including most crucially
its view of language as a social institution, its particular conception of
the relationship of text and context, its view of grammar in functional
terms, and, relatedly, its notion of language in terms of system or
choice. In developing the discussion, we shall seek both to suggest
ways in which such a model of language is relevant to an educational
linguistics, and to suggest points of similarity and difference with
work that has been done in employing other linguistic perspectives
to examine educational questions. In addition, as the discussion
proceeds, we shall indicate some of the directions to be taken in the
study reported in the subsequent chapters. Specifically, in the
following sections of this chapter, we aim to do the following:

1) examine the notion of
language as a social institution,
showing something of its
emergence in systemic
linguistic theory, and the
contribution to it of certain
other social theories;

2) examine the systemic
linguistic view of language as
system or choice, and develop
an overview of the systemic
functional grammar Halliday has
proposed;

3) introduce the notions of
genre and register as they will
be used in this study, showing
their relationship to the
systemic functional grammar, as
well as commenting briefly upon
some differing interpretations of the two notions;

4) argue the relevance of the systemic functional grammar to an emergent educational linguistics, providing as it does a rigorous tool with which both to understand educational processes, and to intervene in and change the nature of such processes, where that is desirable;

5) suggest, inter alia, that a theoretically rigorous approach to language education of the kind provided by systemic linguistics will afford teachers a set of new principles for planning curriculum. Such a set of principles will (i) hold an appropriate concern for the manner in which different fields of knowledge are generated and organised in language, and (ii) see the young as initiates, actually involved in learning their culture.
1.2 Language as a social institution

In adopting a view of language as a social phenomenon, systemic linguistic theory allies itself rather more with certain traditions of ethnography, sociology and semiotic theory than it does with many more orthodox traditions of linguistics. Indeed, among the theorists influential originally in Firth's work as well as in Halliday's, was the ethnographer, Malinowski. Interested in the problems of interpreting and explaining the activities of the people of the Trobriand Islands whom he studied, and finding that he needed in fact to explain a great deal of the context in which language was used before anyone unfamiliar might make sense of it, Malinowski initially coined the term CONTEXT OF SITUATION (1923), though he later (1935) developed the additional term CONTEXT OF CULTURE. Where the former refers to the specific context in which language is used, the latter refers to the wider sense of the culture in which that particular context of situation is found. Fundamental to the insights that Malinowski offered, then, was the sense that language is to be understood in terms of its relationship both to a culture and to a particular context within that culture. It is an understanding which has profoundly important consequences for one's appreciation of a great deal else about language as well, including a great deal of relevance to education.

For example, as Malinowski pointed out, such a perspective suggests that meaning is to be understood as something socially created and sustained in social activity. This was a view whose implications ran counter to a great deal of conventional wisdom in linguistic enquiry. It pointed to a very different view of what might constitute the objects of linguistic research, as well as to appropriate ways of undertaking this research, of the kind for example, which interested Firth (1968) in a paper titled "Linguistic analysis as a study of

2 Though this paper was published in 1968, it was apparently written in 1952 or 1953.
meaning". There, Firth argued that while some linguists still subscribed to a centuries-old tradition, part philosophical, part logico-grammatical, whose concerns were with words and sentences "as if they somehow could have meanings in and by themselves", the proper object of linguistics should be "the handling of speech events." Such speech events, he went on, were to be understood as:

interlocked not only with an environment of particular sights and sounds, but deeply embedded in the living processes of persons maintaining themselves in society. (Firth, 1968, 12-13)

To subscribe to such a view of the object of linguistic research is in turn to subscribe to a particular conception of the person, and, by implication at least, to propose an associated social theory. In such a social theory the conception of the person is very different from that of the independent and private individual which, in section 1.1 above, we have suggested has had a well established place in the traditions of western thought. Moreover, the social theory involved offers the possibility of explaining a great deal of the nature of human experience, and of the manner in which human beings build such experience. Finally, the social theory allows the possibility of intervention in the processes of human experience in helpful ways. This is extremely important to educational practices, suggesting significant perspectives upon the manner in which persons learn in social processes, and hence potentially pointing to the development of powerful new learning theories.

Much of the character of the social theory to which Firth was generally pointing was developed, for example, by sociologists such as Berger and Luckman (1966), Berger and Kellner (1970) and anthropologists like Douglas (1973). Berger and Luckman, in a book significantly titled The Social Construction of Reality developed a view of human experience as something shaped in interaction, and a principal resource they identified as both facilitating and mediating such interaction was language. Like Bernstein, whose work we will
refer to later in this section, Berger and Luckman were unusual among sociologists in that they took language seriously in the social organisation and structuring of experience, and the influence of their work lay behind Halliday's Learning How to Mean (1975), in itself a seminal volume in the steady development of the latter's conception of language as a social semiotic.

In proposing that language is a social semiotic Halliday has suggested that it is language which is the principal resource with which persons build meaning. Language is a symbolic system with which persons "sign" (Halliday, 1985b, 4-9), though it is not to be understood in any idealised sense as independent of the other signing systems which human beings use (Halliday, in Halliday & Hasan, 1985, 3-4). Language has evolved, Halliday argues, in the service of human needs and purposes, and it must therefore be understood very much in functional terms: that is to say, we must focus on how people use language in order to understand its true significance as a resource which is systematically employed to build and transmit "the essential patterns of the culture", where these include, among other things "systems of knowledge, value systems, (and) the social structure" (Halliday, 1974a, 99).

Such a proposition is crucially important in at least two interrelated senses: partly in the sense of what it suggests of language as an institution, and partly in the sense of what it suggests of the role of language in the developing child. Halliday's initial interest in early language development (1969; 1975) cut across a period in which a number of other researchers were examining young children's language development or "acquisition", as they often called it, many of them very much influenced by Chomsky's model of language. Good introductions to these studies were, for example provided in Smith and Miller (1969) and Bar-Adon and Leopold (eds.) (1971). In general, these studies examined such matters as emergent control of phonology, morphology and syntax. In proposing his interpretation
of language development, Halliday was concerned to indicate how markedly his proposals differed from these studies. His was overwhelmingly a concern with the manner in which in learning language children also learn their culture: that is to say, they learn language as a necessary aspect of learning "how to mean" for the purposes of participation in their culture.

However, important though he certainly saw his work to be as a response to the work of other researchers examining pre-school language development, Halliday's proposition that the learning of language involved the learning of a meaning system had a much wider significance, directly relating to and illuminating his conception of language as a social institution. Language is both an instrument of socialisation, he argues, in the sense that with it we build and make sense of experience, and itself a social institution, functioning in systematic ways in the service of important social ends. According to Halliday, then, the character of language simply cannot be understood unless this fundamental appreciation is built into any description or account of language that may be offered. In this sense, therefore, Halliday's observations with respect to the significance of early language learning are quite fundamentally a part of the total linguistic theory he has proposed. Thus, the conventional distinction between theoretical and applied studies in linguistics - at least with respect to early child language development - simply does not hold, though Halliday is in general not persuaded of the value of such distinctions.

Halliday's linguistic theory is itself a social theory, seeking in collaboration with certain other twentieth century traditions in both the social and the biological sciences, to interpret and explain the nature of human experience in new ways - ways which offer both the possibility of understanding ourselves afresh, and, potentially, the possibility of achieving some control over the directions taken in the course of human affairs. It is because of this that at least one writer (McKellar, 1987, 528) has suggested that history will ultimately
judge Halliday as having made a major contribution to human knowledge, specifically to "the emergent reinterpretation of human nature".

All this has great significance for education, suggesting as we have already indicated above a view of persons shaped in social processes, including educational processes. In an important and quite profound sense, an educational process is an initiation into one's culture and its ways of meanings. Indeed, in the view of the present writer the most important proposition Halliday has ever offered education is that which says "learning language is learning how to mean". Such a proposition has consequences both for teaching and learning, and ultimately, as suggested above, for the development of a new theory of learning, richer in many ways than the various learning theories which twentieth century educational psychology has so far proposed. In particular, the view of learning involved suggests - indeed, requires - that we adopt an interventionist model of the teaching process, such that teachers are encouraged to see their role as actively guiding the directions their students take in learning. Much conventional educational psychology, in that it proposes the presence of "inner" capacities, would see the teacher's role at most as that of "facilitator" of the learning process, or sometimes as that of "setting up the conditions" necessary for learning. A socially relevant educational linguistics, in that it sees the very deep connection between what children learn to do in language, and what their life opportunities and circumstances dispose them to learn to do, can be quite liberating. That is because a functional grammar of the kind we are proposing should be developed in an educational linguistics, offers a means of explaining the ways meanings are built in language. It thus allows teachers to intervene in their students' learning in an effective manner, and to change the quality of learning available to their students. The kind of learning theory we have in mind, incidentally, would in fact adopt perspectives very much closer to those of Vygotsky (1934) and Luria (1976) than to those of the more...
familiar paradigms associated with educational practice, whether the latter are those of Piaget (e.g. 1954) or of Skinner (e.g. 1953), both of whom have been influential in western education for some years now. Butt (1985) has recently provided an interesting discussion of the manner in which the perspectives of systemic linguistics can be related to the perspectives of Luria in particular.

A linguistically based learning theory of the kind we propose is emerging from systemic linguistic research will challenge much twentieth century educational theory, especially with respect to the nature of childhood and to the manner in which it is claimed young children ideally learn. Various educational theories have been proposed in the twentieth century and been influential in Australian schools in the last 20 to 30 years. Some for example, have tended to stress the values of "enquiry learning", others the importance of "stages of learning", while others still have proposed "language experience approaches" to learning. Briefly, we shall suggest that twentieth century educational theories of the kind influential in our schools in Australia have tended to have the effect of demanding too little of young children. Such a problem is itself born of the dichotomies in our cultural traditions alluded to earlier. We refer to the dichotomies created where a distinction is made between language and learning, or between language and "content", or between the "unique individual" and the "outer world". Where a more intimate relationship was acknowledged between these things, then our learning theories would focus the more directly upon the dynamic processes in which persons must engage in order to learn, and upon the substance and the quality of what it is that they should learn. That is to say, not only would the model of learning be more truly interactionist, but it would also take much more seriously the cause of knowledge itself, and the manner in which knowledge is constructed. As it is, much contemporary early childhood educational practice, we shall argue, actually delays young children's opportunity to engage with worthwhile knowledge, on the grounds
that they must instead be encouraged to engage in various "learning processes" and enquiry and/or play activities of a rather general kind, more remarkable for their tendency to perpetuate children's relatively "commonsense" or local knowledge of the world than to enhance or change it.

We have observed that Halliday has little use for distinctions between theoretical and applied studies in linguistics and in this he has not been alone. In fact one notable American theorist, namely Dell Hymes, while working with a somewhat different theoretical framework with respect to language, has argued the relevance of linguistic studies to educational concerns, and conversely, the fundamental value to linguistic enquiry of an examination of the role of language in education. Much influenced himself by the tradition of American linguistics associated with Sapir (e.g. 1963), and writing in a context in which the paradigms associated with Chomsky (1957; 1965) had become quite dominant, Hymes (1974, vii) argued the need for a sociolinguistics to:

change the practice of linguistics and other disciplines, because their present practice perpetuates a fragmented, incomplete understanding of humanity.

Sociolinguistics, so conceived, he went on, would lead to a new assessment of the "place of language in human life." Elsewhere (Cazden, John & Hymes, 1972, xviii), addressing questions of classroom language research, he wrote that language "must be studied in its social context, in terms of its organization to serve social ends", and a little later:

The problem of the functions of language in the classroom is a challenge and an opportunity for the advancement of linguistics itself. Studying language in the classroom is not really "applied linguistics"; it is really basic research. (Hymes' emphasis) (Hymes, 1972, xviii)
Working in what he called the ethnography of communication, Hymes proposed a number of principles for studying the role of language in functional terms, and his work has proved influential among other scholars such as Cazden (1972; 1986; 1987; 1988) and Heath (1983). Other American researchers interested in developing related sociolinguistic and/or ethnographic perspectives upon the study of educational practices have included Mehan (1974; 1979), who, working with Cazden (1988) in the junior primary school, sought to understand the ways in which behaviour is structured and organised in classrooms, including in language. Shuy (1976; 1979a; 1979b), who was also interested in classroom learning, became concerned with what sociolinguistic research might say about reading and about the language of testing. Cicourel et al (1974) sought to examine language use in the early years of schooling, and the complexity of factors influencing children's performance. Lemke (1983; 1985), in an ethnographic study examining the practices of teaching and learning science in the secondary school, sought to explain both the manner in which teaching and learning occurred, and the very variable patterns of success enjoyed by different students: the study took him into an examination of the ways language in particular was used to order and realise what was done. Heath (1983) produced a major study based upon some 10 years' observation of very different social groups in two communities. The study involved examining patterns of socialisation of the young, including patterns of language use, and investigating the implications of such patterns for subsequent performance in school classrooms. More recently, Green and Kantor-Martin (1988) have studied the systematic ways in which the experience of the junior primary classroom is structured, where this necessarily includes examination of patterns of language.

The study we shall be reporting in this dissertation will have several points of contact with the work of the American researchers we have just quickly identified. Reference will again be made to the work of several of them both in chapter 5 (section 5.3) (where we
shall introduce our notion of the WRITING PLANNING GENRE, as a notion useful for understanding the manner in which classroom experience is organised), and again in chapter 8 (section 8.2) (where we shall examine CONVERSATION STRUCTURE in the writing planning genre). Like many American classroom ethnographers and/or sociolinguists, we shall be concerned with the manner in which experience is structured in the classroom, and we shall in particular be interested in the role language has to play in so structuring experience.

American researchers such as Hymes and the younger generation of ethnographers and sociolinguists whom he has influenced have all been concerned to focus upon issues of language in use, and to explore the manner in which language mediates experience in a number of ways. In this sense, their work has been often usefully related to that of Halliday and others who use systemic linguistics. Hymes in fact advanced a functional model of the relationship of language to context (1967), which compares in many ways with Halliday's view of this relationship, as the latter discusses this in terms of REGISTER, a term to be considered below in section 1.3.

What makes the work of Halliday different from that of the American sociolinguists and ethnographers of communication, however, is that Halliday's model of grammar - or of the lexicogrammar, as he prefers to call it - is of a quite distinctive character, such that he proposes a very intimate relationship of grammar and experience. As already noted above, language is understood as a social semiotic, actually involved like other semiotic systems, in the building of reality. Its grammar is the basic tool with which reality is constructed. We shall discuss such matters below more fully in section 1.3, where we shall examine the systemic functional model of grammar more closely.
Before turning to that section, we should make brief mention of some British researchers whose research interests in language have had some influence in language education over the last few years, though we shall suggest that what they have had to say departs in quite significant ways from the general theoretical position adopted by Halliday. In addition, in this our opening review of some major themes in the development of a model of language as a social institution, we should refer to the major influence upon Halliday's work of the sociology of Bernstein.

Among the British researchers influential in adopting new orientations upon language over the last 20 years probably the single most influential of them has been Britton (1970; Britton et al, 1975), who together with his colleagues at the London Institute of Education, such as Rosen (1973) and Nancy Martin (Martin et al, 1976) has investigated the role of language in learning, both in talk and in writing. Like their equally influential colleagues from other British institutions, Dixon (1967; 1975; 1985) and Barnes (Barnes et al, 1971; 1976; Barnes & Todd, 1977; Barnes et al, 1986), these researchers are not linguists, and indeed, most are openly sceptical about the value of linguistics to educational enquiry. There is no question, however, that their work, dating from the late 1960's on has been very significant in research and discussion about language education, in Australia as well as Britain, and that such work, particularly in the early 1970's, served to give renewed energy and drive to teachers exploring language.

The influence of their work in Australia has been matched, incidentally, by the influence of several American researchers, including Kenneth Goodman (e.g.1982, 1986), Frank Smith (e.g.1973, 1975, 1982), Harste (e.g Harste, Woodward and Burke, 1984a & 1984b; Harste and Short, 1988), and Moffett (1968; 1981a; 1981b) all of them interested in language and what have been referred to as "language experience" and/or "whole language"
approaches to learning language in general and reading and writing in particular. Since we intend to examine the impact of the ideas of both these British and American researchers rather more fully in chapter 4, we do not intend to say more about them here. We shall observe only that a general and important problem in the work of the British group in particular (who have always, incidentally, held differences of opinion about many questions) has been the significant absence of a social dimension to their theorising, so that many of the strengths of the perspectives represented by Hymes and others, or of Halliday and his colleagues, have been lacking. To these matters we shall return in the discussion of chapter 4, where, in section 4.2 in particular, we shall take up in some detail consideration of the concept of the unique individual as conceived in the work of Britton and others, and the problems for educational practice apparent in such a concept.

More recent work in Britain by researchers such as Walkerdine (1982), drawing upon the semiotic theories of Foucault among others, has done much to address questions of the social, and of the social construction of experience, in ways much closer to the preoccupations of the systemic linguistic framework. Other recent British work, intended to build social perspectives upon our general understandings of language use in schools, has included that of Mercer and Edwards (1981) and Edwards and Mercer (1987) who are psychologists. Edwards and Mercer are concerned to chart new perspectives upon classroom psychology, so that they focus upon the social organisation of knowledge and experience, rather than upon the traditional interests of psychology with individual differences, and the development of individuals, conceived as somewhat isolated beings, and following developmental paths in independent ways. In proposing these perspectives, Edwards and Mercer take up concerns with the study of classroom discourse, and they draw on areas of enquiry outside the traditional concerns of psychology. They argue for a new appreciation of the manner in
which experience and knowledge are constructed and shaped in the shared and essentially social enterprise of building discourse. Their work has proved helpful in many ways, providing useful support for many of the perspectives drawn rather more directly from sociolinguistic and/or linguistic research of the kind involved in this study.

Stubbs (1976; Stubbs & Delamont, 1976; 1983; 1986) is another recent British researcher who has sought to explore language in education, in his case drawing upon linguistic research. His publication of 1986 is actually called *Educational Linguistics*, suggesting that he has interests in common with the present writer. This particular volume, while it does acknowledge some debt to Halliday's research, does not make any direct use of systemic linguistics, especially with respect to the grammar, and a reading of the book indicates that Stubbs is reasonably eclectic in his choices of the sources in linguistic research on which he draws to develop his account of an educational linguistics. He is of course entitled to be eclectic in the choices he makes from linguistic theory to inform educational practice.

Indeed quite a lot of others interested in educational research are also eclectic, drawing upon studies like psychology or sociology for example, and applying what they take to educational issues. However, we would suggest that Stubbs' volume suffers because it is hard to find an overall theme or set of theoretically linked practices emerging from the book: the eclecticism, in other words, robs his book of any coherent and unified vision of its own. In this respect, his book is in fact about the application of several strands in linguistic research to educational questions, and not in our view a statement about an educational linguistics at all. We would argue that both Hymes and Halliday do considerably better, because both take a coherent theoretical view about language, and pursue a number of its consequences for educational enquiry. For our purposes in this study, we wish to
articulate an educational linguistics which is theoretically coherent and, hopefully, rigorous.

Such an educational linguistics we shall suggest in this study will, firstly, examine how the meanings characteristic of educational practices are constructed, employing a functionally motivated grammar to do so. Secondly, we shall argue, since such an activity will bring to consciousness a great deal of the processes in which we structure and organise experience in schools, it will enable us to move on deliberately to plan for, and build, the kinds of educational experiences we would wish to see in our schools in future.

To turn to the influence of Bernstein in Halliday's work, this has been important, since as Halliday has noted more than once, Bernstein has been unusual among sociologists interested in education, in that he has always taken seriously the role of language in the ordering of experience. As a young school teacher in London in the early 1960's, Bernstein was early unhappy at the manner in which so many working class students failed in schools. Their failure was regularly explained in terms that suggested that they did not have the intelligence or sometimes the "aptitude" (Bissaret, 1979) to do well at school, while middle class children were held to be more often possessed of these qualities. Such a notion, which had emerged in the latter half of the nineteenth century, was based upon a belief in:

> a spontaneous distribution of capacities according to a natural and ultimately biological order. (Hodgins, 1988, 11)

The attempt to find ways of explaining how and why working class children failed led Bernstein to begin to explore the language use of working class and middle class children, and this attempt in turn led him to seek out sympathetic linguists such as Halliday and Hasan (1973), who might offer ways into examining language in productive ways.
Much of the early work of Bernstein and his colleagues into language was to be found in *Class, Codes and Control*, Volumes 1 (1971a; Rev. Ed., 1973a) 2, (1973b) and 3 (1975). A distinction Bernstein originally made between a "public language" associated with working class children and a "formal language", associated with middle class children led to the development of his two terms "restricted" and "elaborated codes." (1973a, 76-117) Elaborated codes were the codes rewarded and promoted in schools, and children not oriented to uses of elaborated codes were significantly disadvantaged in school learning, he argued. The two might be defined, he wrote:

> on a linguistic level, in terms of the probability of predicting for any one speaker which syntactic elements will be used to organize meaning. In the case of an elaborated code, the speaker will select from a relatively extensive range of alternatives and therefore the probability of predicting the pattern of organizing elements is considerably reduced. In the case of a restricted code the number of these alternatives is often severely limited and the probability of predicting the pattern is greatly increased. (Bernstein, 1973b, 76-77)

The purest form of a restricted code would be one where the lexicon was wholly predictable, as for example in many religious services, though in practice most restricted codes were a little less predictable than that. In most examples, the lexicon would vary from one instance to another, "but in all cases it is drawn from a narrow range" (1973b, 77). Such codes were produced in social forms most generally characterised by:

> some common set of closely shared identifications self-consciously held by the members, where immediacy of the relationship is stressed. (1973b, 77).

Restricted codes would be found, for example, among groups of children, criminal sub-cultures, "married couples of long standing", and any others used to operating together in close circumstances. Non-verbal components of communication would always be important
in such groups as indicating a great deal of what was meant at any
time. Such codes would tend:

to be impersonal in that the speech is not specially
prepared to fit a particular referent. How things are
sold rather than what is said, becomes important. The
intent of the speaker may be taken for granted.
Finally, the content of the speech is likely to be
concrete, descriptive and narrative rather than
analytical and abstract. (1973b, 78)

Since the function of the restricted code was to reinforce the social
relationship as "warm and inclusive" it restricted "the verbal
signalling of individuated responses."

The elaborated code, by contrast, developed in social relationships
where persons felt some pressure or need to operate as individuals
and to select from their linguistic resources language which did
identify specific referents. Thus, where the restricted code became
a means of facilitating "social" symbols, the elaborated code facilitated
"individuated" symbols. (1973b, 78)

What Bernstein went on to argue was that the elaborated code
became "a facility for transmitting individuated verbal responses"
(1973b, 132), and that the kinds of capacities to learn - Halliday
would say capacities to "mean" - enjoyed by those using elaborated
codes are of a very different order from those enjoyed by those using
restricted codes. Quite crucial to the hypothesis that he went on to
develop was the notion that the child using the elaborated code
learns to orient himself or herself in terms of making meanings
through verbal means, and he went on:

An elaborated code, through its regulation, induces
developmentally in its speakers an expectation of
separateness and difference from others. It points to
the possibilities inherent in a complex conceptual
hierarchy for the organization of experience. (1973b,
133)
If the general argument is accepted, then children who are oriented to use of the elaborated code will adjust the more readily to the particular demands of an educational experience of the kind offered in our schools, especially to the ways of organising intellectual enquiry characteristic of the various school "subjects", while those not oriented to such codes will experience disadvantage.

Bernstein was at some pains to point out that neither code was any better than the other, though society might well place different values on the orders of experience involved in each:

Clearly one code is not better than another; each possesses its own aesthetic, its own possibilities. Society, however, may place different values on the orders of experience elicited, maintained and progressively strengthened through the different coding systems. (1973b, 135)

We have quoted at some length from Bernstein here, because he has been seriously misrepresented since his work first began to appear. (e.g. Labov, 1969; Rosen, 1973; Stubbs, 1976, 1983) While a careful reading of what he has written makes it clear that he has not proposed that those who use restricted codes are "less intelligent" than those who use the elaborated code, that is a proposition that has sometimes been attributed to him. Such confusions arise, incidentally, in situations where persons are not understood as functioning in social processes, but are instead understood as having abilities and aptitudes of a wholly "inner" character, which are not subject to development in social contexts.

An Australian variant of the same kind of problem arises quite frequently in discussions of Aboriginal education. Harris (1980) has proposed that traditional Aboriginal people have "cognitive styles" different from those of whites, and of a kind not easily accommodated in the terms of western schooling: it is because of this, he believes, that Aboriginal children have had a fairly consistent history of failure in schools. But Harris has been attacked from time
to time, on the grounds that he appears to suggest a "cognitive deficiency" in Aboriginal people - a suggestion, needless to say, that he strongly denies.

While Bernstein never did propose that all working class families used restricted codes and all middle class families used elaborated codes, or that the two were associated with non-standard dialects on the one hand and standard dialects on the other, he was so heard by some people. In a recent review of the development of his thinking on codes from 1958 to 1986 (Bernstein, 1987), he has been able to show that those who did attribute such propositions to him did so at the expense of a very selective reading of his work. He did, however, suggest that the restricted codes were more commonly a feature of working class children than of middle class children, while the latter more commonly used elaborated codes, though they also used restricted codes as well. The middle class children thus benefited in that they could operate with both codes and with the orientations to experience that both conferred. What is clear, and Bernstein does acknowledge this, is that his attempts to find rigorous linguistic measures of the two codes largely eluded him in the 1960's. He turned instead to work on specifying as explicitly as possible features of the various contexts and power relationships in terms of which codes operate, and in the light of that work he has written recently that:

a code is a regulative principle, tacitly acquired, which selects and integrates relevant meanings, forms of realisations and evoking contexts. (1987)

As this definition suggests, the most appropriate sense in which to understand Bernstein's notion of codes is in terms of a principle operating at very deep levels of experience, and positioning or orienting persons in terms of "fundamental sets of relationships within and between fields of cultural signification." (Atkinson, 1985, 82)
Bernstein’s notions of codes are linked to his concerns with the manner in which a society transmits educational knowledge, and the differential distribution of such knowledge to the various social classes or groups (1971b). He argues that educational failure is in a deep sense linguistic failure, as Halliday (1969) observed some years ago. Halliday (1986) has recently noted that at this distance of time there is much in the methodology employed by Bernstein in the 1960's that might be criticised, but that that in no way detracts from the major contribution he has made, or the continuing value of his insights to the work of scholars such as himself. He might have added that Bernstein’s early attempts to find ways of identifying the linguistic resources which realised the restricted and elaborated codes foundered because at the time there was simply no model for examining language sufficiently delicate to do justice to such a complex task, and that his recently published An Introduction to Functional Grammar (1985) does provide such a model. Hasan’s research project (1986a; 1986b; 1987), which makes use of Halliday’s systemic functional grammar, promises to do much towards providing at least some of the evidence needed properly to test Bernstein’s hypotheses.

It should perhaps be noted at this stage that the study to be reported in this thesis does not claim to make any contribution to the development of Bernstein’s theory with respect to providing evidence for the presence of elaborated and restricted codes in different social groups. Our primary purpose in drawing attention to his work has been to demonstrate its general relevance to a view of language as a social institution, and to establish that in the development of Halliday’s own work, Bernstein has made a major contribution. In addition, however, what we have said of Bernstein’s work and its theoretical problems serves to demonstrate quite cogently at least some of the social questions to which Halliday would hope his work in linguistics will help provide answers. If indeed, as Halliday argues, language operates in systematic ways for the
realisation of socially significant meanings of many kinds, then he actually requires a grammar to prove the point. And if, as Bernstein suggests, persons learn to use language to create different orders of meanings, themselves a function of the operation of different social groups, and as such differentially rewarded and valued in society, then we are entitled to expect that an appropriately sensitive grammar will provide the methodological tools with which to support his claim. As research activities of the kind in which Hasan is currently engaged begin to bear fruit, we may expect to see advancement not only of linguistic theory generally, but potentially of educational linguistics as well.

Bernstein's work on codes is itself intimately linked to his views on the transmission of knowledge and on the curriculum and pedagogy of schools, and about these we shall need to say a little, because of their relevance to matters argued later in this study. In particular, we need to refer to his notions of classification and framing (1971b) and of the pedagogic discourse (1986). Both are very much bound up with Bernstein's theories of the curriculum, and with the manner in which he argues schools operate for the transmission of knowledge. We will first consider classification and framing.

The notion of classification relates to the manner in which the curriculum is organised. (1971b, 49-50) Clearly, any educational institution needs to make decisions about the principles by which the knowledge taught in schools is to be selected and organised. An orthodox pattern by which the curriculum is organised in the secondary school, for example, identifies various "subjects" or "disciplines", such as the sciences, the social sciences, mathematics and languages. Schools operating with "strong classification" divide the curriculum up in ways that separate these subjects, and the subject specialists involved in teaching them have little to do with each other. Where strong classification applies, then, the boundaries between subjects are marked.
The term framing, on the other hand, refers to "the strength of the boundary between what may be transmitted and what may not be transmitted, in the pedagogical relationship" (Bernstein, 1971b, 50). Where framing is strong, then teacher and taught have relatively few options in what they do; where it is weak, they have considerable freedom and scope in the options they take up in teaching and learning. These matters established, Bernstein went on to argue the kinds of pedagogies which applied, and he distinguished a visible and an invisible pedagogy (1975, 116). A visible pedagogy applied where both classification and framing were strong, because the criteria for transmission of knowledge were explicit. An invisible pedagogy applied, on the other hand, where both classification and framing were weak, and the criteria for transmission of knowledge were implicit.

We would suggest that twentieth century educational practice, inspired in part by the influence of the American educationist Dewey (e.g.1915) and others like him, has tended to favour the development of a curriculum based upon weak classification and framing; that is because it has sought to focus upon the "unique child" and his or her learning processes, losing sight both of the social nature of experience and of the principles for organising such experience which fields of enquiry actually represent. Such a development, we would argue, while in itself quite long in its historical emergence, has had particularly marked and unfortunate consequences in education since the 1960's, notable in theory both with respect to the curriculum generally, and with respect to language education. These are matters we shall address in some detail in Chapter 4 (section 4.2 in particular). At this stage, however, we should note that when we earlier referred to what we would argue has been the unsatisfactory tendency of much twentieth century early childhood educational practice to delay children's encounter with significant knowledge, we were actually alluding to some of the results of the loss of a visible pedagogy, in which the criteria for determining what knowledge
should be taught, as well as for monitoring children's learning, have become confused and often lost altogether. In this respect it is worth noting a distinction Bernstein makes between "commonsense" and "uncommonsense" knowledge. The latter, he writes:

"is knowledge freed from the particular, the local, through the various languages of the sciences or forms of reflexiveness of the arts which make possible either the creation or the discovery of new realities. (Bernstein, 1971b, 58)"

"Commonsense" knowledge on the other hand is "the everyday community knowledge of the pupil, his family and his peer group." (1971b, 58) Much contemporary early childhood education, we would argue, seeks to exploit children's "commonsense" and/or immediate and local knowledge, and we suggest this is a sensible principle to employ, provided an effort is made to build with and transform such knowledge as part of the process of building the "uncommonsense" knowledge of schooling. However, in practice, because weak principles of both classification and framing tend to apply these days in early childhood education, in the manner alluded to above, it is too often the case that children are left doing no more than rehearsing the familiar and the commonplace, and not learning to deal with new and "uncommonsense" ways of handling experience. The difficulty is brought about not by teacher apathy or indifference, but because of the particular ideologies of childhood and of knowledge which the wider cultural practices and beliefs concerning these matters dispose them to adopt.

These matters will be of some importance in the examination of early childhood literacy education we intend to pursue in the rest of this thesis. Now it will be relevant to observe, from the point of view of completing some sense of Bernstein's theory, that he suggests the invisible pedagogy, fostered in situations where weak classification and framing apply, is most amenable to the children of the middle class, who are for the most part oriented in terms of the elaborated
code, and hence able to penetrate the kinds of invisible criteria by which school success is actually achieved.

Turning to Bernstein's notion of the pedagogic discourse, he argues that the term refers to:

the rules of specialised communication through which pedagogic subjects are selectively created (1986, 209-210).

His general view is that sociologists of education have tended to pay too little attention to the nature of the specialist discourse of education, looking instead to "other voices" such as class, gender and race, and seeing the pedagogic discourse as merely a vehicle for their expression. One might note in passing that this is yet another manifestation of the "conduit metaphor" - the tendency earlier referred to in our western traditions to create dichotomies of many kinds, deflecting attention from the very semiotic systems in which important meanings come into being.

The interest in the pedagogic discourse for us is that in our examination of early childhood teaching practices, and in particular in our proposal that we may distinguish various "curriculum genres" of early childhood, we will be proposing the operation of a pedagogic discourse, conceived of in somewhat different terms from Bernstein, since we would use the term "discourse" a little differently from him\(^3\), but nonetheless pursuing at least some of the concerns he holds. We will argue that a systemic linguistic approach to the manner in which the discourse of the classroom is constructed is of critical value in understanding both how meanings are made, and the nature of those meanings.

---

\(^3\) Bernstein notes a particular debt to Foucault in his formulation of the pedagogic discourse, and it is in the sense in which the latter uses the term "discourse" that we understand Bernstein to be using it.
Where Bernstein proposes the operation of a pedagogic discourse identifiable in two senses, one of which he calls the "instructional discourse", and the other of which he calls the "regulative discourse", we shall propose the operation of two registers. Of his two senses Bernstein (1986, 210) writes that the instructional discourse is that which "(transmits) specialised competencies and their relation to each other", while the regulative discourse "(creates) specialised order, relation and identity", in such a manner that the instructional discourse is always embedded in the regulative discourse. The competencies to be transmitted - the "content" to be taught, in fact - do not determine the nature of the discourse created overall. On the contrary, since the pedagogic discourse involves a recontextualising principle, he argues, it is this which primarily determines the nature of the discourse created at any time. Educational practice, in other words, takes the discourses of many activities, or fields of enquiry, and relocates them, ordering them in ways deemed relevant to the educational endeavour.

When in chapters 3 (section 3.4) and 5 (section 5.4), in particular we examine the operation of our two registers in early childhood education, we shall argue the presence of a first order register which relates to Bernstein's regulative discourse, and a second order register which relates to his instructional discourse. It will not be appropriate to say more of these matters at this point, since it will first be necessary to turn to the nature of Halliday's systemic functional grammar.

In summary, as we bring this section to a close, we should note that we have sought to argue the following:

1) that the view of language as a social institution, intimately involved in constructing human experience, draws partly from
linguistic research, and also from other traditions in the social sciences, including certain traditions of sociology, ethnography and sociolinguistics;

2) that Halliday's notion of language as a social semiotic is of central importance in his theory of language, linked as it is to his model of grammar as the central tool with which reality is constructed in language;

3) that the model of language as a social semiotic is closely related to a general theoretical view of the individual as shaped in social processes. This contrasts with the more orthodox western view of the individual, developing and responding to primarily "inner" or "innate" characteristics. The model suggests a view of learning which is more responsive to the impact of teacher intervention than much twentieth century educational theory proposes;
4) that much educational failure may be thought of as linguistic failure, and that it is in this sense that Bernstein's work has made a major contribution to the development of an educational linguistics.

1.3 A systemic functional grammar

In section 1.2 we noted in passing that a systemic linguistic approach to grammar does not draw a distinction between semantics and syntax, in the manner of many other traditions of linguistics both of a recent order (e.g. Chomsky, 1957; 1965), or of the older logico-grammatical tradition to which (also in section 1.2) we noted Firth alluded some years ago. (Chomsky's model is of course ultimately closely related to the older tradition). It is important to point out that to the extent that the contemporary teacher or educationist has any acquaintance with grammar, it will normally be in terms of the somewhat enfeebled version of the logico-grammatical tradition known as "school grammar", and that this in itself seriously confuses attempts to engage such people in talk of grammar in a functional sense. We note that the logico-grammatical tradition is enfeebled, incidentally, because movements in language education, especially of the last 30 years, have done much, deservedly, to discredit the older tradition, while not necessarily proposing any useful alternatives. A model of language which separates syntax on the one hand - conceived as a set of rules determining how sentences are put together - and semantics or meaning on the other hand - conceived as something separate and in some way "carried through" the syntax - is, as we have already noted, one manifestation of a "conduit metaphor", and as such, one which has been damaging to educational practice.
Traditional school grammar and its associated consequences for the teaching of language we have considered in detail elsewhere (1976; 1981). We would note here only that in the eighteenth century tradition of scholarly interest in the grammar - more accurately the syntax - of the English sentence, a distinguished grammarian such as Murray (1795) was able to say some valuable things about the organisation of written English. He wrote right at the end of a century in which a great deal of scholarly effort had been expended in describing the syntax of written English, and the concerns of the scholars involved had been to regularise the general principles by which English sentences were understood to operate. This was in itself a very desirable development, the need for which had been increasingly felt in an age in which a number of related historical factors converged: the extension of printing and the growing number of print materials produced, which pointed the need for some regularising of the principles of sentence construction; the growth of mercantile and middle classes, many of whose children, educated in nonconformist academies, needed proficiency in written English for their trading and commercial activities; the growth of a pride in the English language among leisured and cultivated classes, who became interested in the niceties of felicitous or elegantly formed sentences; the need felt, into the nineteenth century, to provide education in basic literacy in English for the children of the poor.

The close study of the grammar of the written English sentence was undertaken, as Murray made very clear, only in association with the other and very important study of rhetoric: a study whose basic preoccupation was with the manner in which the language was used in different ways to serve many purposes, persuasive, argumentative, didactic and so on. While it will not be necessary here to review developments in grammar and rhetorical studies very far, we should note that as the nineteenth century developed, grammar became increasingly dissociated from rhetorical studies, with what have been
unfortunate results well into the twentieth century. We have argued elsewhere (Christie, 1981; in press) that as the two became dissociated, grammar became no more than a series of mechanical exercises in identifying the parts of speech of the written English sentence, while rhetoric largely disappeared in the Anglo-Australian tradition. In fact, rhetoric became the subject of derision or suspicion, as Ballard (1921) noted, and an associated attitude built up of resistance to any attempt to look systematically at the ways in which language worked for the realisation of meaning.

By the twentieth century traditional school grammar had come to bear less and less relationship to any useful understanding of the language, serving instead to perpetuate a number of confusions both about speech and writing. Small wonder, then, that when in the 1960's a new drive for a fresh examination of language in schools commenced, both in Australia and the U.K., grammar was summarily dismissed as irrelevant to the needs of children. Commenting on this period, in which he was heavily involved because of the British Schools Council Project on Linguistics and English Teaching which he directed, Halliday has observed that given the traditional model of grammar about at the time, and rejecting that as he did, he and his colleagues were able to show that one might generate an excellent language program for secondary students without introducing any study of grammar (Halliday, 1985a, xvi). More recently, however, and in the light of changing needs in language education, it has become clear that a model of grammar is needed both in education and no doubt in many other areas of human endeavour in which the concern is to understand how language works to realise meanings.

To return to Bernstein's notions of visible and invisible pedagogies discussed in section 1.2, we would argue that where pedagogies become invisible, one of the first casualties will always be language. Excellence in schooling depends very considerably upon ability to use language successfully, both in talk and in the many written texts
students will be required to produce, especially for assessment purposes. Yet the very principles so fundamentally involved in deploying one’s language successfully to produce the various written texts required for assessment are the ones that in practice remain most elusive and least well explained. Indeed, such have been the effects of a fairly long history of language education, we have now a generation of teachers so deskillled that they do not themselves know how language works for the creation of the various texts of concern, and they are thus in no position to offer their students much help. Without a grasp of an appropriately functional grammar, we would suggest, they will remain deskillled and their students correspondingly disadvantaged - especially, of course, those students who are already disadvantaged in terms of not operating with the kinds of language use rewarded by schooling.

In contemporary Australia, so at least two recent studies have shown, the “received tradition” of school grammar with which teachers work is either often wrong (Huddleston, N.D.) or perceived even by themselves to be largely useless, though they persist with teaching it, uncertain of what else to do (Piper, 1983; 1985). Overseas, the evidence suggests that others do little better. The British Government’s recent appointment of the Kingman Committee, for example, charged with responsibility for developing a model of the English language for teaching purposes, appears to have led to a set of recommendations having little new to offer, at least with respect to a grammar. (Kingman Report, 1989) It is notable that one of the few applied linguists associated with the Kingman Committee, namely Widdowson, unhappy at the general nature of much of the advice given with respect to language, felt obliged to write a “note of reservation” in the report, expressing his concerns.

A functional approach to grammar of the kind that Halliday proposes, argues that language has actually evolved in the human species to satisfy basic human needs. Emerging out of what must have been
various non-verbal patterns of "signing", he speculates, of a kind that humans presumably shared to some extent with other animals, the first steps towards the emergence of language in the human species must have been not unlike the first steps in the emergence of language in young children. (Halliday, 1985b) Meaning - perhaps the expression of a need to influence or control others in some ways - found expression in some "sign", in much the same way that very young children develop a protolanguage in which a given utterance, used systematically enough, can be shown to be associated with a particular meaning. The full signing system the child goes on to develop involves, crucially, the lexicogrammar - a term Halliday selects in preference to "grammar" since it focuses the more appropriately upon the total "wording" system the child learns to use, and it rejects the clearcut distinction between lexis and grammar normally made in other traditions of language study.

As we shall see later, unlike grammars in the logico-grammatical tradition referred to earlier, when we label linguistic items in the systemic functional grammar, the labels relate primarily to their role in the construction of meaning. In other words, Halliday's is a semantically driven grammar, which, while not denying that certain principles of syntax can be shown to apply, seeks to consider and identify the role of various linguistic items in any text not in terms of their grammatical class, such as "noun", "verb", and the like, but in terms of their function in building meaning. There is, in other words, no dissociation of "grammar" on the one hand, and of "semantics" or meaning on the other. (Halliday, 1985a, xiv)

This is in fact one of the most important of the principles most basic to an understanding of the systemic functional approach to grammar. It is also one of the most difficult of a number of difficult ideas about language Halliday and others have given us, yet unless it is grasped, most of the rest of the view of language involved is simply misunderstood. Such an idea, of course, runs quite contrary to the
prevailing beliefs about language available to teachers, most notably those which see grammar as the study of the parts of speech, and their role in the organisation of a sentence. Hence it sometimes happens, when systemic linguists talk of the relevance of a grammar to educational practice, that teachers and educationists imagine that they talk of grammar as so many "rules" to be passed on to children in a manner nor primarily concerned with meaning or purposes in using language, and serving to "constrain" the children in unacceptable ways. Plainly, there is much to be done in making clearer the claims of systemic functional linguistics to address educational questions in helpful ways.

The most complete and comprehensive statement of Halliday's grammar of English is provided in his *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (1985a). However, such a statement needs to be read and understood in association with a great deal else of the theoretical position Halliday and others have developed over some 30 years, principally because much is in fact not covered in this volume. The systemic functional grammar, as its name implies, is in particular a theory of language as SYSTEM or CHOICE. When we use language, so the theory proposes, we exercise choices for the realisation of meanings. *The Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Halliday points out (1985a, xv), offers no explanation of the various system networks; rather, it offers an explication of how to analyse text from a functional perspective, and the sense of system, while assumed, remains in the background.

Before saying a little more about the functional grammar, we need first to say rather more than we did in section 1.2 about the nature of the context in which it is held language is always used.

It will be recalled that in section 1.2 we have noted Malinowski's distinction between "context of situation" and "context of culture". Both notions were taken over by Firth and by Halliday, though since
Malinowski was not a linguist, it became necessary to be able to say in a more precise way than he had, something about the relationship of language to context. The first matter to note is that a more appropriate way to think of the language associated with any context will be to think of it as TEXT, a term of importance because it immediately focuses attention upon the character of language as meaning. In its simplest and most basic definition, writes Halliday (Halliday & Hasan, 1985, 10) text "is language that is functional", or:

language that is doing some job in some context, as opposed to isolated words or sentences... (Thus) any instance of living language that is playing some part in a context of situation... is a text.

The notion of language manifested as text is, we should note here, of great importance to education, and to the educational linguistics we would propose is in development. Like Malinowski's preoccupation with language as meaning in a context, from which Halliday's notion of text ultimately derives, the idea of language as text serves immediately to direct teachers' attention away from older and more conventional ideas of language as "words" or "correct grammar", neither of which in any way does justice either to our actual purposes in using language, or to the manner in which language operates to make meanings.

The issue for Firth originally, but later for Halliday, was how to account for the relationship of text to context, to which Malinowski had originally drawn attention. Borrowing a term from music theory, Halliday and his colleagues in the early 1960's proposed the notion of REGISTER, arguing that as we move from context of situation to context of situation, we make changes in our language register. (See Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, 1966, for an early discussion of the theory.) The three elements of any context of situation Halliday currently proposes we identify are FIELD OF DISCOURSE, TENOR OF DISCOURSE and MODE. (Halliday in Halliday and Hasan 1985, 31-34) The theory holds that the three operate to cause the users of
language to take up sets of options in language for the realisation of meanings relevant to the context of situation. While there have always been some theoretical differences about field, tenor and mode, and how they should be conceptualised, we shall here introduce the three by drawing initially upon Halliday's work. We shall go on to note at least one important source of difference of opinion he has always had with others such as Gregory (1967), Benson and Greaves (1973) and Martin (e.g. in Martin and Rothery, 1980). Later, in the light of our discussion in section 1.4, where we will examine Martin's models of register and genre, we shall modify the definitions of field, tenor and mode given here.

Field of discourse, then, refers to what is happening in the context of situation. This will be social activity of some kind in which language has a necessary role. Tenor of discourse refers to the participants in the situation, particularly to the nature of their relationships. Mode of discourse refers to the role of language itself in the context of situation, and to its status in that context, including perhaps most obviously its channel: is it spoken or written, or perhaps some combination of the two, as often happens in a classroom situation? (Halliday in Halliday and Hasan, 1985, 12)

Somewhat different formulations of the elements of a context of situation have been proposed from time to time, and it is interesting to note in passing that the notion of formulating the elements of a context having consequences for the language used, is actually quite old. Eighteenth century rhetoricians such as Campbell (1783), for example, a contemporary of the grammarian Murray referred to above, proposed the following factors as responsible for the kind of language produced:

the speaker, the hearers or persons addressed, the subject, the occasion, and the end in view, or the effect intended to be produced by the discourse. (Campbell, 1783, 162)
It is also clear that rhetorical studies much older than Campbell’s had similar notions (Christie, 1981). The antecedents of the idea of register are in fact very old.

Choosing to view register somewhat differently from Halliday, Gregory (1967; Gregory and Carroll, 1978) proposed four elements of context of situation, taken up by Benson and Greaves (1973): field of discourse, personal tenor of discourse, functional tenor of discourse, and mode of discourse. The principal difference between their formulation and that of Halliday related to the fourth element they included – the functional tenor of discourse.

While he argued that personal tenor of discourse was to be understood in terms which related quite closely to those of Halliday, Gregory in particular suggested that there was one aspect of the context of situation not adequately dealt with in the latter’s formulation: namely, the matter of the social function served in using language. Hence, he proposed a functional tenor of discourse which, as Benson and Greaves were to put it in their textbook *The Language People Really Use*, referred to “language used to achieve a social end”. They went on:

> There are many functional tenors, some of the most frequent being phatic, expository, didactic, persuasive, commanding and narrative. (Benson & Greaves, 1973, 196)

Consideration of function in this sense Halliday believes is adequately dealt with in the description he provides, especially in his formulation of mode. In giving his definition of the latter Halliday writes among other things, that it includes consideration of:

> the rhetorical mode, what is being achieved by the text in terms of such categories as persuasive, expository, didactic, and the like. (in Halliday & Hasan, 1985, 12)
The issue of how to handle the functional significance of a text in this sense has proved a matter of considerable theoretical importance, principally because, as we shall see in our next section, it relates to the particular formulation of register and genre to be adopted in this study, and taken up from the work of Martin. Himself trained by Gregory, Martin originally adopted Gregory's fourth element of the functional tenor of discourse (see for example, the discussions in Martin and Rothery, 1980). However, in more recent years he has approached the whole question of the social function of a text somewhat differently. He has instead proposed (e.g. 1984a; 1984b; 1984c; 1984d; 1985a) that we recognise the three categories of register, field, tenor and mode, but that the fourth category - that of functional discourse - has such importance that it should be completely reinterpreted. In reinterpreting it, he has proposed that the text created in any context of situation is an instance of a GENRE, having a particular schematic structure, whose shape is to be explained by reference to the context of culture.

One consequence of Martin's proposals is that where Halliday or indeed Hasan would see register and genre as interchangeable terms, each constituting an alternative label for referring to the text type produced in any context of situation, Martin (1984a; 1985; 1986; in preparation) proposes that register and genre constitute two different semiotic systems. About this we shall have more to say in our next section, where we will argue that the distinction between register and genre is of considerable significance in the educational linguistics we are proposing. First, however, we need to take up more directly the manner in which Halliday has argued that language operates in relation to field, tenor and mode.

Work that Halliday and his colleagues did in the 1960's looking at the grammar of the English clause, led him to an important discovery. (See, for example, discussions in Halliday, ed. Kress, 1976) It was the discovery that there was a principled way to show the relationship of
text and context, by linking the work on the grammar to the earlier work already done in identifying the three register categories of field, tenor and mode. Focussing in particular on the nature of the clause, he began to argue a systematic relationship between features of the linguistic organisation of the clause and his three register categories of field, tenor and mode. Two fundamental principles were simultaneously invoked to explain this phenomenon. One was the principle of system or choice which it was held operated in the selection of the appropriate aspects of language used at any time; the other was the principle that such choices could be shown to be grouped in such a manner that they clustered, some in response to the demands of field, some to the demands of tenor, and some to the demands of mode. The clause might thus be shown to be constructed in non-arbitrary ways to realise different components of meaning. (Halliday, 1987, 606-7) Language could therefore be shown to order experience in ways that Whorf (1956) had once sought to demonstrate, or as Berger and Luckman (1966), referred to in section 1.2, had suggested it did.

