CHAPTER FIVE

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE QUANTITATIVE DATA: TEACHERS' RESPONSES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter dealt with the presentation of the teachers' and learners' demographic details, language profiles, and language use, as well as their perceptions about the functional domains of English and Setswana. The present chapter deals with the views of the teachers in response to the questions that were asked to obtain information so that the main research questions can be answered.

The views of the teachers are grouped into three sections according to the sub-themes of the study: The first section presents the teachers' subjective evaluation of the learners' competence in English and Setswana, and how they use the two languages in class. The teachers' views on the learners' proficiency in both languages are important because they impact on their views on the learners' CS in the classroom. The second section deals with the educational role of English and Setswana in the schools in Botswana, including CS during a lesson. The third and final section deals with the role of other local languages in education, and / or CS during a lesson to those languages.

5.2 PRESENTATION FORMAT OF THE ANALYZED DATA IN THE PRESENT CHAPTER

As previously explained in Chapter Three, section 3.7, the data relate mainly to independent and dependent variables. *Independent* variables are those variables that the researcher studies as a possible cause of something (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005) or those key factors that may influence how the respondents perceive a particular issue; while the *dependent* variables are those that depend on the independent variables for their interpretation in relation to the question at hand. The independent variables (used to obtain data about the teachers and to further analyze their responses under the dependent variables) were (with their explanations placed in parenthesis):

- **school location** (urban or peri-urban);
- **gender** (Male or Female) ;
- **age** (Under 31 years: younger, 31 to 40 years: middle-age, and over 40 years: mature age);
- **home language**: (Setswana, Ikalanga, English, Others);
- **teaching experience**: (0-5 years: inexperienced, 6-10 years: moderately-experienced, 11-15 years: well experienced and 16 years and above: most experienced);
- **subjects taught**: (language subjects -- English (L and L), and Setswana vs. content subjects -- Biology, History and Home Economics; in some cases,
- **language subject** (English -- L and L) vs. language subject (Setswana); and
- **fluency in speaking English**: (fluent or moderately fluent).

The data on the dependent variables fall into three broad categories: Teachers' views on the role of English and Setswana as LoLT; their views and attitudes towards CS and its role in teaching and learning; and the role of other local languages, and / or CS to them in teaching and learning. The data are highly subjective as they were provided by the teachers. Thereafter, the dependent variables were further analyzed with respect to the independent variables. The results from the analyzed data were then interpreted to determine if there was any relationship of influence between the dependent and the independent variables regarding the phenomenon under consideration, namely, the role of CS in the classroom and its effects on teaching and learning. The results showed that some of the independent variables influenced the teachers' responses with respect to some of the dependent variables, while others did not. However, for reasons of space, only the teachers' responses to the dependent variables are presented in tabular form in this chapter; the researcher only reports on the results of the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables without using the tabular presentation of the data.

Multi-variance analysis was *not* done on any of the dependent variables. This was found unnecessary at this stage as the objective of the study was mainly to establish the effect of CS on teaching and learning. Such analysis will be done in the next phase of the study.

Descriptive statistics in the form of percentages were used as a basis for the interpretation of the data in respect of the teachers' and the learners' responses. The interpretations were used to formulate a number of hypotheses in respect of the educational effects of CS in the classroom. These hypotheses were focused on the extent of CS in the classroom; who code-switches; when and why they do so. After the data analysis and interpretation, the hypotheses (based on the results of the influence of independent variables on the dependent variables) were then subjected to statistical tests to establish their validity. Only questions that were directly related to the objectives of the study were subjected to statistical tests. These were mainly questions on CS (mainly between English and Setswana, and to some extent to a local language); attitudes towards it; and its role in teaching and learning.

Robinson (1996: 66, in Strydom, 2002: 103) states the following regarding statistics: " … provide one more way of understanding a sociolinguistic situation and may not be regarded … as the pillars of irrefutable proof on which the argument stands".

In this respect, the results from the statistical tests are used to corroborate or refute the results obtained through the questionnaires, as well as by observing the lessons in the classrooms.

