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Abstract:
The aim of this paper, which makes use of Basil Bernstein’s theoretical framework, is to take a sociological approach to the pedagogical practices that are implemented by literature teachers for teaching Modern Greek Language in the first year of Senior High School, which is a transitional year in the second tier of Greek secondary education. We also aim to investigate the corrective ‘strategies’ that these teachers adopt in order to contribute to their pupils’ successful acquisition of school knowledge related to the Language lesson. The research was carried out using the tools of structured observation and semi-structured interview with a sample of 14 literature teachers, who were working in Greek secondary education. The most significant research findings revealed that the pedagogical practices that were implemented by the teachers in the sample are linked to the implementation of explicit regulative and instructional rules that originate in a visible pedagogical practice. What’s more, ‘corrective’ strategies were implemented with the pupils who weren’t able to satisfy the sequencing and pacing rules of the transmitted
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knowledge. It also emerged that an important site for the completion of the acquisition of transmitted school knowledge is related to the field of ‘shadow’ education.
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1. Introduction

Greece has a centralized education system and hence school knowledge is shaped and determined by the Ministry of Education and its specialized bodies (Koustourakis, 2007; Bouzakis, 2003). More specifically, this includes common curricula and timetables for all the state and private primary and secondary schools, as well as approved textbooks for each subject.

At the beginning of the 21st century reform took place in the area of school knowledge in Greek compulsory education (primary education and gymnasium), with the establishment of new curricula which were called cross-thematic, which in turn led in 2006 to the publication of new school textbooks to support the cross-thematic approach to knowledge. The objective of this reform is replacing teacher-centred teaching and rote-learning with the pupils’ active participation in the educational process for the acquisition of knowledge (Alahiotis & Karatzia-Stavlioti, 2006; Koustopliakis, 2007). However, the question arises of the extent to which these particular changes related to the approach to school knowledge influenced the Greek Senior High School (henceforth it is called Lyceum). This is because the main aim of the Lyceum is to prepare the pupils for their participation in the national (Pan-Hellenic) exams that lead to university, placing emphasis on the teaching of subjects that are likely to be examined in these exams (Bouzakis, 2003). This has transformed this stage of education into a preparatory centre for University entrance and has led to the development of ‘shadow’ education. In other words a private sector of lesson provision in the form of coaching schools or private tuition that prepare the candidates for their participation in the national University entrance exams (Giavrimis, Eleftherakis, & Koustourakis, 2018; Kassotakis & Verdis, 2013; Sianou-Kyrgiou, 2008).

The Language lesson, which appears in the form of ‘Modern Greek Language’, is one of the lessons examined nationally and for that reason it has a high status as much on the curriculum of the General Lyceum (G.L) as on that of the Professional Lyceum, where studies last for three years. The aim of this lesson is for the pupils to acquire linguistic competency and literacy skills in order to be equipped to respond to the needs of contemporary society, needs which are linked to the ability to participate in linguistic communication with other people (Curriculum for the courses Ancient Greek Language and Literature, 2011, p. 21052). More specifically, the aim of the teaching of this particular lesson in the first year of Lyceum is to force the pupils’ linguistic literacy in a more sociocentric as opposed to lingo centric direction. Here the teacher, who shapes the pedagogical practices for the teaching of the Language lesson and who may adapt his teaching objectives to the particularities and needs of the pupils, is an important factor in the implementation of the educational process (Konstantinou, 2001; Koustopliakis, 2017; Papanoum, 2003).
From a review of the scientific bibliography, it emerges that the pedagogical practices that are implemented by teachers internationally for teaching the Language lesson, are, due to the great breadth of its teaching content (literary texts, teaching of grammar, reinforcement and teaching of the mother tongue) and due to the objectives of the curricula of their countries, distinguished either according to their teach-centered or their student-centered character (see: Bakken & Lund, 2018; Batanero, 2010; Bloemert, Paran, Jansen, & van de Grift, 2017; Copland, Garton, & Burns, 2013; Nishimuro & Borg, 2013; Towndrow & Kwek, 2017). Research that focuses on the case of Greek secondary school teachers reveals that to a great extent their goal is strict compliance with the curriculum guidelines and the linking of the cognitive subjects that they teach with the pupils’ national university entrance exams (Antonopoulou & Koutrouba, 2011; Liakopoulou, 2010; Filippatou & Ventista, 2017). However, there is an absence of specialized research focusing on the implementation of the pedagogical practices of secondary school teachers at the microlevel of the school classroom in the teaching of school subjects, such as Language.

