

**DELVING INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC
LANGUAGE BY FOUNDATION PHASE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
LEARNERS**

HEILA JORDAAN

7506037

DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY

SCHOOL OF HUMAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY, IN THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES, UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND**

AUGUST 2011

ABSTRACT

Language competence is both the means and the end to educational achievement, and multilingualism in particular, has important cognitive, academic and societal advantages. The linguistic diversity in South Africa creates an ideal context to provide young children with educational opportunities that promote high levels of linguistic proficiency in their home and additional languages. Unfortunately, the education system has not delivered on the constitutional imperatives of promoting multilingualism and English continues to dominate as the preferred language of teaching and learning, at the expense and marginalisation of the African languages. This is regarded by many researchers as the primary reason for the disturbingly low achievement levels in numeracy and literacy by the majority of South African schoolchildren. However, the effects of language-in-education practices are not straightforward. There are a number of factors impacting on these practices. Of particular concern are the following: limited awareness of the psycholinguistic processes underlying academic language development leading to inadequate language-in-education practices irrespective of the medium of instruction; poor utilisation of appropriate language practitioners in the education system; inadequate support for the development and use of the African languages; and significant inequality in different contexts of education.

In addition, significant individual variation in the rate and process of additional language learning has been widely reported in the literature, but there has been little research on the cognitive processes contributing to the aptitude for language learning in children. One of the cognitive processes receiving increased attention is working memory.

Against this background, the aim of the present study was to describe the development of the psycholinguistic processes underlying the acquisition of academic language by English language learners in the critical first three grades of formal schooling. In a descriptive, longitudinal design, 134 children were assessed at the end of each academic year on the Developmental Evaluation of Language Variation-Criterion Referenced Edition (Seymour, Roeper and de Villiers, 2003). The selection of this measure was based on its strong theoretical foundations in psycholinguistics and its ability to tap the academic language skills required in the early stages of education. The study was conducted in two educational contexts where English serves as the medium of instruction from the first grade. In the first context (EAL only), all the children were learning in English as an additional language and were taught by teachers who were also English additional language speakers. In the second context (integrated), English additional language learners and English first language learners were taught by English-speaking teachers in integrated classes. The two groups of English additional language (EAL) learners were compared in order to assess the effects of certain anticipated contextual advantages and disadvantages on the acquisition of academic language. The two groups of EAL learners were also compared to English first language (L1) learners in the integrated context, who provided a comparative group of South African children in a similar education system. In order to determine the relationship between oral and literate measures of academic language, the reading accuracy and comprehension skills of the children were assessed in grades 2 and 3 and correlated to their language processing abilities.

The children's performance on the Automated Working Memory Assessment (AWMA) (Alloway, 2007) was correlated to their language and reading skills for two reasons. The first was to establish whether any aspects of working memory contributed to the aptitude for instructed additional language learning and the second was to assess the value of working memory measures in the assessment of EAL learners.

The longitudinal design of the study also allowed for the identification of seven children who consistently performed significantly below their peer groups on the language measures and may be

presenting with specific language impairment. Their performance on the language, reading and working memory measures was analysed in detail to describe the manifestations of language impairment in English as an additional language and to assess the extent to which children with language impairment have the capacity to learn in an additional language.

The results of the study showed significant development in all the language processes underlying academic language by all three groups of children over the three year period. On the measures assessing language skills addressed in the classroom (e.g. narratives and question answering), the three groups performed similarly by the end of grade 3. These findings were most encouraging and provided evidence for successful language learning in both instructional contexts. However, there were differences between the groups, and the L1 and EAL children in the integrated context performed significantly better than the EAL children in the first context (EAL only) on most measures by the end of grade 3. The latter group made no progress on reading comprehension from grades 2 to 3, which suggests that the protracted period of oral language development may have a negative impact on literacy acquisition. There were also some measures on which the L1 children performed significantly better than their EAL peers in the integrated context, suggesting that the EAL children in this context require support to develop these skills. The oral and literate measures of language proficiency were significantly correlated, confirming the important relationship between oral language skills and reading comprehension. The results have implications for teaching practices with EAL learners and raise questions concerning English as the medium of instruction, particularly when L1 peer and adult models are not available.