Language then, it is argued, orders experience in systematic ways which have evolved in order to satisfy human needs, and it is in this sense that to the systemist, the grammar of a language is functional:

Language has evolved to serve human needs; and the way it is organized is functional with respect to these needs - it is not arbitrary. A functional grammar is essentially a "natural" grammar, in the sense that everything in it can be explained, ultimately, by reference to how language is used. (1985a, xiii)

The three clusters of choices to be made for the realisation of meaning Halliday has termed IDEATIONAL (relating to field), INTERPERSONAL (relating to tenor) and TEXTUAL (relating to mode). These Halliday has explained thus:

All languages are organized around two main kinds of meaning, the "ideational" or reflective, and the "interpersonal" or active. These components, called
"metafunctions" in the terminology of the present theory, are the manifestations in the linguistic system of the two very general purposes which underlie all uses of language: (i) to understand the environment (ideational), and (ii) to act on the others in it (interpersonal). Combined with these is a third metafunctional component, the "textual", which breathes relevance into the other two. (Halliday, 1985a, xiii)

The ideational metafunction, may be thought of in terms of two other metafunctions, the EXPERIENTIAL and the LOGICAL. The former, as its name suggests, refers to the nature of the experiences or activities involved when language is being used, while the latter - to be explained more fully below - refers to logical relations in language as these are encoded in the grammar. Figure 1.1, taken from Halliday (in Halliday & Hasan, 1985) shows the manner in which he explains the relationship of the register variables of the context of situation to the three metafunctions, textual, experiential, and interpersonal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION Feature of the context</th>
<th>(realised by)</th>
<th>TEXT Functional component of semantic system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field of discourse (what is going on)</td>
<td>Experiential meanings (transitivity, naming, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor of discourse (who are taking part)</td>
<td>Interpersonal meanings (mood, modality, person, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of discourse (role assigned to language)</td>
<td>Textual meanings (theme, information, cohesive relations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1 Relation of the text to the context of situation (from Halliday & Hasan, 1985, 26)
Before we explain more fully the nature of the three metafunctions, we need firstly to explain the notion of system, for it will be recalled that so central is this to Halliday's linguistic theory that it is actually termed a "systemic functional" theory of language. The first point to note in this connection is that the term "systemic" is not in any way to be confused with "systematic". Instead, the term "system" is used in the same way that numbers of other natural and social sciences of the twentieth century use it:

A system is a set of options with an entry condition: that is to say, a set of things of which one must be chosen, together with a statement of the conditions under which the choice is available. (Halliday, 1976, 3)

When we use language, the theory proposes, we exercise a number of simultaneous choices for the realisation of meaning, and the nature of the particular range of choices to be made at any time depends upon the general environment in which language is used. "It is the system that formalizes the notion of choice in language." (1976, 3)

A system network is always read from left to right. The easiest way to illustrate the point quickly is to take a simple and familiar aspect of English grammar, and set it out as a system network. We might for example, take MOOD, and set it out as in Figure 1.2.

---

3 The particular paper in which this first appeared was published in 1969.
Reading from the left, then, one chooses from the MOOD SYSTEM. In fact, of course, a choice from the MOOD system is only one of a number of simultaneous choices made in creating a clause, so that language is in fact polysystemic. Moving right then, one makes a choice of the [indicative] or [imperative] MOOD; where a choice is of the [indicative], a further choice must immediately be made, between [declarative] and [interrogative] and in the latter case between a polar or a WH question.

We may now return to the register variables of field, tenor and mode, and to the manner in which Halliday proposes these are realised in the grammar.

Since field relates to social activity, the first of the systems Halliday identifies as particularly realising the experiential metafunction is the TRANSITIVITY SYSTEM. (Halliday, 1985a, 101-157) This is a term referring to the processes of doing or happening, of thinking and
believing, of saying, and of identifying and describing. Such processes are themselves realised through choices in verbs, along with their associated sets of participants and circumstances, which are realised through naming items such as nouns and pronouns in the former case, and through adverbial and other groupings in the latter case. We shall have a little more to say about TRANSITIVITY below.

As tenor relates to relationship, the systems which realise the interpersonal metafunction are particularly those of MOOD, MODALITY and PERSON. Speakers take up different MOOD choices depending upon their roles in the creation of a text, such that they may make statements, ask questions or order others to do things. With respect to MODALITY, they may express something of the nature of their judgments about what is going on, in terms of possibility, probability or certainty. With respect to PERSON, they may select the first, second or third person.

As mode relates to the role and status of language in whatever is going on, the textual metafunction is realised through systems which are most involved in the organisation of the language, and in holding it together, so that it is meaningful or has TEXTURE. One of the most important of these systems is the THEME SYSTEM, which identifies what the speaker/writer chooses to make the point of departure for the message of a clause. It is "that with which the clause is concerned." (Halliday, 1985a, 38) In English, but not necessarily in other languages, Theme comes first in the clause.

In thinking about the manner in which the grammar operates we may focus upon the notion of the clause, and the three simultaneous sets of choices to be made in creating the clause. They will be choices in the TRANSITIVITY, MOOD and THEME systems, as Figure 1.3 attempts to indicate.
Consider, for example, the following clause complex, taken from a book on Australia's plants:

Australia is a vast continent and its plants vary considerably.

If we set this out, following the model proposed by Halliday, we can look in turn, at TRANSITIVITY, MOOD and THEME. We shall take TRANSITIVITY first:

- **Australia** is a vast continent
- **Carrier** Process **Attribute**

and

- its plants vary considerably.
- **Actor** Process: **Circumstance; manner; quality**

Here, what is captured is some sense of what is "going on". Thus, in the first clause, a part of the verb "to be" realises what is technically a RELATIONAL PROCESS of attribution (see Figure 1.4 below): in other words, what is being built up here is some description of the PARTICIPANT "Australia", and in a functional sense that participant is held to be a "Carrier" of the Attribute. In the case of the second clause, the process, this time realised in the verb "vary" is a MATERIAL one, for it builds a sense of something "going on" in the world of material things. The principal participant for such a process is called an Actor, though that term is not to be interpreted as
suggesting human agency. On the contrary, the Actor here is "its plants". Finally, the adverb "considerably" realises what is termed a CIRCUMSTANCE (See Figure 1.5 below). Processes typically, though not invariably, involve sets of associated circumstances, as well as participants. It will be observed, by the way, that the conjunction "and" is not in any way involved in the transitivity analysis.

An analysis of THEME may be set out thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>is a vast continent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>topical</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>experiential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rheme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and</strong></td>
<td>its plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>structural</strong></td>
<td><strong>topical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>textual</strong></td>
<td><strong>experiential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rheme</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the first clause, experiential Theme position comes first and it is occupied by a topical Theme, "Australia". In fact, the experiential Theme will always be filled by a topical Theme, though interpersonal and textual Themes may be of several kinds. The latter we will discuss more fully in chapter 3. A topical Theme creates the "topic" the speaker/writer chooses to make the point of departure for the message.

In the second clause the experiential Theme position is filled by the topical Theme choice "its plants". Here, the experiential Theme does not come first, for the first position is held by a textual Theme, realised in a structural Theme which is a conjunction "and". Textual
Themes have the function of tying clauses together and relating them to their context in a variety of ways, thus helping to build texture.

There is no interpersonal Theme choice in either clause, and this is reasonably common in written language. The only other matter to be noted here is that when we do a Theme analysis, everything in the clause apart from the Theme is known as the RHEME.

To turn to MOOD:

| Australia | is a vast continent |
| Mood      | Residue            |
| declarative |
| and       | its plants         | vary considerably. |
| Mood      | Residue            |
| declarative |

The Mood choice in both clauses is [declarative]. Because Mood choice is signalled in the choices made with respect to placement of subject and verb, the Mood labelling is always attached to the portion of the clause where they appear, while the rest of the clause is known simply as RESIDUE.

While considerably more might well be said with respect to the functional grammar and its manner of labelling linguistic items so that their role in terms of building meaning is brought out, we have, hopefully, said sufficient at this stage to make some of its principles clear.

One other matter, with respect to Halliday's metafunctions does require comment. The fourth metafunction that he recognises, and to which reference was made above is the logical metafunction. This is to do with the building of univariate structures which allow
meanings of various kinds to be selected recursively; i.e. the logical
metafunction is responsible for hypotactic and paratactic complexes
at clause, group, and word ranks. Where experiential meanings
represent experience in terms of happenings, entities that
participate in these happenings, and associated circumstances,
logical meanings represent meanings in terms of certain logical
relations. Thus, to return to our two clauses above, technically we
may note that they are in a relationship of parataxis, meaning that the
two are of equal status, and that the second simply continues what
the first clause initiates. The conjunction that links them is an
additive conjunction, "and", and this in itself builds one of the
number of possible logical relationships between clauses which
English permits.

We may think of the metafunctions as themselves modes of meaning,
such that the experiential and logical metafunctions just
discussed are said to be subsumed as aspects of the ideational mode
of meaning, while the interpersonal and textual metafunctions also
represent modes of meaning. Halliday (1979, 59) represents them
thus:

```
    IDEATIONAL           INTERPERSONAL       TEXTUAL
       |                     |                    |
       |                     v                    |
    EXPERIENTIAL         LOGICAL
```

As we shall see in our subsequent chapters, the elements of the
grammar which we shall use in our analysis are THEME,
TRANSITIVITY and MOOD, all selected, as we aim to demonstrate,
because the three provide an excellent means of interpreting a text.
As such, we would argue, the three constitute essential elements of
the grammar for inclusion in any account of it to be given to teachers.
There are two reasons why we would argue that Theme is a natural
first system to examine. Firstly, Theme is the most readily accessible
aspect of the systemic functional grammar to offer the person becoming familiar with its methods, and we have found that its general findings accord with most people's intuitive understandings of how language works, encouraging them to seek to explore other aspects of the grammar. The second reason why Theme analysis is worth starting with, is that it permits a simultaneous engagement with Halliday’s three metafunctions, allowing us to identify ways in which meanings in all three senses are realised. We shall take up Theme again both in chapter 3 (section 3.5.2), where we shall examine the first of our selected types of curriculum text and in chapter 6 (section 6.3) where we shall commence examination of our second type of curriculum text.

Mood, analysis of which is also relatively accessible to the person becoming familiar with the systemic functional grammar, opens up possibilities of seeing how persons take up relationships in text, in particular creating the character of conversation in the spoken mode. While mood will be alluded to at various times in the discussion throughout the study, it will be of most significance in helping us to explain CONVERSATION STRUCTURE, as we shall interpret that in our chosen texts in chapter 8.

Lastly, transitivity, in that it most directly identifies what is “going on” in a text, allows us to explore the experiential meanings relating to field. Since transitivity is in our view somewhat less immediately accessible than the other two systems we have identified, we shall conclude this introductory discussion of the grammar by providing an overview of the six types of transitivity processes found in English (Figure 1.4), and of the principal types of circumstance found in association with the various transitivity processes (Figure 1.5). Fuller discussion of the processes will be provided both in chapter 3 (section 3.5.3) and in chapter 7 (section 7.3).
As Figure 1.4 seeks to indicate, transitivity processes may be arranged into three broad groups, arranged in a cline, such that there is a movement out from processes to do with action and the material world, to processes of signification of various kinds, and beyond these, to processes of being. The participants associated with each type of process are indicated.
Figure 1.4 The TRANSITIVITY SYSTEM in English

By way of illustrating how the approach to the TRANSITIVITY SYSTEM works, we shall here provide a few examples of each type of process. Processes of action are material or behavioural. Examples of material processes include:
she baked a cake.
the meeting was dissolved.
bats live in trees.

Behavioural processes include:

she is watching the TV.
I wrote a letter.
he pondered the problem.

Of the processes of signification, the verbal processes cover various symbolic exchanges of meaning, not only processes of saying, as in:

he said he was sorry.
the clock tells the time.
the notice says not to trespass.

Mental processes are of three kinds, cognition, affect and perception, as in:

I think he's wrong.
she likes that dress.
he can hear the music.

Of the processes of being, the major group are relational, and more will need to be said of these especially in chapter 7 (section 7.3). Suffice to note here some obvious examples:

he is the king.
the child looks unhappy.
the cat has a bowl of milk.

Existential processes are those which represent that something exists or occurs, as in:
there's a dog in the garden.
there was a great argument.
there was no time to lose.

Before concluding this brief discussion of selected aspects of the functional grammar, we need to offer an overview of the principal types of circumstance associated with the various transitivity processes we have just reviewed. This is because we shall need to identify them in undertaking our analyses of TRANSITIVITY in subsequent chapters, especially chapters 3 and 7; it will be helpful to have explained them here as a basis for proceeding forward later.

![Diagram of CIRCUMSTANCE in English](image)

Figure 1.5 CIRCUMSTANCE in English
Reflecting for the moment on the notions of grammar of the logico-grammatical tradition to which we made brief mention at the start of this section, it will be clear that a transitivity analysis takes us considerably further in terms of understanding how language works than does such a grammar. All the clauses listed in Figure 1.4 to exemplify the various transitivity processes make use of nouns and verbs, as well as various other parts of speech. This much, and not much more, is the only grammatical knowledge about such clauses available to many teachers trained in the logico-grammatical tradition, though that not even this amount of knowledge is possessed by all teachers today. Such knowledge about the various parts of speech is not entirely valueless of course, but in itself it does nothing to illuminate the significant differences in meaning between, for example:

there's a dog in the garden,
and
the meeting was dissolved.

We need a functional grammar in order usefully to explain the differences. Such a grammar, furthermore, will take the average teacher well away from the conventional preoccupations of the logico-grammatical tradition towards a concern with understanding how texts are motivated.

All this brings us to the issues to be taken up in our last section of this chapter in which we have begun to develop a systemic functional approach to the development of an educational linguistics. Such issues concern the nature of the text types or genres developed in our culture, especially those most pertinent to education. We need to consider how these are identified, how they are shaped, and how it will be argued they come into being. This will take us into some further examination of register as well as of genre. Before turning to
such matters, however, we need first to summarise what we have sought to establish in this section:

1) That the systemic functional grammar proposes that meaning is constructed in language, and that the grammar of a language operates in non-arbitrary ways to realise meanings of various kinds.

2) That the systemic functional grammar thus makes no clearcut distinction between grammar and semantics, unlike the logico-grammatical tradition from which conventional school grammar derives.

3) That as an aspect of explaining how meanings are built in a grammar functioning in non-arbitrary ways, systemic linguistic theory proposes that language relates in a systematic manner to three elements of context of situation - field, tenor and mode.

4) That the relationship is such that experiential features of language are said to relate to field, interpersonal features to
tenor and textual features to mode.

5) That language is said to be polysystemic, so that when one uses language, one selects linguistic items from a number of systems, in order to realise meanings.

6) That three important systems from which one must select in creating a clause, are MOOD, TRANSITIVITY and THEME. These three are all of relevance both in the study to be developed here, and in the model of an educational linguistics we would propose for teachers.

7) That to the extent that teachers have any knowledge of grammar, it is in terms of the logico-grammatical traditions associated with conventional school grammar, and this handicaps them in coming to terms with a functional grammar.
1.4 Register and genre

We have already noted in section 1.3 that opinion differs among systemic linguists about the manner in which register is conceptualised, and we have also noted that the model of register to be adopted here is that developed by Martin (1984a; 1984b; 1984c; 1984d; 1985a; in preparation), in working with a register research group in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Sydney. The group included in particular Rothery (in preparation), Ventola (1984), Plum (1988) and Poynton (in preparation). Martin and others have in fact proposed that register and genre are to be understood as two independent semiotic systems. Halliday (1987, 619-620) and Hasen (1978; in Halliday and Hasan, 1980; in Halliday & Hasan, 1985) do not accept Martin's proposals, seeing the two terms "register" and "genre" as interchangeable. The point is of some significance to education. Briefly, we shall argue that an educational linguistics needs to embrace both notions of register and genre. This is because of the requirement felt by those of us working in education to be able to develop a means of describing and explaining the different text types or genres students need to learn in a culture. That is to say, we need both to account for where the various genres come from and to explain how they are motivated linguistically. In order to do the former, we need to invoke notions both of context of situation and of context of culture. In order to do the latter, we need to be able to demonstrate how the linguistic features that realise given genres are patterned, changing in response to the requirements of the different elements of their SCHEMATIC STRUCTURES. Such an endeavour is in itself of considerable theoretical significance in systemic linguistic theory. However, we shall argue that such an endeavour is quite essential for the advancement of educational activity. Provided we are aware of the manner in which genres come into being, we shall suggest, then we are in a position to intervene, where that is desirable, with a view to bringing about new types of genres.
Much of the important work of the last few years on context of culture, register and/or genre generally has been undertaken by Hasan (1978; in Halliday & Hasan, 1980; in Halliday & Hasan, 1985) and Martin (1984b; 1984c; 1984d; 1985a). It will be necessary to say briefly something of the theoretical differences between the two, by way of explaining how Martin and others have come to propose the two semiotic systems of register and genre. There are of course, a number of ways in which Martin's and Hasan's theoretical positions are very similar, as both would recognize. Both, for example, argue that any context of situation has an associated text type. Both have called the text type a "genre", and both argue that the term must be widened in terms of its conventional uses to include the many "non-prestige" genres we might think of, such as making a medical appointment, a service encounter or a classroom teaching/learning activity. Both see any text as having an overall pattern or shape - a beginning -middle - end structure, and both are interested to explain what it is and how it comes into being.

It was Hasan, who, earlier than Martin, sought to develop the concept of the text in the systemic functional tradition. Initially influenced by earlier work done by Mitchell (1956/1975) examining the structure of trading encounters in Cyrenaica, Hasan sought to examine the structure of medical appointments (1978) and of trading encounters (in Halliday and Hasan 1980; Halliday and Hasan, 1985), though she has also examined the structure of the nursery tale (1984). Accepting the general model of register variables as proposed by Halliday, and explained above in section 1.3, Hasan argued (1978) that the notion of language as text might only be explained in terms of some systematisation of context of situation. The concept of register, she argued:

*is a ready-made link between context and generic structure, since...register and genre are synonymous.* (Hasan, 1978, 230)
Martin was himself considerably influenced originally by the general
approach to the study of text types or genres as Hasan proposed it,
although as already noted in section 1.3, he had early adopted
Gregory's model of register in terms of four rather than the three
variables proposed by Halliday. Thus, it will be recalled, while
accepting the general view that field, tenor and mode were all
significant aspects of any context of culture, determining much of the
nature of the text produced, Martin also argued for the recognition of
a fourth aspect, called the functional tenor. The latter referred to
the overall character of the text in terms of its function in achieving
social ends: was it, for example, persuasive, didactic, expository, and
so on?

In an early paper, in which he first began to write of the nature of
"genre", and to argue for a recognition of texts as instances of genres,
Martin adopted a view very like Hasan's in writing that "the more
technical term" for genre was "register" (Martin, in Martin and
Rothery, 1980, 1). Subsequently, however, he was to change his mind.
He was to accept firstly, that the three variables, field, tenor and
mode did relate to the experiential, interpersonal and textual
metafunctions. However, secondly, he was to suggest that the
particular sense of "function" originally captured in Gregory's notion
of the "functional tenor of discourse" was of such significance that it
must be interpreted as superordinate to the three metafunctions.
Having argued that, he then termed the thing he had accorded such a
superordinate status a "genre."

The issue of significant theoretical difference between Hasan and
Martin concerns how the schematic structure is said to be motivated
- or, to put it less formally, where the schematic structure of a genre
comes from. Like Halliday, Hasan argues that the structure is
determined by particular values of field, tenor and mode, and she
invokes another related notion to help explain this - the
CONTEXTUAL CONFIGURATION (CC) (1978; 1980; 1985). That is to
say, in any given context of situation, field, tenor and mode operate in such a way as to generate a set of values making up the CC of the context of situation. The CC can be used to make predictions about the overall shape of the elements of the text. It can be used, in other words, she says, to state the GENERIC STRUCTURE POTENTIAL (GSP) of a text. The GSP is thus actually generated by register.

Martin, on the other hand, argues that such an explanation is theoretically insufficient (Martin, 1984c; 1985a) because it cannot adequately explain the relations between genres. He chooses to use the term SCHEMATIC STRUCTURE rather than GENERIC STRUCTURE POTENTIAL, by the way, though for reasons we shall explain below, he does also need the term SCHEMATIC STRUCTURE POTENTIAL to complete his description.

In suggesting that Hasan's argument does not properly explain the relationships between genres, Martin can argue for example, that we should consider narratives, and the manner in which quite different field, tenor and mode values can be shown to generate narratives having very similar schematic structures. Conversely, consider, as Martin does (1984c) the fact that texts might make the same choices in terms of field, tenor and mode, yet generate different genres. Martin and his colleagues, when addressing these questions in the early 1980's, concluded that they must develop explanations other than simply in terms of register. If the explanation was not to be found as an aspect of the context of situation, they determined instead to seek an explanation as an aspect of the context of culture: genres correspond to contexts of culture, as registers correspond to contexts of situation. When persons engage in social activity and use language as a necessary part of engagement in that social activity, they select one of the many genres available to them as an aspect of their culture. Life as we know it, the theory holds, would be inconceivable without the many genres in terms of which we structure and give direction to our lives.
A genre, then, in this theory is "a staged, goal oriented social process:"

Most members of a given culture would participate in some dozens of these. Australian examples include jokes, letters to the editor, job applications, lab reports, sermons, medical examinations, appointment making, service encounters, anecdotes, reports, interviews and so on. Genres are referred to as social processes because members of a culture interact with each other to achieve them; as goal oriented because they have evolved to get things done; and as staged because it usually takes more than one step for participants to achieve their goals. (Martin, Christie & Rothery, 1987, 59)

We should at this point return to the force of the differences between generic structure potential and schematic structure. In Hasan's description the term contextual configuration (CC) refers to the actual shape of a given text, while the term generic structure (GSP) refers to the potential structure of a given genre type, where one may specify those elements of an optional and obligatory character found in the genre. The significance of Hasan's latter term is that it stresses the potential character of the text types she describes. In using his term schematic structure, Martin refers to the actual shape of any given text, a shape which, as we have seen in his theory, comes not from the context of situation but from the context of culture. Though he has not to this point in his discussions invoked an associated term, schematic structure potential, we shall argue in this study that such a term actually requires to be adopted. That is because, as we shall see in chapters 3 and 5 in particular, it is possible to identify more than one possible way that particular genres may be realised. Hence, we shall seek in our discussions both (i) to identify a schematic structure potential characteristic of each of the two types of CURRICULUM GENRE we shall seek to describe, and (ii) to identify an actual schematic structure in each of those instances of the genres we shall examine.
As we have already indicated above Halliday generally adopts a perspective on matters of register and genre closer to that of Hasan than to that of Martin. He has written (Halliday, 1978, 134) that "there is a generic structure in all discourse, including the most informal spontaneous conversation." However, he then writes:

The concept of generic structure can be brought within the general framework of the concept of register, the semantic patterning that is characteristically associated with the "context of situation" of a text. (Halliday, 1978, 134)

More recently, in contrasting the work of Hasan and Martin (1987, 618), Halliday has reaffirmed this general position. We should note, by the way that in arguing that the notion of the generic structure "can be brought within the general framework of the concept of register", Halliday argues this for exactly the same reasons as we noted in section 1.4 he sees "rhetorical function" as being an aspect of mode. But it seems to us he has not demonstrated this, leaving the issue as it were undefended in his own writings, and since it is a matter of some importance educationally, this is unfortunate.

Hasan (1984) when writing of the nursery tale, and in offering what is an interesting discussion of some of the problems inherent in any attempt to account for the structure of the fairy tale, actually appears to acknowledge some of the factors which have caused Martin to make his proposals, but then she draws back. It is a fact, she concludes, that:

the structure of the nursery tale conforms largely to a pre-existing convention.

But since, she argues, it is impossible:

to provide a convincing account of how artistic conventions themselves originate and how any change is successfully introduced into a body of pre-existing conventions,
she concludes she will shelve for the time being

the question of what motivates the structure of the nursery tale. (Hasan, 1984, 78)

It is true that Martin and others have not as yet advanced convincing explanations of how genres are generated or modified. But that does not in itself constitute sufficient reason not to explore the question of the elements of generic structure in terms other than by simply invoking the operation of certain "conventions" to explain their presence. On the contrary, it seems to us to suggest the possible advantages of pursuing and testing Martin's hypothesis. We need, for example, a very much enlarged body of research investigating different genres, in particular exploring the question Martin (1985a) has raised of trying to identify genres that are agnate, or related. Assuming typologies of agnate genres do emerge, that will not in itself necessarily address the question of how new genres are generated, though it may throw some light upon the subject. In that it will enhance our general knowledge about similarities and differences in the elements of structure of related text types, however, it will, we would argue, help build additional information, at least, about the kinds of "conventions" Hasan has acknowledged do exist. Such knowledge will allow a further testing of Martin's general claims with respect to the context of culture.

As Plum (1988) says in an excellent discussion of the two models of register, we as yet lack conclusive evidence to support either the Halliday/Hasan model or the Martin model. In the opinion of this writer, what one does with respect to these matters depends upon what one wants to do with one's data: what problems one wants to solve, and what one's ultimate goals really are. In this connection, Plum actually cites Halliday as suggesting in a seminar in the Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney in 1987 that whether one focuses upon register or genre depends upon the perspective adopted. From the phylogenetic point of view, he said, it seems it is
register which determines genre, but from the ontogenetic perspective, it seems it is genre which determines register (Plum, 1988, 49-50).

The point is of some significance to education. In the phylogenetic sense, Halliday seemed to be suggesting, the emergence of a social process of the kind realised in a genre takes place in a community over quite long periods of time, and the participants in the various contexts of situation which generate the new social processes are not of course very much aware of what is happening. They are generating new contexts of situation, having consequences, ultimately, for changes in the context of culture as well. But for the young, who are being initiated into the culture, the various social processes are encountered as things "ready made and handed down" to them, to quote Plum. They thus experience the learning of new social processes as genres, though these are learned of course in relevant contexts of situation.

For those of us working in education, and in the development of an educational linguistics, such a general perception of matters is of importance. Education is par excellence a process of initiation into one's culture - into its ways of working, its ways of valuing, its ways of dealing with experience. The primary responsibility of the teacher or the educationist is that of focussing upon what it is that students must learn to do in order to be successful in mastering the various "ways of knowing" that are involved. That is not of course, because the object is to teach one's students some kind of unquestioning "conformity" to the genres that apply in one's culture, though critics of genre theories in education (e.g. Sawyer and Watson, 1987) appear to have assumed that from time to time. On the contrary, it is for the most fundamentally important of reasons: namely, that an education is one of the significant ways in which one "learns to mean", as Halliday has put it. Far from the issue being one of inducing "conformity" in one's students, the issue rather is that of developing
students so confident in understanding and manipulating the ways of working valued in their culture that they are enabled not only to use these, but also to make intelligent decisions about them, and to change them, where change seems a desirable thing.

It is interesting to note in the latter context, by the way, that members of social groups who operate well outside the "mainstream" culture, such as many traditional Aboriginal people, are able to articulate their sense of there being ways of working in language in "the white feller's world" to which they are not privy, and in consequence they feel disadvantaged. The writer's experience in working with Aboriginal teachers completing degree courses at Deakin University in 1986-7 confirms this, while anthropologists like Bain (cited in Michael J. Christie, 1985, 50) have reported that traditional Aboriginal people in central Australia have talked of what they believed was a "secret language" that whites used.

The issue is apparently a difficult one for successful participants in the mainstream culture always to appreciate, including many teachers. In consequence they do not always see the urgency with which one needs to address the language learning needs of students, especially those from ethnic and/or social class groups whose ways of working in language are not valued in schools. The point relates very closely to Bernstein's concerns discussed above in section 1.2, most notably to his concerns with visible and invisible pedagogies. Invisible pedagogies leave what it is to be successful in language inexplicit, and in that sense the language involved is indeed "secret." We would argue, following Bernstein, that only those students already oriented in terms of life experience to some appreciation of the kinds of language - the kinds of genres - required for schooling, actually flourish in schools where an invisible pedagogy applies, though even they will substantially benefit where the pedagogy becomes explicit, enabling them to make much greater progress than much conventional schooling appears to permit.
Rather more now needs to be said of genre, register and language as Martin models these, and as we shall use them in this study. Below, in Figure 1.6, we shall set out the manner in which Martin models genre, register and language, but before introducing that, we need to return to matters of field, tenor and mode as we developed these in section 1.3. It will be recalled that we offered an introductory discussion of the three, based primarily upon Halliday's explanations, and we indicated we would need to adjust what was said in the light of subsequent discussion of register and genre. Now that we have offered a brief discussion of different theories over the significance of register and the status to be accorded to genre, and have indicated our decision to adopt Martin's model, it will be necessary to outline the model of field, tenor and mode as proposed by Martin and his colleagues, including Poynton (in preparation) and Plum (1988). We shall consider mode firstly, going on to consider field and tenor.

We have already indicated that Martin's formulation of mode is somewhat different from that proposed by Halliday, in that the latter includes rhetorical function or mode within his general model, while Martin does not. (1984b). While at first sight mode might appear to be a matter of choice of channel, as was indicated in the account given above, it becomes apparent that this in itself needs to be amended in two senses. The first sense involves the relationship of participants in the construction of the discourse, ranging from face to face conversation, through the various permutations caused by uses of various aural and/or visual aids such as telephone, television, radio, and out to the various relationships achieved through the written mode, from intimate letters to materials written for remote and often unknown audiences. These may be thought of as arranged on a scale, according to the "spatial" distance of the participants in the discourse.
The second sense in which there are mode differences involves another kind of scale, ranging from language which is part of action, as for example, when footballers call out to each other on a football field while they play, on to perhaps the language of commentary upon that play, and ultimately through a range of other ways of using language less and less closely related to action - language for reflection upon experience in fact. The distance in this sense is "temporal", not spatial.

Mode operates in both senses in teaching situations. Daily teachers and students converse in face to face situations. Sometimes their talk is language as part of action, as when teachers direct the children to move about the room, to start tasks, or perhaps to desist from doing something; on these occasions, the language is relatively minimal, indicating the fact that it is used very much in association with actions. Sometimes, as when the teachers and children talk about some "content" to be learned, the language is very much more language for reflection on experience, and it is much less minimal. Language for reflection upon experience often involves a movement between spoken and written modes, sometimes because the teacher and students need to consult books, sometimes because they actually write themselves, as well as talking about it.

To turn to field, this Martin defines as:

```
a set of activity sequences oriented to some some
global institutional purpose. (Martin, 1986)
```

Different types of fields include teaching, cooking, gardening, science, religion, history, politics or sewing, to name a few obvious examples. Such fields often have sub-fields: science, for example, has a number of sub-fields. Activity sequences typically define the kinds of actions persons undertake in engaging in a field, and these will be of many kinds. Teachers for example, typically marshall the children in the school playground at the commencement of the school day;
they bring them into school, mark attendance roles, enquire about absentees, organise teaching aids, identify learning tasks for the children, teach lessons, mark the children's work, and so on.

Tenor, according to Poynton (1984; 1985) is to be understood in terms of three dimensions: power (referred to by her in 1984 as "status") - having to do with relations between persons in terms of equality or inequality; contact - having to do with the frequency of connection between persons in terms of their involvement with each other; and affect - having to do with the degree of affection or alternatively of loathing, that persons have for each other. Considerations of tenor in Poynton's and Martin's model do not, incidentally, include consideration of whether the interlocutors are questioning, commanding or informing, as they do in Halliday's model. These matters are handled in Martin's model of CONVERSATION STRUCTURE, about which we shall say more below.

Figure 1.6, taken from Plum (1988, 43) summarises the revised register categories proposed by Martin and Poynton.
FIELD - set of activity sequences oriented to a global institutional purpose: e.g. dog breeding, sailing, medicine, shopping.

TENOR - formality of interlocutors' relations as modulated by:

1 power - power and solidarity relations
2 contact - degree of involvement in relationship
3 affect - love-through-hate predisposition of interlocutors.

MODE - spatial and temporal "distance" scales:

1 distance between interlocutors as affecting aural and visual feedback
2 distance between language and the social activity in which it plays a part (language-in-action to language-as-reflection)

Figure 1.6 Martin and Poynton's revised register categories (Plum, 1988, 43)

Now that we have stated the formulations of register and genre to be adopted in this study, we can introduce Figure 1.7, which sets out the manner in which the relationship of these two to language is formulated. It is taken from Martin, 1985a.

Figure 1.7: Language, register and genre. (Martin, 1985a, 250)
In his discussions of the three systems, Martin (1984b; 1985a) suggests that each operates on a different plane. In the bottom right hand corner lies language itself, operating as a meaning system in the manner discussed in section 1.3. Above it, and in fact standing in a parasitic relationship to language lies register. It is described as parasitic in that it must select from language in order to realise its meanings, since it has no form of expression of its own. Similarly, genre is said to stand in parasitic relationship to register, in that it finds expression through register, which, as we have noted, is said in turn to find expression through language. Hence genre and register “stack up” in relation to language, accounting for the manner in which they are represented in the figure.

As we shall see when we seek to undertake our analyses of genre in forthcoming chapters, the theory would suggest that if genre selects from register, and the latter in turn selects from the linguistic system, we should be able show the manner in which the linguistic resources in a curriculum genre are deployed to realise the elements of that genre. That we shall undertake to do. In particular, we shall argue that the language is systematically deployed across the text in each case, its patterning simultaneously realising the two registers we would claim are operating and the various elements of the schematic structure.

In order to complete our outline of the model of register and genre to be adopted in this study, we should note further that Martin proposes a model of the grammar, consisting of three strata, as these are set out in Figure 1.8.
CONVERSATIONAL STRUCTURE | TRANSITIVITY | TONALITY
CONJUNCTION | THEME | TONICITY
REFERENCE | MOOD | TONE
LEXICAL COHESION | group | foot & syllable
& word systems | LEXIS | prosodies
phoneme systems

discourse | lexicogrammar | phonology

Figure 1.8: Outline of a tri-stratal systemic functional grammar with central systems on each stratum noted (Martin, 1985a, 249)

One stratum, he argues, is the phonology, consisting of those features of the language relating to TONE and TONALITY systems, among other matters. Presumably, recognising that language is sometimes expressed in a written mode, Martin also recognises the WRITING SYSTEMS operating as alternatives on this stratum. Another stratum is the lexicogrammar, described much as we have already discussed it in section 1.3. The third stratum is that of the discourse semantic, where the term "discourse" refers in particular to those systems involved in holding a text together, including CONJUNCTION and REFERENCE, both of which we alluded to in section 1.3, as well as LEXICAL COHESION and CONVERSATIONAL STRUCTURE.

The term LEXICAL COHESION, like REFERENCE and CONJUNCTION, was developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), and it refers to the manner in which the various lexical items relevant to a field may be shown to be patterned or distributed across a text, helping to give it texture. Since we shall not be considering LEXICAL COHESION, REFERENCE or CONJUNCTION in our study, we shall say no more about these here.

The term CONVERSATION STRUCTURE, developed by Berry (1981a; 1981b; 1981c), Martin (1986) and Ventola (1984; 1988) will be of concern to us. When we consider CONVERSATION STRUCTURE, we
consider discourse as dialogue: how it is that spoken text becomes conversation, and the kinds of speech acts in which persons engage to create such conversation. Consideration of these matters, as indicated above, will subsume consideration of Halliday's notions of how we create discourse moves such as commanding, questioning or informing through our MOOD choices. We shall be considering CONVERSATION STRUCTURE in chapter 8, where we shall take up such matters in some detail.

All this brings to a close our overview of register, genre and language as they will be interpreted in this study, and as we would propose they should be used in the development of an educational linguistics. It remains to indicate something of the manner in which we aim to use these matters, although we have already indicated at least some of our concerns as the discussion has developed. Before we move to doing that in section 1.5, where we will also give an overview of the planned subsequent chapters in this thesis, we shall summarise the main points we have sought to establish in this section. We have sought:

1) To indicate that the major theoretical difference between the model of register as proposed by Halliday and Hasan, and that proposed by Martin, concerns the status Martin gives to genre, conceived as a semiotic system, operating at a different communication plane from register, which in turn operates at a different plane from language.
2) To indicate that the model has been proposed in order to help explain the facts that (i) the same types of genres may occur, given quite different field, tenor and mode variables, and (ii) the same field, tenor and mode variables can generate different genres.

3) To state that a genre in this model is defined as a staged, purposeful, goal-directed activity.

4) To state that where register is said to relate to context of situation, genre is said to relate to context of culture.

5) To indicate that while evidence for the different models of genre remains to be amassed, we shall adopt Martin's model, since it appears best to serve the cause of educational enquiry, putting the issue of the genres relevant to education firmly to the fore.

6) To state that in the somewhat revised formulation of register Martin and others propose, field is defined as a set
of activity sequences directed to 
some goal; tenor is defined in 
terms of power, affect and 
contact; and mode is defined in 
terms of spatial and temporal 
distance.

7) To indicate that Martin's 
tristratal model of the grammar 
is adopted, one stratum of 
which is the "expressive" one of 
phonology or graphology; one of 
which is the lexicogrammar; 
and one of which is the stratum 
of discourse semantics.

1.5 Pointing some directions

We have sought to argue in this, our introductory chapter, the value 
and the need for the articulation of an educational linguistics, to the 
development of which we would suggest that systemic linguistics can 
make a major contribution. We sought, especially in our discussion in 
section 1.2, to identify at least some of the other traditions in 
sociolinguistics, anthropology and sociology which have offered 
complementary perspectives to those we would propose. In section 
1.3 we have noted that we hold systemic linguistic theory, as 
developed principally by Halliday, to be distinctive when set 
alongside other related traditions in the social sciences because of 
the particular role it gives to a functionally relevant grammar. Such a 
graham enables us to trace the manner in which language operates 
for the realisation of meaning, and it thus opens up the possibility 
both of penetrating how various social practices are developed and 
sustained, and of intervening in and changing these, where that is 
desirable.
In section 1.4, we have briefly examined two different models of register and genre, and we have argued the values of adopting a perspective that see genres—defined as staged, purposeful, goal-directed activities—as responsive to context of culture, while registers are seen as responsive to context of situation. A genre selects an appropriate register for any given context of situation, it is suggested, and the register in turn selects from the language system. The notion of a genre, perceived in these terms, we have noted, is to be understood as one of the many "ways of meaning" or of knowing valued in a culture. As such, genres are an appropriate object of study in educational enquiry.

We have also sought to argue, inter alia, that much contemporary educational practice, especially with respect to language, fails to take seriously the claims of language, leaving the criteria for success in language to remain at an implicit or "invisible" level, and as such sorely disadvantaging many students in schools. In addition, and as another aspect of the same problem, we have argued that much contemporary educational practice, focussing as it tends to do, upon "processes" in learning at the expense of "products" to be learned, overlooks the particular claims of the significant knowledge an education is intended to make available to students. This problem, we have suggested, is particularly acute in the stages of early childhood education, so that young children's entry to significant knowledge is often needlessly delayed.

These matters having been stated, it now remains to identify what it is that we want to do in this study, though we have to some extent offered some reflections upon this already. Briefly, then we aim to do the following:
1) To argue that educational activity needs to be conceived in terms of the operation of a range of curriculum genres, and that examination of these allows us to penetrate and understand both how the practices of education are constructed, and potentially, how we might go about changing these.

2) To identify two curriculum genres drawn from early childhood education, both of which have a role in the development of early literacy: the morning news genre and the writing planning genre.

3) To argue that two registers operate in these curriculum genres - a first order or pedagogical register and a second order or "content" register.

4) To argue that the two registers can be shown to operate in systematic ways to realise the various elements of each type of curriculum genre.
5) To argue that the pedagogical register corresponds to Bernstein's regulative discourse, and the "content" register corresponds to Bernstein's instructional discourse, and that in "unpacking" the operation of the two registers, we also show how these two discourses work.

6) To argue that an ideology of early literacy education appears to apply in our chosen curriculum genres, such that a preoccupation with "process", not "product" in learning tends to produce educational practices which demand too little of young children in their learning.

7) To argue for policies of active intervention in the operation of early childhood genres of the type examined, with a view to bringing about changes in pedagogical practices that will both (i) make available to children access to worthwhile knowledge, and (ii) make available to children explicit knowledge about language of a kind helpful in developing literacy about such knowledge.
As part of developing these arguments, we shall, in chapter 2, give a brief account of the manner in which we undertook our study, and we shall also provide some information about the particular school in which the case study was done. Then in chapter 3, we shall introduce the first of our chosen curriculum genres - the morning news genre. Here we shall discuss the schematic structure potential of the genre, identify the schematic structure we would claim is present in the particular instance of the genre we shall examine in detail, and then go on to show the manner in which the two registers operate to realise that structure. The principal tools we shall use from the systemic functional grammar are THEME and TRANSITIVITY, and it will be in using these that we shall undertake our analysis. Broadly, we shall argue that within the schematic structure of the morning news genre, certain other genres can be shown to be embedded, and that in learning to produce these, the children in fact rehearse some of the first genres they also write. Throughout the discussion, we shall in addition point to and question the kinds of ideologies of early childhood education which seem to apply in such curriculum activities, particularly as they appear to place particular significance upon the children's reconstructing personal experience.

Having drawn attention to what we would argue are some of the problems of a preoccupation with involving children in reconstructing personal experience as a necessary part of school learning, we shall go on in chapter 4 to examine where such preoccupations appear to come from. This will take us into some discussion of developments in language education theory and in general curriculum theory of the last 25-30 years. We shall argue that such developments (i) have tended to emphasise "process" in learning over "product", and (ii) have concentrated upon valuing the unique individual and his or her experience, at the expense of an appropriate sense of the social construction of experience. We shall suggest that, trained and indeed actively encouraged as they have
been to operate with these general perspectives informing their teaching practice, teachers have been deskillled, so that they are often less effective than their general commitment to teaching indicates they would want to be.

These general considerations will then take us forward into an investigation of practices in teaching literacy in early childhood education as these are to be found in the writing planning genre.

Chapter 5 will introduce the writing planning genre, by giving an overview of both the schematic structure potential of such a genre and register.

Chapter 6 will then introduce the three instances of the writing planning genre we have chosen to examine, and we will commence our examination of the manner in which they are realised by investigating THEME. We shall seek to demonstrate that a Theme examination can take us quite a long way into understanding how the schematic structure of an instance of the genre is built up, exposing a great deal of the kinds of meaning constructed, and suggesting some of the limitations of such meanings. In particular, we shall argue both that the "content" dealt with is not as demanding as it could be, and that, given that the object is that the children should learn to write, the actual principles for writing that the children are to use remain largely "invisible" in the classroom discourse.

Chapter 7 will seek to develop the discussion undertaken in chapter 6, examining TRANSITIVITY in the three instances of the writing planning genre, and showing how the schematic structure in each instance is constructed, as well as further uncovering the kinds of meanings made. Chapter 8 will then examine the three instances of the genre from the point of view of CONVERSATION STRUCTURE, both confirming the general observations of the earlier analyses, and significantly augmenting these in ways which reflect upon the
relationships of the participants in the discourse, as these are revealed in the kind of conversation they construct.

Chapter 9 will constitute the concluding chapter. It will offer a relatively brief and non-technical examination of samples of the written texts produced by the children in each of the instances of the writing planning genre. The written texts, we shall show, are relatively poor, and their poverty is to be explained less in terms of the relative inexperience of the children and rather more in terms of the limitations of what they have learned. In fact, the general characteristics of the texts, we shall argue, are to be directly attributed to the patterns of teaching and learning as these have been found to be realised in our analysis of the writing planning genre. Such patterns, we shall argue, are in turn to be attributed to the ideologies of early childhood literacy education which operate in many contemporary Australian schools, and which we shall have sought to expose throughout the previous chapters. More explicit intervention on the part of the teachers involved, both with respect to the "content" learned, and to the demands of the written mode, we shall suggest, would produce better results.

The development of educational programs committed to the principle of deliberate teacher intervention in children's early literacy growth is a responsibility of teacher education for the immediate future. An educational linguistics of the kind we have sought to explicate in this study, we shall argue, provides a basis for the development and implementation of such programs.
2 Developing a case study in early literacy

2.1 Recognising the relationship of spoken and written discourse

As already indicated, the present study seeks to examine the manner in which writing capacities are developed in young children, as one aspect of early literacy development. While the study was undertaken initially with a primary focus upon the written genres produced by young children, its focus soon shifted quite markedly from the written to the spoken mode, because, as the researcher recognised very early, it is impossible to say much of use about what children do in writing unless we also know what they have done in talk preparatory to writing. The educational implications of such an important proposition, it was considered, require thoughtful examination.

In this chapter we will:

1) outline the background considerations the researcher had in mind in undertaking the study;

2) give a brief account of the school in which the study was conducted, and of the population of young children who were the subjects of the study. Here we shall say a little about the community from which the children were drawn;
3) describe the manner of collecting the data used, and make some observations on the type of report produced here as a contribution towards an educational linguistics.

2.2 Some background considerations

A concern for early literacy development is not new. Indeed, as we have already noted in chapter 1, (section 1.1) certainly as far back as the nineteenth century all English speaking countries witnessed the growth of elementary schools intended to impart some basic literacy and numeracy as well as some useful "general knowledge". The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries thus saw the appearance of large numbers of teachers' manuals, school grammars, spelling books, readers and composition books. A particular model of language and of the development of literacy was in general apparent in such books, one which as we have already suggested in chapter 1 (section 1.1) dissociated "form" from "content", and which saw literacy as a matter of so many discrete "skills" to be drilled and mastered, as part of the process of "giving expression" to thoughts and ideas. We have elsewhere argued (1976; 1981; in press) that the model of language involved in fact gave rise to a "received tradition" of English language teaching, both with respect to the teaching of grammar and to the teaching of language generally, and that the effects of that tradition are with us yet. Thus, writing and reading were viewed as independent activities, and the relationship of written language to spoken language was ignored.

Learning to read involved learning to recognise the letters of the alphabet, and then combinations of these in one syllable words, followed by words of two syllables, and thence three syllable words. The "skills" of letter recognition were seen as the essential elements
of learning to read, and reading for the young learner was most remarkable for its lack of sense, so ruthlessly did the principle prevail by which words were selected for the opportunity they afforded to recognise letters rather than to build any meaning. A concern for meaning came later, so that, paradoxically enough, readers for somewhat older students were much more intelligible than the early readers or primers designed for the first steps of learning to read. At least one quite distinguished authority (Huey, 1908) in the early years of this century deplored the use of such readers, and the general view of literacy that they represented, though they continued to be used.

Writing on the other hand was seen as involving initially learning to form letters, often on slates, followed by practising the writing of these in copy books, while at the same time some instruction was phased in to introduce students to a recognition of the parts of speech of the written English sentence. Only after some years of learning to parse and analyse written sentences were students deemed competent to begin to "compose". The same general principle applied as in reading development. The activity of using language was broken down into its alleged smallest component parts, and students were to master these before moving to putting the various pieces together for the more sustained processes of reading or writing texts of relative length and intelligibility.

The "received tradition" of English language teaching in fact dissociated "form" from "function", just as the logico-grammatical tradition of language study alluded to in chapter 1 (section 1.2) dissociated syntax from semantics. There are at least two unfortunate effects of the older traditions of literacy education. Firstly, the basic realisation that language is a resource for the building of meaning is overlooked, and teaching practices tend to involve children in language related exercises most remarkable for their lack of concern for meaning and use. Secondly, as already
suggested, the relationship of spoken to written language is not acknowledged. The result of both these effects is that a great deal of ignorance and confusion about language is perpetuated, and early literacy programs have often been much less effective than they might otherwise have been.

All the above matters we have discussed hitherto (1976; 1981; in press), and we have referred to them here principally because we would argue that the older traditions of language and literacy teaching have survived well into this century. Furthermore, we shall argue that their legacy was apparent in at least some of the practices in the particular school in which the study to be reported here took place, even though developments in language education since the 1960's have certainly challenged aspects of the older traditions.

In chapter 4, we shall be considering in some detail developments in language education especially since the 1960's, and for that reason we shall not offer a detailed discussion of them here. We shall need to say enough, however, to give some sense both of the policies regarding language education in the school in which we worked, and of the kinds of aspirations we had in embarking on our study. The period of the 1960's was remarkable, then, for the development of important research interests in language and language education. As we have already noted in chapter 1 (section 1.2) there was significant research interest from the '60's on in early pre-school language development, and this in fact led to a great upsurge of interest in literacy education generally among English language specialists. The work and influence of a number of these specialists will be discussed in chapter 4 (section 4.2 in particular). Considerable interest emerged in the 1960's and 1970's, both in Australia and the U.K., in the development of new language curriculum initiatives.
Among other matters, the new curriculum programs that emerged after the 1960's stressed that reading and writing should be taught together. One such program, which did have an impact in Australia, was the Nuffield/Schools Council Project which Halliday directed in London. It led to the development of Breakthrough to Literacy (Mackay, Thompson and Schaub, 1970; 2nd ed., 1979) a curriculum program designed to develop reading and writing capacities in young children. By use of its sentence makers, children were enabled to become literate before they had actually mastered the English handwriting system, and as they learned to use the sentence makers they necessarily learned to read as well. (See Thornton et al, in press, for a recent review of the development and implementation of Halliday's School Council Project materials).

In Australia, The Mt Gravatt Reading Program (Hart and Gray, 1977; Hart, Gray, Walker and Walker 1977), developed in Brisbane in the 1970's by Hart, Walker and their colleagues, adopted "wholistic" and "language experience" based approaches to the teaching of reading and writing. Thus, reading and writing were seen to be intimately related, and the importance of talk in learning to read and write was also stressed. The Mt. Gravatt Reading Program was one of the best researched programs of its kind ever produced in Australia, for it was based on a careful review of what was known of young children's spoken language development, and of the most appropriate processes by which they might be inducted into recognising and using the written language. (Walker, 1985)

"Wholistic" and/or "language experience" approaches incidentally, will be discussed in chapter 4 (sections 4.2 and 4.3). Suffice to note here, that while the terms have tended to mean different things to different people, in general the use of the former was intended to highlight the need to see language and its development in a unified sense, rather than in terms of discrete elements to be mastered. The latter term - "language experience" - refers to developing
programs which exploit children's own language in learning, including learning to be literate.

Other language curriculum initiatives in Australia since the 1960's have included the many developments around the Australian states in the name of the national Language Development Project (LDP), a project sponsored by the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) (1976-81), and more recently, the Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC) (1982-87) (Reviewed in Curriculum Development Centre, 1987), also sponsored by the CDC, and widely supported in the various states. The latter program has sought to extend an understanding of integrated approaches to early literacy development by providing a set of curriculum materials for the inservice development of early childhood teachers.

The LDP (Curriculum Development Centre, 1979; 1980a; 1980b) was intended to develop fresh and better integrated approaches to the teaching of literacy, especially in the transition years from primary to secondary school, though its model of language development had important consequences for early literacy development as well. Initiatives like the LDP were made possible in Australia because of the changing nature of attitudes towards language and language development as these were expressed in the language curriculum guidelines of the various states. A review of these guidelines which the Curriculum Development Development Centre commissioned in the mid-1970's (Christie and Rothery, 1979) showed that all Australian states had, officially at least, adopted "integrated" approaches to literacy education. Henceforth, all teachers were enjoined to develop language in programs that stressed the interrelatedness of language capacities. Official guidelines to this very day similarly stress the interrelatedness of language (e.g. New South Wales Department of Education, 1987; Ministry of Education, Victoria, 1988), and they are variously supported by the curriculum materials of ELIC referred to above.
We would argue that although the various language curriculum materials we have just referred to have represented considerable gains in Australian education, these materials have not on the whole offered teachers sufficient information about language, especially how to teach about it. This is a point to which we shall return in chapter 4, though it is in addition one of the major themes of this study. In fact, we would argue that the "language revolution" as it has sometimes been termed, which has taken place since the '60's has had much to say in general terms about children learning language, but comparatively little in a systematic way either of the nature of language or of how to teach about language.