This research aims to approach and analyze the pedagogical practices that literature teachers implement during the teaching of Modern Greek Language in the G.E.L sociologically, and investigate the corrective ‘strategies’ that they adopt to help their pupils in the acquisition of the transmitted knowledge.

The paper begins with an approach to the concepts from Basil Bernstein’s theoretical framework that are used in this research, and this is followed by the section with the research questions and the methodology. The research findings are then presented and analyzed and the paper closes with the section containing the discussion and conclusions.

2. Theoretical Framework

According to Bernstein (1989) codes are regulative principles that involve power relations, as well as social control principles. The code of instructional knowledge (and especially for the Modern Greek Language lesson in the case of this paper) refers to the fundamental principles that shape the curriculum, the pedagogy, as well as the ways in which the teachers assess their pupils. These elements make up the actualizations of the educational code (Bernstein, 1989, 2003). Even as a regulative principle the code is acquired silently by the subjects, in this case the literature teachers in the first year of Lyceum at the day G.E.L., shaping the forms of implementation, as well as the contexts for the expression of their pedagogical practices.

From this perspective we can say that, due to the centralized nature of the Greek educational system (Koustourakis, 2007), the curriculum for the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum, constitutes an educational code that decisively determines, shapes and intervenes in the implemented pedagogical practices of the literature teachers at the G.E.L. at the microlevel of the school classroom.

Two other concepts that are interwoven with the concept of code in Bernstein’s theoretical framework are the concepts of classification and framing (Bernstein, 1989, pp. 21-22; Bernstein, 1990, pp. 11-12; McLean, Abbas, & Ashwin, 2012, p. 265). Classification depends on the power that determines what can be placed with what to form a category. It is also linked to the
actualization of particular categories through the imposition of strong – or not – borders and separations between categories such as the cognitive subjects, for example (Bernstein, 1989, p. 25; McLean et al, 2012, p. 266; Hoadley, 2007, p. 683). Framing refers to the ‘nature’ of the pedagogical relationship (transmitter – acquirer) and to the opportunity that the transmitter and the acquirers have to select, organize, shape the time limits and to pace the knowledge that is transmitted in the communicative framework of the school classroom. When framing is strong (F++/F+) the transmitter’s choices are prominent since they are the most significant factor that explicitly defines the operational framework for the school classroom. When framing is weak (F--/F-) then the choices of the acquirer, who is placed at the centre of the learning process, are accepted (Bernstein, 1989, p. 68; McLean et al., 2012, p. 266; Hoadley, 2007, p. 683).

In this case we suppose that the G.E.L. literature teachers will apply strong framings within the school classroom as much in terms of the choice of the transmitted knowledge of the Modern Greek Language lesson, as in terms of the time provided by the legal educational framework for its transmission (Law 4186, 2013). These framings will probably be governed by strong borders that are determined by the compulsory, for the main part, nature of the curriculum in the Greek educational system.

Absolutely linked to the concept of code is the concept of pedagogical practices, which according to Bernstein (1989, 2000) are understood as the social context through which cultural reproduction takes place. Bernstein (1989, 2000) distinguishes two genetic types of pedagogical practice: visible pedagogy, which places emphasis on strict procedures for the transmission and evaluation of knowledge, as well as on specialized forms of it. This type of pedagogical practice is defined by strong classifications (C++/C+) and framings (F++/F+) of knowledge. In contrast invisible pedagogical practice is defined by relaxed classifications (C--/C-) and framings (F--/F-) and is oriented towards an autonomous course of learning for the acquisition of knowledge as well as on more or less informal evaluation practices, based on a relaxed hierarchical relationship between teacher and pupils (Bernstein, 1989; Lamnias, 2002).