Some of the results were statistically significant whilst others were not. Where statistical tests were done, the results were reported as either statistically significant or not statistically significant. Only the details of the statistically significant results will be reported, while the results of the data that are not statistically significant or only have a significant tendency for a relationship will be very briefly reported. A list of the data not statistically significant is available but for reasons of space, has not been included in this study. If necessary, an interested reader could request that it be made available.

As previously reported in Chapter Three (cf. section 3.6.2 paragraph 1), the questionnaires largely contained close-ended questions and a few open-ended questions, namely 6% or 13 questions in the teachers' questionnaire; and 5% or 11 questions in the learners' questionnaire. Unfortunately, the open-ended questions were largely ignored by the respondents. As a result, these questions were excluded from

the analysis of the data. This setback will, however, not affect the results of the study owing to the smaller number of the questions involved (cf. Addenda D and E). The discussion and interpretation of both the quantitative (Chapters Four to Six) and the qualitative data (Chapter Seven) will be done in Chapter Eight below each research question.

While the chronological order of the data presentation largely follows the order in which the data appeared in the questionnaires, in some cases, it was necessary to shift some items to the other sections that contained items addressing the same sub-theme, and with relevance to a particular research question. While this style of presentation, to some extent, affects the chronological presentation of the tables of results, it nonetheless allows for grouping the data into sub-headings and for better comprehension of the results. In addition, the analysis of the results was done within and between the tables; and cross-referencing between the tables was made where more than one table addressed the same sub-theme. The data in this chapter will be used in Chapter Eight to respond to the research questions.

5.3 TEACHERS' VIEWS ON THE LEARNERS' PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH AND SETSWANA

The teachers' views essentially fall into three categories: the views of Setswana teachers (25 in total); the views of the teachers of subjects that are taught in 'English' -- hereafter referred to as content-subject teachers -- (69 in total); and the views of all the teachers, irrespective of the subjects they teach (94 in total). In this study, the following legends for interpretation will be used:

Very well = Good to excellent
Well = fair or Average
Not that well = Poor / unsatisfactory

Table 5.1: Teachers' evaluation of learners' proficiency in English and Setswana (RQ 5 ii)

Domains of language competency		VW		W		NW		Total		M Frq
	Lang	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Read texts	**Eng.**	5	7	38	57	24	36	67	100	2
	Sets.	1	4	13	52	11	44	25	100	0
2. Write texts	**Eng.**	1	2	23	35	42	64	66	100	3
	Sets.	1	4	11	44	13	52	25	100	0
3. Speak during class discussions	**Eng.**	2	4	34	50	32	47	68	100	1
	Sets.	3	12	15	60	7	28	25	100	0
4. Understand when interpreting a test / exam	**Eng.**	3	4	26	39	38	57	67	100	2
	Sets.	0	0	15	60	10	40	25	100	0

Legends: VW = Very Well; W = Well; NW = Not Well

The teachers evaluated the learners' proficiency in English and Setswana as they used them in the classroom and the results, presented in Table 5.1 above, indicate that learners were more proficient in Setswana than in English. They speak, understand and interpret test or examination questions better in Setswana than in English. However, learners read better in English than in Setswana. The results are not unexpected, given that English is usually spoken in the classroom only, but Setswana is spoken inside and outside the classroom and even outside the school environment. Therefore, learners are more exposed to Setswana than to English.

Concerning English, more teachers were concerned more about the learners' writing skills and interpretation of questions (understanding) in English than about their oral domains of competence (reading and speaking) as indicated by 64% and 57% as opposed to 36% and 47% respectively. The results suggest that learners experienced the most problems in self-expression through writing and interpretation of written information, be it a test or an examination, as well as speaking. Reading was the least problematic in the four domains of language competence. The results therefore indicate that skills pertaining to speaking and interpretation (understanding) may have an effect on CS use in the classroom.

Regarding learners' competence in Setswana, Setswana teachers were satisfied with the learners' speaking and interpretation skills as indicated by 72% and 60%

respectively. Reading was also not problematic as 64% of the teachers were satisfied with the learners' reading ability; the majority of them (52%) saying that learners read well. Writing in Setswana was considered the most problematic as 52% of the teachers were dissatisfied with the learners' writing ability. The results of the analysis suggest that the skills acquired at school (reading and writing) were considered more difficult than those acquired before entering school (speaking and interpretation, as the latter is closely associated to understanding). This could be due to the fact that Setswana is not a HL for a significant proportion of the learners (at least 46%). The results suggest that BICS had been acquired in Setswana; hence learners were considered able to express themselves in Setswana, but it may have been CALP in Setswana that could have been more problematic since in learning, it is acquisition of CALP in a LoLT that is required. The results suggest that learners perform better in the domains of speaking and interpretation in Setswana than in English, hence they used CS (the subject of this study) in the classroom.