This qualification having been noted, we should observe that much of the curriculum advice to foster literacy in integrated ways has been useful, principally because it has sought to encourage teachers to develop literacy programs by building with children's own language uses. Nonetheless, and despite the advice, early childhood teachers have tended to concentrate upon reading development, delaying development of writing capacities on the grounds that such capacities should ideally be promoted after basic reading has been established. The older practices referred to above, of teaching the parts of speech and of parsing before children were deemed competent to start composing passages of their own were discredited after the 1960's. However, in practice writing itself was still seen by many teachers as a skill to be developed after much copying of what the teacher wrote and/or use of simple exercises involving completion of sentences and the like. Opportunity for development of more independent writing capacities was seen as something to be postponed until children had been at school for some time.
This situation was to some extent changed in the late 1970's and early 1980's when the work of Graves (ed. Walshe, 1981) first became known in Australia. In the wake of his work, a concern for what became known as "process writing" was taken up in much educational discussion. (e.g. Turbill, 1983) In that he argued for involving young children in writing as well as reading from their earliest days of schooling, Graves was instrumental in encouraging teachers to allow their young students to write rather earlier than had previously been true; in this sense, his influence was helpful. However, his influence also brought significant problems, for his concerns for "process", fitting as they did with other, quite dominant curriculum paradigms also concerned with "learning processes", led to support for the general proposition that the "process" of writing is in some way more important than the "product." As we shall argue in chapter 4 (sections 4.2 and 4.3) when we review developments in language curriculum theory, a policy of trying to dissociate "process" from "product" in writing development has unfortunate educational consequences.

The present study was commenced at a period when the impact of Graves' work was just beginning to be felt in Australia, and the writer was concerned to develop more appropriate curriculum models than Graves and his admirers appeared to offer. At the same time, Martin and Rothery had produced the first two of a series of reports on the Writing Project they developed within the Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney (1980; 1981). Theirs was a first attempt to develop an approach to the understanding of written genres based upon a use of the systemic functional grammar, and their general findings with respect to early writing development seemed most important to the present writer. What they offered was a means of

---

1 Graves made a visit to Australia in August 1980 to attend an International Conference on the Teaching of English held at the University of Sydney. He was a plenary speaker at the Conference, and from that time on, his work became influential in the country.
identifying different types of written genres in a manner potentially very helpful to teachers. It was this which was what was most lacking in the model of writing Graves and his supporters offered, as well as in that of authorities like Britton (1975), also influential in Australia at the time. (see section 4.2 of chapter 4) From the point of view of the writer, however, what the Martin/Rothery reports seemed most to lack was any account of where the written genres came from. In short, the curriculum planning implications of their work needed considerable development.

It was with these general considerations in mind that in 1983 the researcher sought to undertake an investigation of early writing in a selected school in Geelong. Since it seemed important to be able to trace the writing development over an extended period of time, it was determined to work in the school for at least three years, observing the same population of children from their first months at school through to the end of their third year.

2.3 The children at "Normanbury" school

The school in which this study was conducted is in a suburb of the city of Geelong, one of Australia’s larger rural cities. These days, such is the impact of modern transport, Geelong is only an hour’s drive from the city of Melbourne via a modern freeway, so that the relative isolation of many rural communities is not a particular feature of Geelong. Geelong was once a prosperous city, having been developed last century as a major port for the rich rural industry of Victoria, though its economic activities were also significantly enriched by the gold rushes in nearby Ballarat in the 1850’s. This century, particularly after the Second World War, secondary industry came to have a significant role in the life of Geelong, employing large numbers of European migrants who came to Australia once the war was over. They have worked in such industries as the Ford motor car works,
the woollen mills and textiles generally, shoe factories, and Harvester International, once an important manufacturer of farm machinery.

By the 1980's much of Geelong's former prosperity had diminished, and by the time this study had commenced the city was feeling the effects of recession caused partly by drought and partly by the general decline of the international economy. Geelong is no longer a very wealthy city, though it has continued to attract considerable numbers of migrant settlers, many of whom find employment in the secondary industries which Geelong still supports, such as the car industry.

The school in which this investigation took place lies in a northern suburb of Geelong, to which we have given the fictitious name of "Normanbury". It is a community in which significant numbers of the children - about a third in fact - come from backgrounds in which English is a second language. The two largest ethnic communities are Croatian and Macedonian speaking, both from Yugoslavia, where conflict between the two groups is not unknown. However, they maintain quite cordial relations with each other in Geelong. Of the two communities the Croatian speaking is the larger. The general store closest to the school, incidentally, is remarkable in that, apart from locally grown fruit and vegetables on sale there, everything else is imported from Yugoslavia, and when the researcher occasionally visited the shop, the woman in charge was more often than not engaged in conversation in Croatian with a customer. At the time this study commenced the school had both a Croatian and a Macedonian teaching aide, and before the study was completed, a Croatian-speaking teacher had been employed, actually taking classes in Croatian with the Croatian-speaking children. Efforts to find a suitably qualified Macedonian speaking teacher proved unsuccessful, and the Macedonian teaching aide continued to be employed. The third largest ethnic community in the area is Italian, and apart from that, smaller numbers of children may be found from Greek, Hungarian, Serbian, Polish and Dutch families. By the time the
period of data collection had finished at the end of 1985, a sprinkling of South East Asian children had also appeared in the school, though there were no such children in the population of children studied closely.

The children whose education formed the focus of this study commenced schooling in 1983, entering the preparatory year as it is called in the state of Victoria. Their number changed a little over the three years of the study, hovering between 50 and 55, since the occasional child moved away or was sent to a private school instead. Of the 50-55 children, a half were in fact from backgrounds in which English was a second language, and they started school with rather variable levels of proficiency in English. Though no formal attempt was made by the researcher to establish the degree of capacity in English among the children when they first came to school, the principal did advise that 10 of them had very little indeed at the start of schooling. Some children, such as a little girl from a Dutch-speaking family, could speak only English, but other children from Croatian, Macedonian or Italian backgrounds, were bilingual. Over the long Christmas break at the end of the first year of the study some of the Croatian and Macedonian speaking children actually forgot some of their English, since they were speaking it very little, but they recovered it reasonably rapidly once they resumed school in 1984.

The community from which the children came was largely working class. There were five children in the 50-55 involved who came from professional families: one was the child of school teachers, two others were the children of fathers who were engineers, and two, who were twins, were the children of an accountant, and they were all native born Australians. The other children's fathers, both migrant and Australian born, tended to work in blue collar jobs of various kinds including the following: locomotive driving, baking bread, assembling cars at the Ford car factory, selling fish, carpentering, welding, glass-
making, laboring, concrete finishing, shearing and tyre building. Numbers of the mothers worked, normally in a part time capacity in semi or unskilled jobs as in a shop or cleaning offices, though one was learning to be a nurse aide. A number of mothers did not work, including at least several who spoke no English at all.

While the children might not be described as well off, they were not desperately poor either. The school principal advised that a number of school programs were supplemented through grants under the Commonwealth Government’s Disadvantaged Schools scheme, a scheme which apportions money to schools where some hardship is experienced. Most of the children lived within walking distance of the school, in one of the trim brick veneer houses found in Normanbury, all of them recently built on what had, until very recent years, been farming country. A number of families were paying off their homes, while others rented, and the general character of the houses, with their large vegetable gardens and carefully mown lawns, bespoke people with considerable pride in their dwellings.

Most children - those in particular from migrant backgrounds - came from quite large families, being able to talk about various aunts, uncles and cousins and grandparents as well as their parents and siblings, mostly living within Geelong, and often, in the case of the Croatian and Macedonian children, in the same suburb. The only children in the study (two in fact) whose parents had divorced were native born Australians, while the migrant families tended to remain together. Strong ties of affection seemed to be a feature of the family life enjoyed by most of the children involved in the study, and few exhibited significant behavioural problems.
3.3 Methodological considerations

The Normanbury school had introduced early writing activity into the preparatory year at the general direction of the school principal who had heard Graves speak and been interested in what he said. Aware of this, the researcher sought to undertake a case study there, with a view to identifying the types of genres the children learned to produce as well as explaining how these developed. In the event, relatively little progress was made in the children's writing development during the preparatory or first year, and by the end of the year, only five children had achieved any degree of independence as writers, in that they could produce rudimentary texts consisting of one or occasionally two clauses. They were normally instances of what Martin (1994e) termed Labelling genres, in that they accompanied and labelled a picture. Other children produced scribbles, sometimes incorporating actual letters of the alphabet, and normally accompanying pictures.

Two general observations had occurred to the researcher as the year progressed. The first was that the children had made very slow progress, and that this was to be attributed partly, at least, she believed, to the reluctance of the teachers to make available explicit knowledge of a kind which would have helped the children to progress more quickly. An ideology appeared to prevail, such that very little with respect to literacy was actually taught to the children, on the grounds that they were "too young", and that it would make things "too hard" if the pace and general directions were changed. The second observation made by the researcher was that the approach to the teaching of literacy appeared piecemeal, rather than based upon a coherent overall view of language. In other words, much of the legacy of the traditional approaches referred to above, of breaking up aspects of the written language into discrete parts for teaching and learning, appeared to prevail.
Two kinds of conflicting approaches to early childhood literacy appeared to be in operation. The one was that of "language experience" drawing upon the children's own language as indicated above. The other involved the older and time-honoured practices of working first through the learning of letters of the alphabet, and later to the learning of words. "Language experience" approaches seemed more apparent in the writing program, while the older practices to do with letter and word recognition seemed to be used in the reading program.

The manner in which the literacy program worked was in some ways surprising. It was policy to take the whole year to introduce the 26 letters of the alphabet to the children. Initially, they were all taught to recognise the letter that started their own first name, though a few already knew this, having been taught by their families. After that, a different letter was introduced most weeks, though some weeks letters already dealt with were revised; the children learned to recognise the letter and to name it, and they also encountered it in the reading program the principal had devised. The latter program involved a series of simple reading activities, whose language was essentially that of speech rather than of writing, as indeed is the language of the first readers in the Mt Gravatt scheme. The reading activities were set out in a so-called "big book" which could be displayed by the teacher so that the children could read it along with her. The children also received their own smaller copies of the pages from this book, and they were put in their folders as the year progressed. These readers had the merit that they offered the children complete sentences to read, never arbitrary lists of words, as sometimes still applies, though the language was nonetheless often reminiscent of that which one associates with the older readers to which reference has already been made in section 3.2 above.
The principal's general view of how the writing program might operate involved engaging the children in some activity such as watching a clown in the school playground, talking about that, and then having the children write about it. To some extent, this plan was implemented, though since the children often did not even recognise the letters they needed to form in order to write about such an activity, they normally produced scribbles, allowing the teachers to write a "translation" underneath when they had the time. The latter is itself an entirely defensible procedure, by the way, since it does enable the children to see their teachers model some relevant writing behaviour for them. However, such a procedure should not be a substitute for the more direct teaching about the spelling and handwriting systems which it seemed the teachers were reluctant to embark on, taking the view that this was "too hard" for such young children.

One of the most enduring impressions formed over the first year was that schooling seemed to ask so little of the children. Of course, what was done with respect to literacy was in itself only part of a wider educational program which included other learning activities of various kinds, and it might be suggested that the pace of learning overall in the total program was reasonable. That would certainly have been the view of the teachers, though the researcher remained unconvinced.

The principal's attitude on these matters was somewhat equivocal. Very much influenced by recent publicity which had been given to Graves' work, and much more committed than the teachers to "language experience" approaches, she appeared to subscribe to the view that the appropriate programs would both "bring forth" the creative capacities of the children in their writing and allow them to "pick up" those features of the spelling and handwriting systems that they needed as they went along. The researcher always had serious reservations about this particular formulation of "language
experience", since it was so reminiscent of Bernstein's notions of the invisible pedagogy. (Chapter 1, section 1.2) Where the principles for what constitutes educational success remain indeterminate and not explicitly stated, then the students are left groping, and only those already advantaged in terms of having some prior knowledge of such principles are likely to progress. The point is not one easily accepted where teachers operate with different understandings. In the school in question, for example, the teachers could point to the patent lack of progress of most children in terms of becoming writers by the end of the preparatory year as evidence that the tasks involved were difficult and needed to be taken slowly. Equally, however, it seemed to the researcher that where children are simply not enabled to acquire the tools with which to go about being literate, then they will not become literate. It was this, she felt, that accounted for the relative lack of progress.

Above all, when some attempt was made to identify the types of genres the few successful children wrote, it seemed to the researcher that these were to be explained, not in terms of the expression of some capacity "brought forth" in response to the activities of the classroom, but rather in terms of the types of generic choices the children had managed to learn. Close examination of the matter seemed to indicate these choices had actually been modelled, albeit unconsciously, by the teachers in their talk. It was because of this that it was determined to record the classroom discourse in writing lessons in years 2 and 3, so that the relationship between what the children wrote and what they did in talk preparatory to writing might be appropriately tested and analysed.

Thus, as the children entered year 1, the researcher obtained an appropriate audio recorder which was taken out to the school one day a week. Lessons in one class were recorded in the first time slot of the day from 9.00 a.m. to 10.30 a.m., and with the other class in the second time slot from 10.45 a.m till 12.10 p.m. A writing lesson
was always undertaken in these time periods in both classess, though normally along with other activities. For example, in the morning, entry to school was followed by roll call and morning news, so that the writing lesson, which came after these activities, normally lasted about 45 minutes. After morning play, the first activity was often singing, though sometimes some news giving was undertaken then too. The writing activity was normally about 45-50 minutes in this situation. All the writing done by the children over the two years was kept by the researcher - not only that done when she was present.

Detailed field notes on all activities observed by the researcher were kept, and these provided essential additional information when the classroom discourse was transcribed. In addition, copies were kept of the teachers' registers of work completed and of any materials handed out to the children pertinent to the literacy program. Copies were also made of the class rolls and other school records, with which to obtain information about family backgrounds. Every opportunity was taken to meet parents where possible, and in fact over the two years in weekly visits and intensive collection of data, the researcher did meet many parents, even making occasional visits to their homes.

In practice, as the program proceeded, the principles adopted by the teachers for developing early writing development departed in a number of ways from the principles of Graves, as these are explained for example in a collection of papers edited by Walshe (1981) and also in a volume of Graves (1983). There were at least two senses in which the principles adopted in the school differed from those normally attributed to Graves. Firstly, while the children chose their own topics for writing in their journals, they did not on the whole choose them in other parts of the writing program. Secondly, the practice of holding "conferences" (e.g. Walshe, 1981, 11-12) with young writers at different stages in the writing activity was not formally constituted, though the children were given frequent help
during their writing by their teachers, especially with spelling and punctuation.

Whereas in the preparatory year, three teachers had taught the children involved, when they entered year 1 they were broken into two classes, each of about 25, and while two classes were also retained in year 2, some of the children were moved around a little. In year 1 there were thus two teachers involved, quite different from those involved in the preparatory year's teaching, and in year 2 yet another two teachers took over the classes. One of the latter left towards the end of the first term to go on maternity leave, and in the consequent reorganisation this occasioned, another teacher took over one of the year 2 classes. There were thus eight teachers involved in teaching the children over the first three years of schooling, with unfortunate results both for the children and for the researcher. About these we shall comment further below, through first we shall address certain other matters to do with the research procedures adopted, the data collected and methods of analysis.

While it was possible to obtain a reasonably good recording of the talk in activities like roll call, morning news or the writing lesson itself, it proved quite impossible to record talk during the time when the children actually undertook their writing. It would have been very useful to record such talk, perhaps by concentrating on one or two children and attaching a microphone to their clothing as they wrote and sometimes talked to other children or to the teacher. However, the recording equipment used would not have permitted such a thing. In any case, since the research interest was very squarely focussed on the patterns of language use preparatory to writing, and on the manner in which understandings with respect to literacy were built up under the teacher's guidance, it was sufficient to record the preparatory talk, in which both the "content" for writing and the nature of the writing task were really intended to be established.
Over the two years of the children's schooling in years 1 and 2, a large number of teaching episodes were thus recorded, and in time the focus of the researcher's attention shifted quite dramatically. In the first place, the focus shifted increasingly to considerations of spoken discourse, not written discourse, so that in the analyses we shall offer in subsequent chapters, we shall examine spoken language only in a systematic and detailed way, confining our remarks with respect to the writing the children did to some general observations in chapter 9. In the second place, such was the interest we developed in the kinds of spoken discourse schooling seems to foster and reward, we undertook to look systematically at talk in the morning news activity as well as in the writing activity. So powerful is the need of young writers to find appropriate patterns of language for writing, especially where no systematic or explicit advice is given to them about these, that in morning news activities they actually rehearse and practise at least some of the genres they go on to produce in writing lessons. The attempt to analyse the various patterns of talk found in the morning news and writing activities led in time to the formulation of the idea of the "curriculum genre".

The principles of analysis provided by Halliday's grammar are quite exhaustive, and in using it choices needed to be made in at least two senses. The first sense concerned the ways in which texts were selected for eventual analysis, and the second concerned the decisions made about what aspects of the systemic functional grammar were chosen for undertaking the analysis.

To take the first of these, as we shall see in our subsequent chapters, it was decided to select one morning news activity only for close analysis, and from that we have examined only two instances of news giving by two different children. In the case of the writing activities, we have selected three writing lessons, two undertaken when the children were in year 2, and one in year 1. The examples selected for close study are thus rather few in number, though they were chosen
with care and it is felt that they are quite representative. In addition, as it proceeds, the discussion will from time to time allude to, and cite from, other instances both of morning news lessons and of writing planning lessons, drawn from the data collected.

To turn to the second set of choices made, these concerned those aspects of the grammar selected for close analysis of the ways in which the texts realised their meanings. As already indicated in chapter 1 (section 1.5), we have selected THEME and TRANSITIVITY as the primary elements of the grammar used, though we shall make use of the MOOD SYSTEM, both in that we shall make frequent incidental references to mood choices as the discussion proceeds, and in that the MOOD SYSTEM lies behind the operation of the CONVERSATION STRUCTURE analysis we shall undertake in chapter 8. We should note here that the choices of what aspects of the grammar to use in order to undertake our analysis were based upon considerable trial and error in using different aspects of the grammar, and we believe that what we have selected suits the data involved.

Overall, the investigation constituted a case study. The fact that case studies permit a sampling of only a very small number of the social activities examined reflects the particular problems of the social sciences generally, and their need to come to terms with explaining complex social processes in sufficiently comprehensive ways. In what we believe is probably the first attempt to offer a description of educational activities in terms of the notion of the curriculum genre, we aim to make a contribution to the cause of educational understanding, but we would also hope that others will seek to undertake similar or related studies. In that way the observations made in this study may well in time be tested by others, and no doubt be amended in the light of others' experience.
Earlier, we suggested that the manner in which the children worked with some eight teachers over the three years of the study was unfortunate both for the children and for the research study. We need now to comment rather more fully on our reasons for suggesting this.

To take the impact on the children first, since their welfare as the persons being educated must be held by far the most important consideration, we would observe that while it is not uncommon to see such a rapid turn over of staff in contemporary Australian schools, it is nonetheless most unsettling in its effects. Children throughout all the years of a primary education actually need all the benefits of continuity as they accustom themselves to schooling and to the demands it places upon them. However, we would argue that especially in the first three years of their schooling, such young children require the security of constant relationship with the same adult or adults, and that as little movement as possible from teacher to teacher is most desirable. Even in the best planned situations where teachers advise each other of their teaching activities, different teachers have varying expectations of their students, and there is the problem that children who have just managed to adjust to the expectations of one teacher, must set about accustoming themselves to quite different ones set by another teacher.

In practice, the researcher was herself satisfied that the two teachers most substantially involved in teaching the children in year 2 had very little knowledge of what had been accomplished in year 1 and, certainly in the case of the writing program, activities already used in the previous year were sometimes employed again. In principle, a learning activity undertaken one year may often be worthy of revisiting in another year; but this will be true only where the second time around the teacher has an understanding of what was done before and can seek to build upon and develop that. Such did not prove to be the case in the study reported here. Occasional attempts
by the researcher tactfully to point out that some activity had been undertaken hitherto were not well received. In fact, it was not her place to plan curriculum, though the occasional comment was sometimes sought from her.

All this brings us to the difficulties experienced by the researcher. She was present in the school with the blessing of the principal and the rather more cautious support of the staff. The particular teachers who taught the children in the study did all become reasonably friendly with the researcher, who was at some pains to build good working relations. We have already observed that recording of teaching episodes commenced in year 1, the second year of the study. Had it been possible to see the teachers who worked with the children in that year proceed with them into the following year, then the nature of the subsequent study we believe would have been very different. We say this partly because of the identity of one of the year 2 teachers in particular, and partly because of the benefits children, teachers and researcher might all have enjoyed had greater continuity of effort been made possible. We shall comment on each of these, taking the latter point first.

As a matter of policy, the principal chose to introduce different teachers when the children were in year 2, for she tended to move teachers around to different classes every year. One unfortunate result was that the two teachers who took over the children in year 2, who had not hitherto had much experience in teaching young children to write, had now to learn to do so. This accounted in part for the repetition of activities that sometimes occurred. From the point of view of the development of the study and the researcher's own interest in what young children might learn to write, it would have been helpful if the teachers from year 1 had moved into year 2 with the children, and continued to build on what they had done the previous year.
This brings us to the issue of the identity of one of the year 1 teachers, who will be referred to in the study as Mrs. L. As the work of year 1 proceeded, Mrs L in particular became interested in the orientations of the researcher, and she was especially attracted to the idea that it would be possible to identify different types of genres for teaching purposes. She had begun to feel a degree of frustration with what she had been doing, and she welcomed the opportunity of going further, and developing her work as a teacher. By the end of the year she had had several discussions with the researcher and she was keen to proceed further in working with the latter the following year. The principal, however, took the view that Mrs L would be better attached to another class, and while that was perhaps unfortunate, at least she and the researcher had agreed to work together in so far as they could in the new arrangements. However, tragedy struck almost as soon as this had been agreed. Mrs L - a young woman of only 32-developed cancer, rapidly resigned from the school, and within a matter of months she was dead. It remains a matter of great regret to the researcher that Mrs L died as she did, for she had become a good friend.

From the point of view of the growth of the research study, the death of Mrs L meant that the teacher most interested to pursue a possible description of various genres for writing and hence to develop programs for direct teaching about these genres, was lost.

Such are the problems of case studies of this kind, where the object is primarily to investigate aspects of educational programs as they are. One cannot and should not lament the loss of the relative "tidiness" of studies developed according to other research paradigms of a more "experimental" character, in which the vicissitudes and misfortunes of "real life" are not allowed to intrude. Rather, one must accept both that "real life" is not "tidy", and that there are in fact many important lessons to be learned from its close observation.
As for the other three teachers whose teaching will be sampled most closely in succeeding chapters, the researcher became friendly with all three. Two of them subsequently left the school on maternity leave, while the third remains actively involved in the school.

One ongoing consequence of the study was that the researcher was drawn into discussions of curriculum planning at the school. Once the period of data collection was finished, she remained on good terms with the staff at the school, and continued to visit, though less frequently. The researcher has always made a point of discussing the findings of her study with the teachers. Under the principal's leadership the school went on to reassess its writing program, drawing upon the researcher's work. About this we shall have more to say in chapter 9.

Two final general points need to be made in this section with respect to the study, one to do with the manner of its writing up, the other to do with the reflections offered upon the school teaching practices examined. To take the first of these, as we have already noted in chapter 1, this thesis seeks to make a contribution to the development of an educational linguistics, specifically by using principles of systemic linguistic analysis. In the attempt the writer has drawn upon three different and sizeable traditions of academic enquiry: systemic linguistic theory, language education theory and general curriculum theory. This is in itself an ambitious undertaking, not least because the discourses the three traditions generate are quite different in character. This accounts for certain features of the thesis as it is presented. Those chapters involving close linguistic analyses of the texts selected are in fact quite long, for the very methodology adopted forces that requirement upon the writer. Chapter 3, which introduces the first curriculum genre examined, makes use of a reasonably long text, and develops lengthy linguistic analyses of it. For chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 appendices have been included, setting out lengthy analyses, though even then these
chapters are long. Other chapters are considerably shorter, reflecting the fact that they construct different discourses, and draw upon different traditions of enquiry, such as chapter 4, and also much of chapter 1. The result therefore, is that the chapters are of somewhat variable lengths, though we believe they are all of equal importance in the overall argument.

To turn to the other matter we raised concerning reflections upon the school teaching practices found in the enquiry, it is with some surprise that the writer finds herself disclaiming any attempt to be merely negatively critical of the efforts of the teachers in the study. More than once in the preparation of this thesis, and in discussions of some of its findings, it has been remarked that the researcher appears to be unfairly critical of the teachers concerned. At the risk of appearing defensive, therefore, we would point out that nothing could be further from the truth. The five teachers involved with the teaching of the children in years 1 and 2 were of course very generous in regularly allowing a stranger into their classrooms, and they deserve no criticism at all. However, the effort to try to understand what they did certainly has led to some criticisms of the teaching practices they adopted, and these criticisms are explained at some length throughout the thesis.

The whole study was undertaken with the intention of finding out what actually happened in some classrooms where an attempt was being made to teach literacy to young learners. The hope beyond that was that the researcher, equipped with such knowledge herself, might go on to propose the kinds of changes that could be made to improve literacy teaching practices in the future. No "blame" attaches to anyone for any failures or shortcomings found in the classrooms studied. On the contrary, such failures as there were must be explained in terms of long established practices and ideologies in western cultures and western schooling, some of which will be discussed in chapter 4. It is to these that we must look, and
about these that we shall need in the future to be vigilant if we are indeed to see the desired changes in literacy education.

2.4 The aim of the study

Overall then in this chapter we have sought to establish something of the nature of the study undertaken, where that has involved consideration of our reasons for undertaking it, as well as some relevant information concerning the school worked in, and the character of the community and of the particular children concerned. Briefly, the school lay in the industrial belt of north Geelong, most of the children came from families where the principal bread winner was a blue collar worker, and almost half the children came from backgrounds where another language was spoken, though not all the children were bilingual.

The study was inspired by an interest in the early writing development of young learners, and in particular by the need felt to explain the ways in which young children learned to make appropriate choices of genres for writing. Where Martin and Rothery had offered an excellent account of many of the genres of early school learning, they had not, it was felt, reflected sufficiently upon where these came from, or upon the wider curriculum planning implications of such reflections. Furthermore, since the ideas of Graves and so-called "process approaches" to writing seemed in particular influential in the implementation of early writing programs both in Australia generally and in the school selected for the case study, it seemed important to address questions of how children learned to write the genres or text types they did. Experience in the first rather tentative year of the study caused the researcher to reach certain conclusions about the relationship between what it is children do in writing and the nature of what they are enabled to learn to do in the activities preparatory to writing. These
conclusions were then tested in the subsequent two years of the study. Specifically, it was hypothesised:

That there is a very intimate relationship between the nature of the language young children learn to write and the nature of the language made available to them preparatory to writing.

It was argued that this was a very important educational principle to establish because of its consequences for curriculum planning and educational practices generally. It would at the very least have important implications for teachers in that it would indicate they should have an explicit sense both of the language they used themselves and of that which their students needed to learn in order to write. But beyond that, such a principle would point the way to the implementation of educational practices in which active teacher intervention in the development of children's literacy would be deemed a desirable thing.

As we conclude this chapter it is important to note that in the period since we ceased collection of the data used in the study at the end of 1985 and completed writing it up in 1988-89, much has already changed in language education in Australia. We believe - we hope modestly! - that the study reported here has helped to make some small contribution at least to some of the changes. (e.g. Christie, 1984; 1986c; 1987b; 1988a) Because of the efforts of many people in fact, we are already very much closer to the development of an educational linguistics in Australia than was true even when the study commenced in 1983. In addition, we have seen the development of several language curriculum initiatives of note - ones which offer teachers models of the English language for working generally with students in schools, and which in particular address questions of the teaching of writing. These matters will be reviewed in our final chapter, when we consider some of the overall implications of our study.
3 The Morning News Genre

3.1 The importance of the morning news genre both as an instance of a curriculum genre and as a context for rehearsing writing

In this chapter, we will introduce the morning news genre. It is of significance in this study overall for two reasons. Firstly, it is significant because it is one of the two instances of the curriculum genre we will identify in this investigation, though many more curriculum genres require to be described.1 Secondly, it is of significance because it is in this curriculum activity that children often practise not only several oral genres apparently valued in the culture, but they also practise some of the first genres that they write. This latter point will be developed a little more fully in chapter 9, when we shall examine some of the written genres produced by the children. To return to the first point, we should note that by establishing the presence of at least two curriculum genres, we will by implication have argued the operation of others, and we will also, hopefully, have demonstrated the value to educational research of such enquiries. Our purposes here will be twofold. Firstly, we shall seek to uncover the schematic structure potential of the morning news genre. Secondly, we shall seek to identify the particular values about early childhood education which are actually at work in such genres, both as they pertain to the nature of authority and children's respect for it, and as they pertain to the use of personal and/or "language experience" as a form of knowledge.

---

1A third curriculum genre, the roll call genre, has been identified in F. Christie (1985). 'Curriculum genres: towards a description of the construction of knowledge in the junior primary school.' A paper given at the Language in Education Conference on Interaction of Spoken and Written Language, held at the University of New England, Armidale, November, 1985.
We will argue that the values and attitudes towards childhood and knowledge realised in such genres are very similar to those which may also be demonstrated to apply in the writing planning genre to be considered in later chapters. We will also argue eventually that such values are in need of change.

By way of developing the discussion in this chapter, we aim to do the following things:

1) to offer some opening reflections on the objectives of "morning news" activities, and to establish the significance of these activities as one aspect of "language experience" approaches to early childhood education;

2) to give an overview of the schematic structure potential of the genre, indicating the general function of each element in the overall pattern;

3) to outline the values of register in the pedagogical and "content" registers as they operate in the morning news genre, suggesting something of the ways they realise the schematic structure;
4) using THEME and TRANSITIVITY, to undertake an analysis of the schematic structure of one instance of the morning news genre, involving two children in the role of Morning News Giver:

5) through the analysis undertaken to demonstrate how the two registers realise the elements of schematic structure;

6) to argue that within the genre, other genres will be found to be embedded, of a kind that the children producing them will often go on to produce in writing;

7) to offer some reflections on the manner in which attitude, opinion and judgment are realised linguistically in the instance of the morning news genre, drawing attention to the differences in the teacher's use of such language and that of the children.
3.2 The educational objectives of morning news activities

Morning news is a very frequent feature of the first years of schooling in Australian schools. Sometimes, the term "show and tell" is used rather than morning news, and in the U.S.A. at least, the activity is also called "sharing time" (Michaels, 1980; Lazarus & Homer, 1980; Foster, 1982; Cazden, Michael and Tabors, 1985; Cazden, 1988). In a morning news session, the News Giver is intended to have an item or items of news to share. In the show and tell session, the child brings an object to show the other children and talk about it. In practice, in the study reported on here, the teachers appeared indifferent to whether the children had an object or not, since the primary purpose was to encourage the children to talk, and the possession of an object was seen as merely a means to achieving that end. One of the seven teachers who taught at least some of the 50-55 children over the three years involved, regularly used the term "show and tell" to refer to the session, though the others used "morning news".

In this study to avoid confusion, we will use the term "morning news" to identify the genre under discussion, and, as it is intended to demonstrate, we will argue that within that element of the schematic structure which actually involves the child in morning news giving, there is some variation, so that one or more of several other genres will actually be found to be embedded. The term "embedding", in itself a technical term taken from Halliday's systemic functional grammar, will be explained a little more fully in section 3.2 below.

There is of course some variation in morning news activities from teacher to teacher, reflecting the fact that different teachers do set somewhat different priorities. For example, of the two teachers who taught the children in two Year 1 classes, one (Mrs. L) interpreted her role rather differently from her colleague (Mrs. B), and in fact from all the other teachers observed in the study. For instance,
where a child moved into the morning news giving mode, Mrs. L sought to allow the other children opportunity to ask questions of that child rather more freely than did Mrs. B, and she tended to ask fewer questions herself than did the latter, though this was not invariably so. In addition, she frequently stepped so far back back from the central authoritative role that the child operating as the Morning News Giver was enabled to create sustained monologic discourse leading to the creation of such "story-like" genres as OBSERVATIONS, or ANECDOTES. (Rothery, 1984, in preparation; Plum, 1988) Such genres did not feature, by contrast, in the discourse of the children of Mrs. B's class because she took a more active role in the construction of the morning news giving activity. Despite the fact that the classroom texts produced in each case did show some significant variation in consequence, however, the overall schematic structure did not vary.

Morning news or sharing time has a fairly old tradition in the U.S.A., dating apparently from the 1930's at least, though its appearance in Australia appears to have been much more recent. Certainly, it was not a feature of the writer's own early childhood education in an Australian school in Sydney in the 1940's. As has been already suggested, it seems clear that the recent fairly widespread adoption in Australian schools of activities like morning news has been part of the "language experience" movement in early childhood education, dating from the late 1960's, and having important consequences for language curriculum both in the U.K and in Australia. As part of this movement, the primary object of morning news, as it is normally identified by teachers, is to promote children's oral language. Another recent Australian enquiry into morning news (Baker and Perrott, 1988) reports that teachers see the activity as an opportunity for children to talk about matters important to them, and to assume some of the capacity to talk which is normally the prerogative of the teacher. As we shall argue later, the goal of "promoting children's talk" is somewhat misleading, because too
superficial. It is misleading because it begs much wider questions about the implications and purposes of such pedagogical practices. Consideration of these matters, as we shall see later, can be resolved only by recourse to a consideration of genre and register, and ultimately to a consideration of the ideologies of early childhood and of knowledge which are realised in the genre.

Certainly, it is true that many teachers attach great importance to the development or oral language abilities in early childhood education. As two British educationists, Ede and Williamson (1980) have noted, a surprising number of teachers are of the view that children "have no language" when they come to school, and they therefore imagine that an important function of the early years of schooling will be to teach them language. The writer can recall some years ago visiting a Catholic primary school in the western districts of Sydney. Since she had not visited the school previously, the religious sister in charge of the infants department asked her what her particular area of professional interest was in education. Upon being told that the interest was in mother tongue language education, the teacher said that she shared the interest, and that since the children at her school "had no language" when they arrived at school aged 5+ years, she sought to teach them to use language. Such an observation was the more surprising, because a visit to the infants year classroom (where the children had been at school about three weeks only), revealed the children were clustered on the floor in various groups, animatedly talking about several different tasks in which they were engaged. Many teachers of young children in the city in which the present study was conducted have from time to time expressed similar views to the Sydney teacher, revealing that they possess a number of quite serious misunderstandings about the nature of language.
Language development in the first three years of schooling is perceived as important by school teachers, both because capacity in oral language is to be established, and because the children are to acquire "basic literacy". One of the primary objectives of the early childhood years, in fact, is to establish basic language abilities with which children will go on to the later years of education. While it is historically the case that basic language abilities have always been perceived as important in the early years of education (Christie, 1976), it is also clear that since the '60's language has come to be understood in some ways a little differently from in the past. In Australia at least it seems that the particular contemporary interest in activities like morning news belongs to the period since the '60's. It represents one response to what has been perceived by many as the need to encourage children to talk, as a necessary instrument for learning. In the contemporary preoccupations with language which have emerged as a result of developments in language education since the '60's, language abilities or "skills", to use a term more widely employed by teachers, are conceived of as matters which may be taught or developed independently of "content area". The tendency to create dualisms or dichotomies, to which we have already alluded in chapter 1, (section 1.2) is very much in evidence here. Children should be taught to talk, to read and to write, is the implication, so that when they pass out of the infants years into the middle and upper primary years, and on to the secondary years, they will be able to deal with the "content" of schooling. One expression of this dubious educational proposition was a few years ago provided by an authority on the teaching of reading, Singer (1979), who drew a distinction between "learning to read" (a task for the first years of school) and "learning to read content" (a task for the middle and upper years of the primary school).

The interest in using morning news as a means to teach children oral language comes from the same set of assumptions about language, and about its relationship to "content", as Singer's assumptions about
basic literacy. Children must learn to talk in the early years, the theory goes, so that they will be able to talk about "content" as they progress up the school. It is for this reason that the choice of topic or object for talking about, is of incidental significance to the teacher. What matters is that the children learn to talk: what they talk about need not matter.

Choice of topic is not, however, as thoroughly open ended as the latter statement may seem to imply. As we shall see in section 3.4 below, we shall argue the operation of a first order or pedagogical register and a second order or "content" register in the morning news genre. Where the former is involved in operationalising teaching/learning activity, the latter involves the "content" to be dealt with in that activity. We shall suggest among others things that the pedagogical field significantly constrains the kinds of choices of "topic" which may be taken up as a suitable "content" field. This we suggest is an instance of the working of the theories developed by Bernstein, and outlined in chapter 1 (section 1.2). Thus, as we noted, he identifies a recontextualising principle at work in educational contexts, so that the fields of enquiry of "outside the school", are recontextualised for the purposes of teaching and learning in schools. A regulative discourse operates in educational settings, he argues, such that this determines much of the manner of working, and within which another discourse operates, to which he gives the name instructional discourse.

Bernstein actually writes that the instructional discourse is "embedded" within the regulative discourse, a term we shall not use, since as already alluded to in passing, we shall be using the notion of embedding in another technical sense, which is drawn from Halliday's grammar. We will discuss this in section 3.3. For reasons to be explained a little more fully in section 3.4, we shall take another technical term from the grammar - that of "projection" - and
argue that the pedagogical register "projects" the second order or "content" register.

The "content" of the morning news genre is to be understood a little differently from that of the writing planning genre, incidentally, in that, subject to the general requirements of the pedagogical field, the children exercise choices in the "content" examined, whereas they do not do so normally in the writing planning genre. However, the same general principle of projection will be found to apply, a matter we shall take up in chapter 5.

The model of genre, register and language adopted here, it will be recalled (see chapter 1, sections 1.2 and 1.3), argues that genre relates to context of culture, as register relates to context of situation. The schematic structure of a given instance of a genre is said to be realised in choices made in register, while register is in turn realised in choices made in language. The model thus disposes us to consider the schematic structure potential of the morning news genre first, and then to examine register and finally language later. Thus, in section 3.3 we shall outline the schematic structure potential we claim characterises the morning news genre, while in section 3.4 we shall examine the two registers we suggest operate, taking up our grammatical analyses in the remaining sections of the chapter. In our preliminary account of the schematic structure potential of the genre, however, some mention will need to be made of the working of the two registers. It should be borne in mind then, as already indicated, that the pedagogical register relates to the general operationalising of activity. This particular register tends to be most marked at the beginning and end of genres, and/or at the beginnings and ends of elements. The "content" register, on the other hand, since it relates to the "content" dealt with in the genre, tends to come in the "body" or the middle element(s) of a genre. The more detailed account of the two registers to be offered in section 3.4 will develop these points more fully. We have said
sufficient to commence our discussion of the schematic structure potential of the genre.

3.3. The morning news genre: its cultural significance and its schematic structure potential

It will be worth reminding ourselves as we begin this discussion that the definition of a genre adopted here is that of a "staged, purposeful, goal-directed activity": as such, it is argued, it represents one of the many ways of getting things done that are valued in a culture. The morning news genre represents one of the first and most highly ritualised of the genres of early childhood education, revealing a lot of the aspirations apparently held in the sub-culture of schooling to do with developing in children patterns of acceptable behaviour. Inevitably, the first few months and years of schooling have as an important goal socialising young children to the ways of working in schools: learning to follow certain principles of moving about the classroom and the rest of the school, learning to work to the teacher's general directions, learning to operate in identifiable time slots, the beginning and end of which are often signalled very audibly by the ringing of a bell, learning to talk in acceptable ways.

A large number of classroom ethnographers, reviewed by Green and Kantor-Martin (1988), have all pointed to the "patterned ways of 'doing' life in classrooms" and to the manner in which these develop over time. Green and Kantor-Martin go on to argue that children's successful participation in any one instance of the teaching/learning episode needs to be understood in terms of some sense of the history of the children's emergent understanding and control of the ways of behaving appropriate to that kind of episode. One study they report, undertaken by Kantor, investigated the development of collaborative conversation skills in very young children in a classroom situation over a year. The study showed firstly, that a number of principles for initiating and participating in such conversations emerged and were
adopted by the children, changing in various ways over the year. Secondly, the study indicated that these very principles, once explicitly stated, became increasingly implicit, because with practice and habit they became tacitly understood as part of the modus operandi applying in the classroom.

As we shall see in our later chapters, we will argue that over the years of this study many of the principles of operating in the writing planning genre became implicit, and that such principles, especially with respect to what constituted acceptably attentive behaviour, were in fact normally explicitly expressed by the teacher only at points at which some "breakdown" occurred, and the children had done something that was unacceptable. There are some exceptions to this, however, especially in an activity like morning news, where the teaching of good behaviour seems to be so much a direct object of the lesson. In this situation the acceptable behavioural principles are sometimes expressed, not so much because of a "breakdown," but because of the teacher's desire to remind the children of what is required of them. In general, where a "breakdown" appears to occur in the otherwise smooth unfolding of the elements of the generic structure, in either the morning news or the writing planning genre, we shall argue that another element, specifically to do with control of the children, will be invoked by the teacher. This we shall actually call a Control element, and since, unlike the other elements of the structure, it may appear at any point in the overall generic structure, we shall argue that it is to be explained as operating prosodically - functioning that is, like a prosodic motif running through the text, a notion in itself taken from Halliday (1979). We shall also argue that where, as sometimes happens in the morning news genre, the teacher gives explicit expression to the desired principles for working as a kind of reminder to the children of what is expected, we shall identify this as an instance of an operation of a Control element as well. These matters we shall explain in greater detail below.
One of the several ways in which the morning news genre is in fact very different from the writing planning genre is that whereas in the latter acceptable standards of "good manners" are always expected of the children, in the former a much more overt object of the activity is that the children demonstrate - and hence learn - "good manners" in the styles they adopt for speaking and listening to each other as well as to the teacher, and in showing respect for the teacher's authority. A cultural requirement or expectation is thus satisfied, we believe, such that young children are intended to be socialised into adopting acceptable methods of relating to the teacher and of addressing each other, of talking about aspects of experience, and of listening to each other - all in a pattern orchestrated by the teacher.

Children who are successful in morning news giving, it seems clear, are those who can elaborate upon aspects of experience in some way, whether that involves recreating event(s) or building commentary upon objects such as toys. Ability to elaborate about experience was what Halliday (1978b) had in mind when he referred to the development in young children of the capacity for "narration of experience." Of the various functions for which children learn language in the pre-school years, Halliday notes, that involving the use of language for informing about experience would appear to develop last (1985b, 69-70). In fact, he believes that for many children, such a function is still developing when they enter school. Painter (1984;1985) appears to have provided confirmatory evidence for Halliday's general proposition in her study of her own pre-school child's language development. Thus, she demonstrated that the recognition that language could be used to represent experience for an audience of people who had not actually been present during the events dealt with, did develop later than others.

In that morning news does provide one context in which children can talk about various matters in a relatively public forum, it seems likely that it has evolved in English-speaking cultures such as
Australia partly to satisfy the need for young children to learn to "narrate about" experience in the sense that Halliday meant. And, also as he generally means it when he proposes a very intimate relationship of language and social reality, it seems clear that the learning of language in morning news is also an aspect of learning the culture.

We have already noted that an aspect of the culturally significant learning involved in the morning news genre - as indeed in the writing planning genre - is the learning of respect for the teacher's authority. As we shall see, this finds interesting expression linguistically: whereas the teacher uses language to create frequent expressions of attitude, evaluation and judgment of various kinds, the children make very sparing use of such language. In fact the evidence suggests that for the purposes of schooling at least, the young children involved are often discouraged from employing language for the expression of attitude and judgment. Ultimately, the capacity found in the teachers to use language for the expression of judgment and evaluation must be explained as a feature of their role, and of the particular function they exercise in measuring and/or grading the children, in terms of their performance as learners. It need not follow, however, that children are so constrained in their capacity to offer judgment and/or evaluation as they appear to be. Indeed, since we would argue that possession of such a capacity is a measure of some independence in persons, it should be promoted as an aspect of an education. In that capacity for evaluation and judgment was not on the whole encouraged in the children in this study, we must conclude that this was an instance of the operation of the particular ideology of early childhood which applied - an ideology which tended on the whole to create dependence in the children rather than independence. One teacher in the study, Mrs. L, was in some senses an interesting exception, and since we shall be examining in detail instances of morning news giving in her classroom, we shall be able to see how at least some of the children
involved were enabled to build attitudinal expression in recreating aspects of personal experience.

Bearing these considerations in mind, we shall now turn to some examination of the principal elements of the schematic structure potential of the morning news genre.

All curriculum genres have an initiating element in which the teacher points the class in the direction in which they are to go. This is followed by an element or sometimes elements, in which some "content" is negotiated, though there is of course considerable variation in the "middle" section(s) of the curriculum genre, depending upon the pedagogical purposes involved. A concluding element marks a closure of some kind. The various elements may be shown to be built up in selectively different ways through various choices made in both the first order or pedagogical register, and in the second order or "content" register. In general, those elements of a curriculum genre at the beginning and the end of the schematic structure show less variation than do the "middle" element(s).

The schematic structure potential for the morning news genre may be set out thus:

\[(C------------------------------------------\rightarrow)\]
\[L \leftarrow [ M N N \leftarrow (M N G R) \leftarrow M N G I \leftarrow M N F ] \leftarrow \leftarrow L C,\]

where

C-----\rightarrow represents Control
L I represents Lesson Initiation,
M N N represents Morning News Nomination,
M N GR represents Morning News Greeting,
M N GI represents Morning News Giving,
M N F represents Morning News Finish, and
L C represents Lesson Closure.
In addition, [ ] represents the zone of recursion,
^ represents recursion,
∧ represents sequence and
() indicates optional status.

We shall firstly examine the C element which we have previously suggested is to be seen as operating prosodically in the genre, following a suggestion originally made by Halliday (1979) with respect to the operation of grammar. We will make some observations here about this matter, and return to it again in chapter 5, where we will examine genre and register in the writing planning genre. It will be recalled that we have already outlined Halliday's model of the grammar in chapter 1 (section 1.3), and that among other matters, we noted that he argues there are four modes of meaning in language, each one of which is realised in a different set of choices in the grammar: experiential, interpersonal, textual and logical. In seeking to explain how the various meaning modes are realised in the grammar, Halliday has borrowed several terms from physics. Concentrating on the first three modes of meaning listed, we should note that he suggests experiential meanings, which are realised as we saw primarily in transitivity processes may be said to have a constituent or "particulate" character. That is to say, a transitivity process is made up of a process, its associated participants, and its attendant circumstances. Textual meanings, having to do with the organisation of the message of a clause are to be thought of in "wave-length" terms, or as Matthiessen (1985) puts it, functioning as a "pulse". Theme, for instance - constituting the point of departure for the message of the clause - comes first in English at least, though not in other languages, and there is a subsequent patterned movement through the clause.
Interpersonal meanings, by contrast, are neither "particulate", in that they do not find expression in particular constituents, nor are they of a "wave-length" character, in that they do not find expression in any patterned way across the clause. Thus, writes Halliday, interpersonal meaning is:

strung throughout the clause as a continuous motif or colouring.

He goes on a little later:

we shall refer to this mode of realisation as "prosodic", since the meaning is distributed like a prosody throughout a continuous stretch of discourse.
(Halliday, 1979, 66)

In representing the C element of the morning new genre as we do, showing a broken line followed by an arrow head, we seek to show that the element is also strung across the structure in prosodic fashion. A metaphor is really involved here: Halliday has made his observations with respect to the operation of the grammar, and we have borrowed them to illuminate our understanding of the operation of an element of schematic structure. Just how well the metaphor works, incidentally, is apparent when we consider another remark Halliday makes concerning the tendency of the interpersonal component of a text to be strung prosodically throughout a text:

The interpersonal component of meaning is the speaker's ongoing intrusion into the speech situation.
(Halliday, 1979, 67)

In a sense, the C element is also an ongoing intrusion of the teacher's judgments with respect to acceptable behaviour into the operation of the schematic structure of the morning news genre. With some exceptions of a kind we shall shortly see below, these judgments find overt expression normally at those points at which a "breakdown" appears to occur. In this sense, though the principles for behaving properly are actually intended to be in operation all the time in the
genre, in that they achieve overt expression only where the teacher sees them to be at risk we must regard as optional any C element in an instance of the schematic structure. It is for this reason that the C element is shown above in brackets - ( )

One other element only, it will be observed, has optional status in the morning news genre - the M N GR or Morning News Greeting - though all the others are essential. Most instances of the morning news genre appear to include the M N GR element, but in the study here, at least one teacher frequently allowed its exclusion.

The sequence of elements in the schematic structure potential never varies. Since in the course of a morning news genre, several children are always allowed the opportunity to take a turn as the Morning News Giver, we have indicated the recursive area or "zone" in which the elements of M N N, M N GR, M N GI and M N F occur.

With respect to Halliday's description of the other two modes of meaning - experiential and textual - as particulate and "wave-length" in character respectively, we should note at this stage that we can similarly characterise the other aspects of our schematic structure and potential. Thus, the various elements as identified above in our model - apart, that is from the C element - are the constituents, in that they operate in a "particulate" manner, making up the component "parts" of the schematic structure. In addition, the overall pattern from the Lesson Initiation to the Lesson Closure, marked as it is for sequence and for the presence of a recursive zone, shows a certain "wave-like" structure. In chapter 5, when we explain the elements of the schematic structure potential of the writing planning genre (section 5.3), we will compare our description with descriptions proposed especially in certain other recent "sociolinguistic" studies of the classroom. We will argue that one of the strengths we can claim for this study is its capacity to
characterise the various elements of schematic structure potential in
the manner we have just described.

In Section 3.5, we will discuss in some detail the linguistic
realisation of the morning news genre by reference to an actual
instance of the genre, and we will consider how each element is
realised through the operation of the two registers. In addition, we
will argue that in moving into the morning news giving role, the child
involved actually constructs one or more of several other possible
genres, so that the latter genres may be said to be "embedded" within
the morning news genre itself. Technically, the term "embedding" is
drawn from Halliday's systemic functional grammar (1985a), and by
invoking its use here, we are employing yet another metaphor, once
again borrowing a notion from the description of grammar to
illuminate our description of the nature of genres. The term
"embedding", in earlier systemic theory called "rankshifting", refers
to the manner in which a grammatical structure may be found to be
within another structure of comparable "rank" and character. In the
following clause, for example, one clause is embedded within another
clause:

The man [who came to dinner] stayed all night.