Bernstein (1989, 2000) assigns great importance to the pedagogical relationship between transmitters and acquirers and claims that its essential logic is based on three interconnected rules: a) the hierarchical (or regulative) rules, which are necessary for the formation of appropriate behaviour in each pedagogical relationship and are linked to the learning of the roles of the transmitter and the acquirer, which determines rules of conduct, ethics and social order, b) the sequencing and pacing rules that concern the order of the transmission of knowledge as well as the time sequence for its acquisition on the part of the pupils (Bernstein, 1989, p. 115; Morais & Neves, 2007, p. 124). Finally, the rules of criteria (which belong to the instructional rules) through the acquisition and application of which the pupil understands which communication, social relationship or position is permitted in the school field, and which not (Bernstein, 2003).

In contrast to invisible pedagogical practice which is characterized by implicit rules that place emphasis on the acquirers’ reception and skill, visible pedagogical practice is characterized by the absolute clarity of the three aforementioned rules. What’s more certain premises co-exist in the internal structure of a visible pedagogical practice which are determined by the explicit form of the regulative and instructional rules and they specify the pupil’s future in particular
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3. Material and Methods

In this research paper we endeavour to answer the following research questions:

- Which pedagogical practices are used by literature teachers during teaching of Modern Greek Language, to first year Lyceum students, at the Day General Lyceum?
- Which corrective ‘strategies’ within the school field do the literature teachers adopt during the teaching of Modern Greek Language at the Day General Lyceum for the acquisition of the transmitted knowledge by their pupils?

For the collection of the research data the multi-method approach (triangulation) was chosen since the research tools of structured observation and the semi-structured interview were used (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2008, p. 190). In the beginning the tool of structured observation was applied, where the role of the researchers was of the ‘observer as participant’, aimed at the investigation and precise recording of the action of the research subjects at the microlevel of the school classrooms within which their pedagogical practices for the teaching of Modern Greek Language were manifest. In this case the observer is present in the classroom where the daily teaching activities are developed, without however participating or becoming involved in any way in them (Robson, 2007; Grawitz, 2006). The observation log was shaped according to the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the research questions. Recording of the events that took place in the school classroom started five minutes after the entrance of the pupils. Moreover the recording followed a procedure of alternation between open and closed five-minute periods, in other words observation and non-observation, where in the
case of the latter, detailed notes were made of what had taken place in the open five minutes (Robson, 2007, pp. 327-328).

On completion of the observation, the tool of the semi-structured interview was used in order to investigate in depth the discourse of the research subjects on the pedagogical practices they chose during their teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson (Mason, 2011, p. 85).

The research took place in spring 2018 and the sample, which was chosen through convenient sampling (Robson, 2007) was made up of 14 literature teachers (6 men and 8 women) who taught Modern Greek Language in the first year of Lyceum. The average age of the teachers in the sample was 50.5 years old (min. 45 years old and max. 56 years old) and the average length of service in education was 26 years (min. 18 years and max. 34 years).

During the conduct of the research we applied the research code of conduct and ethics. More specifically, we informed the participants about the aim of this research, and the procedure for carrying it out and we obtained their consent for implementation of the observation and the interviews, ensuring the protection of their personal data which is linked to the anonymity of the teachers themselves and the schools in which they work (Kyriazi, 2011, pp. 303-306; Patton, 2002, pp. 402-405).

The data that emerged from the two research tools was codified and analyzed using qualitative content analysis. The theme was selected as unit of analysis (Kyriazi, 2011).

Based on the aim and the theoretical background of the research we put together the following four main conceptual analysis categories that correspond to the use of the observation tool:

1) Verbal interaction between teachers and pupils during the teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum.
2) Pacing of the transmission of the knowledge taught to the pupils.
3) Teachers’ choices regarding the shaping of the material in the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum.
4) Evaluation criteria that the teachers applied during the teaching of Modern Greek Language in the first year of Lyceum.