Table 5.2: Teachers' observations on learners' language use in class (RQ 5 ii)

	Always		Sometime		Never		Total		M Frq
Language use	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. *Standard Setswana	6	27	14	64	2	9	22	100	3
2. *Vernacular Setswana	5	22	16	70	2	9	23	100	2
3. Code-switch between English and Setswana	31	37	47	57	5	6	83	100	11

*Teachers in Setswana only; Item 3: All teachers

The results in Table 5.2 above show that CS takes place, irrespective of the subject taught, as indicated by 94% of the teachers. The results also show that both Standard and Vernacular Setswana are used in the classroom as confirmed by 91% and 92% of the Setswana teachers respectively. Although the central focus of this study is not on Setswana as a subject *per se*, it nonetheless has an effect on CS as the results show that CS in the classroom mainly involves English and Setswana (as languages). The results hence indicate that there is prevalent use of CS in the classroom.

The influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The effect of various independent variables on the teachers' views on the dependent variables contained in Table 5.2 above was investigated, but not found to be determinant of CS. These are:

- teaching experience;
- age;
- HL;
- subject taught;
- fluency in speaking English;
- gender; and
- school location.

The results suggest that CS occurred in the classroom irrespective of the factors listed above. Similarly, during Setswana lessons, teachers of Setswana used both Standard and Vernacular Setswana.

The researcher tested the data on CS for statistical significance. Only the teachers' age had an influence on their views about the learners' CS in class. The statistical test result ($p = 0.008$) shows that the relationship between the teachers' age and their views on the learners' CS in class is highly significant. The nature of the relationship is such that more of the younger teachers (70%) than the middle-aged (31%) and the mature teachers (11%) stated that their learners **always** CS between English and Setswana in class. Conversely, more middle-aged teachers (62%) and mature teachers (78%) said their learners **sometimes** CS between English and Setswana in class. The results suggest that learners were more likely to CS during lessons of younger teachers than during lessons of the middle-aged and the more mature teachers. The reason could be that perhaps the younger teachers were more tolerant of CS than the other teachers.

Other relationships between the teachers' views on the dependent variables and the other independent variables had no statistical significance. For instance, the statistical test result ($p = 0.08$) indicates that the relationship between school location and the teachers' responses on the learners' CS in class has a tendency for statistical significance. The results show that the majority of the teachers at both urban and peri

urban schools said their learners **sometimes** CS to Setswana in class: S 1: 65%, and S 2: 50%; S 3: 61%, and S 4: 52%. The results show that there are no significant differences in the teachers' responses by school location.

Subsequent results, both significant and insignificant, should be interpreted in the same way. The results on the use of Standard and Vernacular Setswana during Setswana lessons were not tested for statistical significance as they had no direct relevance to CS.

Table 5.3: Reasons why teachers always use English in class (RQ 5 i)

Reasons	N	%
1. It is school policy.	24	35
2. There are non-Setswana speakers in my class.	6	9
3. It is easier to explain and to understand concepts in English.	23	33
4. It is an international language for education and work.	47	67
5. It is a neutral language.	16	22

Please note: Only views of non-Setswana teachers are given
Total and percentage cannot be given as respondents could choose more than one item.

The results in Table 5.3 above show that the main reason for always using English in class is a result of its status as an international language for education and work, as indicated by 67% of the teachers. Other reasons were not as important as the aforementioned reason. The results suggest that teachers were aware of the benefits of teaching in English in addition to adhering to the LiEP of Botswana that teaching (except Setswana) should be done in English. The results are interesting in that, notwithstanding the indicators above, CS still occurred in the classroom. The issue will be discussed further in Chapter Eight when the research questions are answered.