An embedding is always represented by showing the sets of brackets,
thus: [ ]. As we shall see, several types of genres can be shown to be
embedded within the morning news genre. Plum (1988), in a study
investigating "narrative-type" texts, generated in interview situations,
has argued a similar principle of the embedding of one genre within
another.

This general principle having been established, we need to say
something of the placement of the morning news activity in the
school day, as well as something of the physical disposition of the
participants during the activity. When we have completed these
things, we shall consider the overall schematic structure potential of the genre by using examples.

The children always gathered outside the school building on the ringing of the school bell at 9.00 a.m., and trooped into school when advised by their teacher to do so. This pattern varied one morning a week when the entry to the building was delayed by the holding of an assembly, while the principal addressed the whole school about sundry matters. Once in the classroom, the children immediately sat on the floor in a semi circle in front of the teacher, who marked the roll, collected monies from the children for their lunch orders, and generally prepared the class for the day's activities. The morning news activity normally proceeded straight after these matters, though occasionally it was delayed, to be taken up after the morning recess at 10.30 a.m. The children remained grouped on the floor in front of the teacher throughout the morning news genre, as indeed they also did in the next activity, the writing planning genre.

It seems to be a quite invariable practice in the junior primary school that the children in both genres are grouped in a semi circle thus, while the teacher looks down upon the children from her chair. The teacher's comparative elevation with respect to the children gives her the advantage that she can see what each of the children is doing, and therefore keep general control of their behaviour. Her position is also symbolically significant, we would argue, since she is physically placed in such a way that her comparative "bigness" when set alongside the "smallness" of the children is enhanced, and her power to direct what will happen in learning activity is thus strengthened, as well as to correct the children, should they do anything unacceptable. Matters of general physical disposition in the classroom are quite important, as Mehan (1979) observed in his ethnographic study in a junior primary school classroom in the United States. Teacher and children tend to signal the closure of one activity and the commencement of another by making some quite
marked change in their physical placement. A marked shift always occurs at the end of the writing planning genre, for example, a matter we shall discuss in chapters 5 and 6 when we introduce the genre in some detail. Sometimes there is a shift in the physical disposition after the roll call genre and before the morning news genre commences. The teacher may, for example, look around the group and decide that she wants to separate children prone to talking to each other more than she likes, rather than listening to the Morning News Giver. Sometimes, she effects a shift to make sure the children are all comfortable. Sometimes she invites the children to sing a song before they settle for the morning news genre. Finally, she normally checks with a rapid scan of the eyes across the group of children, to see that they are looking towards her, sitting still and apparently ready to listen. Since the children tend to enjoy morning news, they normally settle readily for the commencement of the activity. Gerot (1988) working in the secondary classroom, has also remarked the tendency of teachers to look carefully around the group of students at the start of a lesson, seeking to achieve eye to eye contact before the lesson formally commences.

Looking to our texts below, Example 1 is drawn from the Year 1 classroom of Mrs. L, and it involves a boy called Aaron who was always very successful in the Morning News giving role. Example 2 is drawn from the classroom of Mrs. L's colleague, Mrs. B, and it involves a boy, Christopher, who was normally much less successful in the Morning News Giving role.
Example 1
Lesson Initiation

T: Okay Simone, can you please shut door? I'm going to let you have your show and tell now.

Control

Please remember your manners. Miss M was talking about manners this morning. Unfortunately, some people didn't even have the manners to listen to her, and I was a little bit cross with them. Manners in school and out of school are very very important, so make sure you can show each other how good your manners are.

Jeffrey: Mrs. L, I seen some yellow sawdust this morning.

T: I don't know what that has to do with manners.

(Several children raise their hands.)

Morning News Nomination

T: Yes, Aaron, you can start off please.

(Aaron gets up from the floor & moves to sit in the chair at the front of the class)

Morning News Greeting

Example 2
Lesson Initiation

T: Newstime? News?

(Several children raise their hands)

Morning News Nomination

T: Come out first, Christopher, please.

(Christopher gets up from the floor & moves to stand next to the teacher who sits in a chair facing the other children.)

Morning News Greeting
Aaron: Good morning boys and girls.
Chorus: Good morning Aaron.

Morning News Giving

Aaron: When Brian was getting the rubbish bins, he found this box of old stuff and he saw this racing car, and he gave it to me. He gave it to me and the wheel's broken, and Stephen came over to my house on Saturday and he saw it.
Stephen: So did Mirko.
Aaron: And Mirko. And the car-
Stephen: We got toys down at the creek, and um we was taking it up the hill and rolling it down-
Aaron: Rolling it down-
Stephen: And then we jumped on it, and then it came down and then rrmm splash. It had gone down in the river. I didn't even get in trouble when I was soaking wet.
Aaron: And it's up at Ross's place, cause I was going to bring it, except Ross said he might try and fix it.
Child: Ross?

Aaron: Yes, Jodie's dad. My brother's friend.

Christopher: Good morning
Mrs. B. Good morning girls and boys.
Chorus: Good morning Christopher.

Morning News Giving

Christopher: I've got a car.
T: What's that make it go, does it?
Child: I know.
T: Well let Christopher tell, please. Oh that's really good, isn't it?
What's that number on the front, Christopher?
Christopher: Five
T: Yes, but what's the whole number?
Christopher: Um.
T: It's a big number.
Child: I know.
Several children: Fifty
T: Right well you tell us Kelly.
Kelly: Fifty.
T: Right number 50 in the race. What else have you got there?
Where did you get them?
Christopher: My dad.
T: Your dad... well how did you get them? I mean, did you buy them?
Christopher: No, I don't know where he gets them.
T: Lots of lovely, lovely cars. Are there many Geelong ones?
Christopher: Mmm.
T: Which is your favourite team?
Christopher: Um.
T: Who do you barrack for?
Child: Geelong.
Child: Essendon.
Child: Hawthorn.

**Morning News Finish**

Aaron: Finished.
(He looks around the group, deciding which girl to nominate to follow him)

**Morning News Nomination**

Aaron: Susy.
(He sits down, & Susy comes to the front of the group, sitting in the chair)

**Lesson Closure**

T: Right, have you finished, Stephen?
It's time to do some maths
(Stephen returns to his place on the floor)

T: All right hands behind back. Hands on heads. Hands behind backs.
(The children all do the exercises as requested)

* Note that the rows of dots indicate that elements of the genre have been omitted, where several other children take turns at operating in the Morning News giving role.
We will briefly consider in turn each of the elements in the schematic structures set out in Examples 1 and 2 of the morning news genre.

3.3.1 LESSON INITIATION

Lesson Initiations are normally relatively brief, for their function is to generate action, not to use language for reflection upon experience, a matter we shall return to in section 3.4, when we consider fully register in the morning news genre. The pedagogical or first order register is in fact to the fore in the Lesson Initiation, as it also is in the Lesson Closure. The opening of Example 1, it will be observed, is considerably longer than that of Example 2, and that is because a Control element is introduced. The very minimal nature of the Lesson Initiation in Example 2 is a measure of just how much the language used is an aspect of action. Whether it is long or not, and whether there is also a Control element or not, the principal point to note about the Lesson Initiation is that it is always signalled by the teacher, in itself a measure of her authority in this situation, and that the intention is to focus the children's attention upon what is in fact a fresh activity in the day.

In Example 1 the teacher's concern with "good manners", the learning of which we have already noted above is an important purpose of morning news, finds quite explicit expression in her Control element: she intends to remind the children of what is expected of them. Although there is no explicit reference to good manners in Example 2, it would be a mistake to imagine the teacher here did not devote time to the subject, or did not think it important. An explicit reinforcement of the need to be both well mannered and happy or cheerful had in fact been provided in the classroom from which Example 2 was drawn, immediately after the roll call and before the collecting of lunch monies, when the children had been asked by the teacher to sing with her their "morning song":
Good morning, good morning,
And how do you do?
Good morning, good morning,
And a happy day to you.
Good morning to you
Good morning to you.
We’re all in our places,
With bright shiny faces,
And this is the way
To start our new day.

With this particular teacher, the children sang the morning song quite frequently.

Examples 1 and 2 offer an interesting measure of the variation associated with the ways the L. I. may be realised linguistically. The teacher in Example 1, while devoting considerable attention to talk of good manners in her Control element, did not directly indicate that she was looking for a volunteer to be the first child to perform as Morning News Giver. That she did intend to look for one, who must observe the principles of appropriate behaviour in signalling his interest, was, however, evident in her rejection of Jeffrey’s remark that he had seen some sawdust: he did not make his bid to be the Morning News Giver at the right time or in the right way, a matter to which we shall return in section 3.5. In Example 2, minimal though the element is, the teacher did explicitly signal her interest in identifying a volunteer, because she spoke on a high rising tone, indicating that she sought a volunteer: "Newstime? News?" In both cases, the children correctly understood the teacher’s intention, and several children raised their hands, signalling their interest to talk. It is an interesting measure of the differential status enjoyed by the participants here, incidentally, that while the teacher initiates morning news in talk, those who volunteer to speak are required to do so in a non-linguistic way.
3.3.2 MORNING NEWS NOMINATION

There never is much variation in the manner in which this step in the schematic structure is realised, because its primary function is to operationalise action, and its very familiarity makes it easy to accomplish quickly. It is realised through the pedagogical register. There is some difference between the way teachers handle an instance of the M N N, and the ways children do so. Very often, the teacher retains to herself the right to nominate all Morning News Givers, one after the other. However, sometimes teachers like Mrs. L in Example 1 do accord Morning News Givers the right to nominate the next child to take up that role, though as one would expect, it is she who determines when a Morning News Giver is the last for the day, before proceeding to a new activity. Where it is the case that the Morning News Giver nominees the next child to step into that role, the child simply calls out the next person's name: Susy, Joel, Joseph, and so on. In Mrs L's classroom, the rule was that where a boy spoke first, he must be followed by a girl, and she by another boy, and so on, though no such rule applied in Mrs. B's classroom. As in the M N GR element which immediately follows this element, a strong flavour of the ritual seems to govern the behaviour of the participants here.

3.3.3 MORNING NEWS GREETING

The Morning News Greeting varies very little, and this is of course because a conventional formulaic expression pertains here, much as it does in the world outside the school as well. Sometimes, as in Example 2, the Morning News Giver greets the teacher first, before greeting the other children. Sometimes, as in the case of one other teacher in the study, the Morning News giver, once nominated and positioned at the front of the rest of the group, was permitted to go straight into the M N GI, omitting the M N GR altogether. It is for this reason that we have noted earlier that this element is optional.
3.3.4 MORNING NEWS GIVING

As we have already noted, the greatest variation in the morning news genre will always be found in the MN GI element, and it is here that the second order or "content register" comes into play. It is in this element, operating within the general first order field requirement mentioned earlier that the Morning News Giver select pleasurable events and/or objects to talk about, that the child has some genuine capacity to choose. It is because of this capacity for choice that one, or sometimes more than one, of several other genres will in fact be found to be embedded within the Morning News Giving element, of a kind often used by children in their first writing. Embedded genres include, for example, observations (Martin & Rothery, 1980, 1981) and anecdotes (Plum, 1988; Rothery, in preparation). At least two other genres, which we will call the INTERVIEW genre and the SHOW AND TELL genre, are sometimes taken up in the MN GI as well. Although these have no complete parallel in the written mode, we will argue that both also involve the child in learning to model observations and descriptions in particular.

There will be a quite significant mode variation in the nature of the language produced in the MN GI, depending upon both the genre taken up and the field selected for talking about. Where a child elects to talk about an aspect of personal experience, the language will be that of reconstruction of experience of an earlier time, and either a recount or an anecdote will be produced. Where a child displays and talks about an object or objects, the child is likely to select a show and tell genre. However, if the teacher chooses to participate quite actively in the text construction with the child, they may together produce also an interview genre. In either case the language creates some commentary upon the object(s) involved.
Examples 1 and 2 bring out the differences very clearly. In Example 1, where Aaron is the Morning News Giver, he has events to tell about, and, as we shall seek to prove later, he creates an anecdote, and the language is entirely involved in reconstruction of past activity. In Example 2, where Christopher is the Morning News Giver, he has toys to display, and there are quite marked mode differences between the language used and that in Example 1, most notably of course in the use of frequent exophoric reference. Because of the role the teacher takes up vis a vis Christopher, the genre embedded here is that of the interview.

Unlike Aaron, Christopher was never particularly vocal in the morning news activity. He was in fact at his most audible when exchanging greetings with the rest of the class, for this was one element in the schematic structure where the child had the comfort of a clear formula to follow: the ritual quality of this element was in fact reassuring. Otherwise, Christopher was regularly tongue tied and, as Gray (1982a) has written of very disadvantaged children in another context, unwilling to "take risks" in representing his experience for the purposes of a school-valued activity. The teacher chose to try to draw him into talk by setting up a dialogue with him. One other teacher in the study, incidentally, regularly set up the interview genre with the Morning News Giver, because she apparently saw her role as drawing out the children in this way.

Whatever the merits of such an approach, it must be said that in Christopher's case it was not particularly successful, since by the time this study ceased at the end of his third year at school, he still performed in morning news much as he had done at the commencement of the study. Aaron was from the beginning an articulate boy, and he relished recreating his experience for the audience which morning news provided, so that while he certainly enjoyed the activity, that was in fact because he was always good at it. Christopher was less articulate, at least in the terms schooling
appeared to value, and he rarely performed in any of his school tasks as well as did Aaron, though he was a conscientious boy. The two children came from very different social class backgrounds: Aaron was one of the few children from a middle class family, the son of school teachers in fact, while Christopher was from a working class family. Not all middle class children perform well, of course, any more than all working class children do not. However, we urgently need well based educational research the better to understand the nature of the differences in performance that children like Aaron and Christopher reveal. Hasan's work, to which reference was made in chapter 1 (section 1.2) will certainly help. (Page 24)

As we earlier noted, teachers do vary, so that while Mrs. L, the teacher in Example 1, always expected the Morning News Giver to indicate when he or she had finished, Mrs. B, in Example 2, always herself declared the finish of the M N GI. In Mrs. L's class, there was never any variation in the manner in which the Morning News Giver signalled completion of the activity: simply in the one word, "Finished", pronounced on a high falling tone. Mrs. B.'s manner of signalling the finish varied a little. Sometimes she thanked the child concerned, and sometimes, as in Example 2, her manner of indicating the M.N.F. was in fact somewhat oblique. Any child, asked to return his objects to a shopping bag or some similar utensil, and to place it on a designated shelf at the back of the classroom, knew that he or she was being asked to put the objects away for safe keeping, preparatory to sitting down before the next Morning News Giver stepped forward.

Despite the variations between the ways the M N F was dealt with in Examples 1 and 2, this element of the schematic structure, unlike the M N GI, never did show marked variation, because it again involved language for the maintenance and direction of action. It is language of the pedagogical register.
3.3.5 LESSON CLOSURE

Lesson Closure is always signalled by the teacher, and it too relates primarily to the pedagogical register. In Example 1 Mrs. L asks the News Giver if he has finished, in effect signalling both the finish of his MN GI (since in her class, the child normally has the right to nominate a successor in the role, if indeed another sequence of Morning News Giving is to be permitted) and the LC. In addition, she immediately indicates what the new learning activity is to be. In Example 2, the teacher directs the children into a changed physical activity - namely moving their hands and bodies about a little. The latter strategy is intended to allow the children opportunity for some relaxation from the effort of sitting still, as they are required to do during lesson times. It prepares them therefore, is the implication, for the movement to the next learning activity. As we earlier noted, some change in physical disposition very often signals the end of one activity and/or the start of another.

Now that we have established some overall sense of the schematic structure of the morning news genre, we need to turn to a more complete consideration than we have yet offered of register in the morning news genre.

3.4 Register in the morning news genre

We will begin this section with some general observations about our two registers, and we will then progress to setting out some formal definition of field, tenor and mode in each of the two registers.

In arguing the presence of two registers, we are indebted to Halliday (1978a, 128-151) for his original notion of the two registers, though since we use Martin's models of register and genre here (section 1.4 in chapter 1), our notion of the first and second order registers is rather different from Halliday's. Halliday (1978a, 144) cites the
example of the football match, in which, as he says, any language used is itself part of the social activity or the field involved. But where, as often happens, he goes on, a discussion about the match takes place after the event, it is the discussion which becomes a first order field, while the football match achieves the status of a second order field, to which, non-technically, we tend to give the name "subject-matter".

In Martin's terms, the distinction to which Halliday draws attention can be explained in terms of his two dimensions of mode - space and time. Thus, in the game of playing football, the language used is necessarily of the moment and part of the activity: it is language of action in fact. But the language of the discussion after the event of the game is removed from the activity, both in terms of time and space: the language used is thus much more that of reflection upon activity. In both cases, however, the field is the same. It is the mode which has altered. It may well be, of course, that the tenor changes too, depending upon the participants. If the participants in the discussion are also the football players, then the tenor values probably do not change, but if it is a discussion of some other participants, such as spectators, or sports commentators, the tenor may change.

Our reason for proposing the operation of the two registers relates very closely to the principles that Bernstein appears to be seeking to explain in proposing his regulative and instructional discourses (chapter 1, section 1.2). Activities such as educational ones appear to be characterised by their tendency to select from a range of different fields of human experience and enquiry, and to relocate aspects of those fields in other contexts whose purposes are that some will teach and others will learn about those fields. It is the demands of the teaching and learning activities which primarily seem to determine the manner of treatment of the other fields. It is for this reason that we propose the working of the first and second registers. It is the first order register then, which very considerably determines the operation of the second order register. Indeed, as
we shall suggest below, the first order register projects the second order register.

We call the first order register in an educational context of situation the "pedagogical register", while the second order register is the "content register", whose concerns are with the "content" or "information" examined. The use of the term "content" is not an altogether happy one, carrying with it the unintended implication that what is taught is some kind of "package" or "commodity" to be passed on. What is really at issue in teaching a second order register is teaching the young to recognise some of the activities associated with a particular field: that is, the ways of working and of dealing with experience characteristic of a particular field of human endeavour. Such a field might be, for example, how to conduct scientific experiments and write up observations as in the natural sciences, how to research and amass data as in the social sciences, or how to craft a literary piece as in English language studies. We use the terms "content" register and "content" field, however, because no other acceptable alternative seems available. Provided our reservations here expressed are borne in mind, the use of the term "content" should serve our purposes reasonably well.

With respect to tenor, at the first order level this is to do with the relationship of teacher as authority figure to children as school students, and with her concern to direct and control the behaviour of the children. At the second order level, at least in the morning news genre, though not normally in other curriculum genres, there is a marked change in tenor, as the child nominated for the role of Morning News Giver takes up an authoritative role vis-à-vis the other children. Here, however, the authority is not primarily to do with control of behaviour, but rather with being authoritative about the matter(s) or the "content" under discussion. For the purposes of most curriculum genres, however, the teacher is an authority both in the sense that she is supposed to be authoritative about the "content"
in hand, and because she is "in authority" in terms of directing and controlling the students in her care. It is because she carries authority in this latter sense at all times that the teacher is capable of introducing one of the Control elements into the schematic structure of the genre, to which we made reference in section 3.3 above. At these points, since she normally gives expression to her displeasure about some unacceptable aspect of behaviour, she will show some negative change in tenor.

As regards mode, while the language of the first order field is language for action, that of the second order field is primarily, though not invariably, language for reflection upon experience, a distinction to which Malinowski originally drew attention (1923), and which Martin has essentially built into his model of mode. Of language in the former sense Malinowski wrote that it:

functions as a link in concerted human activity, as a piece of human behaviour. It is a mode of action and not an instrument of reflection. (Malinowski, 1923, 312)

As we shall see, where the pedagogical field is being foregrounded, and behaviour being operationalised, as in the Lesson Initiation, the Morning News Nomination, the Morning News Greeting, the Morning News Finish and the Lesson Closure, the language does "function as a link in concerted human activity". But in the Morning News Giving element of the genre, where the "content" field is foregrounded, the language tends to operate more as "an instrument of reflection," though there is some variation depending upon the field. Thus, where the activity involves reconstruction of event(s), and the narrator is thus removed from those events both in terms of time and space, the language reflects the effects of the distance in both senses; but where children display and talk about objects, their language is that of commentary upon the objects.
We have earlier suggested that the relationship of the first and second order registers is such that we should think of the one as projecting the other. Since the notion of projection is yet another one taken and used metaphorically from Halliday’s grammar, we need to say a little here of what is involved in using the term. We have already noted four modes of meaning found in the grammar (section 1.3 of chapter 1): interpersonal, textual, experiential and logical, where the latter two may also be thought of as subsumed within the ideational mode of meaning. We have invoked certain principles from the grammar with respect to the experiential, interpersonal and textual modes of meaning, in order to explain the operation of the elements of the morning news genre as "particulate", "prosodic" and "wave-length" in character. Turning now to the logical mode of meaning, in general this refers to the kinds of logical relations built between clauses or groups, and to the building of what Halliday terms clause complexes and group complexes. Looking specifically to the relations within clause complexes (Halliday, 1985a, 192-251), of the two possible sets of relationships between clauses he identifies, one is the relationship of expansion, while the other is that of projection. It is the latter that concerns us here.

Clauses are said to project when:

the secondary clause is projected through the primary clause, which instates it as (a) a locution or (b) an idea. (Halliday, 1985, 196)

Some examples will serve to illustrate. An example of a projecting clause of locution is found in:

he said he wanted his dinner,

where it is clear that the second clause, (technically in a relationship of dependency or hyoptaxis) is projected through the former clause. An example of a projecting clause of idea may be found in:
he thought he wanted his dinner.

Clauses which are projected, according to Halliday, are "categories of the language, not of the real world." (1985a, 251) That is to say, in the case of a locution, what is represented has previously been represented in language. In the case of an idea, that which is represented has previously been a meaning of the "inner world" of thought, and hence not directly of the "outer world" of action. What is projected through the primary clause in both cases is thus a re-expression of some other representation of reality. In this sense, the projected clause involves a kind of relocation.

We have already observed (section 3.2 above) that Bernstein argues a recontextualising principle at work in educational endeavour, such that the endeavour takes from the various avenues of human experience those fields of enquiry which it relocates for the purposes of teaching and learning. Further, he argues that in the processes of relocating, a regulative discourse operates, in terms of which an instructional discourse comes into play. While he says that the latter is "embedded" in the former, we have abandoned that term, on the grounds of its technical significance in the systemic functional grammar, which we have already invoked with respect to the embedding of genres, one within the other. However, we do argue that just as in the grammar, we can see that one clause - a primary one - projects another, so too, the first order or pedagogical register may be said to project a second order or "content" register. Just as the projected clause is not as it were directly "of the real world", but in some sense removed from it, so too the second order or "content" register is in some sense removed and "reconstructed" for the purposes of education.

There is a parallel between our manner of recognising first and second order registers in educational discourses, and the approach adopted by Lemke (1985) to the study of educational discourse.
Lemke draws a distinction between "activity structure" and "thematic system", where the former refers to:

the routines of classroom interaction including getting started, introducing topics, asking and answering questions, interrupting, keeping control, confirming answers, summarising, etc (as they are) carried on according to their regular patterns. (Lemke, 1985, 10)

The latter term -"thematic system" - refers to "the meaning relations" built up in a text through "the same or equivalent terms and expressions." (Lemke, 1985, 10). We would argue that Lemke's distinction, though it can certainly be used to illuminate features of what happens in the building of meaning in classroom discourse, nonetheless provides a less rigorous tool for examining what is going on than the method proposed here in identifying first and second order registers. Thematic system appears to relate roughly to field, while activity structure appears to embrace aspects of both tenor and mode. The first and second order distinction we are making is subsumed in some sense in Lemke's distinction between activity structure on the one hand, and thematic system on the other. Whatever the strengths of the latter two notions, however, they will not permit of a teasing out of the elements of the thematic structure which we would claim applies, nor will they help illuminate our notion of the embedded genre.

In the morning news activity then, we would suggest there is a first order register of a pedagogical character, to do with the social activity in which the participants - teacher and children - engage, and a second order register, to do with the "subject-matter" or "content" to be talked about by the Morning News Giver. The demands of the first order register actually determine the kinds of choices of topic that may be taken up at the second order level in the morning news activity. This is because at the first order level, language is used primarily in a behavioural manner, or as a form of action. Here, language is used for the structuring and maintenance of
a learning activity, such that the manner of operating of both teacher and children is generated along appropriate lines. That is to say, the pedagogical register operationalises the pattern and nature of the activity, determining the range of behavioural options that are acceptable to the participants, and hence regulating their manner of working together.

When we turn to examine the second order or "content" registers, and we look in particular at the second order fields which may be drawn upon for the purposes of the activity called morning news, we find that a fairly limited range of topics, taken from pleasurable personal experience, may in fact be used. This is because the absolute requirement of the social activity concerned is that the child involved in the role of News Giver should be "polite", or "well mannered", where one measure of the politeness will be that the topics chosen are "nice", and not likely to give offence, particularly to the teacher. They must deal with pleasant or happy events or items.

Table 3.1 sets out field at a glance in both the first and second order senses.

Table 3.1 Field in the morning news genre

1 The pedagogical field: development and maintenance of institutionally approved patterns of behaviour in children, where this involves:
(i) maintenance of habits of obedience in children and respect for the teacher's authority;
(ii) maintenance of approved attitudes towards politeness and good manners;
(iii) fostering of children's ability to talk clearly on approved topics.
2 The "content" field: personal experience of a pleasurable kind, where this might involve:
i) a play activity e.g. finding a toy car and playing with it in the creek;
ii) the birth of a new baby;
iii) the acquisition of a new possession, e.g. a toy, a book, an item of clothing, a pet;
iv) a special event e.g. a visit to the zoo, staying at a friend's house, going on holidays;
v) displaying a valued object, e.g. a toy, a stamp album, a picture.

As Table 3.1 is intended to indicate, the social activity actually concerned in the morning news activity, and of fundamental importance at the level of the first order or pedagogical field, involves the children learning habits of respect for the teacher's authority, and associated habits of politeness, both in addressing others and in listening to what is said.

At the second order level of field, the choices of topics, all of them to be drawn from personal experience, are constrained by the need to deal with enjoyable or happy events or items, and which are in that sense acceptably "nice", reflecting some measure of good taste or decorum in the child, and hence calculated to be acceptable to the teacher, whose authority as ultimate arbiter of what constitutes "good manners" is always present.

It is a noteworthy fact that over the many, many morning news sessions recorded in the course of undertaking the study reported on here, no child ever introduced "bad," unpleasant or sad news. On the odd occasion where such news was introduced, it was incidental to the main activity in hand, and as such soon passed over. For
example, one little girl once reported that a family friend had given
birth to a baby. When the teacher - suitably indicating pleasure at
such "good news" (the teacher's own term) - asked if the baby was a
first child in the family, the child replied that there had been
another baby born earlier, but that it had died soon after birth. The
matter was not pursued.

In practice, the topics deemed acceptable for morning news always
involve some element of the celebratory- the entertaining event, the
acquisition of a new object, or the identification of an old and valued
one, where both of the latter two may or may not be visibly displayed
in the classroom for talk. That these topics alone may be selected,
comes from the very strong moral imperative associated with the
genre as well as the pedagogical field, that children be "well
behaved", and that they talk about and share news and events that
might be deemed "good" or wholesome". One child's father shot
himself in the family garage, and while it would be unlikely that such
a shocking tragedy might be shared in the morning news activity,
reflection about the implications of such an event in the life of the
girl concerned, nonetheless demonstrates how selectively the
requirement operates that determines that only the "nice" things in
one's life might be considered acceptable to talk about in the
morning news activity. "Nice" things are not after all, necessarily the
most significant or character-influencing matters in a child's life, but
schooling, it seems, at least in so far as the morning news activity is
concerned, is intended to filter out those matters not considered
"nice" or "good mannered".

That teachers really value and reward those children capable of
selecting from the daily pattern of their lives items worth
transforming into the "nice topics" approved for morning news was
often apparent in the study. It was apparent both in the manner in
which they praised the children, and in that they often unconsciously
had certain favourites among the children, whom they tended to
select quite regularly for morning news giving. One such child was the girl mentioned above, whose family friend had had a baby; she always had an item to share with others. By contrast, one boy regularly had nothing to offer, and the same teacher, with unconscious but startling cruelty, told him that he "never had anything nice or interesting happen to him," because he never in fact offered to share any news, or to show an object, though he listened quite politely to the other children who did do so. The implication was that he was in some way a less interesting human being. Bearing in mind the very "ordinariness" of the topics the successful girl regularly chose, it was clear to this observer at least, that the boy often had similar events happen in his life. However, he was unable, it seemed, or unwilling, to make similar selections from his life, and to recreate these in ways deemed acceptable to the teacher, and he was therefore criticised by her. Thus are the rewards of schooling differentially offered to children in activities as apparently simple as morning news.

As we shall demonstrate later, the two fields operate in such a way that they help to realise differentially selected elements of the morning news genre.

As one would expect, tenor and mode with respect to the two fields operate in correspondingly differential ways throughout the organisation of the schematic structure of the text as well. Table 3.2, to do with tenor, follows Martin's and Poynton's model (section 1.4. of chapter 1) as well as that of Plum (1988). Tenor is dealt with, it will be recalled, in terms of three dimensions - power, affect and contact.
Table 3.2 Tenor in the morning news genre

1 The pedagogical tenor:

Teacher vs students

| POWER:      | hierarchic result of institutionalised relationship of teacher to students. |
| AFFECT:     | often positive result of the effort to build cordial relationships in the infants' school, but sometimes negative result of the effort to maintain acceptable patterns of behaviour, and to control unacceptable patterns. |
| CONTACT:    | frequent result of the daily interaction of the teacher and children, not only in morning new activities, but in all other areas of the school program. |

2 The content tenor:

Morning News Giver vs other students

| POWER:      | hierarchic result of institutionalised relationship of Morning News Giver to other children. |
| AFFECT:     | positive result of normally friendly relationships among the children in the infants' school. |
| CONTACT:    | frequent result of the daily interaction of the children in all aspects of their school program, as well as their constant interaction in the nearby neighbourhood in which they all live. |
With respect to power, the principal authority in the morning news genre, as in all other curriculum genres, is that of the teacher, and the essentially hierarchic nature of the teacher/student relationship is realised in various ways in the text. However, as we shall see, the role of the teacher as authority is most pronounced in the two elements of the genre which mark its initiation and its closure. In the "middle" element of the genre, at the point at which a child steps into the morning news giving role, that child achieves status and some authority, though the degree of the authority assumed varies somewhat from one teacher's classroom to another. Thus, in the case of Mrs. L, she frequently allowed the Morning News Giver to address the rest of the group directly, and the authority of the child was relatively marked. But in the case of another teacher, Mrs. P, she chose to interview the Morning News Giver, so that while the child operating in that role still had status, by virtue of being selected to come to the front of the group and speak, the child's authority as Morning News Giver was somewhat mediated by the role of the teacher.

Considerations of contact do not vary with respect to the first and second order fields, and that is not surprising: the children know each other well, living in a relatively close and settled community around the school, and spending a lot of time together both inside and outside school hours. Similarly, since they keep the same teacher for the year (unless, as did happen, one becomes ill or goes on maternity leave), and since they have all but the occasional lesson in the library with her, they get to know her quite well as the school year progresses.

There is some variation with respect to affect, especially within the pedagogical field, and the source of this variation we have already referred to above in section 3.2, in our earlier discussion of the Control element of the schematic structure. Acceptable patterns of behaviour are to be followed by the children, and the teacher, for her
part keen to foster such acceptable patterns, seeks to be positive and cheerful in her dealings with the children most of the time. However, at the points at which some breach in acceptable patterns occurs, or perhaps at which the teacher judges the children to be in need of a reminder of those patterns, she will often become rather negative, sharply reproving the children.

Table 3.3 sets out mode, following the model proposed by Martin (section 1.4. of chapter 1), and as also employed by Plum (1988). There are two aspects of mode, it will be recalled: space and time.
Table 3.3 Mode in the morning news genre

1 Mode in the pedagogical field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>language-as-action</td>
<td>primarily monologic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>direction &amp; maintenance of activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Mode in the "content" field

either:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>language-as-reflection</td>
<td>primarily monologic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reconstruction of experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>language-as-commentary</td>
<td>primarily dialogic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creation of description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>language-as-reflection</td>
<td>primarily dialogic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reconstruction of experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking to the pedagogical field which as earlier noted realise those elements of the genre at its opening and closure, since the language used is that of direction of activity - in this case, the activity of the
children - it tends to be monologic. That is to say, the teacher directs the children to action. Even where she selects and nominates a child to step into the Morning News Giving role, the child does not on the whole have the right to speak. On the contrary, as we noted above, the child must show interest to speak by raising a hand. The same principle applies, incidentally, when, as in Mrs. L's class, a child who has completed morning news giving has the right to select the next person to take up the role: the child reviews the group and nominates someone who has signalled interest to speak. The only point in the operation of the pedagogical field where the talk becomes dialogic is at the point where morning news greetings are exchanged and a Morning News Greeting element in the schematic structure is created. Such an element, it will be recalled, is in fact optional, confirming our general characterisation of mode in the pedagogical field as "primarily dialogic".

Turning to the possible modes for the "content" field, there will be some variation depending upon both (i) the genre selected for creation and embedding within the Morning News Giving element, and (ii) the "content" field taken up. Three possible variations in mode with respect to genre and the "content" field have been identified. With respect to the dimension of space, mode will in all three cases be face-to-face, though in one case primarily monologic, while in the other cases, it will be primarily dialogic. Where personal experience is drawn upon for the purposes of building say, a recount or perhaps an anecdote, the language used with respect to time will involve language-as-reflection, and it will be used for the reconstruction of personal experience. For the purposes of building such a genre, and drawing upon experience in this way, the language used will be primarily monologic, though as we shall see later, there may be some contribution from other children apart from the Morning News Giver. Occasionally, another child asks a clarifying question, but in one case, a second child actually contributes to the joint building of an anecdote genre.
Turning to the second of the possible variations available with respect to mode, language will be again face-to-face but dialogic where it is used to construct a show and tell genre, and where an object or objects are displayed and the Morning News Giver talks about them as well as answering questions about them. Here the language is that of commentary upon the object(s), and it is used to build description. In the third possible variation, language is again dialogic, and an interview genre is created, drawing upon the personal experiences of the child in some way, where the language is again language-as-reflection, and used for the reconstruction of experience.

We have now completed our overall account of register in the morning news genre, and have said sufficient at least to suggest something of the manner in which it is argued, following Martin's model, that it is genre which selects from, or is realised through, our two registers. It is argued that:

1) the morning news genre selects differentially from the pedagogical and "content" fields so that the overall pattern of the schematic structure is created. The pedagogical register realises the opening and closing elements of the genre, and the "content" register realises the "middle" element;

2) within the Morning News Giving element, one or more other genres will be embedded, drawing upon the fields of personal experience in various ways.
3.5 The linguistic realisation of the morning news genre

In undertaking an analysis of the manner in which the schematic structure of the morning news genre is built up, we will investigate one instance of the genre, in which there are two examples of morning news giving. We will in fact use the instance provided in Example 1 set out in section 3.3 above, where a boy called Aaron is involved in morning news giving, and we will also include the example of news giving undertaken by a girl called Susy, immediately after Aaron. Like Christopher, the boy briefly considered for his role in Example 2, also set out in section 3.3, Susy had brought some toys to school, and to that extent, like Christopher, she offers a useful contrast to Aaron. Unlike Christopher, however, and indeed unlike Aaron too, she actually creates two genres, which are embedded within her Morning News Giving element. Where Aaron creates an anecdote, Susy creates a show and tell genre, followed by an anecdote. Overall, we have two reasons for selecting the instance of the morning news genre we have chosen:

1) the two children involved in morning news giving are both successful, providing good instances of the social process concerned;

2) the two children's Morning News Giving elements provide interesting contrasts, the first having only the one genre embedded within it, the second one having two.
In undertaking our linguistic analysis, we shall focus on two systems of the grammar, THEME and TRANSITIVITY, though we shall offer some observations on the various ways in which attitude and judgment are realised in the text, including through the MOOD SYSTEM. In terms of Martin's tristratal model of language as outlined in chapter 1 (section 1.4), THEME, TRANSITIVITY and MOOD belong to the stratum of the lexicogrammar. Where, in the case of the writing planing we intend to examine CONVERSATION STRUCTURE, relating to the stratum of discourse semantics. However, as already noted, we shall not undertake such an examination for the morning news genre. It would in principle be useful to examine CONVERSATION STRUCTURE. However, for two reasons it has been decided not to do so. Firstly, we have made such a decision in the interests of conserving space, since the analyses to be undertaken will be reasonably detailed anyway. Secondly, we have made the decision we have because we believe for the purposes of "unpacking" and explaining the manner in which the genre is motivated, the analyses undertaken will serve usefully. Where we go on in later chapters to examine the writing planning genre, our instances of which are longer and more dia|'ogic than our instance of the morning news genre, we will find that it will be important to address more directly their status as conversations - didactic conversations at that - having many of the features peculiar to the activities of teaching and learning. As already noted, we shall take up CONVERSATION STRUCTURE in chapter 8.

3.5.1 THE TEXT OF AN INSTANCE OF THE MORNING NEWS GENRE

In the interests of making easy comparison between the two instances of the Morning News Giving element (M N GI) examined here, we have set them out side by side, beneath the Lesson Initiation or LI element. It should be borne in mind in reading them, however, that Susy's M N GI actually followed after Aaron's. For ease
of subsequent discussion we shall call the text involved here Text 1, noting as we do so that our selected text is strictly speaking incomplete. This is partly because it constitutes part of the larger text of the whole morning's work, from the time of entry to the school at 9.00 a.m. until 10.30 a.m. when morning break was declared, and partly because we have omitted most of the actual instances of morning news giving involved. It should be noted that in setting out the text this time, we have sought to provide additional relevant information about the physical disposition of the persons, as well as selected features of the ways the language is used.

Lesson Initiation.

(The teacher is sitting on her chair in front of the children who are grouped in a semi-circle around her. She glances over and sees that the classroom door has been left open.)

T: Okay. Sh. Simone, can you please shut the door? I'm going to let you have your show and tell now. (Simone gets up and closes the door as asked.)

Control

Please remember your manners. Miss M. was talking about manners this morning. Unfortunately, some people didn't even have the manners to listen to her, and I was a little bit cross with them. Manners in school and out of school are very very important, so make sure you can show each other how good your manners are.

Jeffrey: Mrs. S. I seen some yellow sawdust this morning.

T: I don't know what that has to do with manners.

(Several children raise their hands.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morning News Nomination</th>
<th>Morning News Nomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T: Yes, Aaron, you can start off please. (Aaron gets up from the floor &amp; moves to sit in the chair at the front of the class.</td>
<td>T: Susy (Susy gets up from the floor &amp; moves to sit in the chair at the front of the class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class.) The teacher vacates the chair & moves to the side of the room where she stands. She thus continues to command a view of all the children, but she has symbolically given the chair to the child in the news giving role.)

Morning News Greeting

Aaron: Good morning boys and girls.
Chorus: Good morning Aaron.

Morning News Giving

Aaron: When Brian was getting the rubbish bins, he found this box of old stuff, and and he saw this racing car, and he gave it to me. He gave it to me and the wheel's broken, and Stephen came over to my house on Saturday and he saw it.
Stephen: So did Mirko.
Aaron: And Mirko. And the car-
Stephen: We got toys down at the creek, and um we was taking it up the hill and rolling it down-
Aaron: Rolling it down- (smiles & shows much pleasure at this)
Stephen: And then we jumped on it, and then it came down and then rrrrm splash. (laughter) I had gone down in the river.
I didn't even get in trouble when I was soaking wet. (Said on a highrising tone, suggesting surprise & pleasure.

She is carrying a plastic shopping bag full of various toys.

Susy: Good morning boys and girls.
Chorus: Good morning Susy.

Morning News Giving

Susy: My sister's got a little pet. She reckons it's her pet. (she displays it)
Child: What is it?
Susy: A racoon
T.: Oh how do you know it's a racoon, a racoon?
Susy: 'Cause it's got a stripey tail.
T.: Yes, and they've also got that striped part
Child: And they've-
T.: around their eyes that looks like a bandit, don't they?
Susy: I've got a frog (she displays it)
Child: A koala. (Susy also displays this)
Child: A koala.
Susy: And I've got a monkey, and he sucks its thumb with both fingers. And my sister triesto make him twist its head but it can't.
(She displays the monkey as she says this)
Much laughter greets this)

Aaron: And it's up at Ross's place, cause I was going to bring it, except Ross said he might try and fix it.

Child: Ross?


(a slight round of applause)

Anthony: What does it say?

Tony: You know what monkeys do? They get fleas out of other monkeys and eat it.

Child: Yuk.

Child: His fingers doesn't stay in. (A reference to the fact that the fingers of one hand of the monkey are in its mouth)

Anthony: Susy, I've got a question.

Susy: What?

Anthony: It's got a sign on it. What does it say?

Several children: What does it say?

Susy: "Beware Gongo loves you", and on the back it says "Gongo". And my uncle gave it to us.

T.: Why does it say "Beware Gongo loves you"?

Child: Have you got another bangle? Can they go anywhere?

Susy: And last night-

T.: Susy, why does it say that? Do you know?

Susy: No.

Anthony: I've got a new question.

Susy: What?

Anthony: Is that a girl or a boy? (points to the monkey)

Susy: I don't know.

Several: Boy.

A boy: It's a girl.

A girl: Boys can't wear bangles.

Anthony: I hope it's a girl.

Stephen: No, men can wear bangles.

A girl: My dad does.
Child: Yeah, Mr. P. does.
Child: My dad doesn’t wear bangles.
(A series of indecipherable exchanges for a few seconds re whether men can wear bangles.)
Susy: And I’ve got a little plant, an empty yellow pot plant, and I’ve got a pad. (shows it)
Anthony: To write what?
Susy: I don’t write. My sister does.
Anthony: What does that say? (points to it)
Susy: “Chrissy”, and she done some scribble round it.
Anthony: Oh! Can’t she draw better than that?

Control

T.: Shh! Right, that’s enough, don’t forget your manners.

Susy: And at Tracey’s house, not yesterday but the day before, I slept at her place because Mum was looking after Paul, and Paul slept in my bed and Chrissy slept in her bed, and mum and dad slept in their bed, and I slept in Tracey’s bed. And in the morning we jumped on uncle Dougie, and we called him lazy bones, and we called him lazy bones all day.
Tracey: Who, Dougie?
Susy: Uncle Dougie, and we called my dad lazy bones, (much laughter greets this) because we was the first ones up because
Bradley came and jumped on us, and then when he jumped on us, we all got up and Bradley was screaming "All aboard, all aboard, the shark'll eat you", (more laughter) and we was dancing all around the bed and we was jumping up and down and then me and Tracey said "Bradley go back to bed and Uncle Dougie and Aunty Eda'll get a headache", and he didn't, he keeoped on screaming. (much laughter)

**Morning News Finish**

Aaron: Finished.

**Morning News Finish**

Susy: Finished.

**Morning News Nomination**

Aaron: Susy.

Susy: Joel.

* Note that the row of dots indicates that other instances of Morning News Giving have been omitted.

~ The child addressed as "Stephen" is not the same child who helps in the construction of Aaron's M.N.GI.

**Lesson Closure**

T: Right, have you finished, Stephen? ~ It's time to do some maths.
3.5.2 THE SCHEMATIC STRUCTURE OF TEXT 1

As we commence our examination of Text 1, it will be as well to set out the schematic structure we claim is present here.

C---->LI^{|MNN^MNGR^MNGI^MNFMNN^MNGR^MNGI^MNF}^LC

A Lesson Initiation in which a Control element also prosodically operates, is followed by a Morning News Nomination, and this in turn by a Morning News Greeting; then a Morning News Giving element is developed, followed by a Morning News Finish, and a second Morning News Nomination. The whole pattern is repeated, though in the second Morning News Giving element the teacher intrudes with another Control element at a somewhat different point.

We will begin our examination of the grammar by discussing the elements of the text in the construction of which the teacher is almost solely responsible: the LI, the first C element and the LC. These elements are directly realised through the pedagogical register: their primary function is to control and direct learning activity.

3.5.3 THEME IN THE LESSON INITIATION AND THE CONTROL ELEMENTS

As we start this section, we should note that both here and in our later analysis of TRANSITIVITY, we propose to consider, inter alia, ways in which attitudes, judgments and opinions are realised at various points in the text. As we have already observed following Halliday, such matters operate prosodically in the text, and for that reason it will be most satisfactory to comment upon them at points
where they occur, rather than devoting a separate section to them. The linguistic resources in which attitude, judgment and opinion are realised are quite varied, and studies other than this one need to be undertaken in the future with a view to understanding more fully the ways in which these are realised. Considerably more needs to be said on the subject, in fact, than we can argue here.

When we introduced the THEME SYSTEM in chapter 1 (section 1.3), we did so in somewhat general terms, and because of that it will be necessary now to say something more specific about it, before we undertake any Theme analysis. According to Halliday, Theme

is the element (of the clause) which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that with which the clause is concerned. (Halliday, 1985a, 38)

One of the real values of a Theme analysis, as already noted in general terms in chapter 1 (section 1.3), is that it enables us to examine language in terms of three of Halliday's metafunctions - the textual, the interpersonal and the experiential. By way of developing our discussion, we shall introduce some examples of each of the principal types of Theme. Consider the opening clause in the teacher's discourse in our text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>okay</th>
<th>Simone can</th>
<th>you</th>
<th>please shut the door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>continuative</td>
<td>vocative finite</td>
<td>topical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textual</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>experiential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three types of Theme are used here, and it will be observed that, as is always the case, there is a movement in from the first or outermost Theme choice which is textual, to the interpersonal Theme, and finally to the innermost Theme choice, the experiential.
As we observed when we made a preliminary examination of Theme in section 1.3, experiential Theme choices will always be realised in topical Themes, constituting the "topic" about which one is using language. Textual and interpersonal Theme choices, however, may be of several kinds.

To take the latter first, these Themes may be realised through continuatives such as "okay", or perhaps "right", "yes" or "no": their function, where they are used is both to link activity to what has gone before, and to point us into new directions. Other textual Themes include structural Themes, realised in one of two ways. Firstly, they may be realised in one of the number of conjunctions available in English, a common example of which we considered in our earlier discussion of Theme - namely the additive conjunction, "and."

Secondly, they may be realised in a conjunctive adjunct, of which there are also a number of kinds. Some obvious examples of the latter include:

To sum up, the economy is in a disastrous situation.
Finally, let me say how much I appreciate the honour.

In our example above, there are two interpersonal Themes, one a vocative, "Simone", identifying a person's name, and the other a finite, "can", in interpersonal Theme position because of the Mood choice adopted. Other possible interpersonal Theme choices include modal adjuncts, so named because they introduce something of the speaker/writer's attitudes, as in:

To be honest, I don't understand the matter at all.
Regrettably, I cannot attend the party.

One further interpersonal Theme choice, which operates simultaneously as an experiential Theme as well, is the use of a WH interrogative as in:
Where did you go?
Why did you say that?

As we have elsewhere argued (1985a; 1987b), Theme is a significant measure of the manner in which any curriculum genre is put together. Both the patterns by which Themes are distributed across a text, and the kinds of experiential, textual and interpersonal Themes selected, tell us a great deal about the meanings being made, and the manner in which these are made. Teachers necessarily produce more Themes than children since they talk more than the children. What is more important, however, is that when we compare the types of Theme choices used by teacher and children, we find that while the latter do normally produce a number of experiential Themes, they produce very few interpersonal or textual Themes. Whoever controls textual Themes in particular, very considerably determines the directions taken in the patterns of working which are a feature of the text overall.

Teachers typically mark the opening of an element in the schematic structure of a morning news genre by the use of a continuative, such as "right", "okay", or "now." In addition, where, as is in particular the case in the writing planning genre to be examined in later chapters, they go on to develop some sense of the working patterns in which the children are to proceed, they make quite frequent use of structural Themes - conjunctions in particular, such as "and" or "when" - and of conjunctive adjuncts, such as "next" or "soon". These become essential elements in the processes of building the various patterns of working in which the children are to engage, and which are encoded in the discourse.

We intend to proceed by setting out tables showing the distribution of Theme choices in each of the elements of the schematic structure,
and Table 3.4 sets them out for the Lesson Initiation and the Control element

Table 3.4 Theme in the Lesson Initiation and Control of Text 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>Experiential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td></td>
<td>RHEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay</td>
<td>Simone can</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td>voc. fin.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please</td>
<td>remember</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interp. adj.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfortunately</td>
<td>some people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod. adj.</td>
<td>top.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>manners in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>school and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>out of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>can show each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how good</td>
<td></td>
<td>your manners are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH/top.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>seen some yellow sawdust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
<td>this morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td>that has to do with manners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH/top.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (i) top. = topical; structural = structural; cont. = continuative; fin. = finite; voc. = vocative; mod. adj. = modal adjunct; interp. adj. = interpersonal adjunct; WH = WH interrogative.
(ii) where an imperative is used, we shall regard that as in topical Theme position.

It will be noted that in the LI and C elements of Text 1, the teacher uses three textual Themes, one a continuative- "okay"- and the other two structural - "and" and "so". As we noted above, teachers very characteristically use a continuative to get an element of any curriculum genre going. The other two textual Themes, both realised in conjunctions serve (firstly in an additive sense, and
secondly in a consequential sense) to create simple connectedness of clauses in which the teacher is building her expression of attitudes about the importance of good manners:

    and I was a little bit cross with them

and

    so make sure....

The concern with the teacher’s attitudes is in fact foregrounded in two of her chosen interpersonal Themes, one of which is an interpersonal adjunct “please”, and the other of which is a modal adjunct, “unfortunately”:

    please remember your manners

and

    unfortunately some people didn’t even have the manners...

Modal expression is in fact much more a feature of the talk of teachers than it is of that of children. In addition, the teacher uses four interpersonal Themes. Her other two interpersonal Themes, a vocative and a finite, we have already examined when we explained the different types of Theme above. Vocatives, incidentally, find quite selective expression in Theme position. Children use them relatively little in the classroom, while teachers employ them sparingly also, and frequently as a disciplinary measure, alerting a child that they must do something, or perhaps desist from doing something. Here, no disciplinary significance is intended, though a child is being directed to action.

It will be observed that a child called Jeffrey makes use of a vocative to address the teacher:
Mrs. L, I seen some yellow sawdust this morning.