The results on the working memory measure were inconclusive, showing complex relationships between the level of language proficiency, the language skill assessed and specific working memory components. With the exception of the episodic buffer zone component of working memory capacity, assessed on a sentence repetition task, there was no evidence for any other component of working memory contributing to language learning aptitude. The working memory measure was not unbiased in assessing EAL learners since there were significant differences between the three groups on all the subtests of the AWMA, leading to the conclusion that working memory tests may be tapping nothing more than language processing. The sentence repetition test, which assesses the integration of short-term memory and language processing, was found to correlate significantly with most of the language and reading measures, and is therefore a potentially valuable measure in assessing EAL children.

An important finding was that children who may be at risk for language impairment could be identified as a subgroup within the larger group but only if they were compared with their respective peer groups. Within the EAL group in context 1 (EAL only), the identification of language impairment was reliable only in grade 2, and should thus be delayed until response to instruction can be evaluated. The manifestations of language impairment in EAL children were both similar and different to those observed in monolingual language-impaired children. The results also showed that EAL children with language impairment are additionally disadvantaged in relation to their typically developing EAL peers and to monolingual children with language impairment and they demonstrate very slow development in the additional language.

In addition to theoretical implications, the study has significant implications for language-in-education practices in different teaching contexts, the role of the African languages in education and for the management of children with language impairment in a linguistically diverse society. The findings point to the need for collaboration between teachers and language practitioners in the educational arena and the potential contribution of speech-language therapists in mainstream schools is strongly implicated.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own, unaided, independent work. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at this or any other academic institution, nor has it been published in any form.

Heila Jordaan

August 2011

7506037

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my husband, Johan and my children Wikus, Malette, Sybrandt and Nanette for their encouragement, unwavering support and love.

You are the centre of my world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my sincere thanks to and acknowledge:

Professor Claire Penn, my supervisor who provided me with her time, expertise, support and encouragement. I am truly privileged and deeply honoured to have been guided by someone of her stature. She is a truly inspiring mentor and friend.

Professor Peter Fridjhon for his invaluable advice and guidance on the statistical procedures. I truly value his time and expertise.

My son and statistician, Wikus Jordaan for the hours of work he so generously donated to completing the statistical analysis of the data. He has shown that it certainly pays to “grow your own timber!”

My postgraduate research assistants, Meera Rijhumal and Giselle Meirim for so willingly and graciously assisting me with this project in so many different ways.

The principals and teachers of the four schools who participated in this research for their kind co-operation, interest and time.

The children and parents for participating in the study.

The students who assisted with data collection.

This material is based upon work supported financially by the National Research Foundation. Any opinion, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and therefore the NRF does not accept any liability in regard thereto.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DECLARATION	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
LIST OF TABLES	xix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxiii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. REASONS FOR THE POOR ACHIEVEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLCHILDREN	2
1.1.1. Lack of awareness of psycholinguistic processes underlying academic language development	2
1.1.2. Lack of utilization of appropriate language practitioners in the education system	3
1.1.3. Lack of support for development and use of African languages in education	4
1.1.4. Inequality in educational contexts	5
1.2. THE FOCUS ON ENGLISH	9
1.3. EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION PRACTICES	11
1.3.1. Academic Language	11
1.3.2. The development of academic language	12
1.4 THE ROLE OF THE SPEECH–LANGUAGE THERAPIST IN EDUCATION	14

1.5. LANGUAGE LEARNING IN THE FOUNDATION PHASE OF EDUCATION	16
1.6. CHILDREN WITH LANGUAGE IMPAIRMENT	17
1.7. LANGUAGE LEARNING APTITUDE AND WORKING MEMORY	18
1.8. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 1	20
1.9. OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS	21
 CHAPTER 2: LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND IMPAIRMENT IN MULTILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS	 23
2.1. THE NATURE OF LANGUAGE, LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION.	23
2.2 LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN THE EARLY SCHOOL AGE POPULATION	25
2.3 ACADEMIC LANGUAGE	26
2.4 ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE ACQUISITION IN THE EARLY SCHOOL YEARS:	
THEORY AND RESEARCH	31
2.4.1 Implicit and explicit learning	31
2.4.2 Research findings on second language acquisition in the early school years	33
2.4.3 Factors affecting second language acquisition in the early school years	35
a) Age of acquisition	36
b) The role of the L1 in the acquisition of additional languages	37
c) Effects of education in an L2 on L1 development	38
d) Socio-economic status	38
e) The language learning context	40
(i) Educational programmes	40
(ii) Interactions in the classroom	41
(iii) Language experiences outside the classroom	41