In Table 1 the gradation of the cases of the four analysis categories that constitute components of framing and were highlighted during the implementation of the structured observation are presented.

| Table 1: Gradation of conceptual observation categories and explanation of symbols |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| a. Verbal interaction between teachers and pupils during the teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of lyceum |
| F++ The teacher ignores students’ questions and interventions during the educational process | F+ The teacher avoids students’ questions and interventions during the educational process | F- The teacher allows a number of questions and interventions from the students during the educational process |
b. Pacing of the transmission of the knowledge taught to the pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F++</th>
<th>F+</th>
<th>F-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely fast pace for the expected acquisition of the sequencing rules</td>
<td>Fast pace for the expected acquisition of sequencing rules</td>
<td>Relatively weakened pace for the expected acquisition of sequencing rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


c. Teachers’ choices regarding the shaping of the syllabus for the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F++</th>
<th>F+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The shaping of the syllabus for the knowledge that is to be transmitted is explicitly regulated by the pedagogical code, that is to say by the curriculum and the school textbook for Modern Greek Language</td>
<td>The shaping of the syllabus for the knowledge that is to be transmitted is explicitly regulated by the pedagogical code with certain additions made by the transmitters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Evaluation criteria applied by teachers during the teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F++</th>
<th>F+</th>
<th>F-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely explicit and clear evaluation criteria during the educational process</td>
<td>Reasonably clear evaluation criteria during the educational process</td>
<td>Implicit and partially determined evaluation criteria during the educational process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the classification of the analysis units that emerged from the interview research data we put together the two main conceptual analysis categories and one sub-category below:

1. The teachers’ implemented pedagogical practices within the field of the school classroom.
   1.1 Sites for the completion of the pupils’ acquisition of knowledge.
   2. The teachers’ ‘targeted’ pedagogical practices within the field of the school classroom

4. Findings and Discussion

First, the findings that concern the use of the tool of observation are presented, followed by the findings that emerged from the interviews with the teachers in the sample.

4.1 Findings from the structured observation

In Table 2 the findings that relate to each of the four analysis categories and which reveal the pedagogical practices that the teachers implement during teaching Modern Greek Language are presented analytically for each of the 14 research subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Teachers in the Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal interaction between teachers and pupils during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing of the transmission of the knowledge taught to the pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ choices regarding shaping of the syllabus of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria implemented by teachers during teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1. Verbal interaction between teachers and pupils during the teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum

From the study of the data in Table 2 it emerges that all the teachers in the sample implemented Visible Pedagogical Practices that placed emphasis on the presence of the teachers since they taught the Modern Greek Language lesson in a teacher-centred way (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). More specifically, almost all the literature teachers acted within the context of a strong framing (F++/F+: 12 teachers, 85.7%) since they lectured the pupils and ignored or avoided their questions during the lesson, with the excuse that the teaching time of 45 minutes, which is available for each teaching hour, is not enough to complete the presentation of the lesson. Moreover, the 2 teachers who allowed questions from their pupils (F-: 14.3%), did so at the end of their lecture.

4.1.2. Pacing of the transmission of the knowledge taught to the pupils

Based on the data from the observation, the literature teachers implemented a strong pacing during the teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum, which was shaped based on the explicit rules of a Visible Pedagogical Practice (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). More
specifically, almost all of the teachers completed their presentation of the material of each of the units they taught within the 45 minutes which corresponds to one teaching hour (F+/F++; 12 literature teachers, 85.7%). In other words, they tried to implement everything that the curriculum and the school textbook for the Modern Greek Language lesson in first year Lyceum lay out and clearly define, with precision. Furthermore, 2 of the teachers in the sample (14.3%) followed slower teaching rhythms since, as we observed, their pupils’ level was low and it didn’t help them to complete the teaching of the particular lesson within the time frame foreseen in the curriculum. However, all the teachers followed a uniform manner of teaching which was defined by the following sequence: checking of previous knowledge, presentation of new teaching material, implementation of activities by the pupils for consolidation and acquisition of the transmitted knowledge. These particular choices reveal that for the transmission of school knowledge the teachers form their teaching practices based on the strict and immutable time principles for regulation of the pedagogic code (Bernstein, 1989).

4.1.3. Teachers’ choices for the shaping of the syllabus in the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum

The findings from the observation revealed that all the teachers implemented Visible Pedagogical Practices for the shaping of the syllabus of the lesson they taught, and these practices are specified by explicit guidelines in the curriculum and the school textbook which determine the material in the various teaching units and the manner in which it is to be taught (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). More specifically, the teaching of 9 literature teachers focused exclusively on the presentation of the material in the school textbook (F++: 64.3%), while 5 literature teachers implemented the suggestions of the Modern Greek Language curriculum (Curriculum, 2011, p. 21054) and enriched the material they taught with additional ‘supporting’ material (photocopied worksheets) so as to make it more comprehensible to their pupils. Nevertheless, in this case too these particular teachers, who enriched the syllabus they taught with additional material (F+: 35.7%), acted based on the explicit rules that regulate the determination of the syllabus for the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum, as well as the way in which it must be taught (Curriculum, 2011, p. 21054).