He is in fact signalling his intention to offer a piece of news, and his summary rejection by the teacher demonstrates the risk he has taken in not observing the proper principles for the operation of the genre in question. His rejection by the teacher serves in a negative way to provide confirmatory evidence for the operation of the schematic structure whose presence we are arguing. He must in fact raise his hand to signal his intention to give morning news, and in addition, he must then wait until he has been selected, has moved to the front of the group, and has exchanged greetings with the other children before he can offer his news. Persons flout the principles at work in the genre at their cost, or so Jeffrey must have understood, since he did not in fact attempt to reintroduce his news at any time in the rest of the morning news activity in question.

In Table 3.4 we have shown an instance of a WH item as an interpersonal Theme, even though this also realises an experiential Theme:

how good your manners are.

We shall choose here and elsewhere in this study to identify all WH Themes as interpersonal, though we shall always label them in a manner which draws attention to their status as experiential Themes as well. Our reason for doing this is that in classroom talk, such is the nature of the activity, a lot of questions are asked, especially by the teacher. It is in fact a feature of the relationships that apply that teachers ask questions and children are expected to answer them. It is because of the significance of question-asking as a feature of the relationships that operate in the classroom that we shall highlight the WH items as interpersonal Theme choices.
Incidentally, the clause cited starting with the WH item is a projected clause of dependency or hyoptaxis. For the purposes of Theme analysis it is not always necessary to show such a clause separately from the clause which projects it. However, throughout this study we have chosen to deal always with such clauses separately, and that is because of the nature of the classroom discourse studied. It is for the most part very simple, and the children's contributions are relatively few, though they do on occasion ask questions. It seemed desirable to maximise opportunities to study the patterns of meaning making within the language.

Of the 12 experiential Themes in the LI and C elements, one is produced by the child Jeffrey when he thematises himself as part of his unsuccessful attempt to offer morning news. Of the 11 produced by the teacher, two identify herself "I", two identify the children, "you", and one identifies the school principal who has been talking at the school assembly, "Miss M". In two other places we have shown an imperative in topical Theme position, and we should note that in doing this, we actually operate a little differently from Halliday, who argues that in cases such as those we are considering, strictly speaking there is no Theme (1985a, 49). Imperatives are a very frequent feature of teacher's discourse, however, being often involved in the manner in which they direct and maintain activity. Because of their general importance in teacher talk, we choose to label them as topical Themes. The two involved here in:

\begin{quote}
\textit{remember} your manners
\end{quote}

and

\begin{quote}
\textit{make} sure,
\end{quote}

are clearly significant in building the overall sense of the desirable patterns of behaviour the children are to observe.
A nominal group involving a prepositional phrase complex operating as Qualifier, which serves to stress the concern for "good manners," occupies one other topical Theme position, in:

manners in school and out of school are very very important.

Overall, the teacher's concerns in the L I and the C element are made explicit in all her Thematic choices. The primary issue is the teacher's control of what is going on, and her general requirement that the children behave as she would wish. Her topical Themes identify herself, the school principal and class members, while two imperatives used in topical Theme position serve to reinforce the importance of her general requirements. The pattern created by her use of the interpersonal Themes, especially in the use of an interpersonal and a modal adjunct, serves further to build a sense of the importance of attention to behaviour, while at least two of the textual Themes - the structurals - serve to build connectedness between the teacher's observations with respect to appropriate behaviour. Thus are the values of the culture with respect to young children's behaviour established in the opening element of the schematic structure.

With respect to the manner in which the teacher's judgments and attitudes are so marked in the text, as we have already noted, the children in this study made very sparing use of attitudinal or evaluative expression in their language. They rarely used interpersonal Themes realising attitude, while elsewhere in other parts of the discourse, it is very hard to find frequent instances of the use of modality, or of other linguistic items building attitude. Where children do express attitude or judgment, at least in the morning news genre, it occurs when a teacher such as Mrs. L allows them the opportunity to develop a genre of their own within the M N GI, such as an anecdote, though it can occur in the show and tell as well. Whatever the genre is, however, the critical issue seems to be that
the teacher is not herself involved in the construction of the text, as happens when she deliberately involves the child in constructing an interview genre, of the kind, say, in Example 2, briefly examined above in section 3.3. In other words, capacity to construct a genre with independence within the MN GI, appears to confer the right to take up and express attitude. Personal attitude does find expression in Aaron's MN GI and also in Susy's MN GI. The same general pattern of concern with behaviour - primarily that of the children, but in one instance, that of the teacher herself - is confirmed if we turn to an examination of Transitivity in the LI and the C element.

3.5.4 TRANSITIVITY IN THE LESSON INITIATION AND THE CONTROL ELEMENT

When we introduced TRANSITIVITY in chapter 1 (section 1.3), we observed that transitivity processes made be broadly grouped into three - those of action, those of signification and those of being. We gave examples of each, noting that each type of process has associated types of participants, and that there is a range of possible circumstances. In defining transitivity, Halliday writes:

Our most powerful conception of reality is that it consists of 'goings-on': of doing, happening, feeling, being. These goings-on are sorted out in the semantic system of the language, and expressed through the grammar of the clause......Transitivity specifies the different types of process that are recognised in the language, and the structures by which they are expressed. (Halliday, 1985a, 101)

Plainly, what is "going on" in the main in the LI and the C is the building of meanings to do with acceptable behaviour in the children, as we shall see below in Table 3.5. Before turning to it, however, we need to say a little about relational processes. These need a little more explanation than was given in chapter 1 (section 1.3), since we shall be examining a number in the text under discussion and we need to be able to identify the different types of relational processes.
We shall in addition have rather more to say about them in chapter 7. There, we shall introduce a rather more delicate means of differentiating types of relational processes, with a view to understanding how they work in the building of meanings in the writing planning genre.

Relational processes indicate that something is the case. There are three broad types of such processes. The first type is intensive:

\[ x \textit{ is a}, \]

the second is circumstantial:

\[ x \textit{ is at a}, \]

and the third type is possessive:

\[ x \textit{ has a}. \text{(Halliday, 1985a, 112)} \]

Each of the three types comes in two modes, attributive or identifying, exemplified in Figure 3.1.
Figure 3.1 Relational processes

All processes are the most readily understood in the actual contexts in which they occur. Hence it will be appropriate to turn immediately to some examination of the text. Table 3.5 provides an overview of the complete set of Transitivity processes.
Table 3.5 Transitivity in the Lesson Initiation and Control of Text 1

okay, sh, Simone, can you please shut the door

Agent Pro- Actor -cess: material Goal

I'm going to let you have your show and tell now

Agent Pro- Actor -cess: material Goal Circ: loc: time

please remember your manners

Process: cognition Phenomenon

Miss M. was talking about manners this morning

Behave Process: behavioural Phenomenon Circumstance: loc: time

unfortunately, some people didn't even have the manners [to listen to her]


and I was a little bit cross with them

Carrier Pro: attributive Attribute Circumstance: matter

manners in school and out of school are very very important

Carrier Pro: attributive Attribute

so make sure

Process: intensive Attribute

you can show each other how good your manners are

Sayer Process: verbal Receiver Verbiage

Mrs L I seen some yellow sawdust this morning

Senser Process: perception Phenomenon Circ: loc: time
I don't know what that has to do with manners

Carrier Pro: intensive Attrib: circumstance

Senser Process: cognition Phenomenon

\[
\alpha
\beta
\]

There are 12 transitivity processes here, though an additional one lies in the embedded clause that forms part of the fourth clause used by the teacher:

unfortunately some people didn't even have the manners [to listen to her].

Five of the teacher's processes are relational - more specifically attributive, either possessive or intensive attributive. Such processes are in general concerned with building meanings to do with the desired attributes the children should have. It is in these, just as through the modal adjuncts examined above, that the teacher builds attitudinal expression, as for example at the point when she selects a negative POLARITY and a MOOD ADJUNCT ("even") (Halliday, 1985a, 82):

some people didn't even have the manners to listen to her,

or again when she selects an attributive process to say of the people who didn't have good manners that she:

was a little bit cross with them,

or when she admonishes the children, using another attributive process:

make sure you can show each other how good your manners.
There are in addition three material processes, while there are two
behavioural processes and one mental process. In chapter 7,
incidentally, where we examine TRANSITIVITY in the writing
planning genre in some detail, we shall need to explain our manner
of treating behavioural processes rather more fully (see section 7.3 in
particular). That is partly because such processes have considerable
significance in the operation of this genre and because the method
adopted of handling these processes differs somewhat from that
proposed by Halliday (1985a). At this point, we shall simply note in
passing that our method of categorising these processes departs from
that of Halliday.

Looking to the mental process involved here - a mental process of
cognition in fact - it will be observed that it is part of a clause
complex involving a hypotactic or dependent clause, and that we have
as the convention requires, labelled them as the $\alpha$ and $\beta$ clauses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha & : \text{I don't know} \quad \text{what that has to do with manners.} \\
\beta & : \\
\end{align*}
\]

Unlike Halliday, however, we have labelled the $\beta$ clause
"Phenomenon." Normally where a non-projecting process of
cognition applies, Halliday would label the second participant a
phenomenon as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{please} & \quad \text{remember} \quad \text{your manners} \\
\text{Process: cognition} & \quad \text{Phenomenon}
\end{align*}
\]

We choose to conflate the role of the projected clause with that of a
phenomenon, as a means of drawing attention to the relationship of
the two, though we shall do this only where the second clause is a
hypotactic clause, or one of dependence. We shall not adopt the
principle for paratactic clauses because no comparable relationship of
dependence applies. We have adopted exactly the same principle in
the case of projecting verbal clauses of dependence, where the
projected clause is conflated with verbiage:

\[
\begin{align*}
you & \quad \text{can show} & \quad \text{each other} & \quad \text{how good your manners are} \\
\text{Sayer} & \quad \text{Process: verbal} & \quad \text{Receiver} & \quad \text{Verbiage} \\
\partial & & \beta
\end{align*}
\]

Overall, then, as we have noted, a number of processes are used in
the L I and C elements, primarily concerned with the teacher’s
establishing desirable principles for working. The relatively frequent
use of relational processes in an opening element of a genre is not
uncommon, for such processes may either build observations about
what is the case, or in this case, about what should be the case, as a
necessary point of departure for entry to the main part of the activity
of morning news giving.

3.5.5 THEME AND TRANSITIVITY IN THE LESSON CLOSURE

We should now say something about the other element of the text
under discussion for which the teacher is solely responsible, the L C,
which consists of only two clause complexes. Once again,
examination of Theme and transitivity reveals quite a lot of the way
meaning is made. We have already noted that teachers quite typically
use a continuative to signal the opening of an element of a generic
structure. The commonest tend to be "right", "now", "okay", "well",
as in:

- Right, everybody listen please.
- Now, we’re going to write a story.
- Okay, it’s time to go out to play.
- Well, we’re going to write a shopping list.
In her use of the continuative here - "Right" - the teacher both signals the Morning News Finish to Stephen's Morning News Giving (the details of which have not been examined here), and the Lesson Closure of the genre:

Right, have you finished Stephen?

As we earlier noted, in Mrs. L's classroom, the Morning News Giver has the right to nominate the next person to step into that role. In that the teacher intervenes herself here, she is in fact alerting all the children, as well as Stephen, that the various instances of morning news giving for this particular day are over. Moreover, although she chooses to signal this by using the interrogative mood, such that Stephen theoretically has the option of saying that he has not finished his M N GI, it is clear that she does not expect him to say that he has not, nor does he in fact do so. Instead, the teacher proceeds immediately to herald the start of a new curriculum genre. Significantly, in view of our earlier observation about the role of relational processes in building establishing meanings of various kinds as a basis for proceeding forward, particularly in the opening element of a genre, the teacher goes on to use a relational process. More specifically, it is an intensive attributive process, and it has precisely this enabling function:

```
It 's time [to do some maths today]
Carrier Pro: intensive Attribute
```

Having now briefly examined the LI, the C and the LC elements, it will be clear that in all three elements the pedagogical field is very much to the fore: the language used is that of operationalising activity, in fact. We need now briefly to consider the Morning News Nomination (M N N) and the Morning News Greeting (M N GR), both of which are also realised through the pedagogical register, before
examining Aaron's M N G I, which will take us into a concern with the second order or "content" register.

3.5.6 THE MORNING NEWS NOMINATION AND THE MORNING NEWS GREETING

The M N N consists of only one clause:

Yes Aaron, you can start off please.

The status of that clause as M N N is established by the teacher's use of a textual Theme - "yes" - a continuative. Its use is a response to the fact that the child involved had correctly signalled his interest in talking by raising his hand. There is also an interpersonal Theme, a vocative, in which the child being nominated as Morning New Giver is actually identified: "Aaron." Where children's names are thematised, it is normally part of the process of directing behaviour, and hence a form of language in action, directly responsive in fact to the pedagogical register.

We have already noted the use of a vocative above in the L I: "Simone". We could not, in that case, see the use of the vocative as helping to define an element of the schematic structure, though it certainly was to do with control of the behaviour of the child addressed, and to that extent of the pedagogical field. However, in the element now under discussion, the presence of "Aaron" in interpersonal Theme may be regarded as helping to mark the presence of an element of the text. An essential element of any morning news genre will always be the nomination of the person to do the morning news giving.

From the point of view of transitivity, the only process in the M N N is a material process, identifying an action to be undertaken so that the next element of the genre may be proceeded to:
Aaron correctly understood this as a direction to action, for he got up from the carpeted floor where he was sitting with the other children, and moved to the teacher's seat at the front of the group, an action taken by any child moving into the Morning News Giving role, and intended, through non-linguistic means, to symbolise the status accorded that role. That the M N N is as linguistically minimal as it is, may be taken as another instance of the pedagogical field at work: the language used is language in action.

The element of the text we have called M N GR has neither Theme nor transitivity process, because it is a minor clause, and as we noted above, it is not an essential element, although in practice in this study we found most teachers did insist on its use. The greeting once offered by the Morning News Giver must invite a response. That it did normally occur in the operation of the genre may be attributed to the general and overt intention of the genre to teach children "good manners."

3.5.7 AARON'S MORNING NEWS GIVING ELEMENT: SOME PRELIMINARY CONSIDERAIONS

The M N GI is of course the most interesting element in the genre. It is here that the Morning News Giver has the opportunity to construct one of a number of possible genres, drawing upon fields of pleasurable personal experience of various kinds, so that the genre(s) are actually embedded within the M N GI. A second order or "content" field is involved, in the choice of which the child enjoys some independence, subject as we saw earlier to the general requirements of the pedagogical field, with respect to good taste and good manners as defined by the teacher. In fact, the pedagogical field, operating as we have seen to this point through the L I, the C,
the M N N, the M N G R and the L C, has served to generate a pedagogically acceptable context for working, such that the second order or "content" field, in itself drawn from some other context, both spatial and temporal, is now projected through it.

We shall argue that the genre embedded in Aaron's M N G I element is an example of what Plum (1988) and Rothery (in preparation) have termed an anecdote genre. Before proceeding to define such a genre, and to set out the elements of the instance claimed to be embedded here, we need to note the significance of the fact that Aaron is assisted in the construction of the genre by his friend Stephen, who himself shared in the experiences upon which Aaron draws to create his anecdote. Sometimes in a morning news genre where another child joins in, the additional contribution tends to be regarded by the nominated News Giver or by the teacher as a source of interruption. In the particular text in question, the intervention of another child was not so perceived, principally because the two boys were such good friends, and their joint pleasure in the events described was as evident to the teacher and researcher as it was to the other children. Thus it was that in a totally unplanned way, but nonetheless in a manner very typical of a great deal of natural spoken language text construction, the anecdote genre was truly a joint construction. The construction of natural discourse is, after all, more often than not a joint activity.

It is very interesting to compare the success of Stephen's intervention (if indeed "intervention" is the appropriate word in his case) in the text construction with the lack of success of Jeffrey referred to above, who talked of seeing yellow sawdust on the way to school. As we saw above, Jeffrey was not behaving within the acceptable limits for the overall construction of a morning news giving activity, and so he was dismissed. Stephen's intervention in Aaron's morning news giving is acceptable, unlike Jeffrey's intervention, both because it is successfully incorporated within an
established MN GI element of the text and because his right to share in the text construction appears to be generally acknowledged. In fact, as we shall see, it is Stephen rather than Aaron who actually builds the Reaction element in the genre, making interesting use both of polarity and of a mood adjunct to create expression of attitude to do with the events recreated.

With respect to the character of the anecdote genre, as described by Plum (1988) and Rothery (in preparation), we should observe that this is one of several "narrative-type" genres they propose. Another type of "narrative-type" genre regularly produced by young children is the recount, originally described by Martin and Rothery (1980; 1981). Both, like another genre identified by Plum as the EXEMPLUM, are built around temporally developed reconstruction of events. Where the recount simply recreates a sequence of events, the anecdote tends to introduce a narrator's reaction to the events recreated, such that the reaction makes clear the significance the narrator attaches to the events. Like the narrative (from which it differs because it lacks a Complication), writes Plum, the anecdote is:

primarily concerned with entertaining a hearer with a textual artefact which, in order to be successful, needs to have a status independent of the experiences it represents. (Plum, 1988, 223)

Plum offers the following example of an anecdote, with its elements of schematic structure indicated. It is drawn from an interview Plum generated in which he asked the breeder of an old English sheep dog if he had ever had any emergency to deal with in connection with the dog:
Orientation/Crisis

No, only that a month before Christmas, my young dog, that's down at Mum's, Popeye - I went down to pick him up to bath him for the show the next day - he'd eaten all his hair out of one side.

Reaction

I nearly killed him. He had a flea allergy. He had only one flea on him, and that was it, you know.

Completion

That's something really dramatic though.

Plum argues that were this a classic narrative genre, there would be a Complication created by the need to withdraw the dog from the show, but for the purposes of the construction of an anecdote:

the 'real' resolution within (this text) is to be found in the narrator's Reaction, the sole purpose of which is to underline the enormity, i.e. the 'tellability' of the Crisis created in the actions and events told. If the 'punchline' of an anecdote - the similarity to the conventional genre of the joke being unmistakable - is essentially implicit, the Reaction ensures that the joke is not lost on the hearer. (Plum, 1988, 224)

Bearing in mind Plum's observations, we would propose that the schematic structure of Aaron's and Stephen's jointly constructed anecdote is as follows:

\[ O \wedge EV \wedge CR I \wedge R \wedge COM. \]

where O represents Orientation
EV represents Event
CRI represents Crisis
R represents Reaction
COM represents Completion
[ ] represent a zone of recursion, and
^ represents sequence.

The actual text of the genre may be set out thus:

Orientation

Aaron: When Brian was getting the rubbish bins, he found this box of old stuff, and he saw this racing car, and he gave it to me.

Events

He gave it to me, and the wheel's broken, and Stephen came over to my house on Saturday and he saw it.
Stephen: So did Mirko.
Aaron: And Mirko. And the car-
Stephen: We got toys down at the creek, and um we was taking it up the hill and rolling it down-
Aaron: Rolling it down-
Stephen: And then we jumped on it.

Crisis

and then it came down and rrmm splash! It had gone down to the river. (laughter)

Reaction

Stephen: I didn't even get in trouble when I was soaking wet.
Completion

Aaron: And it's up at Ross's place, 'cause I was going to bring it, except Ross said he might try and fix it.
Child: Ross?
Aaron: Yes, Jodie's dad. My brother's friend.

The object of our ensuring discussion will be to demonstrate, again primarily through an examination of Theme and transitivity, how the schematic structure here is realised.

3.5.8 THEME IN AARON'S MORNING NEWS ELEMENT

Theme in Aaron's MN GI is set out in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6: Textual and Experiential Themes in the Morning News Giving Element of Text 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>RHEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when Brian was getting the rubbish bins</td>
<td>he found this box of old stuff top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (then) struc.</td>
<td>he top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (then) struc.</td>
<td>he top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEME

Textual

EVENTS

and
struc.

and
struc.

and (then)
struc.

so
struc.

and (then)
struc.

and
struc.

and then
struc./conj.

Experiential

the wheel
top.

Stephen
top.

he
top.

we
top.

we
top.

we
top.

we
top.

we
top.

we
top.

RHEME

's broken
came over to my house on
Saturday
saw it
did Mirko
got cars down at the creek
was taking it up the hill
rolling it down
jumped on it
CRISIS

and then it came down
*struc./conj.* top.

end (then) rrm splash
*struc./conj.*

it had gone down in the river
*top.*

REACTION

I didn't even get in trouble
*top.*

when I was soaking wet
*struc.*

COMPLETION

and it 's up at Ross"s place
*struc.* top.

'cause I was going to bring it
*struc.*

except Ross said
*struc.*

*top.*
Aaron opens his text by placing a dependent clause of time in marked topical Theme position:

> when Brian was getting the rubbish bins, he found this box of old stuff

Such a marked topical Theme simultaneously signals the opening of his M N GI and the opening of the Orientation of his anecdote. As such, it compares closely with the Orientation element identified by Rothery (1984; in preparation) and Plum (1988) as opening narratives, recounts and anecdotes, because it introduces persons identified in some sense of time and activity. Aaron and his friend Stephen go on to use 17 textual Themes, all of them either structural or conjunctive adjuncts. Their role in the overall construction of meaning is to build a strong sense of explicit connectedness between clauses. Appropriate "narration" about experience, to use Halliday's term, will often involve reconstruction of personal experience, such that connectedness of events is built up. Children who are successful in constructing anecdotes or recounts in the Morning News Giving element in general make frequent use of such textual Themes. Once the Orientation has been established, subsequent use of textual Themes serves to help build the sequence
of Events. Overall, of the 10 textual Themes used by Aaron and his friend Stephen to build Events, six have the effect of building temporal connectedness, by the use of the structural Theme "and", accompanied either implicitly or explicitly by the sense of a temporal connectedness, realised in a choice of the conjunctive adjunct "then".

There is one textual Theme - "and", carrying a sense of temporal connection - used in the Crisis element:

```
and (then) rrm splash
it had gone down in the river.
```

The Reaction has one textual Theme ("when"), though as we shall shortly argue, the absence of a textual Theme at the beginning of the clause complex in which this is found, is one measure that a new element in the overall schematic structure is actually being signalled. The three textual Themes in the Completion are structural - all of them conjunctions of a non-temporal kind ("and", "cause", and "except"). Their function is to help indicate that the narrator has put behind him both reconstruction of events and reflection upon the significance of those events: a new and concluding element of the schematic structure is in fact being constructed:

```
and it's up at Ross's place
'cause I was going to bring it
except Ross said he might try and fix it
```

Of the 18 experiential Themes used in the M N G I (including that within the opening dependent clause), 14 refer to Aaron himself or to his friends, as in:

```
he found this box of old stuff
we got toys down at the creek,
```
while other experiential Themes identify the toy played with, or parts thereof. To the extent that the experiential component in the text is realised in Theme, it is personal experience -- self and friends in particular -- which predominates throughout the Orientation, the Events and the Crisis.

The commencement of the Reaction is clearly marked in the choice of experiential Theme selected by Stephen -- "I" : the first time in fact that this item is used by either child in the text, and it indicates that a personal response to events is about to be introduced. In fact, it is notable that of the two experiential Themes Stephen produces in his Reaction element, both are instances of "I". It is Stephen's attitudes, in fact, that are being foregrounded at this point. Furthermore, unlike most of the previous experiential Themes in this anecdote genre, the first of Stephen's two instances of "I" is not linked by the use of a textual Theme to what has been said previously. Overall, at this point, a "break" in the direction of the discourse has been signalled by Stephen, both by the absence of a textual Theme and by a new choice of an experiential Theme. Stephen has "stood back" from the events as described to introduce his Reaction:

I didn't even get in trouble when I was soaking wet.

While as we shall see shortly when we look at transitivity, there are other linguistic resources clearly involved in building the Reaction, the pattern of Theme choices here is thus also significant.

The Completion, initiated by Aaron, does use a textual Theme -- another instance of the structural Theme "and" -- which has the effect of building connectedness of an additive, not a temporal kind, and as we saw above, the total pattern of textual Themes in this element serves to build a "tidying up" or "rounding off" of the anecdote. Among the four choices of experiential Theme taken up by Aaron in this element of the discourse, one involves a reference to the car
under discussion - "it", one a reference to self, "I", and two involve references to his friend - "Ross" and "he".

3.5.9 TRANSITIVITY IN AARON'S MORNING NEWS GIVING ELEMENT

When we turn to that other element of the grammar we have chosen to use in our examination of the morning news genre - namely, transitivity - we find additional confirmation of the picture which is emerging by which we characterise the M N GI element as (i) building an anecdote, and (ii) drawing upon personal experience to do so. Of the 22 transitivity processes involved, 16 are material, and to do with reconstruction of event, as in:

Brian was getting the rubbish bins
Actor Process: material Goal

we got toys down at the creek
Actor Process: material Goal Circ: loc: place

we jumped on it
Actor Process: material Circ: loc: place

The material process used in the Reaction element, by the way, is used in association both with a use of a negative polarity (where to this point the polarity choice has been positive) with a mood adjunct ("even"), reinforcing the sense of the building of personal assessment about the matter in hand. This is in itself a relatively uncommon feature of the language of young children in school, for as we noted above in section 3.4, capacity for expression of attitude or evaluation is rare, it being normally the preserve of the teacher. The process involved, with its associated negative polarity and its mood adjunct is:
I didn't even get in trouble

Actor Process: material

Of the other processes, three are mental and they contribute to the building of event, as in:

he saw this racing car

while two are relational, both attributive in fact, and helping to build the Reaction and the Completion, respectively:

I was soaking wet
Carrier Process: intensive Attribute

it's up at Ross's place
Carrier Process: intensive Attribute: circumstantial,

and one is verbal, in:

Ross said he might try and fix it
Actor Pro: material Goal

Sayer Process: verbal Verbiage
β

It will be useful to display in summary fashion the pattern of process types across the text, lining them up along with the pattern of Theme choices, the better to demonstrate how the two sets of choices from the two different grammatical systems realise important aspects of the schematic structure of the anecdote genre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Theme</th>
<th>Material process</th>
<th>Mental process</th>
<th>Relational process</th>
<th>Verbal process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ORIENTATION**

when was getting
found
and (then) saw
and (then) gave

**EVENTS**

gave
and 's broken
came
and (then) saw
so did (see)

got
and (then) was taking
and (then) rolling
rolling
and then jumped
came

**CRISIS**

and (then) (rrm splash)*

had gone
Collectively, the meanings built up through the transitivity processes, and through the range of Themes, textual and experiential, are meanings to do with reconstruction of personal activities, linked in temporal sequence, building up to a crisis, and followed by a reaction and a "rounding off" or completion.

With respect to the status of the M N G I here as an instance of an embedded anecdote genre, we should return for the moment to Plum's observations above concerning this type of genre. It will be recalled he argues that in a sense the "real" Complication of such a genre remains implicit, unlike in a classic narrative, and that the Crisis leads to a Reaction which makes the "punchline" clear to the listener. Now all this is relevant to Aaron's and Stephen's anecdote. The complication created for young children in real life when they
play with toys near water is that they not only get very wet, but that they are actually flouting the usual parental guidelines, hence normally making their parents quite angry. All this the young children knew and understood very well here, as part of the familiar knowledge of early childhood experience. Such knowledge, with the associated pleasure that often comes from mildly defying their parents' instructions, is part of the sub-culture of young children, and considerably more fun is to be had from it by not making all this explicit in the language. Hence Stephen, in making his critically important contributions to Aaron's M N G1, helps to fashion what is in fact a very successful example of an anecdote - successful, that is, in that everyone in the classroom, children, teacher and researcher all laughed.

When teachers like Mrs. L generate morning news activities as she does, it seems that children enjoy a greater degree of independence and authority than often applies in the early childhood classroom, and they are thus enabled to offer some expression of personal attitude. Where children are denied the opportunity to build expression of attitude or judgment, they are to that extent significantly disempowered. This has consequences in at least two different ways: firstly, as we have noted, in that children learn to defer to the teacher's evaluations, recognising them as more significant or important than their own; secondly, and in this study at least, in that children's capacity or willingness to venture expressions of personal evaluation in their first writing activities is quite delayed. A surprisingly large number of the children reported on here wrote few texts offering any expressions of attitude for the first 18 months to two years of their schooling, though they were writing constantly, especially in Year 1. We will return to these matters more fully in chapter 9, where we make some overall assessment of the writing down by the children.
We will now proceed to examining the final element in Aaron's Morning News activity, the M N F.

3.5.10 THE MORNING NEWS FINISH IN AARON'S ACTIVITY

This element in Aaron's morning news activity consists of one elliptical clause: "Finished", involving a material process, clearly a use of language for action. No selection of Theme has been made, though plainly since the clause is elliptical, the experiential Theme, "I", is actually understood to be involved here. The absence of a textual Theme helps to define a new element in the schematic structure here. As we have argued, the textual Themes have a particular significance in the process of building the connectedness which is a feature of successful construction of the representation of experience. By not selecting a textual Theme, Aaron actually signals that his process of recreating and reflecting upon experience has ceased. Because he has moved back from the second order or "content" field to the pedagogical field, he has moved back to the use of language both as an aspect of behaviour and as a means of controlling behaviour, rather than as a resource for reflection upon experience.

In fact, as earlier noted, in Mrs. L's class the children normally signalled their M N F, apart from those occasions on which she determined that the activity was over for the day, in which case she declared the last instance of morning news giving. The children always did it in the same way—by the use of the elliptical clause "Finished", and it was always pronounced on a high falling tone.

While the M N F was always the same in Mrs. L's classroom, in other teachers' classrooms, where the teacher herself signalled this element in the schematic structure, it very commonly involved some kind of evaluative comment:
That was very good, thank you very much.

Mrs. L did in fact sometimes offer an evaluative comment, but in that she also quite often did not, she did in this sense also confer an additional degree of independence upon the children, who were by implication at least, left to make their own judgments about the worthiness of what was said by the Morning News Giver.

It will now be appropriate to turn to the other instance of morning news giving in the text, that of Susy, to develop further our discussion in particular of what is involved in the construction of the MN GI element of a genre.

Having signalled MN F, Aaron takes a final step by introducing the next MN N: "Susy," This is of course elliptical. Significantly, since it comes immediately after the high falling tone used to call out "Finished", this is pronounced on a low falling tone, and once Aaron has said it, he goes, unasked, and sits down as Susy stands and moves to the front of the group to take his place. We would explain the marked change in tone by arguing that whereas the Morning News Giver still enjoys status at the point at which he or she announces the MN F, that status is symbolically handed over when the new Morning News Giver is nominated, and the diminished status is acknowledged in the choice of a low tone. Once again, language is both part of action, and also regulatory of action.

3.5.11 SUSY’S MORNING NEWS GIVING

Like Aaron, Susy, in the opinion of this researcher was always a successful Morning News Giver. Unlike Aaron, she came from a family whose mother tongue was Serbian, though she spoke English from birth, and the family language appeared to have been abandoned. The school principal observed that, unlike a number of other children in the study who came from backgrounds in which English
was not the first language, Susy was a reasonably articulate user of the language from her earliest days at school. Like Aaron, she was confident in the role of Morning News Giver, often capable of entertaining and making the other children laugh, as she developed what she had to say.

We will dispense with discussing M N N, M N G R and M N F in Susy's case, on the grounds that they are exactly the same as those in Aaron's case, merely noting in passing that this very tendency to use exactly the same linguistic items bears testimony to the operation of the pedagogical register at work, operationalising the entry to the second order or "content" register.

Susy's M N G I is considerably longer than Aaron's, and it has two embedded genres, both drawing upon fields of personal experience, though of quite different kinds. The first is built around the activity of displaying toys and talking about these, while the second is built around a recreation of personal events. The first we will call a show and tell genre, the second one we will call an anecdote.

Susy's M.N.G.I. may be said to have the following overall structure:

\[ C \rightarrow M N G R \wedge [S \wedge Q] \wedge [O \wedge [E V] \wedge C R I \wedge R \wedge C O M] \wedge M N F \wedge M N N, \]

where the symbols are to be understood thus:

\[ [ ] \] indicate the embeddings of the first and second embedded genres,
S represents Say,
Q represents Question,
the symbol *represents recursion,
the brackets [ ] indicate the zone of recursion,
O represents Orientation,
EV represents Events,
CRI represents Crisis,
R represents Reaction,
COM represents Completion.

Susy's text is set out below, in such a way that the schematic structure of the M N GI element is indicated, and the two embedded genres and their schematic structures are displayed as well, by means of using indentation.

MORNING NEWS GIVING.

Morning News Greeting

Susy: Good morning boys and girls.
Chorus: Good morning Susy.

SHOW and TELL
Tell and Question

Susy: My sister's got a little pet. She reckons it's her pet.
Child: What is it?
Susy: A racoon
T.: Oh how do you know it's a racoon, a racoon?
Susy: 'Cause it's got a stripey tail.
T.: Yes, and they've also got that striped part
Child: And they've-
T.: around their eyes that looks like a bandit, don't they?
Susy: I've got a frog.
Child: A koala.
Susy: And I've got a monkey, and he sucks its thumb with both fingers. And my sister tries to make him twist its head but it can't.
Anthony: What does it say?
Tony: You know what monkeys do? They get fleas out of other monkeys and eat it.

Child: Yuk.

Child: His fingers doesn't stay in.

Anthony: Susy, I've got a question.

Susy: What?

Anthony: It's got a sign on it. What does it say?

Several children: What does it say?

Susy: "Beware Gongo loves you", and on the back it says "Gongo". And my uncle gave it to us.

T.: Why does it say "Beware Gongo loves you"?

Child: Have you got another bangle? Can they go anywhere?

Susy: And last night-

T.: Susy, why does it say that? Do you know?

Susy: No.

Anthony: I've got a new question.

Susy: What?

Anthony: Is that a girl or a boy?

Susy: I don't know.

Several: Boy.

A boy: It's a girl.

A girl: Boys can't wear bangles.

Anthony: I hope it's a girl.

Stephen: No, men can wear bangles.

A girl: My dad does.

Child: Yeah, Mr. P. does.

Child: My dad doesn't wear bangles.

Susy: And I've got a little plant, an empty yellow pot plant, and I've got a pad.

Anthony: To write what?

Susy: I don't write. My sister does.

Anthony: What does that say?

Susy: "Chrissy", and she done some scribble round it.

Anthony: Oh! Can't she drew better than that?
Control

T: Shh! Right, that's enough, don't forget your manners.

ANECDOTE
Orientation

Susy: And at Tracey's house, not yesterday but the day before, I slepted at her place because Mum was looking after Paul

Events

and Paul slept in my bed and Chrissy slept in her bed, and mum and dad slept in their bed, and I slept in Tracey's bed. And in the morning we jumped on uncle Dougie, and we called him lazy bones, and we called him lazy bones all day. Tracey: Who, Dougie?
Susy: Uncle Dougie, and we called my dad lazy bones, because we was the first ones up, because Bradley came and jumped on us,

Crisis

and then when he jumped on us, we all got up and Bradley was screaming "All aboard, all aboard, the shark'll eat you", and we was dancing all around the bed and we was jumping up and down

Reaction/Completion

and then me and Tracey said "Bradley go back to bed and Uncle Dougie and Aunty Eda'll get a headache," and he didn't, he keepep on screaming.

Morning News Finish.

Susy: Finished.
**Morning News Nomination.**

Susy: Joel.

### 3.5.12 THEME IN SUSY'S MORNING NEWS GIVING ELEMENT

Table 3.8 sets out Theme choices in Susy's Morning News Giving element, and for ease of understanding how the different Themes are patterned to help realise the various elements of the two embedded genres, we have indicated where we claim the various elements occur.

**Table 3.8: Textual Themes in Susy's show and tell and anecdote genres**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>RHEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textual</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show and Tell genre</td>
<td>my sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reckons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WH/top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>RHEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textual</strong></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td>WH/top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'cause</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes and</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont. struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>my sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WH/top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you know what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inter. adj.WH./top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>struc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>his fingers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WH/top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WH/top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>and struc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and struc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>why WH/top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have fin top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can fin top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susy why voc. WH/top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do fin. top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is fin. top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>interp. adj.</em></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cont.</em></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my dad</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cont.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>Mr. P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cont.</em></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my dad</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>I don't write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>does that say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHI/ top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and struc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>done some scribble round it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draw better than that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>that 's enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forget your manners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Anecdote genre**

**THEME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual</th>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>Experiential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and</th>
<th>at Tracey's house, not yesterday but the day before</th>
<th>I slept at her place top.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
<td>Mum top.</td>
<td>was looking after Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and</th>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>slept in my bed top.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>Chrissy</td>
<td>slept in her bed top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>mum and dad</td>
<td>slept in their bed top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>slept in Tracey's bed top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>in the morning</td>
<td>we jumped on uncle Dougie top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Experiential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (then) struc.</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>called him lazy bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (then) struc.</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>called him lazy bones all day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (then) struc.</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>called my dad lazy bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because struc.</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>was the first ones up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because struc.</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (then) struc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>jumped on us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crisis**

<p>| and then | when he jumped on us | we all got up |
| struc. conj. adj | | |
| and struc. | Bradley | was screaming |
| | the shark | 'll eat you |
| | top. | top. |
| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>Experiential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and (then)</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>was dancing all around the bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (then)</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>was jumping up and down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struc.</td>
<td>top.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reaction/Completion**

| and then | me and Tracey | said |
| struc/conj.adj | top. | |

Bradley

| go | back to bed |
| voc. | top. | |

| and | Uncle Dougie and |
| struc. | Auntie Eda | 'll get a headache |

| he | didn’t |
| struc. | top. | |

| he | keeped on screaming |
| top. | |

Susy’s opening choice of Theme is a simple experiential Theme, in contrast to Aaron’s opening in which he chose to use a dependent clause of time in marked experiential Theme position: where his was an opening signalling the creation of an Orientation, Susy’s thus
signals a first step in building the description or commentary upon an object which is a feature of the show and tell genre:

*my sister's got a little pet.*

In fact, all Susy's experiential Theme choices identify herself, her family members, or valued objects belonging to members of her family: the fields she draws upon in both the show and tell genre and the anecdote are thus very much those of personal experience. Her experiential Themes are distributed somewhat differently, however, in the show and tell genre from the way they are distributed in the anecdote genre. Indeed, their differential distribution is one measure of the presence of differing genres, and we shall look at this a little more closely below. We need first to say something of the role of the other participants in the construction of the show and tell genre.

One overall important difference in experiential Themes between the show and tell and the anecdote genres is that in the former there are a number of Themes created by the other classroom participants, whereas in the anecdote, they are all created by Susy. In the show and tell there clearly is a strongly held expectation that others apart from the Morning News Giver will participate in the construction of the text. It is true that in the anecdote which we saw above was embedded in Aaron's Morning News Giving element, two children were involved in creating the genre, but the manner of involvement of the second child called Stephen was quite different from that of the other children and the teacher in Susy's show and tell. There are in fact two sources of difference in Susy's case. Firstly, she talks of objects, as we have already noted, so that much of the language used makes exophoric reference to these objects, and it builds commentary upon them, where Aaron's and Stephen's language recreates events drawn from previous experience of an earlier time. Secondly, on the part of the others involved who are listening to the
Morning News Giver, there is considerable use of language to elicit information about the objects displayed, as well as to express opinion in some cases.

Thus, while Susy creates 39 experiential Themes, the others create 23, where of the latter, those employed initially identify the toys displayed, or parts thereof, as in:

his fingers doesn’t stay in,

or

it’s got a sign on it,

though later they change somewhat after the field momentarily shifts to discussion of gender issues, and whether males can wear bangles, as in:

boys can’t wear bangles,

or

my dad doesn’t wear bangles.

The most significant mark of the contribution of the others in the show and tell genre, however, is the quite frequent use of WH interrogatives, realising both interpersonal and experiential Theme position, as we have already noted, though listed by us in the interpersonal column. Examples include:

what is it?
what does it say?

There are in fact eight uses of such WH interrogatives, and in addition there are five use of finites in interpersonal Theme positions, as in:
have you got another bangle?
can they go anywhere?,

and three uses of a vocative, which are also interpersonal Themes:

Susy, I've got a question,

and

Susy, why does is say that?

The last vocative is in speech reported by Susy:

Bradley, go back to bed

There are in addition two mental clauses operating in an interpersonal Theme position, the first of which is:

you know what monkeys do,

while the other signals the expression of opinion about the monkey:

I hope it's a girl.

The latter is significant, because of the relatively infrequent expression of attitude or opinion normally found in genres of early childhood education, which we have already noted.

The whole series of exchanges about whether males can wear bangles is generated by a child other than the Morning News Giver - a boy called Anthony in fact - and in that the field does not shift entirely to this issue, it is Susy, in her capacity as Morning News Giver who resists, not the teacher, who might in other circumstances demand a return to the "content" field more directly in hand.
Were we to examine CONVERSATION STRUCTURE as we shall do in chapter 8 with respect to the writing planning genre, we would be able to say rather more than we have here about the character of the language in the show and tell genre as conversation. As it is, we have said enough in general terms with respect to Theme to draw attention to the particular character of the genre as one in which the asking and answering of questions about object(s) is quite essential to the successful realisation of the genre.

Turning to Susy’s experiential Theme choices in the show and tell genre, there are 16 in all, five of which relate to Susy’s sister, as in the instance we cited above, or as in:

she reckons it’s her pet.

There are five instances in which Susy identifies herself as in:

and I’ve got a monkey,

one instance in which she identifies another family member - “my uncle”; and five instances of experiential Themes identifying toys, or parts of the toys, as in:

’cause it’s got a stripey tail.

The field shift in the anecdote genre is quite marked, for though she still draws upon personal experience here to create 18 experiential Themes, they deal not with toys or with her young sister, but with self and other significant family members. One important way Susy signals the start of the second genre in fact lies in her choice of a marked experiential Theme, which though it is linked to the earlier discourse by means of a textual Theme, actually heralds an Orientation:
and at Tracey's house, not yesterday but the day before.
Mum was looking after Paul.

There are two other marked experiential Themes in the anecdote, the first where a circumstance of time is placed in Theme position:

and in the morning we jumped on uncle Dougie,

and the second, where a dependent clause of time is placed in topical Theme:

and then when he jumped on us, we all got up.

Otherwise, as noted, Susy's experiential Themes identify family and self, as in:

and Paul slept in my bed
and Chrissy slept in her bed...

One other of her experiential Themes is in fact worthy of comment for its role in helping to signal the Reaction element:

and then me and Tracey said "Bradley go back to bed..."

While Susy has thematised herself before, using "I", this is the first time she thematises herself and Tracey: it is their joint reaction to events that concerns her at this point.

Where there are several interpersonal Themes in the show and tell as we saw above, the anecdote has no interpersonal Themes, apart from one occurring in direct speech that Susy records in constructing her genre:

Bradley, go back to bed.
Compared with the show and tell genre, the anecdote is not a genre in which the contributions of others are welcome for the most part, except in the somewhat special circumstances which applied in Aaron's Morning News Giving element, or where as does happen here, another child asks a clarifying question ("who, Dougie?").

The asking of the latter question, incidentally, seems to have the effect of causing Susy to move off into a slightly new direction in the construction of her anecdote. She has already reported that "in the morning", she and Tracey had got up and called "uncle Dougie" "lazy bones", and that they had called him that all day. After responding to her questioner and confirming that she is indeed talking of "uncle Dougie", she actually backtracks a little in terms of her time line, and she notes that she and Tracey had got up early "because Bradley came and jumped on us." This slight discontinuity that creeps into the development of the anecdote is itself a normal feature of the creation of natural spoken discourse, as Plum (1988) has pointed out. He (1988, 67) makes some initial observations with respect to the effect of the interview situation in which he worked to elicit the texts he did about dog-breeding, noting that when an interviewee is asked to resume, repeat or clarify what has been said, the result is often that some schematic discontinuity is created. A similar principle applies, we would argue, in any situation where persons are narrating about experience, and where a request to clarify or amend what is said tends to point the speaker into somewhat different directions. To that extent, we suggest, some discontinuity in schematic structures is no doubt quite commonplace. In the case of Susy's text we would argue that such discontinuity in no way detracts from the fact that she does construct an anecdote, and that it was indeed perceived by her listeners as a successful one, for they laughed heartily.
To this point we have not considered textual Themes in Susy's Morning News Giving element, and they do in fact operate in interestingly different ways to realise her two embedded genres. The first point to note of interest is the very large number of textual Themes created by Susy. In fact, of the 40 textual Themes involved in the show and tell and the anecdote, all but seven are created by Susy. It will be recalled that in our initial discussion of Theme and its significance in the construction of curriculum genres generally in section 3.5.3 above, we noted among other things that whoever controls the textual Themes in a text effectively controls the directions the discourse takes. Thus, Susy is undoubtedly in control here, despite the very real contributions of the other children, especially as we have seen in the show and tell. Her capacity to create such a large number of textual Themes is of importance in another sense as well. It is important in that it provides further evidence that in Mrs. L's classroom the morning news activity operates in such a way that the Morning News Giver can exercise some independence in constructing chosen genres and in determining the directions taken within those genres.

The three points at which textual themes are created by persons other than Susy, incidentally, are firstly, an occasion on which the teacher speaks:

\textit{yes, and} they've also got that striped part.

and once when Tony says:

they get fleas out of other monkeys \textit{and} eat it.

and once in the talk of males wearing bangles:

\textit{yeah, Mr. P does.}
Looking to the patterns by which Susy employs structural Themes in the show and tell and the anecdote, it will be observed that in the former genre she uses nine instances of the conjunction "and," building connectedness of an additive character, and one of the conjunction "but", building a contrastive connection. Her object then is primarily to build simple commentary upon the items displayed in a manner apparently consistent with the purposes of the genre, as in:

and I've got a monkey
and on the back it says "Beware Gongo loves you."

Of the 22 structural Themes Susy employs in the anecdote genre, 17 are also instances of the conjunction "and". In nine cases the type of connectedness built is of a temporal kind, twice by the use of the conjunctive adjunct "then" in association with a use of "and", and elsewhere at points where we would claim an implicit sense of temporal connectedness is involved. Some examples include:

and in the morning we jumped on uncle Dougie
and (then) we called him lazy bones
and (then) we called him lazy bones all day.

Three other structural Themes employed are all realised in uses of the causative conjunction "because," as in:

because mum was looking after Paul
because we was the first ones up
because Bradley came and jumped on us.

These have quite important roles in building the character of the anecdote. Thus, the first clause listed is in fact part of the Orientation, and involved in building a sense of the context and circumstances for the events recreated:
at Tracey's house, not yesterday but the day
before, I slept at her place
because mum was looking after Paul.

The other two instances and the clauses they herald both occur
towards the end of the series of Events, and they are essential in
helping to build the circumstances which precipitate the Crisis.
These circumstances having been established, the Crisis is thus
signalled by uses of two structural themes and a marked topical
Theme:

and then when he jumped on us we all got up.

The anecdote, then, builds frequent connectedness of a temporal
kind, as well as some causal sense of connectedness though its
structural Theme choices. Its meanings are thus very different from
those of the show and tell, and these very meanings realise a very
different schematic structure from that of the show and tell.

3.5.13 TRANSITIVITY IN SUSY'S MORNING NEWS GIVING
ELEMENT

If we turn our attention to transitivity in Susy's M N GI element, the
same general picture we have been building up through the Theme
analysis is revealed. Thus, if we look first at the show and tell genre,
it is clear that the meanings made are mainly of a descriptive kind,
and consistent with the building of commentary. Of the 49 processes
involved in this genre, 18 are relational, 14 are material, while seven
are mental, five are verbal and five are behavioural. The relational
processes are for the most part possessive attributive or intensive
attributive, though some are identifying, and their collective effect is
to help build a series of descriptions about the persons and toys
spoken of, and their various characteristics (e.g. "it's got a stripey
tail"). Material processes realise activities of the kind for example in
in which the toys engage (such as "sucking thumbs"), and their role in the text is further to contribute to the creation commentary and/or description. There is no sense of the reconstruction of action and event which is a marked feature either of Aaron's MN GI, or of the anecdote later constructed by Susy. The following are all relational processes used in Susy's show and tell:

```
my sister          's got          a little pet
Carrier: possessor Process: possessive Attribute: possessed

she          reckons          it          's          her little pet
Carrier          Pro: intens.          Attrib: possessed
Senser          Pro: cognition          Phenomenon
α          β

what          is          it
Value          Process: intensive          Token

how          do          you          know          it          's          a racoon
Token          Pro: intens.          Value
Pro-          Senser          -cess: cog.          Phenomenon
α          β

'cause          it          's got          a stripey tail
Carr: possessor          Pro: possessive          Attribute: possessed

they          've also got          that striped part around their eyes [that looks like a bandit]

I          've got          a frog
Carrier: possessor          Process: possession          Attribute: possessed
```
I've got a monkey
Carrier: possessor Process: possession Attribute: possessed

I've got a question
Carrier: possessor Process: possession Attribute: possessed

it's got a sign on it

I've got a new question
Carrier: possessor Process: possession Attribute: possessed

is that a girl or boy
Process: intensive Carrier Attribute

it's a girl
Carrier Process: intensive Attribute

I hope it's a girl
Carrier Process: intensive Attribute

Senser Pro: affect Phenomenon
α β

I've got a little plant an empty yellow pot plant
Carrier: possessor Pro: poss. Attribute: possessed

I've got a pad [to write]
Carrier: possessor Process: possession Attribute: possessed

The 14 material processes in the show and tell genre include, for example:
he sucks its thumbs with both fingers
Actor Process: material Goal Circumstance:
manner: means

my sister tries to make him twist its head
Initiator Pro- Actor cess: material Goal

ey get fleas out of other monkeys
Actor Process: material Goal Circumstance: location: place

eat it
Process: material Goal

The mental processes realise aspects of speculation and/or opinion about the toys in question, and to this extent they also tend to contribute to the sense of building commentary, as in the following two which have also appeared above in the examination of relational processes:

how do you know it's a raccoon
I hope it's a girl

The five verbal processes, also contributing to sense of commentary include:

on the back it says "Gongo"
Sayer Process: verbal Verbiage

why does it say "Beware Gongo loves you"
Sayer Pro: verbal Senser Pro: affect Phenomenon
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what does that say
Verbiage Pro- Sayer -cess: verbal
The five behavioural processes relate to the activities of persons talked about in the show and tell, as in:

I don't write.

*Behaver*  *Process: behavioural*

*my sister*  *does (write)*

*Behaver*  *Process: behavioural*

Finally, and before we leave the show and tell to examine the anecdote genre, we should note one other feature of the linguistic choices made which contribute to the character of the show and tell as a genre in which commentary and/or description are built up: the time reference is of the present tense.