f) Individual child factors	42
(i) Working memory	42
Assessment of Working Memory Capacity	45
Working memory and aptitude	46
(ii) Cognitive and Learning style	48
(iii) Language Learning Strategies	48
(iv) Motivation	49
(v) Personality characteristics	49
2.5. READING IN MULTILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS	50
2.6. SPECIFIC LANGUAGE IMPAIRMENT (SLI)	51
2.6.1 Causes of SLI	51
2.6.2 Characteristics of the Language deficits in children with SLI	53
a) Lexical and Semantic Deficits	54
b) Morpho-syntactic Deficits	54
c) Syntactic Deficits	54
e) Pragmatic Deficits	55
e) Reading Comprehension Deficits	55
2.6.3. Identifying EAL children with SLI	56
2.6.4. Can children with SLI learn and learn in an additional language?	58
2.7. SUMMARY AND QUESTIONS	59
CHAPTER 3: THE SOUTH AFRICAN EDUCATION SYSTEM	61
3.1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	63
3.1.1. The pre- colonial era	63

3.1.3. The colonial era	64
3.1.3. Union (1910-1948)	65
3.1.4. Apartheid (1948- 1990)	66
3.1.5. The transitional period (1990 – 1994)	69
3.1.6. 1994- Present	70
3.2. WHAT IS THE CURRENT SITUATION?	72
3.2.1. The crisis in education	72
3.2.2. Limited implementation of policies	74
a) Hegemony of English	75
b) Lack of political will	75
c) Negative attitudes to the African languages	77
3.2.3. Limited Implementation of the Language-in-Education Policy	78
a) Reasons for limited implementation of Language-in-Education policy	79
b) Transitional Education vs. Additive Bilingual education	83
c) Research on children instructed in English as an additional language	86
d) Interpretation of research on language-in-education practices	88
3.2.4. Quality of education and language teaching practices	91
3. 3. SUMMARY AND QUESTIONS ARISING	95
3.4. AIMS AND RATIONALE OF THE STUDY	96
3.4.1. The development of academic language in the foundation phase	96
3.4.2. The relationship between oral language development and reading	98
3.4.3. Comparison between EAL and L1 learners	98
3.4.4. Comparison between educational contexts	99

3.4.5. Comparison between classes in each context	100
3.4.6. Comparison between exposure groups within the EAL groups	100
3.4.7. Gender comparisons	101
3.4.8. Assessment of working memory	101
3.4.9. Identification and description of EAL children with language impairment	102
CHAPTER 4: METHOD	104
4.1. AIMS	104
4.2. DESIGN	104
4.3. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	105
4.4. PARTICIPANTS	106
4.4.1. Criteria for selection	106
4.4.2. Sampling procedure	107
4.4.3. Description of participants	107
4.5. Research Instruments	112
4.5.1. Language profiles of teachers	112
4.5.2. Parent questionnaire	113
4.5.3. Language Assessment Measure: The Diagnostic Evaluation of Language Variation Criterion Referenced Edition (DELV-CR)	113
a) The Syntax Subtest	114
b) The Pragmatics Subtest	114
c) The Semantics subtest	115
d) Scoring on the DELV-CR	116
4.5.4. Reading measure: Gray Oral Reading Test-4 (GORT-4)	116

4.5.5. The Automated Working Memory Assessment (AWMA)	117
a) Verbal Short Term Memory: Digit recall subtest	118
b) Verbal Working Memory: Listening recall and processing listening recall subtest	118
c) Visuo-spatial Short Term Memory: Dot Matrix subtest	118
d) Visuo-spatial Working Memory: Spatial recall and spatial processing recall subtest	118
4.5.6. Sentence Repetition Test	119
4.6. PROCEDURE	121
4.7. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY	122
4.8. DATA ANALYSIS	123
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	126
5.1. SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS	126
5.2. RESULTS: DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC LANGUAGE FROM GRADES 1 -3	127
5.2.1. Overview of total DELV-CR scores obtained by each group over 3 years	127
5.2.2. Statistical comparison between grades over the three year period within each group	128
5.2.3. Development of Syntax over the three grades	129
5.2.4. Development of pragmatics within each group	132
5.2.5. Development of Semantics within each group	135
5.2.6. Profiles of development	138
5.2.7. Developmental trends in EAL context 1 group (EAL only)	140
5.2.8. Developmental trends in L1 and EAL context 2 groups (integrated)	140
5.2.9. Discussion: Development of academic language in the foundation phase	141
5.3. RESULTS: COMPARISON BETWEEN GROUPS	142