4.1.4. Evaluation criteria applied by teachers during the teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum

From observation of the teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson at the micro-level of the school classrooms it emerged that the pupil evaluation criteria that were applied, were determined by the explicit rules of a Visible Pedagogy and are described in the lesson curriculum (Bernstein, 1989; Curriculum, 2001, p. 2105). In particular, the research findings revealed the predominance of a strong framing of evaluation criteria (F++/F+: 12 teachers, 85.7%). In fact, the teachers informed the pupils of the evaluation criteria clearly and explicitly, and they were made up of: comprehension questions on the text, questions for the interpretative approach to the main concepts, on-the-spot checking of the knowledge taught in previous lessons. In addition, the teachers used supplementary evaluation ‘techniques’ for their pupils, where, within the school classroom they asked them oral questions of an open and closed type and for homework (second
site of knowledge acquisition) (Bernstein, 1989, 2000) they set them language exercises and projects for the production of the written word to do. Consequently, it was observed that the teachers in the sample, predominantly implemented an explicit and predictable evaluation proposed by the curriculum of the Modern Greek Language lesson, and focused on the pupils’ performance and the assessment of the ‘final product’ that they produce (Bernstein, 1989; Curriculum, 2001, p. 2105).

4.2 Presentation of interview data
4.2.1. The teachers’ implemented pedagogical practices within the field of the school classroom

According to Bernstein (1989) the shaping of pedagogical practices in the context of the school classroom can be analyzed through the observation of the combination of regulative (hierarchical) rules and the instructional rules (sequencing, pace, evaluation criteria). The interview findings revealed that during the Modern Greek Language lesson the teachers in the sample implemented strong hierarchical rules, which made clear to the pupils the distinction in the roles between teacher and taught (F++ of regulative discourse) as is apparent in the following representative interview excerpts: (Bernstein, 1989; Lamnias, 2002).

“I don’t like complete equality with my pupils. I believe that there should be clear rules, which are obeyed by the pupils” (Interview 3 – I.3).

“…we aren’t friends during lesson time” (I.7).

More specifically, as far as the implementation of instructional rules is concerned, and in particular, in the case of the sequencing of the presentation of material, it emerged that the literature teachers chose to act within the framework of a Visible Pedagogy (Bernstein, 2000), following a clear and linear manner of teaching, which included the following teaching choices in each forty-five minute teaching hour, in chronological order: At the start the teachers check whether the pupils have done their homework and they ask comprehension questions on the material from the previous lesson. Then using the lecture technique they present the new knowledge to the pupils, based exclusively on the school textbook and when they feel it necessary, they sometimes use some photocopied worksheet to support their teaching. The teaching procedure is completed with the setting of exercises for the consolidation of the taught knowledge for the pupils to do at home. The following interview excerpts are characteristic:

“At the start I always check the work from the previous day […] we then move on to a new text in parallel with the book, and at the end I set homework” (I.4).

“First I check the exercises that I have set. After ten minutes, after a discussion, we meet the new material, using the book or on occasion various photocopies” (I.10).
Then, as far as time management and the manner of teaching in each teaching hour is concerned, all the research participants admitted that they try to implement the explicit instructional rules that are defined by the Curriculum for Modern Greek Language in the first year of Lyceum (Law 4186, 2013) and follow a fast teaching pace (F++ of pacing) (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). This is because, as emerges from the following representative excerpts, the teaching time available to them is not sufficient:

“The Language lesson is taught over two hours a week, two consecutive hours, in accordance with the timetable. It is very little time for this particular lesson” (I.2).

“There is not always enough time for the lesson because Language is a whole ocean. We have very little time in the classroom” (I.12).