<u>The influence of independent variables on dependent variables</u>

The results show that there was no significant difference in the teachers' views in respect of home language, teaching experience, gender, school location, subject taught and fluency in speaking English, as the majority of the teachers always used English in class because of its status in education and in the world of work. However, age had a significant influence on the teachers' views in respect of using English in class. The

younger (63%) and the middle-aged (75%) teachers **always** used English in class because of its educational and professional status internationally but all mature teachers (100%) were guided more by pedagogical benefits (that is to say, was it easier for the learners to understand explanation of concepts made in English) than by the educational status of English.

Table 5.4: Teachers' views on the appropriateness of the LiEP (RQ 5 iii)

	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure		Total		M Frq
LoLT	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. Cease using Eng. as LoLT and study only as second / foreign lang.	12	15	62	78	6	8	80	100	14
2. Use Setswana as LoLT in primary school.	42	53	32	40	6	8	80	100	14
3. Use other local languages for T and L.	39	51	25	32	13	17	77	100	17

Please note: T and L = Teaching and Learning

The results in Table 5.4 above show that the majority of the teachers supported the continued use of English as a LoLT (78%) and being learnt as a subject. However, concerning Setswana and other local languages, they called for the revision of the LiEP: that Setswana be the LoLT in primary schools only (53%); and that other local languages be introduction in the school system (51%).

The results suggest that the majority of the teachers recognized the educational value of using Setswana and other local languages during the formative years of a child's education as espoused by Bamgbose (1991: 66). However, some teachers, although in the minority, held a contrary view: Forty percent and nearly one-third (32%) objected to the use of Setswana and other local languages in education respectively. Some teachers (33%) did not express their views on the three issues stated above. The reasons for their lack of a definite opinion are not clear, but the researcher can only surmise that these may be teachers who do not speak the local language or, even if they do, they do not use it as it was not provided for in the LiEP of the country.

The influence of independent variables on the dependent variables

The results show that gender, the nature of the subject taught, home language, age, school location, teaching experience, and fluency in speaking English had no effect on the teachers' responses to the learning of English as a second / foreign language only. The majority of the teachers, irrespective of the above, supported the status quo, namely that English should continue to be used as the LoLT. The results confirm the status that English enjoys in the education system in Botswana.

The results also showed that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of age, school location, teaching experience, and fluency in speaking English supported the use of Setswana as the LoLT or MoI at primary school. Therefore, none of these independent variables had an effect on the teachers' views as the differences in their opinions were not significant except for fluency in English.

The results regarding the relationship between fluency in speaking English (that is, the difference in views between the teachers fluent and the moderately fluent in English) and the teachers' opinion on the view that Setswana should be used as a LoLT in schools is statistically significant ($p = 0.01$). This suggests that both the fluent and the moderately fluent teachers recognize the importance of using Setswana, the national language, in education, especially at the formative stage in a child's life. In addition, gender, subject taught, and HL had an effect on the teachers' views. The majority of the female teachers (65%) were in support of its use but the male teachers (49%) were not. The results are significant and suggest that female teachers were more likely to use Setswana in their classes than the male teachers. The statistical test result ($p = 0.02$) shows that the relationship between the teachers' views and gender pertaining to the use of Setswana as the LoLT in primary schools is statistically significant.

The results also indicate that the majority of the teachers of language subjects (English and Setswana) were in support of the use of Setswana as the LoLT in primary schools; but the majority of the teachers of content subjects (Biology, History, and Home Economics) were not. However, there was no significant difference between the proportion of English teachers who supported the use of Setswana as the LoLT in primary schools and those who were against it (42% vs. 38%), as well as between

Biology teachers who were opposed to this view and those who supported it (50% vs. 44%). The results show that there is a significant difference in the teachers' views due to the nature of the subject taught, as the views of the teachers of language subjects were in contrast to those of the content subjects. The statistical test results show that the interaction between the subject taught and the teachers' views on the use of Setswana as a LoLT is statistically highly significant ($p = 0.002$). The results suggest that teachers of content subjects are more likely to use Setswana in their teaching than those who teach English Language and Literature in English.