As we shall see in chapter 9, some of the earliest of the writing done by the children involved the building of simple commentary and/or description. It seems likely that not only did children practise the models for such writing in activities like the show and tell genre, but that the teacher's general apparent support for the children's constructing such language in the context of morning news encouraged them to believe that construction of similar language in writing would also be approved.

Turning to the anecdote genre, we find that it involves 24 transitivity processes, of which 11 are material, and having to do with the building of events, though in fact the five behavioural and three verbal processes employed are also involved in the building of event. Apart from these, there are five relational processes, and no mental processes: this is very much a genre involving reconstruction of activity. While the number of processes is of course fewer than in the show and tell genre, the most important single source of difference between the two, from the point of transitivity, lies in the frequent
use of relational processes in the latter and their relatively sparing use in the anecdote.

A behavioural and a material process respectively, realise some of the essential meanings of the Orientation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{at Tracey's house} & \quad \text{not yesterday but the day before} \\
\text{Circ: loc: place} & \quad \text{Circ: loc: time} \\
\text{I slept} & \quad \text{at her place} \\
\text{Beh. pro: beh.} & \quad \text{Circ: loc: place} \\
\text{mum was looking after Paul} & \quad \text{Actor \ Process: material \ Goal}
\end{align*}
\]

The pattern of using material and behavioural processes continues to realise the Event elements and in fact the process "slept" is employed five times. Other material processes include "jumped" or "was jumping", employed four times as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{in the morning we jumped on uncle Dougie} \\
\text{Circ: loc: time \ Actor \ Process: material \ Circumstance: loc: place}
\end{align*}
\]

Of the five relational processes used, three are instances of "called", as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{we called him lazy bones} \\
\text{Assigner \ Process: intensive \ Token \ Value}
\end{align*}
\]

The verbal processes used are involved in reconstructing features of what was said in the events under examination, as in:
Bradley was screaming all aboard all aboard the sharks I'll eat you
Sayer  Pro: verbal  Actor  Pro: mat.  Goal
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Overall, a pattern of interweaving material, behavioural, verbal and relational processes operates to help build the Orientation, Events and Reaction/Completion, and as in Aaron's anecdote, the time reference is of the past tense, a choice consistent with the reconstruction of past experience.

Looking to the manner in which the combined Reaction/Completion elements are realised, we should note that another use of a negative polarity serves to signal that some sense of a "punchline" is being delivered:

and then me and Tracey said "Bradley go back to bed and Uncle Dougie and Auntie Eda'll get a headache", and he didn't, he kept on screaming.

The similarities with the manner in which Stephen signalled the Reaction in the earlier anecdote are quite close, though there are also differences. Thus, while Stephen chose not to use a textual Theme such as a structural like "and" in order to signal his Reaction, building the sense of "standing back" from the events reconstructed, Susy chose to use both a structural and a conjunctive adjunct in textual Theme positions ("and then"), deliberately linking her Reaction/Completion to the earlier discourse. Where Stephen thematised himself, Susy chose to thematise herself and her family member, "Tracey". Where Stephen's use of "I" to signal the Reaction was the first time it was used in the genre in question, in Susy's anecdote, her linking of herself with Tracey in topical Theme position was the first occasion for doing this. Thus in both cases personal response to the events as told was actually being
foregrounded. Finally, both children made use of a negative polarity where the discourse hitherto had employed positive polarity.

The general laughter surrounding the manner in which Susy's anecdote was received was in itself proof of its success. Once again, as in Stephen's case, experience of the sub-culture of childhood was being drawn upon. Young children are not, in an ideal world, supposed to get up early in the morning when the adults want to sleep in! The day in question had actually been a Sunday, a day dedicated to "sleeping in" in many an Australian family. Bradley, Tracey and Susy had actually risked severe parental displeasure, and apparently got away with it. As in Stephen's case Susy was actually suggesting to her listeners the element of fun in mildly challenging the authority of her parents. It is amusing to note what she reports of herself and Tracey saying to Bradley, cited immediately above, since it seems to come so much from the world of adult discourse, not that of children. Adults tell children to do things such as "going back to bed", and it is they, not children, who tend to complain of "getting headaches" from children's excessive noise. Susy was aware that she was mimicking the adults of her family, and hence herself amused that Bradley should defy her.

Table 3.9 summarises the number and types of transitivity choices in Susy's two embedded genres.
Table 3.9 Transitivity choices in Susy's two embedded genres

**show and tell genre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>relational</th>
<th>material</th>
<th>behavioural</th>
<th>verbal</th>
<th>mental</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**sneadote genre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

By way of concluding our discussion of Theme and transitivity in both Susy's embedded genres, Tables 3.10 and 3.11 provide an overview of their distribution in both genres.

Table 3.10 Theme and Transitivity choices in Susy's show and tell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>TRANSITIVITY PROCESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Interp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my sister</td>
<td>s'got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>reckons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>'s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>'s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'cause</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes and</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEMES</td>
<td>TRANSLITIVITY PROCESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Interp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>my sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susy</td>
<td>his fingers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>on the back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>my uncle gave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susy</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>'s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my dad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEMES</td>
<td>TRANSPERITY PROCESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Interp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>Mr. P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my dad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>can't</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.11 Textual Theme and Transitivity processes in the Susy's anecdote genre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual</th>
<th>Experiential</th>
<th>Behavioural</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Relational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIENTATION

and at Tracey's
house not yesterday
day but the day
before slept
because mum was looking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Theme</th>
<th>Experiential Theme</th>
<th>Behavioural process</th>
<th>Material process</th>
<th>Verbal process</th>
<th>Relational process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**EVENTS**

and Paul slept
and Chrissy slept
and mum & dad slept
and I slept
and in the morning jumped
and (then) we called
called
called
we was
because we came
and (then) jumped

**CRISIS**

and then when he jumped got up was screaming
on us
and Bradley the sharks 'll eat
and (then) we was dancing
and (then) we was jumping

**REACTION/COMPLETION**

and then me & Tracey said
me & Tracey go*
and Uncle Dougie & Aunty Eda 'll get
didn't kepted on screaming
For reasons explained in section 3.5.2 the imperative is regarded as operating in topical Theme position in the analysis adopted here, though "go" is of course a material process.

Now that we have examined in some detail the manner in which the schematic structure of the morning news genre is realised through various lexicogrammatical choices, it will be appropriate to attempt to summarise what we have learned in section 3.6.

3.6 Summary

We began our discussion of the morning news curriculum genre by suggesting that a careful investigation of the manner in which such a genre is constructed would tell us a great deal about the kinds of values and ideologies regarding early childhood education which are realised in the genre. We argued that morning news activities, like all other school learning activities, may be said to have both a first order or pedagogical register and a second order or "content" register. The former refers to the manner in which teaching/learning activities are organised in the pursuit of certain pedagogical goals, while the latter refers to the nature of the subject matter or "content" of the learning activities. The pedagogical register, we suggested, actually projects the "content" register, and we suggested that in positing the relationship of first and second order registers in this way, we were in fact explaining the principle Bernstein sought to identify in arguing that a regulative discourse "embeds" an instructional discourse.

We argued further, that when we examined the morning news genre, the relationship of that genre to the two registers was such that the elements of the genre were realised in the two registers in systematically different ways. Thus, the opening and closing elements of the schematic structure were realised in the pedagogical register, while the "middle" ones were realised in the "content"
register. The opening and closing elements in which the pedagogical register is involved, are the elements which show the least variation, and this is because it is in these elements that behaviour is operationalised. That is to say, behaviour is directed into appropriate courses, and the language used is strongly marked in terms of mode, so that it is clearly language in action. The pedagogical field requires that children learn and/or maintain habits of polite or well-mannered behaviour, and the ultimate arbiter of what constitutes appropriate manners is the teacher. It also requires that the kinds of choices of "content" field made by the chidren for the purposes of morning news activity should be of a pleasurable kind.

The relationship of the two registers, incidentally, is such that the two do not converge at any point in the morning news genre. This is in interesting contrast to the pattern which applies in the writing planning genre to be examined in later chapters, where as we shall see in chapters 5 to 8, the two do converge.

The language associated with the middle element of the genre will show variation depending both upon the genre(s) embedded within it, and upon the field(s) taken up by the child in the Morning News Giving role. While teachers vary in the amount of independence they accord the children in their class, in Mrs L's class at least the children did enjoy some independence. Where the child concerned selects to create an anecdote genre, drawing upon fields of personal experience, the language used is that of reconstruction of experience. Where the child chooses to create a show and tell genre, displaying object(s) for the purpose, the language used is that of description and/or commentary upon the object(s).

Through our linguistic examination, focussing primarily upon the operation of the THEME and TRANSITIVITY systems in the instance of the morning news genre we investigated, we sought to demonstrate at least some of the linguistic resources in which the
two registers were realised, arguing that these in turn realised the various elements of the genre as referred to above.

We observed that in the operation of the morning news genre a Control element was present, functioning differently from the other elements of schematic structure: the Control element may appear anywhere in the overall structure, whereas all the other elements appear in a fixed order. Such an element, we determined, borrowing from Halliday, may be said to operate prosodically in the schematic structure, while the other elements are constituent. Since the Control element arises from the teacher's need to direct and control the learning activities, we observed that it often represents the teacher's intrusion into the course of the lesson, carrying her judgments about the value or propriety of what is going on. In this connection, we observed the frequency with which teachers tend to employ language expressive of attitude and judgment, and the corresponding infrequency of such features in the language of the children. We attributed this to the nature of the role of the teacher and her relationship with the children as judge and arbiter in matters pertaining to what the children do. However, we pointed out that the frequent inability of children to express judgment, attitude and opinion which does seem to be a feature of many early childhood classrooms tends to build needless dependence on the teacher. This is the more unfortunate since it serves to perpetuate the relative "helplessness" of young children, rather than fostering capacity to exercise judgment and express opinion, and hence develop independence. There is in any case an irony in the fact that though much contemporary early childhood education emphasises the values of exploration of "personal experience" on the grounds that such exploration is a desirable educational endeavour, the children are revealed too often as being unable in fact to build attitude about such experience.
Interestingly, in Mrs. L's classroom, we found evidence that because the children did enjoy some independence in the manner in which she generated the morning news activity, the children did use linguistic features creating some attitudinal expression: the linguistic resources involved uses of modal adjuncts in textual Theme position, mood adjuncts and negative polarity, where the latter was employed in deliberate contrast with use of positive polarity to reinforce expression of attitude.

We noted also that the morning news genre appears to have come into Australian schools since the 1960's, and that its emergence is to be explained in part as an aspect of the "language experience" movement in education, about which more will be said in chapter 4, and in part as a response to the need to foster in children capacity to "narrate about" experience, a capacity which Halliday claims is still developing when children first come to school.

Finally, Figure 3.1 sets out a summary overview of the elements of the schematic structure of the morning news, showing the two types of embedded genres we have examined in detail, and also indicating the operation of the two registers in relation to the various generic elements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of structure</th>
<th>Embedded genres</th>
<th>Registers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Initiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning News Nomination</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Morning News Greeting)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning News Giving</td>
<td>(i) <em>anecdote:</em></td>
<td>&quot;content&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) <em>show and tell</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say &amp; Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning News Finish</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedagogical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2: The morning news genre: schematic structure potential and associated registers
4 The writing program in context: theory and practice in the school

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter we will undertake a discussion intended to establish the background theories and practices in curriculum planning which applied in the junior primary school involved in this study. This will be a necessary step towards commencing some detailed examination of the second of the two curriculum genres identified in our investigation - namely the writing planning genre. Since our interest is primarily in language in the curriculum, as that was developed partly in the morning news genre, and partly in the writing planning genre, the discussion will be directed to uncovering in particular those aspects of curriculum theory and practice which had most direct relevance to language development. Nonetheless, it will be necessary to offer some observations about the curriculum and its planning in general, since considerations of the curriculum overall were closely related to considerations of language curriculum in particular: the two were quite intimately linked, in fact.

The morning news and writing activities both had considerable significance in the overall pattern of the early school day. We have already noted in chapter 3 (section 3.3) the manner in which the writing planning genre followed upon the morning news genre, frequently immediately after morning roll call and before morning recess at 10.30 a.m., though in one class, where the children did mathematics after morning news, they did their writing immediately after morning recess. In either case, the pattern required that language education (or language arts, as the school still tended to call it) and mathematics be completed in the first half of the day, immediately after morning news. This was because literacy and numeracy were considered the most fundamentally important of the
abilities to be fostered in young children, and it was believed that these should be developed early in the day, when the children were relatively fresh and attentive.

Fairly commonly, the early childhood curriculum is planned thus, and science and social science are phased in at different points over the week, sometimes in fact taking the place of a language arts activity on a given day, while art, physical education, music, and a weekly - or sometimes fortnightly - visit to the library are arranged for the afternoon sessions. Planning the curriculum is viewed very seriously by the conscientious teacher of early childhood, and a careful record of what is taught must be kept. For each of the three years of schooling investigated here, the teachers were rostered to have an hour free of teaching once a week, so that they could come together to plan as a team what would be taught in the coming week. The school principal normally attended these planning meetings, and the writer was occasionally invited to attend as an observer, when the children were in Year 2. A broad school program had been laid down by the school principal, who intended that this be viewed as a kind of framework within which the teachers were responsible for developing detailed programs of work.

Two broad principles appeared to apply, to be borne in mind when planning all curriculum activities. The first required that the curriculum be planned in integrated fashion around the use of curriculum themes, such that for, say, a month or even six weeks, most, if not all lessons were taught by drawing upon the theme adopted for that period. The second principle, less consistently applied in fact, required the recognition that all learning activities involved learning language, so that any opportunities for learning language, both oral and written, were to be fostered by the teachers. In her capacity as leader in much curriculum discussion, the school principal was herself very concerned that these two principles be always borne in mind, and most teachers at the school would have
said they did subscribe to them, though with very variable results. They are in fact very difficult principles to implement successfully for at least two related reasons, which we shall discuss immediately below. Before we do so, however, a word needs to be added about the use of the term "theme".

The use of curriculum "themes" to guide and integrate teaching/learning activities has become a familiar feature of primary schooling, and we shall take up and examine principles of theme planning more fully in section 4.4 below. At this point, we want to draw attention to the fact that the term "curriculum theme" is not to be confused with Halliday's notion of the THEME SYSTEM in the grammar, already discussed in chapters 1 (section 1.3) and 3 (section 3.5.2). In the interests of reminding the reader that the two terms are used differently, we have chosen throughout this study to use a capital letter when referring to Theme as an aspect of the grammar.

The first of the two principles intended to guide curriculum planning in the school, then, was that which required that a curriculum theme be used. This is a difficult principle to apply because present levels of understanding about the nature of knowledge and about what constitutes significant knowledge worth teaching to young children, either in integrated or non-integrated fashion, are very confused. In this respect, it will be recalled that in chapter 1 (section 1.2) we have already noted Bernstein's arguments with respect to a distinction he drew between "commonsense" and "uncommonsense" knowledge. The former refers to the local and familiar knowledge of children's everyday experience, and the latter refers to learning to handle experience in new and unfamiliar ways, of a kind associated with the various fields of enquiry valued in the culture. The prevailing ideologies of childhood and of knowledge in our junior primary schools, we would argue, tend to blur the distinctions between local or "commonsense" knowledge and "uncommonsense"
knowledge. The result, we suggest, is that the principles adopted both of classification of knowledge and of framing of teaching/learning activity are weak, to employ other terms of Bernstein. In consequence teachers have become effectively deskillled themselves, and often unable to see the principles by which a field of enquiry or a "body of knowledge" is organised, and hence how they might induct young learners into an appreciation of how it works.

The second principle - requiring the recognition that learning activities involve learning language - is difficult because little is known even yet both about how best to develop language capacities, spoken and written in young children, and about what constitutes real growth in language capacities across the weeks and months of schooling. Too often, though children are kept more or less occupied in the hours of schooling, much of what they do is merely "busy work", involving the children in activities most remarkable for their lack of intellectual challenge. Just as we suggested in chapter 3 (section 3.5), we would argue that in many areas of the early childhood curriculum, an ideology applies such that young children are constrained to participation in a limited range of learning activities, on the grounds that they are incapable of undertaking more varied and rigorous learning activities.

Since this study, as already noted, is confined to examination of two types of curriculum genre only, what we will have to say about the ideology that applies will necessarily reflect most directly what happens in these particular genres. The writing planning genre - of critical importance to the development of the children's control of literacy - needs to be understood both in relation to the rest of the literacy program, and in relation to the integrated curriculum to which brief mention has already been made. Accordingly, in this chapter we aim to do the following:
1) to discuss briefly trends in educational theory about the nature of the integrated curriculum and its design, especially as these have emerged since the 1960's;

2) to discuss developments in language curriculum theory and its emergence over much the same period;

3) to argue that these developments both in general curriculum theory and in language curriculum theory have been responsible for the shaping of much early childhood educational practice of the kind found in Normanbury;

4) in the light of the above, to focus more directly upon early childhood language curriculum and its design as these applied at Normanbury, and to argue that the integrated curriculum found in the school was marked by weak classification and weak framing.

Against this background, we will then be enabled to turn in Chapter 5 to a consideration of schematic structure and register in the writing planning genre.
4.2 Planning the curriculum: background theories

Two essentially related broad themes appear to have emerged and had consequences for developments in Australia in language education and in curriculum theory since the 1960's. The first is a notion of the "child-centred" and "integrated" curriculum - one in which the needs of the learner rather than of any perceived body of knowledge are to determine the guiding principles for curriculum design. The other is a concern with the role of language in personal growth and development, and with the need for educational processes to foster growth through language. Both themes continue to find clear expression in much curriculum documentation in Australia, and both were important elements in the curriculum planning of the early childhood program devised in the school in this study.

When the present writer went to school in New South Wales in the 1940's and 1950's, the school program was laid out in considerable detail, according to documents provided by the New South Wales Department of Education. For each school subject taught, a State-prescribed syllabus was provided, and the pattern of so prescribing a syllabus for each subject applied in all other Australian states as well. The pattern still pertained when the writer commenced teaching in 1961, though by the 1970's, that pattern of prescriptiveness had been significantly challenged, and far less detailed guidelines were developed in the various states. Today, in the interests of fostering school-based curriculum, most states provide only general framework documents, though some school authorities such as the A.C.T. Schools Authority do not provide even these.

One reason given for the abandonment of the older syllabus documents was that they were seen as unnecessarily prescriptive, not allowing for local initiative on the part of teachers, who should be primarily responsive, not to the requirements of a central authority
such as an Education Department, but rather to their students, whose needs might differ markedly from place to place. The older prescriptive documents, it was often said, derived from Australia's colonial past, and from the need for the colonial administrators to provide comprehensive guidance to colonial teachers, who, particularly in the nineteenth century, were often not well educated themselves. Certainly, as we have noted elsewhere (Christie, 1976) the Australian colonies had had a degree of government control in their schools from their earliest days, the like of which was not a feature of English schools. Even though the English had drawn up an educational Code and Schedules in 1880, intended to set minimal standards in the education of the young, these had later been abandoned because they proved unsuccessful. They were in any case not really consistent with the traditions by which education was, and has been since, normally administered in England.

In fact, there seems little doubt that Australia's drive to move away from prescription in education was partly a response to its own history, and to what many had begun to feel were the often inflexible requirements of centralised curriculum planning authorities. However, while this is true, there is another sense in which changing thinking about curriculum and curriculum planning of the late 1960's and 1970's was part of a changing theoretical position about both the nature of knowledge and about the nature of the learner. Such a changing theoretical position, owing much to English and American work at the time, proved very influential in Australia.

The changing theoretical position emerged in discussions on the one hand about the learner and the needs of the learner, and on the other hand, about the curriculum and the planning of the curriculum. Those who theorised about the learner and his or her needs (e.g. Postman and Weingartner, 1971; Holt, 1969, 1970; Rogers, 1968) conceived of the child-learner as actively disposed to explore and find out about the world. Such a learner was primarily a problem-
solver, one who was caused to pose and answer questions about experience because of the sheer necessity to organise and make sense of the world. Some theorists such as Neill (1962) or Rogers (1968) drew upon psychoanalytic theory of various kinds, in Neill’s case to propose that children must learn in environments free of authority and oppression, and nurtured instead through love. Rogers, a practising psychotherapist, proposed that just as in the therapeutic situation, the subject learned important truths through the often stressful need to explore and come to terms with aspects of the self and relationship, the same principle of learning should ideally apply in the educational situation. The role of the therapist and also therefore of the teacher, was to be an intelligent and sympathetic support, while the individual must find out what was worth learning. Holt argued a very similar position in a book which he called How Children Learn:

"I would trust the child to direct his own learning. For it seems to me a fact that, in our struggle to make sense out of life, the things we most need to learn are the things we most want to learn. To put this another way, curiosity is hardly ever idle. What we want to know, we want to know for a reason. The reason is that there is a hole, a gap, an empty space in our understanding of things, our mental model of the world. We feel that gap like a hole in a tooth and want to fill it up. It makes us ask how? When? While the gap is there, we are in tension, in suspense. Listen to the anxiety in a person’s voice when he says, 'This doesn't make sense!' When the gap in our understanding is filled, we feel pleasure, satisfaction, relief. Things make sense again - or at any rate, they make more sense than they did. (Holt, 1970, 171)"

Holt went on to argue that "when we learn this way, for these reasons, we learn both rapidly and permanently" (ibid, 171). The model of the learner thus proposed was seen as in marked contrast with that of the learner in the traditional situation, driven by the authority of the teacher to learn quantities of information not perceived as relevant to the learner’s needs, and therefore normally
learned by force and by rote, and often subsequently rapidly forgotten.

Overall, the concern with the learner was perceived as a concern with "process" - that is, with the processes by which persons learn, and with the related processes in which others must engage in order to "facilitate" the learning processes. So total did the concerns with process and teacher facilitation of learning become that in the ideal classroom, so Postman and Weingartner suggested, the teacher's authority was considerably constrained:

The teacher (who ideally seeks to promote inquiry methods of teaching and learning) rarely tells the students what he thinks they ought to know. (Postman & Weingartner, 1971, 43)

A little later, challenging the usual significance attaching to subjects and to content in the traditional school, they went on:

The only kind of lesson plan, or syllabus, that makes sense to (the good teacher) is one that tries to predict, account for, and deal with the authentic responses of learners to a particular problem: the kinds of questions they will ask, the obstacles they will face, their attitudes, the possible solutions they will offer, etc. (ibid, 45)

Finally, and in a manner which the present writer has heard many others in Australia argue since, Postman and Weingartner noted that they had:

discovered in (their) attempts to install inquiry environments in various schools that great strides can be made if the words 'teach' and 'teaching' are simply subtracted from the operational lexicon. (ibid, 47)

Enquiry methods of learning, and an associated concern with "process" rather than with "product" caused a considerable shift in the manner in which knowledge was perceived, and this has had consequences for the manner in which the "content" of all school
subjects has been conceptualised in curriculum documents in Australia since the late 1960's and early 1970's. In fact, with the steady waning of the use of syllabus statements, an active interest in the curriculum, perceived primarily in terms of "experience", developed from the 1960's on. The term "curriculum" conventionally refers to the sum total of learning experiences planned and undertaken within the school (Wheeler, 1967, 11), a definition officially adopted by the State Director General of Education in New South Wales (Winder, 1985, cited by Skinner, 1987). This kind of definition has been rejected more than once by curriculum researchers such as Stenhouse (1975, 4). Reviewing various contemporary approaches to curriculum, Stenhouse proposed that most had a kind of "end-means" character, in that their concern was with learning experiences whose performance by students would lead to certain specifiable attainments or "ends", which could be measured in some way. Criticising such definitions on the grounds of their alleged narrowness, he wrote that a good "tentative" definition of curriculum was:

A curriculum is an attempt to communicate the essential principles and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical scrutiny and capable of effective translation into practice. (ibid, 4)

In a fairly lengthy discussion of various models of curriculum, Stenhouse went on to argue the virtues of the "process model" - one which pursues in learners "understanding rather than grades" (ibid, 96): one in other words, which particularly values the development of critical learning experiences for young learners, where these are understood as in some sense separable from, and more important than, the "content" learned or the "products" created.

A preoccupation with "learning experiences" and/or "learning processes" has in fact become an essential element of most discussions of curriculum in Australia. Such a preoccupation
accounts for the present concerns in curriculum in Australia with process and/or experience, rather than with "content", conceived of in some sense as a fixed and "dry as dust" body of knowledge.

Since it is the learner's needs and interests which should essentially drive the planning of curriculum, then "content" is necessarily of secondary significance to the process of discovery itself, the more so, it has often been suggested, (e.g. Holt, 1970,170-1; Postman & Weingartner, 1971, 42) because knowledge dates so quickly that by the time young people enter the adult world, what they have learned will be already in many cases no longer useful. Such an attitude, with respect to science education, was also noted by Bruner in his book *The Processes of Education*, and reported by Paul Goodman (1971, 41). Interestingly, in more recent times, Bruner (1986) has indicated he has changed his mind, and that he has revised or at least amended his model both of what it is that is learned and of what it is to be a learner. About his more recent work we shall have more to say below.

Overall, the new approaches to education of the 60's and '70's held that the best programs of learning were those which integrated learning experiences as much as possible, and which developed out of the learners' perceived needs and interests, concentrating upon the processes through which children become good enquiring learners. Thus, a fairly representative handbook for teachers on the revised social studies program for the state of Victoria noted that:

> the acquisition of specific factual knowledge alone is unsatisfactory, (and, since the approach adopted was a "process approach", the aim was to encourage development of) a personal repertoire of well-developed concepts and generalisations about society. (Publications & Information Branch, Education Department of Victoria, 1981,1)

The Victorian science program document offered similar observations to the primary teacher planning science lessons.
Such views about learning, while they did find clear expression in educational discussion from the 1960's on, were in many senses very much older, as Paul Goodman at least noted (1971, 41). The notion of the learner and his or her needs as determining the kinds of decisions that should be made by teachers in planning learning activities had been proposed at least as early as 1896 by Dewey, among others, and it was, as Goodman recognised, a feature of the "progressive movement" in education with which Dewey's name became associated. Contrasting the new perspectives he proposed with those which applied in earlier periods of education in which, he said, content or knowledge largely determined the planning of the school program, Dewey argued that the placing of the child and his or her needs at the centre of educational planning was akin to the shifting of the centre of gravity:

It is a change, a revolution, not unlike that introduced by Copernicus when the astronomical center shifted from the earth to the sun. In this case the child becomes the sun about which the appliances of education revolve; he is the center about which they are organised. (Dewey, 1976, 32)\(^1\)

While it was true that Dewey had written this so early, there was a sense in which such notions were taken up with renewed enthusiasm in educational discussion from the 1960's and their influence has continued to be felt into the 1980's. These notions have been very influential in the drive for school-based curriculum development in Australia, so that official policy statements about this have tended to stress such general ideas as development of persons through various stages of growth, concentrating primarily upon these matters, and abandoning the earlier tendency to make statements of the "contents" of educational programs. For example, the official policy

---

\(^1\)Dewey originally outlined his views in a series of three talks at the University of Chicago Laboratory School in 1896, and these were first published in 1899. A revised edition appeared in 1915.
statement concerning the aims of primary education in New South Wales (1977) read in part:

The central aim of education which, with home and community groups, the school pursues, is to guide individual development in the context of society through recognisable stages of development towards perceptive understanding, mature judgment, responsible self-direction and moral autonomy. (Department of Education, N.S.W., 1977a, 14)

Like the companion document produced to foster the implementation of this statement of aims, the policy statement was remarkable for its lack of specific detail either about how such statements of aim might be acted upon, and about the kinds of knowledge and information with which students might engage in order to develop as was considered desirable. Instead, teachers were encouraged to:

provide appropriate opportunities for development, (where these should include) opportunities to use expression, communication and investigation skills, (as well as) to acquire knowledge, understandings, attitudes and values. (Department of Education, N.S.W., 1977b, 8)

The role of the teacher, it will be noted, is to "provide opportunity" to develop, or, as is often said in these kinds of discussions, to "facilitate" learning. Teaching as an active process is quite pointedly discouraged, while children's growth is intended to be "afforded" or "facilitated." Such policies, we suggest, actually make for the adoption of weak principles of classification of knowledge and weak principles of framing with respect to the options for operating taken up by teachers and students, to hark back to the arguments of Bernstein discussed in chapter 1 (section 1.2). As we shall see below in section 4.3, the curriculum at Normanbury was marked by both weak classification and weak framing.
Preoccupations with "process" and "growth" in learning, well established as we have sought to argue in general curriculum theory, have also been influential in theoretical developments in thinking about language and language development since the 1960's, to which some reference has already been made in chapter 1 (section 1.2) and in chapter 2 (2.2). These developments in thinking about language have in addition drawn of course from many other areas of research, most notably research into language itself, linguistic, psycholinguistic and that undertaken by educationists with a specialist interest in the study of language in schools. Nonetheless, so similar are some of the observations offered educational theory, both from recent curriculum theory and from theory about child language development, that we must conclude that both sets of theorists have in fact operated with very closely related models of human beings, their characteristics and their needs. This should not in itself be a cause for surprise, for in any period of history there are prevailing ideologies as well as prevailing intellectual preoccupations which colour a great deal of the social attitudes and values held in the community at large, as well as the various areas of research endeavour represented by the many disciplines.

Thus, central to much of the ideology in western cultures of the last twenty years or so, (though its historical origins are considerably older) has been a particular concern with the individual, romantically conceived as one who develops through a personal voyage of discovery and exploration. Such a voyage is in some sense a private, even perhaps a lonely activity. At one, rather extreme end of the western culture, the romantic individual was the one who sought himself or herself by "dropping out" in the manner of the hippies of the 1960's and early 1970's, attempting to find the self, ironically enough, by turning away from the very social contexts in which the person achieved selfhood. At another, more "respectable" and hence more difficult to identify end of the culture, lies the "romantic" view of the individual who is to "grow" in Dixon's term (1967) through
educational processes. We would suggest that Dixon's view is the more "respectable", and in some sense more difficult to recognise and challenge therefore, because (unlike that of the hippies) it fits fairly easily within the aspirations that are generally held to prevail in the culture. Such aspirations, concerning for example the advancement of the individual, as well as the protection of his or her own needs and interests, are in principle valued fairly highly in western cultures. When he advanced the view that the teacher should value children's language primarily for its role in personal growth, Dixon had a particular conception of the child individual in mind. Such a child was one who would gain:

new insight into himself (as creator of his own world). (Dixon, 1967, 13) (our emphasis)

A comparable model of the child as individual building his "own world" was provided by the New South Wales Department of Education Visual Arts Curriculum. The child, it read:

lives in an egocentric world of his own making, a world where logic and reality are not dominant, limiting conditions. (New South Wales Department of Education Visual Arts Curriculum, 1971, 7)

Of course, another model of the child as learner and of the role of language both in personal development and in school learning has always been available, of the kind outlined in chapter 1 (section 1.2). Such a model was articulated in particular in the various materials which emerged from the Nuffield/Schools Council Programme in Linguistics and English Teaching, directed by Halliday from 1967-70. (referred to in chapter 2, section 2.2) The best known of the materials that emerged from that Programme were Breakthrough to Literacy (Mackey, Thompson & Schaub, 1970; 1979 2nd ed.) and Language in Use (Doughty, Pearce & Thornton, 1971), though a project for the middle school years, called Language and Communication (Forsyth & Woods, 1977; 1980) was also produced. There were in addition an extensive number of volumes for teachers
variously addressing questions of language and language education, produced in the *Explorations in Language Study* series, under the general editorship of Peter Doughty and Geoffrey Thornton, and published by Edward Arnold, and in the *Longman/Schools Council* series of volumes whose general editor was Stephen Lushington.

The model of the individual as expressed in the Nuffield/Schools Council series of publications, was that of a social being, achieving a sense of identity through learning to enter with increasing confidence into the ways of working that were a feature of one's culture, particularly where such ways of working were linguistic. In this view, where the romantically conceived individual is involved in a journey of personal discovery, the individual here is to be thought of much more as an apprentice, one who is initiated into ways of operating and dealing with experience, through guidance, advice, and experimentation with the models of others.

One manifestation of the latter position, and of its difference from the "romantic" view of the individual held by specialists in language education such as Dixon, was that it focussed much more directly upon the nature of language itself. It proposed that three interrelated characteristics of language were of concern, all of which have been already discussed in chapter 1 (section 1.3 in particular), though we shall briefly allude to them here again. Firstly, language was to be thought of in systemic terms, so that its grammar was based on the notion of choice: to use language was to exercise choices within the linguistic system. Secondly, so to exercise choices in using language was to "make meaning". And finally language was a "social semiotic" - one of the "semiotic systems that constitute a culture", one moreover, "that is distinctive in that it also serves as an encoding system for many (though not all) of the others" (1978, 2). All three characterisitics had consequences for the ways in which the various curriculum materials were conceived and developed. *Language in Use*, for example, was concerned with:
what pupils should know about the nature and function of language and how they can extend their command of their own language in both speaking and writing. (Doughty, Pearce & Thornton, 1971, 8)

As already indicated in chapter 1 (section 1.3), Halliday has noted since that when the Programme was in development, the teaching of grammar in any form was resisted by his colleagues working in the Programme, though a reading today not only of Language in Use, but also of Breakthrough to Literacy and of Language and Communication, reveals just how much carefully planned learning about language in other ways was actually intended.

As already observed in chapter 2 (section 2.2) it is difficult to estimate how widely the materials from Halliday's Programme were used or continue to be used in Australia today. Certainly, those in Australia who work in systemic linguistics and education, most notably those using Martin's notions of "genre" (discussed in section 1.4, chapter 1), have had sufficient impact to have sparked very lively debate, as a volume edited by Reid (1987) indicates. Currently in fact, romantic notions of the individual in language education are under some attack, at least in Australia, although those of a romantic point of view (e.g. Tucker, 1988) remain very vocal.

Whatever the impact of systemic linguistic perspectives on these matters, or indeed the impact of others whose criticisms derive from different if related intellectual traditions (e.g. Coe, 1987; Gilbert, 1987; to appear; Cope, 1986) it remains historically true that it is the notion of the "romantic" individual and his or her claims to personal development through language, rather than the notion of the individual as "social man", to use Halliday's term (1974b) which has been more significant in curriculum discussion and planning for some years.
Among the most influential in Australia of the various theorists about language and language development since the 1960's has been the group, a number of whom worked at the London Institute of Education, and already referred to briefly in chapter 1 (section 1.2). They include Britton (1970; Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod & Rosen, 1975), Connie and Harold Rosen (1973), and Nancy Martin (e.g. Martin, Williams, Wilding, Hemmings and Medway, 1976; Martin, D'Arcy, Newton and Parker, 1976), as well as their colleagues from other institutions such as Barnes (1976; 1977; Barnes & Todd, 1977), Dixon (1967; 1975; 1984), Stratta (with Wilkinson & Dudley, 1974) and Wilkinson (1971). Barnes, Britton and Rosen also collectively wrote an influential book called Language, the Learner and the School, originally published in 1969, and revised in 1971. A third edition, this time with a contribution by Torbe rather than Rosen, was published as recently as 1986, a measure of the continuing interest in its ideas in some quarters. The work of all these people has been variously matched and in many cases supported by American theorists including Moffett (1968; 1981a; 1981b; 1984), Kenneth Goodman (1982; 1986), Smith (1975; 1983), Graves (1981; 1983) and Harste (Harste, Woodward and Burke, 1984a, 1984b; Harste & Short, 1988). While it is not intended to suggest that all these theorists necessarily say the same things, or even that they always agree, it is clear that collectively they have contributed to the shaping of the theoretical assumptions made about language and language development in Australia at least over the last 20-25 years. In addition, a number of Australian writers have contributed to the shaping of such assumptions as well. They include, for example, Walshe (1977, 1981, 1987; Walshe et al, 1986), Cambourne & Turbill (1987; Turbill, 1983). What all such theorists have shared, in their preoccupations with the study of language in schools has been a particular conception of the romantic child individual, nurtured through processes of self discovery, ideally fostered in school programs which encourage enquiry learning. Language is seen as having especial value in such processes of self
discovery, for it is with language that the child learns to express himself or herself.

So profound has been the commitment to the development of the child as individual learner, coming to terms with learning and with reality generally in his or her own way, that there have been at least two related unfortunate consequences. The first has been a questioning of the authority of the teacher, since for some of the reasons given by Holt, Postman and Weingartner quoted earlier, the teacher has been seen as most effective when standing aside, in the interests of letting children learn "in their own way." In practice, as we have suggested elsewhere (1987e) the teacher's authority has often become badly confused and compromised. The other most unfortunate consequence has been the denial of the value of teaching children about language.

The second tendency has been linked with the "language across the curriculum" movement and/or the "whole language" movement. Concerns for the development of language "across the curriculum" (e.g. Rosen in Barnes, Britton and Rosen, 1971) or alternatively, for the development of language in a "wholistic" way (e.g. Goodman & Goodman, 1979; Goodman, 1986) have led to the strong suggestion that regardless of the content being taught, children be allowed to come to terms with it in their own language. The language across the curriculum movement clearly has some merit, in that it asks teachers to encourage children to talk and write freely as they seek to learn new information, rather than being merely talked to by their teachers, or mindlessly aping the teacher's language. However, it nonetheless founders because it has no strong linguistic theory to give it basis and direction. For example, the notion of register points to and explains the reason why the various curriculum areas or school subjects actually require the learning of new language, involving both the specialist or technical terms, as well as capacity to deploy these in new ways for the realisation of the meanings associated with the
subjects concerned. The demands of specialist registers have often been attacked in the name of language across the curriculum, on the grounds that they mystify and confuse. If persons are allowed to express the knowledge and information "in their own words", it is suggested, the mystification will be removed and all will be well. But only a person very naive about language and about the ways in which it is used to create meaning can adopt such a position. Specialist registers evolve in order to deal with experience in ever new ways. While children may reasonably be encouraged to approach all the new registers associated with the different school subjects through their own familiar languages uses, they will not ever be successful in learning the new subjects unless they do eventually master the new registers. It is true that specialists in all sorts of areas of enquiry do often confuse with their use of language, and they need to be resisted where this is the case. But the best way in which to resist them will be to teach children to recognise and understand the various registers such specialists use, the better to challenge and improve what they do. Capacity to recognise and understand language uses should be developed in learning about language.

Teaching about language - knowledge about language of any kind in fact - has been consistently resisted by specialists in English language education for some years now, except in very limited senses. As we saw in chapter 1 (section 1.2), teaching about language is normally held to be synonymous with teaching traditional school grammar, most practices of which have been discredited more than once this century. Indeed, when teachers of English began questioning conventional practices for the teaching of grammar, particularly in the 1960's, we would argue that they had strong grounds for doing so. (Christie, in press) What was needed, as many teachers pointed out, was a completely fresh approach to interesting and imaginative ways to teach about language, in a manner which would both improve children's knowledge about language and its uses, and enhance their developing capacity to use language themselves. However, debate
about the desirability of teaching about language was fairly early compounded by a view which developed that such an activity appeared in some sense to threaten the individual who is to grow through language, in Dixon's terms. Thus, teaching about language, especially where that might involve some exploration of the schematic structures or patterning of different written genres, is perceived by Dixon (1987), and also by Sawyer and Watson (1987), as threatening the individual creativity of children. Indeed, quoting one of the greatest of the English romantic poets (namely, Blake), Dixon proposes that those who would advocate the teaching of genres will perpetuate the tendency of schools to develop "mind-forg'd manacles" for the control of children (Dixon, 1987,9). To teach about language, is the implication, such that it involves children in learning the particular discourse patterns in which much school knowledge is constructed, is to teach for narrow conformity, and hence for capacity to be easily manipulated and exploited once children leave school to enter the workforce.

During the years 1978-81, the writer was national co-ordinator of the Language Development Project, an initiative of the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC), Canberra. The Project adopted Halliday's tripartite model of language development. It proposed that language development involves learning language, learning through language and learning about language (Curriculum Development Centre, 1979). Throughout the entire life of the Project (whose work incidentally, was never completed, owing to a Federal Government decision to wind down the activities of the CDC) it was the proposition that learning about language was a desirable or useful thing that proved most controversial. In fact, while quite a deal of language curriculum work was generated in the name of the Project in the various Australian states, most of it (with the exception of that undertaken in Queensland and the A.C.T., both of which concerned oral language and its development) did not in any way address the need to deal with teaching and learning about language. The various Project teams
in the other states simply resisted any systematic attempts to encourage them to explore what teaching and learning about language might actually involve.

Resistance to issues of teaching about language, as we have already noted, is very closely related to notions of the individual to be developed, and to the most appropriate ways to promote that individual's growth, for teaching about language is seen as a potential threat to the independence of the individual. We have now made mention at several points of the romantically conceived individual, fundamental both to the curriculum theory alluded to earlier, and to much of the language education theory under discussion. It will be appropriate to clarify what is meant by the notion of the idealised individual, the better to develop our argument that it is an unsatisfactory view of the person that is involved. We will argue that the associated notion of language that is involved is unsatisfactory also.

It was the idealised individual - "creator of his own world", as we have already noted in Dixon's terms - who lay at the heart of Britton's work on language and language development (e.g. 1970). Drawing in part upon the observations of Sapir concerning language as symbolic (Britton, 1970, 20), Britton also drew heavily upon the work of the psychologist Kelly (1963) to argue that humans each build inner representations of the world - what Britton also called "world representations". Kelly had suggested that persons build representations of the world as a series of "constructs", constantly subject to modification in the light of experience. In Britton's terms language was "a key way" (1970, 19) to represent experience, and hence to build inner views of the world. Britton drew a distinction between language for participation in the world - in the "participant role" - and language for contemplation - in the "spectator role". These two roles he was later to develop particularly for the purposes of the study of children's writing which he directed (1975), and to
suggest three broad functions for which language was used: the expressive, the transactional and the poetic. These three categories of function are unsatisfactory on linguistic grounds, as anyone who has attempted to use them discovers. They simply lack any rigour as tools for separating out types of writing, though such a consideration need not detain us at any length here. Williams (1977) provided a good critique of Britton’s work.

When we look closely at Britton’s work, the most notable theme that emerges is that his prime concern is with the individual developing his or her “own” sense of the world - a personal “world representation”, where this seems to have privileged status principally for its difference from other people’s “own” representations. The commitment to the social significance of behaviour, including most particularly language-using behaviour, is at best perfunctory in Britton’s work, though he would strongly resist such a suggestion. Towards the end of Language and Learning, after citing and discussing several entries from his daughter Clare’s diaries, as well as materials written by other children and adolescents, (a discussion, during which, by the way, he refers to the work of the psychotherapist Carl Rogers mentioned earlier), Britton says of such young people:

It is themselves they have to become, by the hard road of their own choices, their own intuitions, their commitment to themselves. (1970, 271) (our emphasis).

One finds a sense of the same preoccupations in the work of Dixon already referred to, as well as in that of Barnes (1978), for example, who, at one point, talking of the influence upon him of F.R. Leavis as his teacher at Cambridge, says that he was directed by the latter to read T.S. Eliot on Tradition and the Individual Talent. Barnes writes:

I was much struck by Eliot’s insistence that each generation has to remake the tradition; it isn’t just a matter of taking it over passively. And in Leavis’ emphasis on close reading there seemed to be the
individual equivalent of this remaking. How could we attribute meaning to black marks on a white sheet without bringing our own experience to bear on it? In literature lessons the child must make sense of the poems and stories for himself, or the whole thing is a sham. (Barnes, 1977, 85) (our emphasis)

The concern with the "right" of persons learning to use their "own" language has even been described by Medway as a human rights issue, when he wrote of the "language across the curriculum" movement that:

its position is reminiscent of those earlier demands that the bible be printed in English, not Latin, and that people be allowed to discuss it and interpret it for themselves. We are responding as if our pupils had been saying, "Talk to us in language we can understand, and give us the chance to use the resources and skills we already possess to make sense of the things you are showing us and telling us": "..... Denial of the opportunity to talk and write in personal modes is a reduction in the chance to learn. It is in effect a human rights issue. (Cited in Torbe, 1986, 155)

It is the sense of the interpersonal, finally, which is lacking in all the work of the quite substantial body of theorists on English language education, as well as many of the theorists on more general curriculum and learning theory referred to earlier. It is a lack which lies at the base of all the debates about individuality and how that is conceived, about teaching and learning and how these are understood, and also, quite critically, about language and how that is understood, how it is learned, and what it is learned to do. We can share in part, at least, something of the vision of the person learning that such theorists hold, and agree with them about the quite crippling effects of much conventional school practice upon young learners. But we cannot share their collective preoccupation with the individual "owning" his or her personal visions, thoughts, destinies, where these are perceived as uniquely private and independent things. Such preoccupations are misguided and harmful
both in their implications for the ways children are viewed, and in their implications for school teaching practice generally.

The truth is that the ideologies of "personal growth" and of "individual self-expression", conceived of as ends in themselves, simply fail because they are naive about what constitutes growth and how that is recognised, and about selfhood and what that involves. Growth for what, one might well ask? Expression of what, and to what ends? Since the asking of questions of these sorts is regularly resisted by many language educators, on the grounds that this is to propose ends on behalf of learners who must ideally chart their own course and hence their own ends, a great deal of school teaching practice and of children's learning remains badly focussed and directed.

It was the risk of misdirected and unfocussed teaching in the name of developing "growth" and "self-expression" which led Richards (1978) to argue for a much more strongly interventionist model of teaching, in which teachers helped students develop the linguistic resources with which to be "creative," where that was desirable. She wrote that:

> what is envisaged as free use of language in creative writing can be developed effectively only from basic language resources. Otherwise it is like asking a child to compose his own cadenza when he is just beginning to learn to play his instrument. (Richards, 1987, 35)

But such notions as "growth" and "self-expression" have led to the propositions of Graves and others like him, that it is necessary to the development of young writers that they "choose their own topics" (Graves, 1983, 21), and that the teacher's role in the "writing conference" set up between teacher and children, be that of supporting but never directing the children's work (ibid, 96-148). The present writer has more than once encountered teachers, very much influenced by the so-called "process writing" movement that
has swept Australia largely in the wake of Graves' work, who are genuinely reluctant to intervene in their children's writing development, on the grounds that this would constitute a threat to the children's "own creativity", and their "right to choose" what and how they will write. Others, uneasily conscious that they would like to intervene more directly, are often apologetic about doing so. Their sense of their authority as teachers, in other words, is badly compromised.

It is sometimes suggested that Graves never intended that teachers behave in such thoroughly non-directive ways, and that they constitute a misreading of his work. This is in our view a difficult proposition to sustain, for at least two reasons. In the first place, as Martin and Rothery have pointed out (1986c), when we study closely the various transcripts Graves offers of desirable teacher/pupil conferences, the characteristic most marked about the teacher's discourse is that it does simply follow the agenda the child has selected for himself or herself. It does not in fact allow what might be termed true intervention or direction by the teacher of the child into other channels in writing, perceived by the teacher as more productive than those taken up by the child. In the second place, since, like the various other language theorists briefly discussed so far, Graves does not subscribe to any useful theory of language, including one with a sense of what writing involves, he is quite unable to propose what might constitute helpful bases upon which to guide children's writing. Because the latter point is an important one, it will be necessary to say a little more about it. To do this, we will return for a moment to the alternative model of language and of the individual using language, which, we have already suggested, is offered in the curriculum materials developed by Halliday's team in the '60s and '70s, and more recently in the work of others using systemic linguistics in Australia.
We have already noted that what makes a systemic model of language different from a model of the kind proposed by Britton or Graves, is that it views language as a system, as a resource and as a social semiotic. That is to say, it is to be understood for its fundamental properties as something with which we "sign", as Halliday (1985b) puts it, while we constantly build and negotiate our various representations of experience. But unlike Britton, who as we have already seen, also believes that language is heavily involved in building representations of experience, Halliday suggests that:

the linguistic system is part of the social system,

implying that

what is transmitted to us through language, when we learn it as children, is in fact the social system.

A little later, he says:

the relationship between the individual and language has to be seen as embedded in the social structure.

(Halliday, 1974a,117)

To grow into individuality in these terms, therefore, is necessarily to grow into the social system. The notion of individuality - or the related notion of creativity - makes absolutely no sense at all unless it is understood as shaped in or "derived from" the social structure (ibid,117).

The theory of the learner involved here, it will be clear, is of one who interacts with others in the learning of a socioculture and its ways. Conventional learning theories, whose articulation has been in particular the province of educational psychologists, have normally not conceived the learner in these terms. It is for that reason interesting to note that at least two recent attempts (Edwards & Mercer, 1987, 1-41; Bruner, 1986, 121-149) have been made to reassess conventional models of the learner, with a view to
developing newer models. Such models among other matters, are intended more properly to acknowledge the interactive nature of learning, the role of adults in guiding young learners, and the significance of what is learned as being of the common or shared experience of participating in a culture. Bruner, to whom passing reference was made above in a discussion of views of learning processes, has written of himself:

Some years ago I wrote some very insistent articles about the importance of discovery learning—learning on one's own. . . . My model of the child in those days was very much in the tradition of the solo child mastering the world by representing it to himself in his own terms. In the intervening years I have come to recognize that most learning in most settings is a communal activity, a sharing of the culture. (Bruner, 1986, 127)

Edwards and Mercer, in a recent provocative book in terms of its attempt to readdress some important questions of teaching and learning, have sought to review "progressive" models of teaching and learning of the kind which Dewey and many more recent theorists in language education have proposed. In attempting to develop a model of education which represents neither a return to "traditional" practices, nor a wholesale rejection of all that "progressive" practices have involved, Edwards and Mercer argue for:

an understanding of education as a process in which children are helped and guided into an active, creative participation in their culture. (Edwards & Mercer, 1987, 36)

The particular contribution of Halliday's work to the articulation of models of the learner of the kind that Bruner, Edwards and Mercer all seem to be advocating, as we have seen above, is that he has argued so cogently for a recognition of the role of language both as a social institution, and as a resource individuals use for the building of social experience.
As we noted earlier, those who adopt a romantic position hold a view of the individual driven by "inborn" or "innate" capacities. They can therefore only propose that such an individual be encouraged to grow and express itself. But the view of the individual as socially constructed will actively seek to promote individual growth through guidance, direction and intervention on the part of others already proficient in the socioculture and its ways.

For the purposes of developing abilities in language, this will mean both promoting children's development in language, and directly teaching about language where this is judged useful by the teacher. If the linguistic system is a resource for the "making of meaning", then growth in language abilities will be apparent in developing capacity to do or "mean" more and more things in language as the child grows. While it would be a bold claim to suggest that we know all there is to know about language and language development, and about the best steps to take to promote it, such a general orientation upon language does provide a good basis upon which teachers may proceed to develop language programs in schools.