5.3.1. Group differences on syntax subtests	144
5.3.2. Group differences on pragmatics subtests	145
5.3.3. Group differences on semantic subtests	146
5.3.4. Summary of comparison between L1 and EAL learners in the integrated context (context 2)	147
5.3.5. Summary of comparison between EAL learners in context 1 (EAL only) and L1 and EAL groups in integrated context (context 2)	148
5.3.6. Discussion: Comparison between groups	149
5.4. RESULTS: COMPARISON BETWEEN LANGUAGE DOMAINS	154
5.4.1. Discussion: Comparison between language domains	155
5.5. RESULTS: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORAL AND LITERATE MEASURES OF ACADEMIC LANGUAGE	156
5.5.1. Development of reading accuracy and comprehension from grades 2 to 3	156
5.5.2. Statistical comparison between grades 2 and 3 reading accuracy and comprehension scores within each group	158
5.5.3. Comparison between groups on reading	159
5.5.4. Correlations between language and reading comprehension scores	161
5.5.5. Correlations between syntax subtest and reading comprehension scores	162
5.5.6. Correlations between pragmatics skills and reading comprehension	163
5.5.7. Correlations between semantic measures and reading comprehension	164
5.6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: CLASS DIFFERENCES WITHIN EACH CONTEXT	165
5.7. RESULTS: EXPOSURE GROUP COMPARISONS	167
5.8. RESULTS: GENDER COMPARISONS	168
5.9. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 5	169

CHAPTER 6: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: WORKING MEMORY AND LANGUAGE IMPAIRMENT

6.1. WORKING MEMORY RESULTS	171
6.2. COMPARISON WITH AWMA SCORING SYSTEM	174
6.3. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WORKING MEMORY MEASURES AND DELV AND READING SCORES	176
6.4. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WORKING MEMORY AND LANGUAGE MEASURES IN L1 GROUP	179
6.5. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WORKING MEMORY AND LANGUAGE MEASURES IN EAL CONTEXT 1 GROUP (EAL ONLY)	180
6.6. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WORKING MEMORY AND LANGUAGE MEASURES IN EAL CONTEXT 2 GROUP (INTEGRATED)	180
6.7. INTERPRETATION OF CORRELATIONS	181
6.8. THE EFFECTS OF CLASS, EXPOSURE GROUP AND GENDER ON WORKING MEMORY	184
6.9. CHILDREN WITH LANGUAGE IMPAIRMENT	185
6.9.1. Identification of children with language impairment	185
6.9.2. Description of the performance of the children identified as language impaired	189
6.9.3. Detailed analysis of DELV-CR results for children identified as language- impaired	190
a) Performance of children identified as language- impaired on the syntax domain	191
b) Performance of children identified as language- impaired on the pragmatics domain	191
c) Performance of children identified as language impaired on the semantics domain	191
6.9.4. Reading performance of children identified as language impaired	191
6.9.5. Working Memory scores of children identified as language-impaired	193
6.10. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 6	195

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS	196
7.1. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS	196
7.2. IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN THE FOUNDATION PHASE	199
7.3. IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE, READING AND WORKING MEMORY ASSESSMENT OF EAL CHILDREN	203
7.4. IMPLICATIONS FOR CHILDREN WITH LANGUAGE IMPAIRMENT	204
7.5. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ROLE OF THE SPEECH –LANGUAGE THERAPIST IN EDUCATION	206
REFERENCES	210
APPENDICES	251