As far as the rules of pacing, which, according to Bernstein (1989) are the ‘regulators’ of the time that is offered for the acquisition of the sequencing rules, are concerned, it became apparent from the narrative of the teachers in the sample that they are ‘influenced’ to a large degree by the time variable. So, it became clear that the two-hour teaching period that is provided for the teaching of the cognitive content of Modern Greek Language in the first year of Lyceum, is not sufficient for its acquisition. The teachers state characteristically:

“The teaching material cannot be consolidated, a time of maturation and practice always needs to follow, which is never enough” (I.9).

“You don’t have time to have a discussion so the pupils can comprehend and go deeper into the lesson material in a two-hour lesson” (I.11).

The teachers in the sample claimed in their interviews that they implement clear rules for the evaluation of their pupils’ learning effort which the pupils themselves are familiar with (F++ of evaluation criteria) (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). In particular, as emerges from the interview excerpts below, students are evaluated in the following ways: with work that is set for them either to be done in the school classroom or chiefly to be done at home, through exams and assessment tests, as well as from an evaluation of the students’ participation in the lesson:

“Participation in class is very important for me. How consistently each pupil meets his obligations counts in his final evaluation too” (I. 14).

“My criteria are the assessment test, participation in class and the exams. That is what I mainly evaluate” (I.12).

4.2.1.1. Sites for the completion of knowledge acquisition by the pupils

From the interview findings it appeared that for the teaching of Modern Greek Language a fast pace is chosen (F++/F+ of pacing). Hence, in order for the consolidation of the taught material to
be completed by the pupils it is necessary for them to make use of a second site for knowledge acquisition, in other words their ‘home’ (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). This fact is justified by the teachers with the argument that Modern Greek Language is one of the lessons examined in the entrance exams in the third year of Lyceum, exams which concern the pupils’ access to tertiary education (Law 4610, 2019). So, as it appears from the representative excerpts that are quoted, the literature teachers believe that it is important to prepare the first year Lyceum pupils for these exams by giving them homework through which they will succeed in consolidating the taught material:

“I try to initiate my pupils into the spirit of Lyceum and the Panhellenic exams regarding the demands of the exams, to make the lesson more targeted. The system is exam-centered and we must prepare the children for the final exams” (I. 3).

“I set homework, I consider it essential because if they don’t work, they won’t consolidate the material and there will be gaps in their knowledge when they do the Panhellenic exams. They work at home, creating questions for the next time, and that is how the lesson goes and we move on with the material” (I.7).

From the interviews with the teachers it emerged that in Greece the pupils’ families assign great importance to their children’s preparation for the Panhellenic University entrance exams. Hence for the Modern Greek lesson the parents choose a third site for the acquisition of school knowledge in order to reinforce their children’s learning effort for its acquisition and consolidation. This is the extracurricular field of ‘shadow’ education, which is implemented in the form of private tutoring either in coaching schools or in the form of private lessons at home with specialized teachers (Giavrimis et al., 2018; Van Zanten, 2005). In their opinion, the coaching schools serve to reinforce the pupils’ knowledge acquisition as they increase the length of time that they devote to the improvement of the pace of acquisition and consolidation of knowledge. The teachers’ discourse is indicative:

“As soon as the pupils enter Lyceum, they have the Panhellenic exams on their mind, and so they sign up at tutoring schools because they have to prepare themselves very quickly” (I.14).

“The pupils begin private tuition from the beginning of Lyceum as the demands are much higher. They try to strengthen the cognitive part, to cover more topics in the material, which unfortunately due to the pressure of time and the extent of the material, is not enough at school” (I4).

In fact, the teachers in the sample recognize that the extracurricular support for the pupils by their families through lessons at tutoring schools (third means for knowledge acquisition) serves to aid their acquisition of knowledge as it increases the amount of time they spend on the acquisition and consolidation of knowledge, which improves their school performance in the Modern Greek Language lesson:
“The parent can help his child via private lessons. This is clear in the classroom. He performs better because there, there is the individualized approach that is not easy to achieve at school” (I.9).

4.2.2. The teachers’ “targeted” pedagogical practices within the field of the school classroom

In the case of the implementation of Visible Pedagogical Practices that include fast pacings for knowledge transmission (F++/F+ of pace) the phenomenon of many pupils’ weakness and delay in meeting the demands of the lesson is observed, presenting poor/inadequate learning outcomes (Bernstein, 1989). In this case in order to confront this problem the teachers adopt certain corrective strategies.