It certainly means, for example, that the teacher is or should be authoritative, interpreting, guiding and intervening in children's language learning in many ways. Above all, an orientation upon language as a resource in the social construction of meaning will provide a principled basis upon which to determine the kinds of language worth teaching and learning, and it will also provide a basis upon which to plan and carry out the teaching program. In practice, however, while many people do recognise the justice of such observations, a great many theorists in language education continue to resist any suggestions either that there can be a principled basis for planning language learning in schools, or that some intervention in the name of teaching and learning about language will be a necessary part of effective educational programs.
The most significant report on the teaching of the English language produced in Britain during the 1970's, *A Language for Life* (also known as "the Bullock Report") did advocate "intervention" (1976, 8) in the development of children's language. However, it had little to say in practical terms about what such intervention might mean. As we have already suggested, it is very difficult to see how one might build a basis for systematic intervention in children's language development where no significant linguistic theory informs the enterprise. Wherever the preoccupation with the unique individual prevails, conceived of as learning in an inner private way, then we shall see little progress in the development of a good language teaching/learning theory for schools. Two notable curriculum programs in the Australian context which have had principled theories providing the teachers with a basis for planned intervention in children's language growth have been the *Mt Gravatt Developmental Language Reading Program*, developed by a research team which included Hart, Walker, Gray and Walker. (1977; 1977) (already alluded to in chapter 2, section 2.2) and the *Traeger Park Language Program*, as it was developed by Gray and Walker. (Gray, 1980a, 1980b, 1982a, 1982b, 1984; Walker, 1984)

That growth, process and "individual creativity" models of language and learning finally lead teachers into dead ends is made most clear when we look at what specialists on the teaching of English often say about the "content" of English. In their preface to the revised version of Dixon's *Growth through English*, Britton and Squire wrote:

> What is English? It proves impossible to mark out an area less than the sum total of the planned and unplanned experiences through language by means of which a child gains control of himself and of his relations with the surrounding world. (in Dixon, 1975, xviii)

It would be difficult to find a more unhelpful view of English studies to offer the teacher, since it effectively proposes that English is without definition, and it thus offers no basis upon which to plan
curriculum activity. Small wonder then, that it is often suggested that English is "contentless", on the grounds that what matters above all else, is the individual's "personal experience". The point is made very clearly, incidentally, when theorists such as Morris and Stewart-Dore (1984) speak of reading and writing in the "content areas", a term by which they in fact mean everything else apart from English language studies. Stubbs, invited to Australia in 1979 to give a plenary paper at the annual conference of the Australian Association for the Teaching of English, was asked to address the question "What is English?" Since, as he observed, many English teachers appeared to answer in terms of the kind we have quoted above from Britton and Squire, this tended to create situations "where the English teacher might teach almost anything" (Stubbs, 1986). Carter (1987) in a recent address to the British Association of Applied Linguistics, has made similar observations.

It is the view that personal experience is above all to be prized as the stuff of good learning which actually determines the attitudes towards writing advocated by Graves (1983) and Walshe (1987), among others, when they propose the particular value to the young writer of self selection of topics. Only in a situation in which "personally owned experience" is valued more than the kinds of learning and information potentially made available by an intelligent teacher with a serious grasp of "content", whatever the subject dealt with, will any theorist seriously propose that the learner should ideally select the topics about which he or she will write.

A sense that "content" is of secondary significance, and that "experience" is all, lay behind the tendency that developed from the 1960's on to point to the need to develop language capacities in listening, speaking, reading and writing, conceived of as processes in their own right. A major review of all the English language curriculum documents from the various Australian States (Christie and Rothery, 1979) noted that in their advice to teachers these four
language "skills" were commonly identified as the ones through which children's growth should be fostered. Once again, the absence of a principled view of language leads the curriculum theorist and the teacher into a dead end. The preoccupation with the four "language modes" as they are sometimes called, apart from the contexts in which they are employed, and from the kinds of linguistic choices the learner needs to make in order to deal with those contexts, simply fails to direct teachers and students alike towards effective teaching/learning practices. Listening, speaking, reading and writing are not to be thought of as idealised processes, apart from the contexts in which they are involved, and the purposes they serve. Yet the belief that the various language capacities may be helpfully dissociated from considerations of context and linguistic choice continues, as a recent surprising investigation of students' attitudes to writing indicates. Cambourne (1986) reported that he asked his university students the following three questions:

Do you like writing?
How many pages would you do each day voluntarily? *
Are you good at writing?
(Cambourne, 1986, 1)
*(Cambourne's emphasis)

Such questions seem to us quite meaningless, since they rest on the mistaken belief that "processes" like writing may be considered apart from purposes and reasons for writing. Not surprisingly, Cambourne reported a negative response to all three questions.

As we shall see, a great deal of the general orientation upon language and language education which we have been reviewing was a feature of the curriculum planning at Normanbury, though there the program was not so "laissez-faire" as sometimes does apply in schools wholly committed to "growth" models of language and learning. The early reading program, for example, sought to provide a controlled introduction to reading, though there were features of that program of which we were critical, as we saw in chapter 2 (section 2.3).
Elsewhere, and most notably in the writing program, the policy was less controlled, so that the directions taken in teaching the children to write were not always very certain or clear. The policy as it applied, in fact, was supported by the general orientations with respect to language which we have been reviewing, and which had been emphasised in the preparation of the teachers involved, as well as in the official curriculum guidelines documents they were issued, and in the advice they received in in-service programs.

The official advice they had received too often lacked a principled view of language to guide curriculum practice. In the absence of a principled view of language, as we shall argue, too little is understood of the kinds of capacities to use language which developing maturity and eventual entry to the adult world will require. Yet these are considerations which should be borne in mind even from the earliest days of schooling, for they can critically shape the development of challenging and rewarding learning activities.

Before we proceed to section 4.3, it remains to make one further point about the consequences of a language learning model which does not properly address the requirements of developing maturity and entry to the wider world. The point concerns the tendency to sentimentalise about children's language, related of course to the romantic conception of the learner to which we have already alluded.

Much earlier, we noted that Medway had proposed that the need to allow children to "use their own language" in learning was actually a human rights issue, and we have suggested the confusion such a position involves, with its resistance to the specialist registers, mastery of which is a necessary aspect of developing competence in the various "content areas" or school subjects. Where the theory of language and learning held admits no rigorous sense of the adult world to which the young learner is to gain entry, we would argue that the theorist is forced to sentimentalise about the language of the
child learner. There is really nowhere else to go. Yet the tendency so to sentimentalise has the effect of causing teachers to delay children's developing control of language for various registers, and needlessly to celebrate that which is most childish in their language uses. It is a tendency to which Martin (1985b, 60) has given the name "childism", and as we shall argue later, it is often particularly marked in the junior primary school. One instance of the tendency to sentimentalise over young children's language of a few years ago, will suffice to make the general point.

It is drawn from the study undertaken by Connie and Harold Rosen (1973), investigating the language of primary school children. Citing a transcript of the talk of a group of 6 and 7 year olds about birds and their nesting, the Rosens refer to the contributions of one young girl to the discourse as having:

*the poetic quality of biblical language or a folk tale (ibid, 47)*,

though no evidence is offered for this somewhat surprising claim. Elsewhere in the same volume, they quote a group of 11 year olds, discussing some plant specimens, and holding the discussion on their own, though within the general requirements laid down by their teacher. Noting the "cool, highly disciplined progress and intense focus" of the discourse, suggestive to this reader at least, of the fact that the children are aware they are engaged in an essentially scientific task, and that they have adopted an appropriate register, Connie Rosen expresses her concern at the apparent lack of "feeling" in the discourse. She writes:

*These children are very young to be learning to distrust their feelings, (ibid, 68)*

and she goes on a little later to suggest that readers may be:
a little disturbed, (and wonder) whether less constrained Sunday-best-suit language would not have added a vital human dimension to the extract (ibid, 69).

The implication is that the language of childhood (which is apparently associated with "feelings" rather than more than with "intellect", one supposes), is to be cherished because of its childishness.

Disturbingly, there is a quality to such opinions which is in the end rather patronising. Granted that children will talk like children, and granted also that we need to respect the ways children talk, there is no need to make a particular virtue of their language, simply because it is not that of the adult world. "Childism", as Martin suggests (1985b, 60) actually leaves children in a largely powerless state, for its effect is to deny children the ability to learn the language not only of the specialist registers of which we have made mention, but also, therefore, the language of the adult world. In the early childhood program investigated here, we shall suggest that the tendency to sentimentalise over children's experience and language at times determined the choices made in early curriculum planning.

Bearing all these matters in mind, it will now be appropriate to turn to Section 4.3, and explore the nature of the junior school curriculum at Normanbury, particularly with respect to language education.

4.3 The junior curriculum at Normanbury School, and the place of language development within it

The early childhood curriculum at Normanbury school was intended to be an integrated one, and, according to the principal, "language experience approaches" should determine policies for the development of language within that integrated curriculum. In practice the integrated curriculum as it operated, we would argue, adopted weak principles both with respect to classification and
framing. That is to say, with respect to the former, the fundamental principles determining the organisation of the curriculum were not primarily to do with what was taught, but rather more with the "learning processes" in which individuals were intended to engage, and which were conceived in an idealised sense apart from what was learned. Furthermore, since individuals were held to have many and varied needs, their capacity for movement in learning in many directions was considered desirable, so that the principles of framing generated by the teacher in working with the children were weak as well.

The term "language experience", as one authority on the subject (Goddard, 1974, 1-21) has noted, has been about for some years, though it is important to note that it has meant somewhat different things in the hands of different theorists. In fact, theorists seem to differ in at least two senses. In the first place, we would suggest that attitudes towards the issue of the teacher's role in the learning activities have always varied considerably, and this has had important consequences for the extent to which, if at all, teacher intervention has been considered a desirable thing. Secondly, and for related reasons, theorists appear to differ about the kinds of experiences for children that they value. Some appear to attach particular significance to the known and familiar experience of children as a basis for learning; others appear to attach more importance to the deliberate planning of new experiences by the teacher on behalf of the children.

As Goddard suggests (ibid), the notion of "language experience" as a basis for learning belongs to the wider movements in curriculum theory and in theory about language and learning reviewed in Section 4. 2. In this view of the matter, language experience is linked to the notion of the "child-centred" curriculum, which as we saw has been advocated for most of this century, though probably most actively implemented since the 1960's. It is also closely tied to the romantic
interest in language and learning which developed from the 1960's on. Progressive learning theory proposed that children learn readily where their own interests and needs are engaged. To this general observation were added the insights drawn from research of the 1960's in particular into early language development or "acquisition", as it was often called. The latter research had a considerable impact on much thinking about language learning in schools, for it proposed that just as children learned their language through daily experiences with others, so too, children should ideally continue to learn language, spoken and written, through significant experiences within the school. As Goddard put it:

Children learn spoken language through experiences that demand it, and teachers try to ensure that children first meet reading and writing as skills that are relevant to their own concerns and also as skills seen to be important in the lives of adults. (ibid,2)

Those who have worked in what we have argued is the alternative view of language and learning from the romantic one, including those involved in Halliday's Nuffield/Schools Council Programme, have always agreed with this general position on language experience, with the important additional proviso, however, that teacher intervention and overt teaching about language must have a place in the "experience-based" classroom. Too often, in the romantic/progressive tradition of language experience, what Halliday has referred to as a policy of "benevolent inertia" (Halliday, 1979, 279) prevails, such that children are left largely to grow up on their own, and to work things out with minimal input from adults, on the assumption that this is the "natural" way to learn. Some theorists, such as Kenneth and Yetta Goodman (1979; 1986) and Cambourne (Cambourne & Turbill, 1987) have even proposed "natural language learning theories", suggesting that literacy is ideally learned in the same "natural" ways as spoken language. There are two general problems with such "natural learning"theories. Firstly, as Painter (1986) and Gray (1987) have shown, speech is learned "naturally" in
the pre-school years only with very significant interaction and "scaffolding" from adults, so that in fact children receive an enormous amount of assistance in learning language. Secondly, "natural" learning theories underestimate the very considerable differences between speech and writing. The two are grammatically quite differently organised, and they are learned in different ways, as Halliday (1985b) has pointed out.

In the Australian context, the two notable language curriculum programs mentioned earlier - the Mt Gravatt Developmental Language Reading Program and the Traeger Park Language Program - did have principled bases for teacher intervention in the children's language development. For this reason alone they stand out as among the most important of language curriculum initiatives in Australia for the last few years, though their influence has not been as considerable as they deserve. It is a notable fact, by the way, that Gray, who was the principal architect of the Traeger Park Program, spoke of its interest to develop "natural language learners" (1983). What made his conception of such a learner different from the somewhat romantic one we have been discussing, was that in Gray's model the child developed language in carefully controlled contexts in which interaction and negotiation with significant adults were of critical importance.

Gray argues that it is in interaction and negotiation that the "scaffolding" so critical to children's learning will occur. He takes the latter term from Bruner (e.g. Bruner, 1983; 1986), and, addressing the manner in which it occurs in parent/child interaction, Gray defines it thus:

Scaffolding is a process whereby parents and children construct texts that are based on shared experience. In doing this, the parents actively support children's learning attempts by providing models of the appropriate language and by structuring and regulating the input they provide so children can gradually take over the task of text production. (Gray, 1987)
Such a careful sense of the role of the adult in modelling appropriate language for children does not in general inform many of the "language experience" approaches adopted in Australia.

The curriculum at Normanbury was integrated in that while it was intended that children be introduced to language arts, science, social science, mathematics and physical education, these were as far as possible, to be interrelated one with another. This was primarily out of consideration for the young learner, whose needs should determine how teaching/learning activities were planned, rather than any allegedly arbitrary sense of the needs of a "content" to be taught. This represented, of course, an adoption of the notion of the "child-centred" curriculum whose origins we sketched above. In developing such a curriculum, Normanbury operated much like any other contemporary Australian junior primary school known to the researcher. The organising principle around which teaching/learning activities should be planned was the adoption of a suitable curriculum theme. In a sense a theme became a kind of convenient hanger on which to hang the various learning experiences planned for the children. Language experience, then, should ideally grow out of the various class activities developed around given themes, and through these the children should learn in talking and listening, reading and writing.

Incidentally, the adoption of themes as a basis upon which to plan curriculum activity was being advocated for the secondary English classroom at least as early as 1963, when Clements, Dixon, Stratta and Hansen produced the textbook Reflections, though many others were produced in Australia in the early '70's, some of them becoming very popular for several years. They included Sandals in One Hand (Boomer and Hood, 1970), as well as The Other Side of the Fence (Mallick, Mallick, Delaney and Brooks, 1972), and Some Say a Word is Dead (Mallick, Lewis, Mallick and Christie, 1973), to mention only a few. Such theme-based books were of very variable quality. At their
worst, they invited very general discussion of such themes as "loneliness", "war", "relationship" and "identity", and various texts - sometimes, though not universally, literary - were selected for inclusion in these books, principally because they related in some way to the themes. At their best, theme books permitted both useful exploration of language, particularly in various literary forms, and reflection upon the kinds of themes that concerned the writers of these forms. In other words, as we have already suggested about the language curriculum in other contexts, theme approaches as exemplified in the various secondary English textbooks, were successful only in so far as they took language and its examination seriously. As we shall see, the same observation can be made of theme approaches for the primary school, though there, other studies apart from English language studies are involved.

Theme approaches to the development of the primary school curriculum appear to have been developed over much the same period as the secondary school English textbooks, and a number of books did appear, intended to give the primary school teacher some guidance on how to prepare and develop themes in their classrooms. One such volume, prepared by the Primary Schools Language Committee of the Victorian Department of Education (1975), was called *A Guide to the Thematic Approach for Developing Language in the Primary School*. Professional associations such as the quite influential Primary English Teaching Association of New South Wales have also produced many publications in various ways touching upon approaches to theme teaching, among other matters. One example, *The New English - How To* (Walshe (ed.) 1977) included a section on programming (ibid, 9-14), in which themes were favourably discussed as a basis for planning learning activity for the whole curriculum, not merely English language arts. The influence of the ideas found in such documents could be felt in the manner in which the framework for the primary curriculum at Normanbury had been set out.
In practice, the usual justifications offered for the adoption of theme approaches are very similar to those normally offered for language experience approaches. However, the relative significance given to the children's known and familiar experience on the one hand, and to the deliberately planned development of new experiences does seem to vary somewhat. Consider, for example, the definition offered by the Victorian Primary Schools Language Committee, which appears to attach more importance to the use of children's known experience as a basis for work than was implied in Goddard's definition, quoted earlier:

The thematic approach is a method that uses the day-to-day experiences and interests of the children. For instance, a group of children may follow their interests to develop a theme around pets, which may occupy them for a few days or a few weeks. During that time pets may be brought into the classroom, visits to kennels or shows may be arranged, and class pets may be adopted - so that children may experience at first hand the emotional and practical aspects of pet ownership. Vicarious experiences may also be provided in the form of films, slides, tapes, stories, and poems about pets. All of these experiences would be exploited by the teacher to develop the child's thinking and language. (Education Department of Victoria, Primary Schools Language Committee, 1975, 7)

The theme of "pets" was quite regularly used in the early curriculum at Normanbury, taken up in fact in Year 1, the children's second year at school. The curriculum for the whole school, from the Preparatory Year to Year 6, was developed around four major broad areas of interest. They were:

1 Satisfying our needs and wants.
2 Our ways of life.
3 Our natural and developed environment.
4 Organising ourselves and human relationships.
It was intended that these four broad areas be developed in different ways in each of the years of schooling, by taking up various themes appropriate to each age group. In the first three years of school, the overall areas of interest concerned the children and their adjustment to school, as well as certain aspects of their immediate environment, and/or their immediate interests, and the themes developed here were such things as toys, pets, other animals familiarly found in the garden or local farms, such as chickens or snails, shopping and clothing. As children entered year 3, they were to move into some more systematic examination of the local neighbourhood, so that themes included the local shopping centre, the children's homes and local transport. In year 4, they were to turn to consideration of the wider community, in this case the city of Geelong, and the themes included for example aspects of local history, types of employment and community services. In year 5, the concerns widened again to considerations of the nation as a whole, so that themes here involved features of wider Australian society and history. Finally, in year 6, aspects of Australia in the wider world were explored. Overall, the pattern of movement through the various broad areas of interest was one intended to follow the children's own growth, and their developing capacity to enter more and more fully into aspects of the local community, Australia, and the world.

Despite the intent, the actual themes chosen presented a fragmented rather than a clearly motivated and developed curriculum plan. We would suggest this is a frequent problem with theme-based approaches, and by no means particular to this school. We would suggest that with a more fully developed theory of language, and an associated theory of knowledge to drive it, the curriculum would in fact become less fragmented, and more coherently directed to useful learning goals across the years of the primary school. The total statement of broad areas of interest and associated themes for each year of schooling was as set out in Figure 4.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying our needs &amp; wants</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Media:</td>
<td>Types of food (1850-1980's)</td>
<td>Inventors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Food:</td>
<td>Transport:</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Aust. currency</td>
<td>World wide communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Aust. educ. system (1850-1880's)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hist. of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our ways of life</td>
<td>Teddy bears</td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure &amp; recreation.</td>
<td>Entertainment with magic.</td>
<td>Types of employment.</td>
<td>Aust. Day</td>
<td>Festivals around the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birthdays</td>
<td>Toys</td>
<td>Geelong Show.</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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our natural &amp; developed environment</td>
<td>Colours</td>
<td>Hatching</td>
<td>Animals:</td>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Natural &amp;</td>
<td>Aust. animals, plants, birds.</td>
<td>Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>out</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>reptiles</td>
<td></td>
<td>developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>features of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snails &amp; other small creatures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geelong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anakie Gorge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werribee Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising ourselves &amp; human</td>
<td>Me at school</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Harmony with</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Aust. service organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>others &amp; within</td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>our local</td>
<td>services for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbourhood</td>
<td>people in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geelong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flying doctors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: The overall curriculum framework at Normanbury
There is a degree of arbitrariness about the plan, particularly as it applies for the junior years. It is difficult to see, for example, why "colours", "farm" and "zoo" are listed for the preparatory year against "our natural and developed environment", or, indeed, why "teddy bears", "Easter", "Christmas" and "birthday" are listed against "our ways of life". Similar observations might be made for Year 1, where "Easter", "Christmas" and "toys" are listed against "our ways of life". One can see more consistency and unity of purpose in the concentration upon animals in year 1, against "our natural and developed environment". Here, "hatching out" and "snails and other small animals" are listed together with "Anakie Gorge" and "Werribee Park", the latter two, by the way, places to visit outside Geelong, where animals could be observed, in the former case in the wild, in the latter case, in a zoo. One can see that the themes listed for the preparatory year and for years 1 and 2 against "satisfying our needs and wants" do more or less relate to this area of interest, though their relatedness to each other is harder to see. They are "shopping", "pets", "transport", "clothing" and "food and the supermarket". However, like any other themes, these latter are only worth taking up where they permit significant new learning, and as we shall see shortly, the principles by which these might be turned into matters for challenging learning required considerable development before they might be usefully explored.

We live in difficult days when a serious concern for the ways in which knowledge is organised has often slipped right out of the educational agenda, as our discussion in section 4.2 has already sought to establish. That there are available good alternative approaches to the development of appropriately "integrated" curricula for the primary school, however, is not in doubt. One good model, specifically for the teaching of social science in the middle to upper primary school, has been developed by Kalantzis and Cope (1987; Cope & Kalantzis, in press). The program takes a number of significant social issues and/or themes such as the multicultural character of contemporary
Australia, families, gender, the environment, government, labour and technology to mention only a few, and it involves students in examining questions related to these, in such a way that they draw upon a number of academic fields of enquiry, such as history, geography, commerce and economics, sociology and anthropology. The program produced involves students in learning genres relevant to several different fields of enquiry, and hence in learning something of the ways of working and of addressing questions particular to the various fields. It thus produces a very different overall view of the curriculum from one of the kind identified in Figure 4.1. For example, its pedagogical principles are much more visible than those at Normanbury, in the sense that Bernstein meant this. That is because the program employs relatively strong principles of classification of knowledge, as well as relatively strong principles of framing of teaching/learning activity. In consequence, teachers and students are both able to operate with a reasonably clear sense of what is is students must do in order to be successful in their learning.

Though the researcher was given the table set out in Figure 4.1 as representing broad school policy, it was in practice subject to some variation from year to year. In fact, as Figure 4.2 shows, there was quite considerable variation when the children involved in this study were in years 1 and 2. For example, when the children were in year 1, they undertook a study of recreation and leisure, though these are shown as part of the year 2 program. Again, when they were in year 2 they did a study of the local neighbourhood, though this is actually shown on the program as undertaken in Year 3. They also did a unit of several weeks’ work in year 2 on fairy tales, though this does not appear in fact anywhere on the program as given. Furthermore, the planned themes for year 2 of the "Geelong show", "reptiles", "prehistoric animals", and "school" were not taken up at all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Pets &amp; grandparents</td>
<td>Our neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Circuses</td>
<td>and our homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Toys &amp; Easter</td>
<td>Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Snails</td>
<td>The seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Hatching out: chickens &amp; other animals from eggs</td>
<td>Fairy tales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Chickens, &quot;The Little Red Hen&quot; &amp; other narratives</td>
<td>Fairy tales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Other animals</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; recreations</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Food &amp; birthday parties as leisure activities</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Other recreations &amp; sports</td>
<td>Swimming &amp; other recreations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Curriculum themes taken up in Years 1 and 2

It should be noted, by the way, since school holidays occurred at the end of the terms, that the units of work as shown did not necessarily run for anything like the full month against which they are listed. As regards planning, the principal's attitude was that the curriculum framework represented a statement for the general guidance of the teachers, but variation from year to year was generally encouraged. The principles behind the decisions for variation would be worthy of comment, though they were not always easy to see. For example, the decision to spend a brief period dealing with grandparents and old people generally in Term 1 of year 1 was inspired by the principal's reading in the newspapers that, by State Government decision, a special week was being devoted to Senior Citizens in the state. Visits
by a few grandparents were in fact made to the school, and they talked about such things as their own school days. The principal's view was that it was worth taking advantage of a theme of interest in the wider community at the time, and there was no doubt but that the children enjoyed seeing the visitors to their classes.

The decision to spend about a week on space travel in Term 1 of year 1 was made by the teacher, who was inspired by reading some newspaper articles on the subject. This was a decision to capitalise on something which was current and in the news. The decision to devote what constituted about six weeks of work in year 2 to fairy tales was based upon the teachers' belief that the children would like that. No other justification was offered the researcher, though it was in her view a surprising decision, especially since so many of the fairy tales used were already familiar to the children, having been read to them in the previous two years of school, as the children confirmed when asked. The decisions not to use the planned themes of the "Geelong show", "reptiles", "prehistoric animals" and "school" in year 2 were never explained.

In fact, the principles by which teachers planned and carried out their units of work around themes were often both problematic and uncertain, and we would argue that it reflected a degree of uncertainty about aims and priorities. Such uncertainty is a response to the difficulties created by the prevailing theories of curriculum design we have been reviewing. This is an issue to which we will return more than once in this study. At this stage, we need to go one step further in this discussion of the integrated curriculum, and to examine how the teachers took one of the themes identified in the curriculum overviews set out above, and actually developed a unit of related lessons around that theme.
We will take the theme of "toys", used with the children in the first term of year 1. An overview of the program for this theme, as provided by Mrs. B., one of the two teachers of the children in that year, is set out in Figure 4.3, displayed as Mrs B. prepared it, though in her case, it was hand-written.
Figure 4.3: A curriculum theme on "toys"
As the figure reveals, the intention was to use the notion of toys as an organising theme around which all, or at least most lessons for the various curriculum areas for the duration would be developed. No mathematics activity is included, it will be noted. Quite often, mathematics lessons were developed without reference to the theme, since as the teachers said, it was hard to force mathematics into all theme programs, and in fact often unnecessary or unwise to do so.

In developing a discussion of this theme unit of work, we will take up two related matters which, we will argue, point to some limitations in planning themes in this way. The first concerns the "content" used, while the second concerns the view of language involved. Briefly, we will argue that the "content" is too thin, and its use not likely to be productive of significant new learning by the children. In addition, we will argue that the language learned will therefore be of a limited kind as well. These points may be made most clearly if we contrast the plan provided in Figure 4.3 with that of Gray (1983), developed in the Traeger Park Language Program, Alice Springs.

The latter program was designed in particular for the community of fringe-dwelling Aboriginal children around Alice Springs who came to school at Traeger Park. The program was developed around themes, and as we earlier noted, Gray spoke of the children involved as being ideally, "natural language learners", though as we have also noted, in using that term he always intended a significant role for the adult in the children's learning. Three issues in particular concerned him in the kind of program he devised: they were "interaction", "negotiation" and "modelling". Texts were generated both in interaction and negotiation between children and teacher. Extensive use was made of models of the kinds of language the children needed to learn. Thus, for the written mode, a range of appropriate books and other print materials were used. In addition, spoken language was modelled out of interviews or talks with selected adults. Gray
made much of the importance of all three elements in developing children who would in time become confident and independent users of language - language of a kind, that is, needed both for successful school learning and for participation in the wider community, where white people's values and methods of working often pose a great threat to Aboriginal people. His principles, however, can be shown to apply with equal force for any community of young learners.

Interaction, negotiation and modelling became three fundamental principles in Gray’s pedagogical theory, though what gave them power was the underlying set of assumptions about language and about the role of language in the construction of "content" or knowledge. His was a principled view of language, which, as it developed, drew more and more upon systemic linguistic theory, making use in particular of register (Gray, 1983, published in Michael Christie 1985, 91). As we earlier noted, the notion of register is a particularly good one to offer educational practice, since it both explains why language has variety, and provides a basis upon which to plan effective language learning lessons. In that register necessarily addresses attention both to text and context, it gave Gray and his colleagues a basis on which to plan significant learning contexts, and to identify the kinds of texts to be mastered by the children in order to function properly in those contexts.

At Traeger Park learning contexts were always chosen with a theme in mind, but what mattered was that the theme and/or the "content" to be pursued was likely to extend the children so that they would learn to create new text types (a term Gray used rather than "genre"). Significant new learning experience, as Gray recognised, generates the need to grasp new ways of working in language and hence new "knowledge" or "content" as well. A focus upon the language learning experiences provided by different contexts of situation really sharpens the teacher’s capacity to make good
selections of themes. Where a potential theme offers little in the ways of differing contexts of situation and hence of text types, then the teacher knows to avoid it, but where the range is wide, then significant teaching/learning experience will eventuate. One substantial theme Gray used with great effect with year 1 children examined "insects". One unsuccessful theme which, against his better judgment, a colleague of his used briefly, was "hats". By the way, Gray explained the latter theme and his reservations about it to the researcher when she visited the school, though he has never written about it.

Figure 4.4 sets out the overview Gray has provided of the unit of work on insects. The term "concentrated language encounter" which appears in it will require some explanation. This was a term Gray and Walker borrowed from Courtney Cazden, and it suited their interest to create important teacher-child interaction contexts which supported the development of natural language-learning strategies and negotiation.

The teachers should work to create such concentrated contexts, which might involve:

a range of activities from talking about things together, writing and reading together, to role play and drama, where both teachers and children take an active part. (Gray, 1985, 91)

These concentrated language contexts became central to the curriculum activity, and as the figure reveals, it was through these that various texts, oral and written, were generated as part of a very carefully orchestrated plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom learning context</th>
<th>Concentrated encounters</th>
<th>context</th>
<th>Social transactional Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigators-community (e.g. CSIRO Entomology Section)</td>
<td>Expository text</td>
<td>Texts concerned with describing and explaining processes</td>
<td>Oral texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An entomology section was set up in the classroom for role play</td>
<td>Expository text</td>
<td>&quot;The life cycle of a butterfly&quot;</td>
<td>Written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional texts</td>
<td>Labels for collection, instruction sheets, graphs</td>
<td>Written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive texts</td>
<td>Descriptions of features of insects</td>
<td>Written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama activities to explore context of situation for 'The greedy grasshopper' (Type 2 model)</td>
<td>Literary text</td>
<td>'The greedy grasshopper' (Children's version)</td>
<td>Written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama activities to explore context of 'The very hungry caterpillar'</td>
<td>Literary text</td>
<td>'The very hungry caterpillar' (Children's version)</td>
<td>Written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of other concentrated encounter sessions, plus exploration of other story texts, places children in a position where they can negotiate their own stories</td>
<td>Literary texts</td>
<td>'Happy birthday Aunt Sally'</td>
<td>Written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'The story about a bloodsucker'</td>
<td>Written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'The dragon and the butterflies' etc.</td>
<td>Written text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4 A curriculum theme at Traeger Park
One of the most important characteristics of the plan as provided by Gray is the care with which he identified the range of contexts and associated text types to be developed with the children. Thus, the identification and production of a range of factual texts is planned around the general examination of entomology as a field of enquiry. In addition, a range of literary texts is similarly planned. In both sets of text types, careful provision is made for use of models, as in various expository texts about insects, or in the use of children’s narratives like The Very Hungry Caterpillar. Capacity to recognise and produce such texts, it will be noted, is actually developed in the associated concentrated language encounters, where they are modelled and negotiated in various ways in interaction with both the teacher and other children.

It is worth noting the manner in which Gray's program design compares with that of Kalantzis and Cope, whose Social Literacy curriculum materials we mentioned earlier in this section. Like Kalantzis and Cope, and working in fact with a younger group of children than they, Gray developed his unit of work on insects by careful recourse to what experts in the field had to say on the subject, so that he turned to entomologists, where Kalantzis and Cope turned to various social scientists, as earlier indicated. Strong principles of classification of knowledge were thus involved, leading Gray and his students, among other matters, into the production of factual or scientific genres remarkable in that their "contents" had been appropriately researched. It is this care for knowledge and for the language in which the knowledge is encoded which marks a curriculum program that takes young learners seriously, seeking to induct them into important fields of enquiry. Equally, where as in this case, Gray involved the young children also in reading books as models for constructing their own stories, he took seriously the interest in the construction of simple literary texts, understood as things whose organisation was worth investigating.
By contrast, we would suggest that the theme on toys, selected by Mrs. B. is indeed "thin", as we suggested earlier. In theory, it is probably possible to take any theme, and generate some useful language-learning activities around it, though it is doubtful whether all would permit the same variety and range of such activities. The theme of toys could be used, though we would question whether it could offer the the same kinds of possibilities as Gray's example. To that extent, the theme of toys compares with the one on hats, which as we have noted, was tried at Traeger Park, though with little enthusiastic support from Gray, who did not teach it himself. But even if we accept that a theme on toys might be potentially productive, the overview as given by Mrs. B. does not encourage us to believe that much variety and depth in learning experience might be achieved. Note for example, that all the proposed reading books are stories of various kinds, in itself a measure of the relatively limited range of reading experiences, and hence of genres to be offered the children, compared with those in Gray's unit, which makes use of both factual and narrative genres. Again, if we turn to the "writing ideas", we note a series of potential titles for writing listed, and though there is no explicit indication of the kinds of genres the children might write, the titles listed suggest that stories of some kind are really what the teacher had in mind.

In short, the unit on toys is not driven by any controlled and explicit interest in language. Alternatively, it is not driven by any sense of possibilities for new learning, of a kind for example that a language-based theory of learning could provide. A linguistic theory of the kind that is proposed in the systemic linguistic view of genre and register does not make a distinction between "content" and "form". On the contrary, it proposes that since language is centrally involved in the social construction of experience, what is thought of as "content" comes into being - or is encoded - in linguistic patterns. Poor "content" invites limited language-learning possibilities. Poor language-learning involves the acquisition of limited "knowledge".
The Traeger Park Language Program had two particular strengths. Firstly, its criteria for selection of appropriate themes were based upon observation of valued "real life experience" outside the school. Secondly, its pedagogical principles for exploring the themes selected were explicit and visible. Substantial themes were developed for example, round such things as the post office, the bakery, the pet shop, the town newspaper, and the operation and use of all these, as well as such things as the care and maintenance of animals like the horse on properties around Alice Springs, or observations of phenomena of the natural environment such as insects. For each of these socially useful activities, there is a range of different contexts of situation in which people interact and work, generating a variety of issues to explore and investigate, and a variety of spoken as well as written genres. To engage with such contexts of situation is to learn both significant language and significant "content": the two are not separable.

It is this sense of the very intimate relationship of "content" and language which is missing from Mrs B's unit on toys, just as it is missing from much curriculum planning practice generally. Units like hers are based on the premiss that if one takes a theme of some interest to the children, one can introduce a number of print materials (mainly stories) and activities, and that through use of these the children will learn to talk, listen, read and write, where the processes of doing these things are "ends in themselves". But, as we argued above in Section 4.2, listening, speaking, reading and writing need always to be directed to clear goals - to the comprehension and/or construction of text types or genres which are valuable and worth learning because they serve the needs of socially useful contexts of situation.
The theme of toys was chosen because it would appeal to children, relating clearly to their known experience and interests. In this sense, it permitted a "language experience" approach to curriculum design, though in practice it was not used to open up new experience in any significant way. As we noted above, it would be possible to use such a theme as a basis for opening new experience. Employing Gray's notion of identifying relevant contexts of use in the wider community, one might identify the toy factory and the toy shop. Both places are worth visiting, offering opportunity to observe at work, and perhaps to interview them about their activities. A range of associated contexts of situation might subsequently be reconstructed in concentrated language enquiries, and genres that could emerge might include, for example:

oral genres such as service encounters,  
to do with running a toy shop;  
procedural genres, spoken and written,  
to do with making toys;  
procedural genres, spoken and written,  
to do with selling toys;  
reports on types of toys, spoken and written,

to name some obvious examples. It will be noticed, by the way, that in Mrs B's plan, a visit to a toy shop was made, though it was an occasion merely to see toys either similar to those the children owned, or that they might have liked to buy. In other words, the educational opportunities of such a visit were not turned to much advantage. The principal genres generated were oral and written recounts, recreating aspects of the visit. Otherwise, toys were displayed in the morning news activity, where they featured either in interview genres or show and tell genres, which, like recounts, have been already identified in chapter 3. No written narrative genres
were in fact created, though several were read to the children. To this extent, the "writing ideas" listed were not acted upon.

It might be suggested at this point, that, allowing that the argument with respect to the limitations of toys is accepted, there were a number of other themes set out over the junior school program described that were capable of more substantial language learning opportunities. That is true, and some of these we will be examining in chapters 7, 8 and 9, though even then we shall suggest that the possibilities were not pursued as fully as one might hope. The argument here is not, finally, about the merits of any one theme over another, though we would insist that some are undoubtedly more productive than others. The argument is about the sets of principles, linguistic and pedagogical, that are used to drive the planning of the language curriculum in which the themes have a role. Where these principles are based upon a well articulated theory of language and of its role in the construction of experience or "content" or "knowledge", then the educational program is likely to be a successful one.

Section 4.4 The early reading program at Normanbury school

The early reading program at Normanbury was devised by the school principal within the first twelve months of her taking up her position at the school. Her decision to create such a program was based on her general dissatisfaction with the set of basal readers which had been used at the school hitherto. Like many another such sets of readers they were most remarkable for their poor use of language as well as their unacceptable content. In time, the program led to the development of a series of 16 little books, accompanied by a "big book" for the teachers, as well as a set of explanatory notes provided for the teachers' use. As in other reading programs, the "big book" used the same text as that made available to the children, and its
function was to provide a version of the text which could be read in the group situation. The children were to be issued with their own versions of the various texts only when they had had considerable practice in reading the big book along with the teacher.

The reading program owed a heavy debt to the Mt Gravatt Developmental Language Reading Program, to which mention was made earlier in this discussion. Like that program, this one developed its teaching around giving the children frequent practice in reading items of familiar language as they used these in speech. The developers of Mt Gravatt had based their program upon bodies of research data available to them about the commonest language patterns found in the speech of young and beginning readers. Using such data, they had developed two notions - the "signalling unit", and the "content unit". A signalling unit was a very frequently used language pattern such as the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
I'm & \quad I've \ got \\
That's \ a & \quad I'm \ going \ to \\
It's & \quad Look \ at \\
\text{(Hart \ & \ Gray, \ 1977, \ 6)}
\end{align*}
\]

The idea was that these signalling units would reappear very frequently in the various readers, and that they would become pivotal in the children's developing reading capacity, providing something familiar to which new linguistic items would be linked in varying ways to build different "content", depending upon the theme being pursued. The latter items were the content units, examples of which were:

\[
\begin{align*}
a \ \text{tadpole} & \quad \text{legs} \\
creek & \quad \text{be} \\
\text{my} \ \text{home} & \quad \text{look} \\
\text{(ibid.)}
\end{align*}
\]
Depending on the theme, the children were to engage in various learning activities to do with it, most notably talking in ways in which they would rehearse some of the language they would then turn to read in the readers.

These principles - and indeed the signalling units - were taken from the Mt. Gravatt program, and incorporated into the reading program at Normanbury. As in the Mt. Gravatt scheme, the readers were not intended to be the only reading materials the children were offered. On the contrary, they were to be read a wide set of additional books by the teacher, and they were also to move into reading other books as early as possible. The reading books were used at Normanbury in the preparatory Year, and for the first six months of year 1. By June of that year, they had all been phased out.

A detailed discussion of the reading program is beyond the limits of this study, since we have chosen to concentrate upon the morning new genre and the writing planning genre. However, as we shall see in subsequent chapters, the nature of the reading program was of interest to what happened in the writing program, because at least some of the models for writing the children used were actually taken from the reading program. Models from the reading program, as well as those rehearsed in the morning news genre examined in our last chapter in fact played quite a significant role in the development of writing abilities. The issue is of importance, principally because it points to one of the enduring themes of this study: namely, that children learning to use language will necessarily rely in various ways upon the linguistic models which adults appear to endorse and support in their dealings with them, often indeed unconsciously. This is an important understanding to bear in mind, since it exposes many of the confusions created by those theorists who would stress the importance of children using "their own language", to whom we alluded in Section 4.2 of this chapter.
4.5 Summary

In this chapter, we have sought to examine selected developments in general curriculum theory and in language curriculum theory as they have emerged this century, but particularly over the last 20 to 30 years. We suggested that developments in both theoretical bodies have been closely related. Both for example have developed particular ideologies to do with the individual child learning, so that "child-centred" approaches to teaching and learning have been advocated. These approaches have led to a preoccupation with "learning processes", conceived independently of the "content" being learned. This we suggested has had unfortunate consequences in that it has served to deflect teachers' attention away from consideration of the various fields of enquiry which properly form the concern of education. Teachers are thus too often left deskilled, in that they are not able to recognise the ways fields of enquiry or "contents" are constructed in language, and they are therefore unable to plan effectively to teach these matters to their students.

Early childhood education, we argued, has been particularly affected by the "child-centred" approaches in general curriculum theory and in "language experience" methodologies. In consequence, we suggested that early childhood education challenges young children too little, delaying their entry to control of new knowledge as well as to an understanding of the genres and registers in which this knowledge finds expression.

The early childhood curriculum at Normanbury, we suggested, showed the influence of child-centred language experience approaches. The curriculum was an integrated one, whose pedagogical principles of organisation were "invisible" in Bernstein's terms, so that what might constitute success on the part of the young learner was also largely invisible. As we shall argue later, this made for difficulties in the operation of the writing program.
Overall, the writing program at Normanbury was not in fact as wholly "process-oriented" as those of a number of other schools in Geelong, though as we observed in chapter 2, the influence of Graves upon the principal was important in her decision to encourage early writing in the junior primary school. In the writer's observation wherever Graves' "process approaches" to the teaching of writing apply, children are left to choose their own topics for writing. This observation is supported by Kamler (in preparation) in investigating writing in a junior primary school in New South Wales. The principle of pupil selection of topic was not systematically pursued at Normanbury, and to that extent there was a greater degree of teacher intervention than is true in Kamler's study. The early writing program at Normanbury was such, however, that it did have significant limitations, and these we would argue were to be attributed to the general operation of those principles of curriculum theory and of language theory which we have now argued at some length have become well established in our schools. In subsequent chapters, we shall seek to demonstrate that the writing program suffered in at least three senses:

1) It suffered in that much was made of exploiting the children's familiar and personal experience for the purposes of developing the children's writing capacities. Personal experience is a sufficient basis for starting to learn, but it should not become the primary focus of learning.

2) The program suffered when, as we shall see later, an effort was made by the teacher to introduce new information, or in some way
to involve the children in learning new approaches to dealing with experience. The endeavour was in practice too often handicapped by the teacher's own uncertainty with respect both to recognising what might constitute significant knowledge and to articulating how such knowledge was realised in particular discourse patterns.

3) For reasons closely related to the last point, the program suffered in that the teachers had a very uncertain sense of the kinds of written genres their students should learn to write, so that as we shall see in later chapters, too little was often done in terms of teaching the students about these.

Since the object of the writing program was indeed that children should learn to write, the result of these limitations was that an invisible pedagogy in fact applied: the children were largely left to work out themselves the linguistic organisation of the texts they were to write. They necessarily therefore based what they did on the models available to them in talk and to some extent in their early reading program.

These are all observations which our discussion for the rest of the study will seek to support in various ways.
5 Schematic structure potential and register in the writing planning genre

5.1 Introduction

As we noted in chapter 4 (section 4.4), the curriculum of the junior primary school is an integrated one, so that the various learning activities are organised around selected curriculum themes. Use of the theme is intended to permit development of capacities in several curriculum areas - most commonly language arts, social science, and science. Bearing this in mind, a decision has been made to examine the teaching of writing in three different lessons, selected both because they were all developed out of different themes, and because each related to one of the three different curriculum areas just identified. In addition, it should be noted that the teacher in each case was different as well, and that while two of the selected texts were drawn from year 2 experience, one was drawn from year 1.

Several important matters of principle were involved in selecting the instances of the writing planning genre, worth noting here. Firstly, it was important to sample the teaching of writing across the three areas of the curriculum most regularly integrated, to determine the extent to which, if at all, considerations of different genres and registers in writing had consequences for the teaching. Secondly, it seemed important to draw the instances of the writing planning genre from different areas of the three years of schooling involved in the study, and while none is drawn from the preparatory year, (where, as we noted in chapter 2, little if any independent writing was done by most children, and the spoken discourse was not recorded) care has been taken to sample the other two years. As we shall see, though the two instances of the writing planning genre drawn from the year 2 experience actually emerged about a year after that drawn from year 1, there is not much evidence of increased
difficulty with the growth of the children. Finally, it was particularly important to sample more than one teacher’s work. The object here is not to do a case study of any one teacher, but rather to attempt to sample teaching practices generally with respect to the teaching of writing, as they applied in one junior primary school. A major and useful study requires to be done in undertaking quantitative analyses of teaching practices across a number of schools, the better to inform our collective understanding of what happens in the junior primary school.

As in the morning news genre, we will argue that two registers actually apply in the writing planning genre, so that the first order or pedagogical register projects the second order or "content" register. Two related but different issues are involved in the pedagogical register, the first of which concerns the overall management of the direction of the teaching/learning activity, and the second of which concerns the actual teaching and learning about the activity of writing. The "content" register relates to the "content" about which writing is to take place. As in the case of the morning news genre discussed in chapter 3, we shall argue that the two registers realise the schematic structure potential of the genre in systematic ways, though there is an interesting point of difference in the operation of the two registers in the two genres, brought about by the different social processes involved in each case.

Thus, when we examined the overall schematic structure potential of the morning news genre, representing it diagrammatically in chapter 3, section 3.6, we observed that the two registers operated very clearly to realise the different elements of the structure: there were no points at which the two converged. However, in the case of the writing planning genre, the two do converge at certain points in the schematic structure. This is because in the latter genre, unlike in the morning news genre, actual teaching is taking place: the children are being taught to write about a "content," and inevitably there will
be points at which talk of the writing will converge with talk of the "content" about which the children are to write. As we shall see, the two tend to converge at certain points in the schematic structure, though principally in the middle element(s) of the genre, where the writing task is defined.

In the opening of the first element of schematic structure the pedagogical register is always foregrounded, as indeed it tends to be at the start of any element of structure. At this point the "content" register may have some expression as well, though always in a manner that makes it secondary in importance to the activity of operationalising teaching and learning. Once activity has been operationalised in the beginning of the first element, the "content" register comes to the fore in the "body" of the element. Here the language changes from that of operationalising action to that of reflection upon experience, or sometimes of commentary upon experience. The opening element is in fact normally the longest element in the genre, since it is here that the "content" is realised most fully. While the number of subsequent elements varies somewhat, there will always be at least one "middle" element in which the two registers are brought together, though since the talk about the actual writing task is always very brief and general, this element is relatively short. This is because the nature of the writing task, and the various linguistic choices to be made in writing - a grasp of which is in fact a primary object of the lesson - remains largely implicit, providing confirmation of the operation of an invisible pedagogy in Bernstein's terms. The final element of the schematic structure - which is always the shortest element - is normally realised primarily in the pedagogical register, though the "content" register will sometimes find some very limited expression as well.
In the three lessons we will sample, we will argue that the relative absence of talk to do with the task of writing which is a feature of the pedagogical register on the one hand, and the relative development of the "content" register on the other hand, are both evidence of the problems brought about by the adoption of the particular model of the integrated curriculum which is in use. This model, as we have already seen, draws heavily upon "language experience" and "whole language" approaches of the kind which we reviewed in chapter 4 (section 4.2). These approaches we argued, blur the distinctions between children's familiar and commonsense experience of the world on the one hand, and on the other hand, the experience of dealing with information in new ways which is a feature of various fields of academic enquiry. Where such curriculum practices apply, as we earlier suggested, the teachers have a reasonably underdeveloped awareness of the relationship of language and "content." As a result, we would suggest that their teaching is not informed by a useful sense of genre and register, and of their consequences for the linguistic choices to be made in undertaking a writing task. Indeed, we would argue that the teaching practices are largely informed by a view that the important thing is that the children "learn to write". Considerations of what genre they should write, or of how they should write it, do not rate very highly. It is for this reason that the pedagogical register, at least with respect to talk about the actual task of writing, is often somewhat unfocussed in the writing planning genre. Furthermore, because the "language experience" approach applies, we would argue that the "content" field is frequently treated in ways which do not in practice open up new experience as much as we would argue they should. The result of both these tendencies we believe is that the teaching and learning which occur are of a less significant kind than should ideally be the case.
We will argue that tracking the ways in which the two registers operate in the writing planning genre will be helpful in at least three ways. Firstly, such an analysis will offer confirmatory evidence for the presence of the genre. Secondly, in that the first order or pedagogical register can be shown to project the second order or "content" register, we will argue that this serves to provide linguistic evidence for the operation of Bernstein’s two discourses - the regulative and the instructional discourses. Thirdly, we shall suggest that the analysis overall highlights some of the particular limitations of the pedagogical practices concerned.

As a first step towards establishing these arguments, we aim in this chapter to offer a reasonably general discussion of the schematic structure potential and register in the writing planning genre, developing more detailed linguistic analysis in subsequent chapters. Our objects will be:

1) to give an introductory account of the principal elements in the schematic structure potential of the writing planning genre;

2) to discuss some of the features of the elements of the genre, drawing where appropriate upon representative texts to illustrate what is said;

3) to establish the register variables which apply in the genre.
5.2 The schematic structure potential of the writing planning genre

Just as was true of the morning news genre, the writing planning genre is a social process or activity of considerable significance in early childhood education, serving like the former to help induct young children into behaving in acceptable ways. Such acceptable patterns of behaviour as apply in the writing planning genre, operate both with respect to the children's general interpersonal obligations (which we have seen are an important feature of the morning news genre) and with respect to their becoming literate. It will be recalled that in chapters 3 (3.2) and 4 (section 4.2) we suggested a particular ideology of childhood and of early childhood education applied at Normanbury school, having consequences for the ways things were "done," both linguistically and non-linguistically. An important function of the morning news genre was that children learn habits of respect for the teacher's authority and adoption of approved patterns of politeness and attentiveness. Furthermore, as our analysis of the morning news genre sought to demonstrate, the learning of the appropriate patterns of approved behaviour appears to be associated with the children's relinquishing of certain capacities, at least for the purposes of what applies as acceptable behaviour within school. Thus, with the exception of the patterns found to apply at times in Mrs. L's classroom, children are constrained to make relatively little use of language for expression of attitude, because attitudinal expression is the province of the teacher.