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX 4A: Ethics Clearance Certificate	251
APPENDIX 4B: Gauteng Department of Education Approval	252
APPENDIX 4C: PRINCIPAL INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM	254
APPENDIX 4D: TEACHER INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM	256
APPENDIX 4E: PARENT/GUARDIAN INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM	258
APPENDIX 4F: CHILD ASSENT FORM	260
APPENDIX 4G: PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (EAL LEARNERS)	261
APPENDIX 4H: PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (L1 LEARNERS)	263
APPENDIX 4I: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE	265
APPENDIX 4K: DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE DELV-CR	266
APPENDIX 5A: Independent sample t-tests comparing the L1 and EAL groups in context 1(EAL only) on all DELV -CR subtests and reading comprehension in Grades 1, 2 and 3	272
APPENDIX 5B: Independent sample t-tests comparing the L1 and EAL groups in the integrated context (context 2) on all DELV –CR subtests and reading comprehension in grades 1, 2 and 3	273
APPENDIX 5C: Independent sample t-tests comparing EAL groups in contexts 1(EAL only) and 2(integrated) on all DELV -CR subtests and reading comprehension in Grades 1, 2 and 3	274
APPENDIX 5D: Pearson correlation co-efficients between reading accuracy and language scores for each group in grades 2 and 3	275
APPENDIX 5E: Pearson correlation co-efficients between reading comprehension and DELV-CR subtest scores for each group in grades 2 and 3	276
APPENDIX 5 F: ANOVA results of comparison between classes within L1 and EAL groups in context 2 on DELV-CR measures in Grades 1, 2 and 3	277
APPENDIX 5G: ANOVA results of comparison between classes within EAL group in context 1 on DELV measures in Grades 1, 2 and 3	278

APPENDIX 6A: Correlation Matrices for Working Memory and DELV – CR scores	279
APPENDIX 6B: CLASS, GENDER AND EXPOSURE GROUP COMPARISONS ON WORKING MEMORY MEASURES	282
APPENDIX 6C :Raw scores obtained by each participant identified as language- impaired on each DELV –CR subtest in relation to the peer group mean in each grade	284

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Baddeley's Model of Working Memory	43
Figure 4.1 Contexts, number of schools, classes, EAL and L1 learners assessed over the three year period	108
Figure 4.2 Time frame and procedures employed at each stage of data collection	121
Figure 5.1 Mean DELV-CR domain scores (in %)obtained by each group in grades 1,2 and 3	128
Figure 5.2 Mean % scores obtained by each group on each syntax subtest in grades 1, 2 and 3	131
Figure 5.3 Mean % score obtained by each group on each pragmatics measure from grade 1 to 3	134
Figure 5.4 Mean % scores obtained by each group on each semantic subtest in each grade	137
Figure 5.5 Mean reading accuracy and comprehension scores obtained by each group in grades 2 and 3	157
Figure 6.1 . Mean Scores obtained by each group on each working memory measure in grade 2	172
Figure 6.2 Proportion of learners in each group in each scoring category on the AWMA	175

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Foundation Phase Learning outcomes and assessment standards for the Languages Learning area	30
Table 3.1 Mid-Year Population Estimates for South Africa	61
Table 3.2 Proportion of speakers of each of the official languages in South Africa by race group	62
Table 3.3 Proportional distribution (In %) of dominant home languages across all provinces	73
Table 3.4 Results of large-scale projects on outcomes achieved by South African learners	78
Table 3.5 Percentage of EAL learners selecting and proportion of schools using English as the medium of instruction in certain provinces	82
Table 3.6 Proportion of home language learners by province	100
Table 3.7 Educational contexts compared in this study	107
Table 4.1 Number of schools and description of learners and teachers in each context	109
Table 4.2 Context 1 (EAL only): Number of classes and learners in each grade and teacher and learner language profiles in school A	110
Table 4.3 Context 2 (Integrated): Number of classes and learners in each grade in each school and teacher and learner language profiles	111
Table 4.4 Mean ages and number of children in each gender and exposure group at each period of data collection	120
Table 4.5 Summary of research instruments and time of administration	127
Table 5.1 Means, standard deviations and range of scores obtained by each group in each grade on each DELV-CR domain	129
Table 5.2 Results of paired sample t- tests comparing total DELV- CR scores obtained by each group in grades 1 & 2, 2 & 3 and 1 & 3	130
Table 5.3 Means, standard deviations and range of scores obtained by each group on each syntax subtest in grades 1, 2 and 3	132