The research findings revealed that the literature teachers in the sample claim that there are three kinds of corrective pedagogical ‘strategies’ that they apply for the improvement of their pupils’ learning outcomes in the Modern Greek Language lesson:

a) The teachers approached and supported the particular pupils through individualized teaching. In this way through a set of corrective interventions on the ‘texts’ that their pupils produced, they acted indicatively and supplementarily on the product of their work. They mention characteristically:

“You have to approach the children who don’t perform correctly in the written word in an entirely different way and with individualized teaching” (I.4).

“When I receive a piece of written work I spend a lot of time on it and intervene with my corrections. A lot of my observations are based on individualization especially with pupils who are having difficulty” (I.10).

b) They choose the ‘relaxation’ of the rules of pacing for the pupils they characterize as ‘weak’, who present poor learning outcomes since they have difficulty understanding the taught knowledge of Modern Greek Language (Bernstein, 1989). In this case the teachers choose repetition and explanation of the difficult parts of the material as their corrective strategy:

“Repetition helps a lot, that is why time is needed. Because seeing where a pupil has trouble, that is where I make sure to set lots of revision exercises” (I.10).

“It requires revision, it wants lots of practice, so that it becomes part of them, so that it can be managed…” (I.2).

c) The third pedagogical corrective strategy that the teachers appeared to make use of was the reduction in the quantity of transmitted knowledge that the pupils had to acquire (Bernstein, 1989). They mentioned characteristically:

“I limit the material as much as I can, because by itself it is huge” (I.3).
5. Conclusions and Recommendations

In this research we turned our interest to the investigation of the pedagogical practices that literature teachers implement when teaching the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum at the GE.L. In addition, we investigated the corrective pedagogical ‘strategies’ that they applied in cases where pupils were unable to respond satisfactorily to the pace of the desired acquisition of the transmitted knowledge.

In particular the research findings that emerged from a combination of the research tools of observation and interview revealed the implementation of Visible Pedagogical Practices by the literature teachers that participated in the research during the teaching of the Modern Greek Language lesson. More analytically regarding the first research question, at the micro-level of the school classroom explicit regulative rules were implemented that led clearly and obviously to the promotion of the role of the teacher as transmitter of knowledge (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). It is characteristic that the literature teachers mostly chose the lecture for the presentation of school knowledge, deliberately and frequently either avoiding or ignoring the clarification questions that the pupils wanted to ask in the course of the teaching act. In fact, these choices were justified by the teachers with the argument that the implementation of a fast pace of teaching was necessary (F++/F+ of pace) during the lesson in order to complete the teaching of the material determined by the curriculum and the content of the school textbook of Modern Greek Language within the limits of the 45-minute teaching hour (Law 4186, 2013; Curriculum, 2011). These findings are in line with results of research on how the Language lesson is taught in Secondary Education and the shaping of the pedagogical relationship between transmitters and acquirers in countries like Japan (Nishimuro & Borg, 2013) and Holland (Bloemert et al., 2017).

When teaching, the teachers in the sample acted within the framework of Visible Pedagogical Practices which are linked to the implementation of strong instructional rules of sequencing, pace and evaluation criteria (F++/F+) (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). In particular, the way the literature teachers teach is characterized by a linearity according to which the time order of the timetabled activities was determined, uniform and without modifications. In addition, the strictly defined teaching time for the Modern Greek Language lesson in Lyceum, as this is determined by the official regulative principles (curriculum, timetable, school textbook), appeared to lead the teachers to attempt to apply these particular rules procedurally at the micro-level of the school classroom. These findings are in accordance with findings from other research which revealed that in order to get through the teaching material proposed in the curriculum in the limited time framework available to them, the teachers implemented their teaching with an extremely fast pace strictly abiding by the pattern: checking previous knowledge – presentation of new teaching material – consolidation/extension (Filippatou & Ventista, 2017; Liviero, 2017).