We would argue that the diminution of the children's capacity to express attitude, and the associated requirement upon them to make frequent formal acknowledgement of the power and authority of the teacher, are both elements of the working of the ideology of early childhood education. This ideology operates in other curriculum activities apart from the morning news genre, including the writing planning genre. The ideology that applies requires firstly, that the
children obey the teacher as a powerful authority figure, and secondly, they they wait to be told by her what to do. In general, they are not encouraged to initiate independent activity of any kind. Evidence of the acknowledgement of the power and authority of the teacher is apparent, for example, in the fact that the children are required to take up waiting positions at the start of the day, or when they re-enter the room after morning break and after lunch, or when a teaching/learning activity within these major breaks in the school day has been declared completed. In the taking of such waiting positions, the children must, ideally at least, be silent, and they must look towards the teacher, who will always initiate a new teaching/learning episode. Other evidence of the working of the ideology of early childhood is provided in the fact that the children may not opt to talk whenever they wish. Instead, they must wait to be addressed by the teacher, or alternatively, they must bid for the right to speak by raising a hand to signal their interest in saying something, in which case the teacher may or may not choose to acknowledge the bid. Where she chooses not to do so, she is not required to give any reason for her decision. In fact, as we shall see, the rule that the children must raise a hand to signal interest to talk, or to answer a question, while it does apply most of the time, is sometimes flouted, as for example, when a child offers an observation of some kind which the teacher finds it useful to accept. However, the child who offers an unsolicited observation, or who "calls out" (a teacher's term) an answer to a teacher question, rather than raising a hand and waiting to be selected, always takes a risk, and is indeed often reproved for doing so, and "being rude" (another teacher's term). Indeed, quite often, where a child "calls out" the correct answer to a question, the teacher actually ignores what is said, instead deliberately selecting a child who has taken the appropriate course of action, and raised a hand. Where children do talk, there is a requirement that they do so quietly, for anything suggestive of being "loud" or "boisterous" is bad mannered, and will not be tolerated, just
as any bid to interrupt either the teacher or another child will also be frowned upon.

Overall, a patterned manner of behaviour emerges in this study, such that the children are directed and guided towards the adoption of particular ways of doing things. Whereas in the morning news genre, the children were guided into taking up the role of Morning News Giver, or alternatively into listening to the child operating in that role, in the writing planning genre the children are guided into talking, and then writing, about "contents" of various kinds. In preparing for the writing the children take up the required physical position for the lesson. It is in fact the same position as that for the morning news genre, as we noted earlier - namely, sitting in a semi circle on the floor in front of the teacher. Once seated there, the children must be quiet and attentive to the teacher, and sit still, except when told to move their position in some way.

In fact, as noted in chapter 3, of the seven teachers viewed in this study, all but one instituted the writing planning genre immediately after the morning news genre, so that the children did not need to move to a new position for the new activity, though in other ways steps were taken to mark the intention to start a new activity. For example, as we saw in chapter 3 (section 3.3) sometimes the teacher deliberately involved the children in moving their bodies about after the completion of the morning news genre and before the start of the writing planning genre. In these cases, the children were invited to place hands on heads, and behind backs a couple of time, before being required to sit still again. The writer can in fact recall that her own early childhood teachers regularly invited her to "put hands on heads, hands behind back", and so on, before being required to sit still and listen. Another strategy involved having the children sing a song or two as a changed activity. The latter was particularly popular with the children, for even though it did not involve the taking up of a changed physical position, it did give the children a chance to use
their vocal chords quite vigorously. We would suggest that this offered a welcome respite from the considerable effort not only of staying still for quite long periods of time, but of speaking quietly, and even then, only when invited to do so. Evidence for this interpretation of the significance of the singing, by the way, was apparent in the fact that on occasion, some children did sing very loudly indeed, showing both considerable relish for the enterprise and an awareness of their relative daring in singing so loudly, thereby causing the teacher to call them to order, and to tell them "not to shout."

In chapter 3 (section 3.3) we have already noted following Green and Kantor-Martin (1988) that over the passage of time, the children in a classroom will learn to operate according to principles which become more and more tacit with constant familiarity and practice. These principles are involved in the Control element, which, especially in the case of the writing planning genre, finds explicit expression increasingly at points where some "breakdown" occurs in the otherwise smooth operation of the genre. The teacher may for example, ask a child to "sit up," to "sit properly", to "sit down", to "stand up", to "look to the front", to "stop wriggling", to "be quiet," or, as we shall see later, where some offending article (such as a toy) is in improper use, to hand it over, or to put it away.

Turning now to the schematic structure potential of the writing planning genre, like other genres this will have a very clear beginning/middle/end structure. Though there will always be some variation in the way in which the beginning and end elements are realised, the greatest variation, as one would expect, will be in the middle element(s). The most minimal instance of the writing planning genre will always have three elements, all of which are thus particulate:
\( \text{TO} \land \text{TS} \land \text{T} \),

where \( \text{TO} \) represents Task Orientation, \( \text{TS} \) represents Task Specification, \( \text{T} \) represents Task, and the symbol \( \land \) represents sequence.

This particular sequence of elements never varies, and we may think of the overall pattern or movement that applies in moving through the three as functioning in a "wave-length" fashion. A Control element will frequently be present as well, occurring anywhere in the overall schematic structure, and indicating the manner in which the teacher responds to any features of the children's behaviour. It therefore functions prosodically, as we have just seen above and when allowance is made for its operation, the schematic structure potential may be shown thus:

\[
(C\longrightarrow) \\
\text{TO} \land \text{TS} \land \text{T},
\]

There are several other possible optional elements, all of which will occur, if at all, in the "middle" part of the genre. The most common optional element will represent some variation upon the TS or Task Specification, creating a Task Respecification. Sometimes, in fact, the TS may be shown to break into two distinct elements of the schematic structure, a TS1 and a TS2, so that the TS element in this situation may be described as recursive. In addition, we will actually find one instance in which there is a reworking of the Task Orientation, making what we term a Task Reorientation. Overall, the schematic structure potential of the writing planning genre, showing its optional elements may be set out thus:

\[
(C\longrightarrow\longrightarrow\longrightarrow) \\
\text{TO} \land (\text{TRO}) \land \text{TS} \land (\text{TRS}) \land \text{T},
\]
where C represents Control,
TO represents Task Orientation,
TRO represents Task Reorientation,
TS represents Task Specification,
TRS represents Task Respecification,
C represents Control,
T represents Task.

The brackets ( ) indicate an optional element, while the symbol "indicates that the element involved may be recursive, and the brackets [ ] indicate the domain in which some variation in the number of elements involved occurs.

The TO, or opening element is the one in which the teacher initiates the teaching/learning activity, and its order never varies, as we observed above. The first order or pedagogical register will always be involved here to start, though the second order or "content" register will normally have some expression in the start, and it comes to dominate as this element unfolds. As indicated earlier, the TO is normally the longest element in the schematic structure, and that is because it is here that the "content" field to be developed in writing is explored most fully. Where the TRO occurs, the teacher really repeats much of the activity of the TO, and for that reason the "content" field is in particular foregrounded. The major second element is the TS. Here, both the pedagogical and the "content" register will be involved, though as we have already noted, the former normally finds pretty minimal expression, even though it is concerned with defining the writing task for the children. The TS is normally shorter than the TO, since teachers typically devote nothing like a comparable amount of time and effort to definition of the pedagogical task of writing to the time that they do to the "content" to be written about. However, as we have suggested, the TS is often followed by an optional element, the TRS, in which aspects of the task to be done are repeated. This is because of a generally held
conviction that children will benefit from being reminded of what is involved.

Time-honoured teaching practice requires some repetition in the middle part of the genre, in order to make certain that the children understand the nature of the job they are to do; it is justified in terms of the notion of "reinforcement". The idea of appropriate "reinforcement" has been one often invoked by educational psychologists in their advice to teachers about how to teach, on the grounds that children will benefit from being reminded of what they must do before they start to do it. In this study at least, the TRS tends to be more common than the TRO, and as we shall see, one teacher actually has two distinct TS elements.

Finally, the T, which is normally very minimal linguistically, and which relates to the pedagogical register, involves either a summarising of the task, perhaps by writing a topic heading on the blackboard, or a direction to the children to return from the floor to their seats to commence writing, or both.

We will now illustrate something of the character of each of the elements of the schematic structure potential we have just identified by citing examples, drawn from texts other than those we will use for detailed examination in our next chapter.

5.3 The principal elements in the writing planning genre explained

We shall proceed by examining each element of structure in turn. We should note as we proceed here that the awareness that a curriculum activity does break into a series of related phases is in itself one well established among other researchers, to some of whom we made reference in chapter 1 (section 1.2). In this connection, Cazden (1986) has offered a very useful review of research into classroom
discourse, in which she grouped a number of researchers who, she said, worked with what might loosely be termed "sociolinguistic" perspectives to investigate the practices of classroom life. Those researchers who have worked with such perspectives in recent years (e.g. Cicourel et al, 1974; Mehan, 1975; Lemke, 1983, 1985; Heath, 1983; Cazden, 1988; Green and Kantor-Smith, 1988), have made a number of observations about the patterned ways classroom experience is put together in language. Their observations often compare with those to be made in this study, and for that reason they are of value to us in providing helpful validation of some of the matters to which we would wish to draw attention. We have, for example already cited Green and Kantor-Martin (above and in chapter 3, section 3.3) in their observations concerning the way in which the manners of operating in a classroom become increasingly tacit over periods of time: theirs are essentially ethnographic studies. In his ethnographic studies in an American junior primary school, Mehan (1979, 74-75), noted the presence of a recursive series of components in the behavioural patterns of classroom activity, and each component worked as part of a hierarchical organisation. A lesson was itself a "social event" (a term originally used by the ethnographer Hymes, discussed in chapter 1, section 1.2) and it was made up of three basic recursive phases which he represented thus:

Lesson----> Opening Phase + Instructional Phase + Closing Phase.

Each phase might in turn be broken down into Topic Related Sets of activities, and Topically Related Sets might in turn be broken down into Basic or Conditional Sequences of activities. The latter activities could again be broken down into what Mehan termed an Instructional Sequence, consisting of the three moves Initiation, Reply and Evaluation: a teacher initiates, a child replies and the teacher evaluates. Recursive rules applied determining the manner of operation of the various components of the lesson, and these rules
might be thought of as functioning like a grammar. The function of an investigation of the kind Mehan undertook, then, was:

*to produce a grammar that accounts for the structure of social events.* (Mehan, 1979, 75)

Cazden (1988) who worked with Mehan in the study he reported in 1979 (she was in fact the classroom teacher whom he closely observed), adopts very similar principles to his in her discussion of classroom discourse, as she seeks to uncover and explain the principles that apply in the ordering of experience in talk in the classroom. Heath (1983) who did a major study of three communities in the Appalachians, looked well beyond the schools into the patterns of living and language use in families and neighbourhood, producing findings that complemented and enriched what she was able to say of life in the classrooms. In particular, she was able to demonstrate how different behavioural patterns, including language patterns, were established early in life, having consequences for the ways in which children handled the patterned processes of dealing with experience in school learning. The scope of her study was thus much broader than that of the classroom.

Lemke (1985), who acknowledges a debt to Heath, with whom he worked in order to learn how to undertake ethnographic studies, made a close study of classroom discourse. He has proposed two notions for understanding the patterning of classroom talk – the activity structure and the thematic system – to which reference has already been made in chapter 3 (section 3.4). The former, as we noted, refers to the routine ways of organising interaction in the classroom, while the latter refers to the "meaning relations" built up in the pattern of talk, and in the course of dealing with the "content" of concern.
By way of summarising the principal kinds of insights given us by researchers in the "sociolinguistic" tradition to which Cazden has referred, we shall cite the summary she provides from Green (1983). The latter did a review of studies funded by the National Institute of Education in 1978, with a view to establishing their general assumptions about the nature of classroom behaviour. Cazden's "shortened list" (1986, 434) of such assumptions reads as follows:

Face-to-face interaction, between teacher and students, is governed by context-specific rules.

Activities have participation structures, with rights and obligations for participation. Contextualisation cues are verbal and nonverbal cues (pitch, stress, and intonation; gesture, facial expression and physical distance) that signal how utterances are to be understood, and inferencing is required for conversational comprehension. Rules for participation are implicit, conveyed and learned through interaction itself.

Meaning is context specific. All instances of a behaviour are not functionally equivalent, and messages can serve multiple functions.

Frames of reference are developed over time and guide individual participation. Frame clashes result from differences in perception developed in past interactional experiences. Overt clashes are observable to participants and researchers, but covert clashes requiring a finer level of analysis can also contribute to negative evaluations of student ability.

Complex communicative demands are placed on both teachers and students by the diversity of classroom structures, and teachers evaluate student ability from observing communicative performance.

One of the real strengths of the studies of the "sociolinguistic" researchers - who all owe much to the traditions of work of Sapir and Hymes referred to in chapter 1 (section 1.2) - is that their observations with respect to language are grounded in a strong sense of the social context or the "social event" in which language is used. It is because of this that their perspectives compare in many ways
with those adopted here. Like them, in fact, we also seek to "account for the structure of social events", to use Mehan's words.

The principal point of difference between this study and that of the various workers in the American sociolinguistic tradition just referred to, however, is the fact that we use the systemic functional grammar and the associated model of genre and register which we introduced in chapter 1 (sections 1.3 and 1.4 in particular). We would claim three particular advantages because of the use of the grammar. Firstly, unlike Mehan and Cazden, for example, we do not approach the study of language in the classroom in terms of uncovering the "rules" which determine its order, since the systemic functional grammar is not a rule-driven one at all. On the contrary, the grammar we use here proposes that language is a resource for making meaning, and that we can uncover the ways in which the linguistic system is employed to realise the meanings relevant to a given context of situation. In other words, it is a grammar which permits an analysis of much greater delicacy than the notion of "rules" implies.

Secondly, because of the greater delicacy in analysis, we would claim that we are able to say considerably more with respect to the overall structure of our "social events" or curriculum genres than are any of the classroom ethnographers we have identified. Mehan, Cazden and Lemke, for example, each propose an essentially similar approach to the overall structure of all lessons. Thus, Mehan and Cazden both propose the model of the lesson as outlined above, with its three phases: all lessons can be shown to be similarly hierarchically organised. Lemke, on the other hand, proposes an approach in terms of the operation of his activity structures and thematic systems: all lessons can be shown to have both activity structures and thematic systems. However, we seek to go to another level of delicacy in our analysis. We propose not only that all curriculum genres have a beginning/middle/end sequence, (with which all the
researchers mentioned would certainly agree) but that the character of the elements of these sequences differs quite considerably, depending upon the particular curriculum activity involved. One of our important purposes is to identify the differences. Hence, we have already demonstrated the pattern of the morning news genre in chapter 3, and we now seek to demonstrate the pattern of the writing planning genre in terms which will certainly acknowledge the similarities with the other genre, but which will also uncover the significant differences between the social processes involved. The various elements of the schematic structure potential of the two genres will thus be labelled differently, with the exception of the Control element.

This brings us to the third advantage we would claim arises from the kind of analysis we are proposing. It is the benefit gained by borrowing Halliday's characterisation of the three modes of meaning in grammar as particulate or constituent, prosodic and wave-length. These, it will be recalled, we use metaphorically to characterise the operation of the elements of schematic structure. In doing so, we believe we are able to illuminate the ways in which the various elements operate to create the social process involved in a curriculum genre. Thus, as we noted in chapter 3 (section 3.3) and alluded to immediately above, all the elements with the exception of the Control element are particulate or constitutive. That is to say, they "make up" or constitute the overall set of steps in the genre. In addition, as we have already noted, a Control element operates, though the manner of its operation is prosodic, representing the teacher's periodic expressions of her judgments about what is going on. Finally, there is an overall sequence, marking a movement through from the opening to the closing element of the genre. In fact, this creates a kind of rhythmical patterning or "wave-length" effect.
Overall, all three senses contribute significantly to our awareness of the manner in which the social processes are constructed, on the one hand in the morning new genre, and on the other hand, in the writing planning genre.

One other study worthy of comment because of the fact that its theoretical orientations are close to those taken here, is that of Gerot (1988; in preparation), who, in investigating classroom discourse in an Australian secondary school, has proposed the presence of a "generic structure potential" (GSP), following Hasan (in Halliday and Hasan, 1980), whose elements at the most general level involve:

\[ \text{Convene } \bigwedge \text{Exposure } \bigwedge \text{Closure}. \]

Gerot goes on to offer a more delicate description of these elements, by breaking each into finer component parts. The nature of the curriculum activity she examines is in fact very different from those examined in this study, and because of that her description of the GSP is different from our description of the schematic structure. Her general approach, however, compares in many ways with that adopted in this study.

We will now turn firstly to consideration of the element we have termed the TO.

5.3.1 THE TASK ORIENTATION

Most teachers regard the initiating phase of a lesson as important because it is here that the teacher points the children's behaviour into appropriate channels, with a view to defining a learning task in which they will engage. In order to do this, the teacher frequently needs to assert her authority over the children in some way, and to do this, as we mentioned earlier, she often causes them to move about, or to change aspects of their physical disposition in relation to
herself. Initiation of a new curriculum genre, like its closure, is in fact normally accompanied by some quite significant change, or at least adjustment, in the general physical disposition of the participants, a matter also reported by Mehan (1979, 77), and alluded to in chapter 3, section 3.2).

Thus, in this study, as already noted, if the children were not hitherto seated on the floor in front of the teacher, preparatory to the initiation of the writing planning genre, she directed them to do so. But when, as was very often case, the children had been sitting there for their morning news activity, the teacher frequently took steps necessitating some physical change or movement as part of signalling that a new curriculum activity was to begin. Variation in the physical activity in this manner helps signal the intention to commence a new teaching/learning phase. However, since the expectation is that the children will take up the appropriately attentive, still and silent position required for the new activity, such variation also offers a licensed opportunity to relax the body for a moment before returning to a position which requires some real self discipline to maintain. When the researcher was in training as a teacher, it was a widely held belief that children have a "limited concentration span", and that they needed constant variety in learning activity in order to hold their attention. While the term "concentration span" may not feature today in the advice offered to teachers in training, the general principles for teaching that such a concept implied clearly still do apply. Children are deemed unable to stay attentive for long, and teachers are always encouraged to allow for plenty of planned variation in activity in order to hold their attention.

Once the teacher and children are physically disposed in the manner the teacher desires, the TO commences, and teachers will typically put a degree of effort into initiating and developing this element, the significance of which always merits some attention in the principles
taught teachers in training. In fact, theorists on the study of classroom management from the nineteenth century on, when the practice of training teachers in institutions first commenced, right down to present day institutions like that in which the researcher is employed, all have variously recognised the importance of the first step in a lesson. When the researcher was herself training in 1960, the practice was to adopt the notion of a "motivating" first step, drawn from the perspectives of educational psychology. As Connell has noted (1980, 12-13), educational psychology, which dates as a body of enquiry from the early years of this century, has stimulated concerns for the notions of motivation, interest and sense of satisfaction and achievement, all of them desirable qualities to foster in children, and all of them held to be necessary if learning is to be effected.

Studies of what was once called "classroom management", and more recently tends to be called "classroom processes", while concerned with all phases of a lesson, nonetheless do tend to stress the significance of the opening element for its importance: in establishing acceptable standards of behaviour for learning; in capturing the attention and interest of the learners; and in causing them to concentrate upon matters relevant to the task in hand, to the exclusion, ideally, of all others. In the language of researchers into the "micro skills" of teaching - a term reflecting their essentially behaviourist position - Allen and Ryan (1969) proposed that the first element of the lesson be termed a "set induction": a term by which they meant:

> more than a brief introduction, (for its purpose was) to clarify the goals of instruction, using student's present knowledge and skills to involve them in the lesson. (Allen & Ryan, 1969,19)

Whether the interest of the teacher is defined in terms of "motivating" young learners, or whether in terms of "inducing a mental set", the objects are essentially the same: to capture the
children's attention and interest, and to point their thinking into desired directions.

It is because of the particular importance of the TO in so establishing directions that the teacher's role and authority are always quite marked in this element of the schematic structure, one clear measure of this being the fact that in the opening part of the TO, the teacher always speaks in monologue, explaining in broad terms what is to be done, while there is a strong expectation that the children will listen attentively. The pedagogical register is in fact very much to the fore. Some sense of the "content" field will also normally be established in this monologic opening to the TO. As we shall see in subsequent chapters, the movement from the initial part of the TO is normally signalled by the teacher when she asks a question, turning from monologue to dialogue, and serving to involve the children in developing an understanding of aspects of the "content" field.

Examples 1 and 2 are drawn from lessons taught by two different teachers. Example 1 is from a lesson taught in Year 1 by Mrs. B, while Example 2 is drawn from a lesson by Mrs. P, taught when the children were in Year 2. Both illustrate how the TO is initiated in monologue, while the children are subsequently drawn into dialogue, and their engagement with the "content" field actually commences. It will be noted in Example 1, that Mrs B uses one of the devices alluded to above to give the children a momentary change of physical activity before their attention is then turned to the activity for this curriculum genre.
Example 1

(The children are seated on the floor in front of the teacher who sits on a chair.)
T: All right. Hands behind backs. Hands on heads. I want you to have a little think about our chickens. Now today we've got the new incubator in our room. And Mrs. L's incubator is very full and has too many eggs and we're going to bring some of those eggs down to this incubator and hope that they'll hatch out in ours. Well, we'll be very lucky. If we left them in the other one, there just mightn't be enough moisture for them. This has a special tray under ours full of water just ready for our
Children: Chickens
T: Chickens (overlapping)
(There is a brief interruption at this point caused by another teacher who enters and has a brief talk with Mrs. B, not reported)
T: Right now Mark don't (a reproof for restlessness). Now today we're going to, for our writing think about chickens and how they started. Put up your hand if you know how they start. Yes Vanessa?

Example 2

(The children are seated on the floor in front of the teacher who sits on a chair)
T: All right, well what we're going to do today, we're going to have a look at our recipe from yesterday, Simon (addressed to attract his attention), and we're going to make from our recipe a shopping list. Now the things that we have to buy for our spaghetti bolognaise are the things that we put on our shopping list. We don't have to think of anything new, because they're all written there (She points to the board). The only thing we have to think about is where we would buy them. We didn't find them all in the one shop, When Mrs. S and I went shopping to buy all those things, we didn't just go to one shop and buy them all. We went to different shops. The different things we put into the spaghetti bolognaise sauce, you get in different places. Put up your hand if you can tell me one of the shops we might have gone to, to get something there. (Here she gestures to the recipe written on the board). Have a look. We had to buy meat, we had to buy soup, tomato paste, carrots, onions, spaghetti, and all these herbs and spices and spices. Now, one of these shops would have been what, Joseph?
In both Example 1 and 2, it will be clear that the teacher defines and points some directions. In Example 1, having told the children to engage in some physical activity preparatory to the "thinking" she intends of them, she subsequently tells them what they are to do. In Example 2, the teacher advises the children that they are going to look at their recipe and "make a shopping list." In both cases the lesson is initiated in monologue, and there is a subsequent movement to a point at which the teacher seeks to involve the children in engagement with the "content" field, when she invites them to interact with her in dialogue. In Example 1 Mrs B says "Put up your hand if you know how they start. Yes, Vanessa?" In Example 2 Mrs. P says "Put up your hand if you can tell me one of the shops we might have gone to, to get something there", and a little later she says, "Now one of these shops would have been what, Joseph?"

Subsequent participation in the TO will normally be dialogic, as the children's engagement with the "content" field is developed somewhat. In fact, as it proceeds, it is the "content" register alone which is in operation. Since our object in this chapter is simply to draw attention to the principal features and functions of the various elements of the schematic structure, we will not proceed with examining more of the discourse of these examples of the TO. Instead, we will proceed to the consideration of the middle element(s) of the schematic structure, noting that in Appendix 1, the interested reader will find the complete transcripts of the texts from which Examples 1 and 2 are drawn.

5.3.2 THE MIDDLE ELEMENTS OF THE SCHEMATIC STRUCTURE POTENTIAL: THE TASK SPECIFICATION

As earlier noted, the major element in the middle of the schematic structure is the Task Specification or TS - that element in fact in which the writing task the children are to undertake is stated. A Task Reorientation (TRO) or a Task Respecification (TRS) will be
found sometimes, though the latter is more common than the Task Reorientation. The TS is an essential element if the pedagogical goals of the lesson are to be achieved, while the TRO or the TRS will be perceived by the teacher as a useful, but not essential, additional step. In the two examples we have been considering, Example 1, taught by Mrs B, involves no TRS, while Example 2 taught by Mrs. P, does have a TRS. We will consider the TS in Examples 1 and 2 first, and then we will examine the TRS in Example 2.

It will be in the TS that the pedagogical and "content" registers are brought together, though the pedagogical register will be to the fore at the point at which the element is initiated. Thus, the element will be introduced through teacher monologue, and the teacher will frequently start it by making reference to some desired aspect of the children's behaviour, either physical or mental, or sometimes both. Sometimes for example, she may remind them of the need to "sit still", but sometimes she may tell them she wants them to "think hard", or in some other way, concentrate on what has to be done. Mrs B, the teacher in Example 1, tells the children they are to "wriggle up" - a reference to the fact that they are to fill up spaces just vacated by other children who have left the room to join another teacher, and she tells them she wants them to "sit and listen". In her case, the monologic explanation of the task lasts rather longer than that of Mrs P, who, after a short opening monologue, seeks to involve the children in dialogue in building the nature of their writing task. She nonetheless makes clear that she is directing the development of a task, through the frequency with which she uses the expression "I want"
**Example 1**

T: Right, all wriggle up very very close. All right, all sit down quietly my people. (Some other children have just left the room to join another teacher) Here’s some pictures. Now this is very very important so I want you to sit and listen. Now I’ve got pictures ranging from the very first thing that happens when we want to get chickens to when it hatches out, and I want you to look at those little pictures. If you want to, you can colour them. Cut them out, paste them in your book, but they have to be pasted in a special way. Whatever comes first, first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth. Children chorus: second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth. T: Put them in that way. So if you look would you put that one first? Children: No! T: Would you put that one first? Children: Yes! T: Yes, you would. Then I’ll leave you to work out which are the other ones to put in the right order. I’ll draw a square up on the board so that you’ll know to put them one, two, three, four, five, six. Have a little look and colour, cut, paste and then you can write a little story about your pictures starting with the hen laying the egg. Let’s see how you go. Yes, get your picture there.

**Example 2**

T: All right, now what I want you people now to do, in your blue books, or pink books, whatever you’re in, I want you to make me a shopping list. David: (softly into the microphone): My shopping list. T: Now I don’t want it written like that (she points to the recipe on the board). I want it written out as if you had to go shopping. Now the first shop you’re going to shop at, is the supermarket, so I want you to write on your shopping list ‘Supermarket’, and I want you to pick out all the things from our spaghetti bolognese recipe that you would have to buy at the supermarket, and that’s very easy, because all the things with a number 1 beside them, are the things that we bought at the supermarket. Joel: Do you copy number 1? T: Yes. Then on your shopping list, you first of all write, I need to buy two tins of tomato soup, a jar of tomato paste, three packets of spaghetti. That will leave crushed garlic, oregano leaves, beef cubes, Worcestershire sauce, salt and pepper. Then at the next shop which was the fruit and vegetable shop, I had to buy three carrots, four onions, and some parsley. Then at the next shop which was the butcher shop, I had to
Child: Mrs. B. I've got it.
T.: Have you?

buy?
Several children: Meat.
Minced steak.
Topside.

T: Topside.

In both cases, it will be apparent that the actual genre for writing receives rather summary treatment, though Mrs P, in Example 2 does considerably better in terms of advice to the children in this matter than does Mrs. B in example 1. The latter actually devotes most of the advice she gives to the little series of pictures she distributes, telling the children only that they "can write a little story". In Mrs P's case, she does at least move through the various shops at which the children would go to buy the various food identified, and the sequence provides a sense of a desired order for writing. The principal pedagogical difficulty with her lesson, we would argue, is that the selected task does not really involve a written genre of any consequence at all.

Now that we have examined the TS, we will turn to the TRS in Example 2.

5.3.3 THE MIDDLE ELEMENTS OF THE SCHEMATIC STRUCTURE POTENTIAL: THE TASK RESPECIFICATION

The objective of either a TRO or a TRS will be deliberately to offer the learners some repetition, in the interests of clarifying what has to be done, and as we have earlier noted, the TRS is actually more common than a TRO. The use of repetition as a pedagogical device is in itself a very old strategy. It was for example, often referred to in the manuals for the training of teachers in the nineteenth century, when judicious repetition of matters to be learned was linked to the faculty psychology which prevailed, and to the belief that the object of educational practices was to train mental faculties. In this tradition,
repetition was held to strengthen the memory (Fitch, 1880, 128-29). In the writer's own training, repetition was generally advised, especially in defining a task, because of the need to make the task clear to a class in those days often as large as 45 students!

The notion of repetition as an aspect of "reinforcement" in learning has this century been linked to different traditions of educational psychology. Allen and Ryan, referred to earlier for their interest in "set induction", identified "reinforcement of student participation" (Allen and Ryan, 1969, 15) as a desirable skill in teaching, though in the sense in which they used the term, reinforcement meant giving positive approval to a student's performance, on the grounds that this enhanced learning. In the sense that reinforcement occurs when a task is restated, or perhaps modelled in some way for the benefit of the learner preparatory to undertaking the task, the notion is closest to that applying in reinforcement theories of learning, which were influential in the 1950's - 1960's, and some of which were reviewed by Wallen and Travers (1963, 490-499). Since such theories were most clearly linked to behaviourist theories of human behaviour, it should be noted that in this tradition, the function of reinforcement was to "condition" behaviour towards attainment of the desired learning outcomes.

In this particular study, it would be difficult to establish that the teachers held any particularly behaviourist model of learning. In fact, to the extent that they had an articulated theory of learning, it derived from the "language experience" approaches as they applied in the school, and as we identified them in our last chapter. Such theories, certainly as articulated by writers such as Goddard (1974) referred to in Chapter 4 (section 4.3), in fact reject the behaviourist model of human behaviour and learning. It seems likely that the repetition of an element of the writing planning genre examined in this study is intended to reinforce the children's learning, in that its function is to allow children to repeat and hence commit to memory
the steps they are to take in order to undertake their learning task. As such, the step involved does not in itself imply commitment to any particular theory of educational psychology; rather, we would argue that such a step is sanctioned by very old teaching practice, dating right back to the nineteenth century at least. In fact, it seems to us, given the logic of conventional teaching practices in which children have a very small share in the determination of the tasks they will engage in, and in which they are required to operate under significant physical constraints, with all the attendant discomforts that these involve (such as sitting on the floor close together for quite long periods), that there will normally be a need to reinforce what is to be done before the children start to do it. The effort to remember is in these circumstances quite considerable.

Indeed, we would suggest that the concerns in educational theory with such things as children’s memory, reinforcement of learning tasks, concentration and attentiveness, variation in learning activity and so on, tell us considerably more about the kinds of conditions for learning imposed by teachers and others upon children, than they do about any mental characteristics particular to children. Adults, after all, just as much as children, will grow both restless and inattentive when confined for significantly long periods of time, and obliged to listen to others talk, with relatively little opportunity for initiating talk or any other activity of their own.

As we turn to the instance of the TRS in Example 2, taught by Mrs. P, two matters are worth drawing attention to, as features of her behaviour in initiating a new element, for they are features we have already noted at the start of other elements in the writing planning genre. In the first place the teacher calls for a change in the children’s physical disposition, by asking them to raise hands if they are unsure of what it is they must do, though as we shall argue in a moment, she does not expect a marked physical response, seeking instead to control the children’s attention. In the second place, she
proceeds, through monologue, to repeat much of what has already been covered in the TS element, and as she does so, she gradually allows the children to enter again into dialogue with her. The invitation to the children to raise their hands if unsure what to do is a very common device employed by teachers to alert the children's attention. Rarely do the children respond to such an invitation, and they do not do so in this instance. Even where the children are unsure, they are normally reluctant to acknowledge it in such a public manner, for fear of earning a reproof from the teacher on the grounds of inattention. In this case, the teacher plainly did not expect the children to raise their hands, for she proceeded to go on talking, not really pausing for any response from the children at all. The TRS element shown here from Mrs. P's lesson, by the way, follows on immediately from the TS examined above.

Example 2

T: All right, hands up if you don't think you know what to do. (no-one raises a hand) Now when your mum goes shopping, she probably doesn't have to write down all the shops that she buys things in. She probably knows where she's headed, she needs to go to the butcher, she needs to go to the deli, and she needs to go to the fruit shop, and she needs to go to the supermarket or the dry cleaners, or wherever else she needs to go.

David: The milk bar?

T: What was that, David?

David: The milk bar.

T: The milk bar, if she needs to go there.

A child: You could get the meat at the supermarket at C...... Village.

T: You could, but we bought it at the butcher shop.

Suzy: You could go to the donut shop.

Jodie: We go to the butcher near the donut shop.
T: The butcher on the corner? We went to the other butcher around near V........, around near the deli.
All right, these people can start.....
A child: Can you write the number 1?
T: Can you write down what?
Child: The number 1.
T: You can write 'number 1, supermarket', and then all the things that you need...( There is a short interruption when another teacher enters the room and removes about four children for another lesson) Right, so number 1 is the supermarket, and all the things that we got there. Stacey: Number 2, the fruit and vegetable shop.
T: Number 2, the fruit and vegetable shop and the things we bought there, and number 3 is the butcher. So that if you went to your mum and said I need to do the shopping, I have to go to the supermarket, I have to go to the fruit shop, and I have to go to the butcher, she'd know exactly what to buy in each one.
David: What if the shop's a long way away?
T: I beg your pardon?
David: What if the shop's a long way away? ( He smiles, as he plainly intends this as a joke)
T: You'd have to ride a long way. (T. smiles)
Child: Go by car. ( a little laughter greets this)

Given that this element in the lesson is a TRS, in that the details of the shops in which one buys foods are repeated, it is noteworthy that there is considerably more talk of the "content" for writing, than of the actual task of writing. The teacher does at one point refer to writing, when she says that "your mum" does not need to write down all the shops where she buys different foods, and elsewhere a child asks if he may write the number 1, and the teacher assents. For the most part, however, it is the "content" register which prevails, with some talk of different shops in local shopping districts, as well as
some passing references to the means of travelling to such shops. There is, in other words, little explicit use of linguistic items to do with the writing task, and some considerable use of items to do with the "content" to be written about. Strictly speaking, it is difficult to see what sustained talk one might generate about a shopping list. The point to be made about that, however, is that if the teacher were herself motivated by a better sense of the notion of genres in writing, and of the kinds of challenges to young children in handling these, she would in fact not have chosen the shopping list at all, selecting instead some more demanding activity, leading to the production of a proper genre. The recipe is an obvious and better choice, but it is notable here that the teacher had actually written this herself on the board a day or two earlier, thus depriving the children of the opportunity to construct it themselves.

Finally, let us turn to the T element in the writing planning genre.

5.3.4 THE TASK ELEMENT IN THE SCHEMATIC STRUCTURE POTENTIAL

The T is the shortest element in the writing planning genre. It is always monologic and spoken by the teacher, and the pedagogical register is involved, often, though not always to the exclusion of the "content" register. The primary reason that this element is so short, of course, is that it involves language for the operationalising of activity. With this element, the children are required to move; they must get up from the floor and return to the chairs and desks, where they must start to write. While the teacher often explicitly directs the children to move back to the seats, so well established is this step in the proceedings that the teacher quite often does not explicitly ask the children to move, expecting their movement to take place as a matter of course. The requirement to make such a move is in fact so generally understood that it constitutes one of the principles for operating in the classroom which remain tacit, rather
than explicitly alluded to. Sometimes as well in this element, the teacher writes the task on the board, in which case she normally advises the children that she will do so. For example, she may write up the title about which the children are to write, or she may, as Mrs B does in Example 1, put a diagram or picture on the board to guide activity. The two instances of T in Examples 1 and 2 follow directly upon the elements we have considered in both texts.

**Example 1**

T: I'll draw up the pattern on the board. David, you can go and work in the reading corner. (David was at this time sitting next to Robert, and he has complained he doesn't like that for writing because he says Robert copies from him. At this point, all the children get up and go to their seats).

**Example 2**

T: All right, stand up the girls, mind the chords on the floor, just look where your feet are going. Recorder: Step over, and I'll get it out of the way now.

T: Now the boys. Get your books from your lockers, and you can all start to write your shopping lists. (The children move back to their seats as directed, girls first, then boys)

The pattern Mrs. B draws on the board, it should be clear, is that of the series of pictures the children have received to cut out and paste into their books in an appropriate order. No other information relevant to the writing task is put on the board. Mrs B's request to David to sit in a place different from that he normally occupies is taken as a general signal to the children to move back to their places, so that no more explicit direction to them is required here. In Example 2, Mrs P does explicitly direct the movement of the children, girls first, followed by boys, and she also advises the children to obtain their writing materials and to "write your shopping lists". The task is thus explicitly stated in her discourse.
Some general sense of the schematic structure potential of the writing planning genre having now been established, we will turn to more direct examination of register in the genre.

5.4 Register in the writing planning genre

Since the pedagogical register is involved in operationalising the teaching/learning activity, it is most marked at the start of the opening element of the genre, at the beginning(s) and the end(s) of the "middle" element(s), and in the final element. The pedagogical register has two related aspects - the concern of the teacher to direct the overall behaviour of the children, and the concern to develop literacy behaviour in particular. Language for the control of the children's behaviour will be relatively brief, compared with that to do with the language of the "content". That is because the language in the former sense accompanies, or is part of, action, while the language in the latter sense is much more that of reflection upon experience and action, or sometimes of commentary upon experience. One unfortunate feature of the operation of the pedagogical register is that even at those points at which the writing task is being defined, the language used is both brief and very general in character. We would argue that if the teacher had a more conscious sense of the kinds of linguistic choices to be made in undertaking writing activities, she would make these an explicit feature of the discourse as part of the engagement in the pedagogical register. It is in this sense that the language of the writing planning genre is often critically weak.

For related reasons, the "content" register is often weak as well. Thus, if the interest in the "content" field were better motivated by an appropriate sense of the relationship of language and "content", then the manner of treating the "content" field would be better directed and focussed. As it is, it too often offers little systematic introduction to a field, of the kind that would induct the children
into the ways of working with experience and building knowledge characteristic of a given curriculum "subject" or field.

We will firstly consider field in the writing planning genre, as that is summarised in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Field in the writing planning genre

1. The pedagogical field: development by children of ability to write, where that involves:
i) maintenance of habits of obedience in children and respect for the teacher's authority;
ii) maintenance of approved attitudes towards politeness and good manners;
iii) maintenance of a view of young learners as learning through personal experience;
iv) fostering of children's ability to construct a short written text that relates to a "content" field selected by the teacher.

2. The "content" field: a topic which is:

a) selected by the teacher because of its relevance to a given curriculum theme, where this might involve:
i) the curriculum theme of "Hatching Out", and a topic of "chickens hatching", or,
ii) the curriculum theme of "Food", and a topic of "My Lunch", or
iii) the curriculum theme of "Clothing", and a topic of "Uniforms", or
iv) the curriculum theme of "Circuses", and a topic of "Clowns", or
v) the curriculum theme of "Leisure and Recreation", and a topic of "Party Games", etc.,
and

b) normally developed by the use of some teaching aids(s), and/or class visits, where these might involve:
i) looking at fertilised eggs in an incubator, or handling live chickens;
ii) making sandwiches in the classroom;
iii) examining and/or discussing the uniforms worn by different occupational groups;
iv) visiting a circus;
v) playing party games in the classroom;
vi) reading books or viewing charts or pictures, etc.

The first order or pedagogical field is primarily concerned with directing the children's behaviour, with a view to their doing some writing, and this is itself to be effected through adoption of acceptable patterns of behaviour on the part of the children: the maintenance of these is therefore also an aspect of the pedagogical field. The second order or "content" field is primarily concerned with the "content" about which the children are intended to write. The latter is projected through the former in the sense that entry to the second order field is achieved through the operation of the pedagogical field.

When in chapter 3 (section 3.4) we introduced the idea that the first order or pedagogical register projects the second order or "content" register, we observed that one important effect of this process is that a principle of relocation applies. Where a clause is projected, we saw that Halliday argues that that clause is "a category of the language, not of the real world:" it is to that extent "removed" from the "real world" of experience and event. This we suggested is a useful principle to invoke with respect to the second order register: that is to say, the fields associated with many contexts "outside school" as it were, are taken and in some sense relocated for the purposes of teaching and
learning "inside school." The manner of the relocation is quite fundamentally determined by the operation of the first order register. All this has significance for field.

As we saw in chapter 3, the first order field in the morning news genre operates in such a way that it constrains the kinds of choices that may be made of fields in the second order or "content" sense. This is in fact evidence for the view that the one projects and indeed relocates the other. A similar principle applies in the writing planning genre, though whereas in the morning news genre the choices of "content" field are made by the children, in the writing planning genre, they are made by the teacher.

Thus, as Table 5.1 is intended to suggest, the pedagogical field sets up certain ways of working, in themselves carrying important values and assumptions with respect both to how the participants should relate to each other, how they should learn, and what it is they are to accomplish. Since the ideology of early childhood in operation sees young learners as learning through personal experience, a particular view of the integrated curriculum as we discussed it in chapter 4 applies (section 4.3), having consequences for the choices made of second order or "content" fields. Curriculum themes, and more particularly topics within those themes are selected less because of any principled or overt commitment to teaching the ways of dealing with experience characteristic of a given field or fields, and rather more because of the commitment to generating "language learning processes" or "experiences, " where the latter are conceived in very general terms.

In fact, the integrated curriculum as it operates here employs weak principles of classification of knowledge, and weak principles of framing of teaching/learning activity, to use Bernstein's notions as explained in chapter 1( section 1.2) and also used in chapter 4 (sections 4.1 and 4.3). The pedagogy that is practised is largely
invisible in his terms. It is notable that in discussing some of the assumptions associated with certain contemporary formulations of early childhood education which do produce an invisible pedagogy, Bernstein (1975, 116) draws attention among other things to the following characteristics, which we suggest applied at Normanbury school:

there is a reduced emphasis upon the transmission and acquisition of specific skills.

the criteria for evaluating the pedagogy are multiple and diffuse and so not easily measured.

The pedagogical field in the classrooms studied here, we suggest, operates in such a way that although the development of capacity to write is a goal, what constitutes success in writing, either in terms of how that is recognised, taught, or evaluated, remains unclear. This is because of the overall pedagogical commitment to the setting up of some kind of general "language learning experience", calculated primarily to develop capacity to re-arrange that experience in some way, for the purposes of writing. Such a pedagogical commitment, we suggest, does not predispose the teacher to help young students learn how to classify experience in new ways. Indeed, as we sought to argue in chapter 4, this commitment actually leaves teachers deskilled, often unable to see how the different fields of enquiry are realised in language, and hence themselves disadvantaged in attempting to teach their students.

In fact, as we shall see later in one of the three instances of the writing planning genre we shall examine, the teacher did take the children part of the way into learning about a new field of enquiry, and she offered an interesting contrast to what happened in the other two instances. She was handicapped, however, as we shall see, by her uncertainty about the implications for writing of what she had done. In other words, her commitment to the "language experience" based view of the integrated curriculum compromised her capacity to
go further with the children than she did, in terms of developing their ability to "mean" in new ways in language.

Before concluding this discussion of field in the writing planning genre, we should comment on the significance of the use of teaching aids, reference to which is also made in Table 5.1. Development of some sense of the "content" field will normally involve use either of some resource(s) or teaching aid(s) introduced into the lesson, or sometimes of a visit outside the school, perhaps to a zoo, a factory or a shop. The practice of training teachers for early childhood education attaches great importance to the introduction of appropriate teaching aids, and as part of their lesson planning, teachers in training are normally required to show evidence of the aids they have prepared, and of the manner in which they propose to use them. The use of such resources or aids is explained in at least two senses. Firstly, an aid is intended to provide some "concrete" or specific item(s) which provide information about the "content" field, or perhaps some illustration of an aspect of that field, around which language experience may be built. Secondly, the aid is intended to arouse the children's interest, having what is often termed a "motivational" value.

Commonly, aids will include such things as pictures, photographs, charts, actual objects to handle such as an item of clothing, a kitten, a chicken, cooking implements and so on, written material prepared in advance and displayed on the blackboard, textbooks or story books, hand outs of materials for distribution to the children, such as pictures to be coloured in or sentences to be completed, and video and/or television programs.

Teaching aids are a very useful feature of effective teaching and learning, though as Gray (1982a) has pointed out, they need to be selected with care to the possibilities for learning that they actually provide. Exponents of "language experience" approaches (e.g. Harste
& Short, 1988) frequently make much of the possibilities of "authentic" self-expression as provided through the use of appropriate "learning experiences," where these can include uses of aids of various kinds. The concern for the "authentic" both in the use of aids and in the development of "learning experiences" often becomes confused, however, especially in the absence of any sense of the ways of classifying experience which school subjects and/or disciplines offer. Where this occurs, it is another manifestation of the romantic conception of the child building "personally significant" experience, and referred to in chapter 4 (section 4.2). Richards (1978, 16-35), Gray (1982a) Kalantzis and Cope (1987), Cope and Kalantzis (in press) for example (all referred to either in section 4.2 or 4.3) have drawn attention to the need for teachers to see themselves as teaching students to learn the relevant specialist language in coming to terms with new learning in schools. In the example of Grey's work at Traeger Park school in Alice Springs, his reasons for selecting the aids, community visits, photographic materials and so on he used in working with the Aboriginal children in the school, were always carefully thought out. They were chosen because they permitted the learning of registers appropriate to significant fields of experience, of a kind which it was necessary for the children to learn in creating appropriate genres for school learning.

Tenor values, it will be recalled, as discussed already in chapter 3, may be considered in three senses: in terms of power, affect and contact. As these apply in the writing planning genre they are displayed in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2 Tenor in the writing planning genre

1. The pedagogical tenor:

   and

2. The "content" tenor:

   Teacher vs students

   **POWER:**

   hierarchic

   result of institutionalised relationship of
teacher to students

   **AFFECT:**

   frequently positive

   result of the normally cordial relationships in
the infants' school,

   but

   sometimes negative

   result of the teacher's requirements to control
and discipline children's behaviour.

   **CONTACT:**

   frequent

   result of the daily interaction of the teacher and
children.

Tenor values with respect to both power and contact remain the
same in both the pedagogical and "content" fields. As was also true in
the morning news genre, the one dimension of tenor in which there
may be variation is affect. That is because there may well be points at
which the teacher offers an explicit reminder of the otherwise tacit
principles by which the writing planning genre proceeds. At these
points, a Control element appears in the schematic structure, of a
kind that we have already discussed above.

On these occasions, when the teacher moves to exert her authority,
and to demand a return to the acceptable principles for working
from which there has been some slippage, her manner -otherwise
normally quite cordial - will change, and she will address the
children in a quite forceful manner, suggestive of her displeasure.
important teacher shift when the second order register is involved.

The role of the teacher in the writing planning genre is that of an auxiliary role, with the teacher providing guidance and support to help children develop their ideas. The teacher's role is to help children organize their thoughts and ideas, and to provide feedback and support to help them improve their writing skills.

Children, on the other hand, are expected to take an active role in the writing planning genre. They are responsible for generating their own ideas and for organizing them in a logical and coherent manner. The teacher's role is to support and facilitate this process, rather than to dictate the content or structure of the children's writing.

The effective use of the writing planning genre requires that the teacher and children work together as a team. The teacher provides guidance and support, while the children take an active role in generating and organizing their ideas. This collaboration allows children to develop their writing skills, while also ensuring that the teacher's role is effective in helping children to succeed in their writing tasks.

In conclusion, the writing planning genre is an important tool for helping children to develop their writing skills. By working together as a team, teachers and children can effectively use this genre to support the writing process and help children to achieve their goals.
general ever enjoy a position of comparable authority in other early childhood curriculum genres such as the writing planning genre.

Tenor variables, it should be noted, are reinforced by the terms of the general physical disposition of the teacher and children in the writing planning genre, as we have already described them above, and as we earlier described them in chapter 3 on the morning news genre. The teacher looks down upon the children grouped on the floor at her feet.

Mode in the writing planning genre is set out in Table 5.3. Mode is to be considered in terms of two dimensions, space and time, already explained in chapter 3.
Table 5.3 Mode in the writing planning genre

1 Mode in the pedagogical field

SPACE: face-to-face          primarily monologic
TIME: language-as-action     direction & maintenance of activity

2 Mode in the "content" field

either:

SPACE: face-to-face          primarily dialogic
TIME: language-as-reflection reconstruction of experience

or

SPACE: face-to-face          primarily dialogic
TIME: language-as-commentary creation of description

With respect to space, language in both the first and second order fields is face-to-face. In the former field, because the language used is primarily to do with directing activity, it is normally monologic, and produced by the teacher as she directs and guides the children in various ways. In the latter field, the latter used is primarily dialogic, and to do with engaging the children in talk about matters relevant to the "content" about which they are to write.
With respect to time, the language of the first order field is that of action, and to do with maintenance and forwarding of activity. With respect to time in the case of the second order field, the language used is often that of reflection upon experience, involving reconstruction of events, as for example when some children recreated what had happened when they left their school lunches at home by mistake. Sometimes the language will be that of commentary and building description, as for example when the teacher and children examined and talked about several uniforms of different occupational groups which had been introduced into the classroom.

These observations bring to a close our discussion of register in the morning news genre. It remains only to summarise what we have sought to argue in this chapter before proceeding to chapter 6, where we will commence examination of our instances of the writing planning genre.

5.4 Summary

In this chapter we have sought to examine schematic structure potential and register in the writing planning genre. We have argued that:

1) the writing planning genre
   has an overall
   beginning/middle/end
   structure, like any other
   curriculum genre;

2) that the most basic elements
   of the genre are the Task
   Orientation, the Task
   Specification, and the Task, and
that the greatest variation
occurs in the "middle", where
other optional elements may
occur;

3) that in that this study
proposes we recognise an
overall structure in a teaching
event, it compares with other
ethnographic studies, especially
in the American tradition,
which have sought to uncover
the principles by which such
social events are constructed;

4) that we claim particular
strengths in the approach
adopted here, however, by
virtue of a) the systemic
functional grammar used, and b)
the particular model adopted of
the operation of the elements of
structure as particulate,
prosodic and "wave-length" in
chacter;

5) that the writing planning
genre is realised in the
operation of two registers, the
pedagogical register and the
"content" register, as was true
of the morning news genre.
Unlike the latter genre,
however, the two registers
converge at points in the genre where there is talk about a) the task of writing, and b) the "content" for writing;

6) that the pedagogical register projects the "content" register, in such a way that some "content" is taken from another context and relocated for the purposes of teaching and learning;

7) that because an ideology of "language experience" learning applies in the model of the integrated curriculum adopted in the pedagogical field, the "content" field is selected not in terms of any overt principles to do with the organisation of a field of enquiry, but rather in terms of a rather vague commitment to generating "language learning processes".

8) that in the latter set of circumstances an invisible pedagogy applies in Bernstein's terms, so that what represents success in learning to write, and how that might be evaluated, remain unclear.