Table 5.4 Results of paired sample t-test procedure comparing scores obtained by each group in grades 1 & 2, 2 & 3 and 1 & 3 on syntax subtests	133
Table 5.5 Means, standard deviations and range of scores obtained by each group on each pragmatics measure in Grades 1, 2 and 3	133
Table 5.6 Results of Paired sample t-test procedure comparing scores obtained by each group in grades 1 & 2, grades 2 & 3 and grades 1 & 3 on pragmatic subtests	136
Table 5.7 Means, standard deviations and range of scores obtained by each group on each semantics subtest in grades 1, 2 and 3	138
Table 5.8 Results of Paired sample t-test procedure comparing grades 1 & 2, 2 & 3 and 1 & 3 semantic subtest scores obtained by each group of learners	140
Table 5.9 Developmental profiles exhibited by each group on DELV-CR subtests	142
Table 5.10 Results of ANOVA comparing language groups and contexts on DELV-CR measures in each grade	143
Table 5.11 Results of independent sample t-tests comparing language groups and contexts on DELV-CR total scores	143
Table 5.12 ANOVA Results of comparison between groups (L1 and EAL contexts 1 and 2) in Grades 1, 2 and 3 on syntax subtests	144
Table 5.13 ANOVA results of comparison between groups (L1 and EAL contexts 1 and 2) in Grades 1, 2 and 3 on pragmatic subtests	145
Table 5.14 ANOVA results of comparison between groups in Grades 1, 2 and 3 on semantics subtests	147
Table 5.15 Statistical comparison between language domains within each group in each grade	154
Table 5.16 Mean raw scores and standard deviations obtained by EFL and EAL groups in relation to those obtained by age equivalent groups in the DELV-CR sample on each language domain	155
Table 5.17 Means, standard deviation and range of scores obtained by each group on the reading accuracy and comprehension scores in grades 2 and 3	157

Table 5.18 Paired sample t-test results of comparison between grade 2 and 3 reading scores within each group	158
Table 5.19 Results of ANOVA comparing the three groups on the reading accuracy and comprehension measures in grades 2 and 3	159
Table 5.20 Results of independent sample t-tests comparing groups on reading scores in grades 2 and 3	160
Table 5.21 Pearson correlation co-efficients between reading comprehension and language scores for each group in grades 2 and 3	161
Table 5.22 Pearson correlations co-efficients between reading accuracy and comprehension scores for each group in grades 2 and 3	161
Table 5.23 ANOVA results of comparison between classes in each educational context on reading measures in Grades 2 and 3	166
Table 5.24 ANOVA results of comparison between exposure groups in each EAL context on total DELV-CR and reading scores in grades 1, 2 and 3	167
Table 5.25 ANOVA results of comparison between males and females on total DELV-CR and reading scores in Grades 1, 2 and 3	168
Table 6.1 Mean scores, standard deviations and range of scores obtained by each group on each working memory measure in grade 2	171
Table 6.2 Independent sample t-tests comparing groups on working memory measures	173
Table 6.3 Pearson correlation co-efficients reflecting the relationship between each of the working memory scores and the DELV-CR and reading scores within each group	177
Table 6.4 Language and Reading measures on which significant correlations with sentence repetition were found in each group	178
Table 6.5 Summary of working memory and language measures found to correlate in each of the groups	182
Table 6.6 Mean raw scores, standard deviations and raw scores corresponding to 2 standard deviations below the mean obtained by each group on each DELV-CR domain in each grade	186

Table 6.7 Total raw scores obtained by each child identified as at risk for language impairment on the DELV-CR domains in each grade	187
Table 6.8 Reading accuracy and comprehension scores of children identified as language impaired	192
Table 6.9 Working memory scores obtained by children identified as language-impaired	193

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADEA: Association for the Development of Education in Africa

AWMA: Automated Working Memory Assessment

DELV-CR: Developmental Evaluation of Language Variation

BICS: Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills

CALP: Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

CLIL: Content and Language-Integrated Instruction

cont.: context

CUMSA: Curriculum Model for Education in South Africa

DET: Department of Education and Training

DOE: Department of Education

DST: Dynamic Systems Theory

EAL: English Additional Language

EAL-LI: English Additional Language children with Language Impairment

EAP: English for Academic Purposes

ESL: English Second Language

ESP: English for Specific Purposes

GDE: Gauteng Department of Education

GORT-4: Gray Oral Reading Test- 4th edition

Grd: Grade

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

LANGTAG: Language Plan Task Group

LiEP: Language- in-Education Policy

NEPI: National Education Policy Investigation

NQF: National Qualifications Framework

OBE: Outcomes-based Education

PANSALB: Pan South African Language Board

Pr: Probability

RNCS: Revised National Curriculum Statement

SABC: South African Broadcasting Corporation

SES: Socio-economic Status

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

SLI: Specific Language Impairment

SLT: Speech-Language Therapist

Std.dev: Standard Deviation

TESOL: Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages

WM: Working Memory

WMC: Working Memory Capacity