The choice made by the teachers in the sample to apply a fast pace of teaching of Modern Greek Language was justified by them using the argument that it is an important lesson as it is examined in the pupils’ University entrance exams (Law 4610, 2019). So, in order to achieve the best possible preparation of the pupils for these exams, and taking into account the great breadth
of the material that they have to teach them, the teachers thought it necessary to use the home as a second site for knowledge acquisition (Bernstein, 1989, 2000). For this reason, after every teaching hour they set their pupils consolidation exercises for homework as a result of the fast pace of teaching (F++ of pace) which they implement so as to complete the presentation of school knowledge.

As far as the criteria rules are concerned, we observed that the teachers apply Visible Pedagogies with explicit and clear evaluation criteria (Bernstein, 1989), which follow the guidelines of the official pedagogical code of Modern Greek Language in Lyceum (Curriculum, 2011). In particular it appeared that emphasis is placed on ‘performance’ on the part of the pupils, who are expected to complete the work set by the literature teachers to consolidate and acquire knowledge. In this way the aim is that the evaluation criteria, the acquisition of which, as Morais’ research (2002) showed, may make them more able to produce the expected ‘correct’ pedagogical ‘texts’, will become absolutely clear to the pupils.

Regarding the second research question concerning the corrective ‘strategies’ that the literature teachers adopt when teaching Modern Greek Language in the GE.L., for the acquisition of the transmitted knowledge by the pupils, we observed that most teachers in the sample, during the development of the teaching process, applied corrective pedagogical strategies. They applied these particular strategies in order to provide the weaker pupils with the opportunity to acquire the transmitted knowledge. These strategies concerned first and foremost correcting the pupils’ written ‘texts’ so that they were in line with the requirements of a ‘text’ which satisfies the final learning criteria (Lamnias, 2002). In addition, through the individualized approach to their pupils, the teachers attempted to increase the time for the expected acquisition of knowledge, offering them in this way the opportunity to satisfy the explicit rules of sequencing and make progress. The final ‘corrective’ pedagogical strategy the teachers applied was the limitation of the quantity of material in the Modern Greek Language lesson (Bernstein, 1989).

Furthermore, the teachers in the sample believed that an essential prerequisite for their pupils to acquire the rules of sequencing and pacing regarding the Modern Greek Language lesson in the first year of Lyceum, is the devotion of time on their part, in the second site of knowledge acquisition – the home. Their opinion is linked to the fact that there is not enough time at school for the acquisition of everything defined by the lesson’s official pedagogical code. For this reason, they set their pupils exercises for the production of written language. Through these specific pedagogical practices, it appears that the teachers in the sample aim to help those pupils that they believe can satisfy the demands of the instructional discourse (Bernstein, 1989).

A noteworthy finding is the fact that most of the teachers in the sample claimed that in Greek educational reality, the home is not enough as a second site for the acquisition of the official pedagogical code. Hence, a third acquisition site, the private lesson, is considered essential. In any case, the importance of the Panhellenic exams, as the high point of the pupils’ educational career, particularly in the three years of Lyceum, lies precisely in the distinction that is made between the mass approach of secondary education and the selectivity of tertiary education, as well as in the social pressure for individual wellbeing through the latter (Kyridis, 1997). So, bearing in mind the peculiarities of the Greek case where the Panhellenic University entrance exams constitute the high point of the educational process at Lyceum, the literature
teachers recognize that the pupils’ families use ‘shadow education’, in other words private tutoring (Giavrimis et al., 2018; Sianou-Kyrgiou, 2008) as a third site of knowledge acquisition of Modern Greek Language for their children, believing that in this way they improve their learning outcomes and school performance.

The results of this study while not generalizable are revealing of the choices adopted by teachers for the shaping of their Pedagogical Practices when teaching the Language lesson in the first year of Greek Lyceum. However, it would be interesting to conduct a comparative study regarding the manner of teaching the Language lesson, across the three years of Lyceum, as much in Greece as in other European countries. In addition, the comparative approach to teaching the Language lesson in Lyceum by teachers in Greece and in countries in which ‘shadow education’ operates for the support of the pupils’ learning effort would also be interesting. Finally, the investigation of the teachers’ choices for the recontextualization of school knowledge of the Language lesson at the micro-level of the school classrooms in comparison with the guidelines and contents of the curricula and school textbooks that determine it, would be of equal interest.
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