Home language had an effect on the teachers' views on using Setswana as the LoLT. The majority of the teachers whose HL is Ikalanga (60%) did not support the use of Setswana as the LoLT in primary schools; but other teachers did (Setswana: 57%; English: 100%; and others: 64%). The results are significant and show that the teachers whose HL is Ikalanga did not want to promote the use of Setswana for teaching and learning at the expense of their HL. The relationship between HL and the teachers' views on the use of Setswana as the LoLT in primary schools is statistically significant ($p = 0.04$).

Furthermore, the majority of the teachers, irrespective of gender, subject taught, school location, teaching experience, and fluency in speaking English supported the inclusion of other local languages in education. This suggests that none of the independent variables mentioned above had an influence on the teachers' views. However, HL and age did have an effect on their views. All the teachers whose HL is English (100%), and 41% of the teachers whose HL is Setswana did not support the inclusion of other local languages in education; but the majority of the teachers whose HL is either Ikalanga (86%) or 'others' (65%) did support it. The differences in the teachers' views are significant and suggest that the teachers whose HL is either Setswana or English, the languages taught in schools, are against the inclusion of other local languages in education, but the teachers whose HLs are currently not taught in schools advocated for their inclusion in the curriculum. The statistical test result ($p = 0.008$) shows that the relationship between HL and the teachers' views on the use of other local languages in education is statistically highly significant. This suggests that there is reasonable association between the teachers' views and home language.

There was also a difference in opinion between the younger teachers, the least experienced on the one hand and the older and more experienced teachers on the other. The former (38%) were opposed to the view that other local languages should also be used for teaching and learning, but the latter (the middle-aged, 55%; and the mature, 75%) supported this view. However, the difference was not that significant as 29% of the younger teachers did not offer their views at all. This suggests that either they did not speak any of the local languages or they never used them because the system did not officially cater for them in the LiEP. Hence the results were not statistically significant.

5.4 TEACHERS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS CS AND ITS ROLE IN THE CLASSROOM

Table 5.5: Teachers' attitude to learners' CS use in the classroom (RQ 2)

	Always		Sometime		Never		Total		M Frq
Are you bothered by …	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. CS to Setswana in a Non-Setswana class?	37	54	29	43	2	3	68	100	1
2. CS to English in a Setswana class?	16	64	9	36	0	0	25	100	0
3. CS to other local languages?	60	69	24	28	3	3	87	100	7

Please note: Item 1: Non-Setswana teachers only = 69; Item 2: Setswana teachers only = 25; Item 3: all teachers = 94.

The results in Table 5.5 above show that the majority of the teachers were **always** bothered by the learners' CS in class, irrespective of the subject that they taught and the language to which CS was taking place. The results further reveal that the majority of the teachers objected more to CS to a local language than to Setswana, or even from Setswana to English. The data suggest that although CS occurs, not all teachers (irrespective of the subject they teach) support its use by the learners. The results also show that Setswana teachers felt more strongly about CS than the teachers of the other subjects as none of them stated that CS during Setswana lessons did *not* bother them.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results show that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of teaching experience, school location, fluency in speaking English, age, HL and gender were bothered by CS to Setswana. This indicates that the above-stated independent variables did not significantly influence the teachers' views (except subject taught). Hence their results were also not statistically significant.

Subject taught had a significant influence on the teachers' views about CS to Setswana. The results are such that the language teachers (English L and L) were more bothered by the learners' CS to Setswana than teachers of content subjects (History, Home Economics and Biology) (72% vs. 50%, 57, 67%) were. The statistical test result (p = 0.007) shows that the relationship between the nature of the subject taught and the teachers' views on the learners' CS to Setswana in class is highly significant. The results suggest that, as expected, CS was likely to occur more during the lessons of content subjects than during the lessons of language subjects (English L and L), as their focus was more on the learners' understanding of the content than on improvement of learners' proficiency in English, which was the task of English (L and L) teachers. The results on the effect of fluency in English were also significant in that more teachers who were fluent in English than the teachers moderately fluent in English were expected to be bothered by learners' CS. So, the results are such that 55% of the teachers fluent in English, and 58% of the teachers moderately fluent in English were *always* bothered by learners' CS. The results indicate that both the fluent and the moderately fluent teachers were likely to CS and would then allow their learners to CS. Therefore, the relationship between fluency in speaking English and the teachers' views about the learners' CS to Setswana in a class taught in 'English' was statistically significant (p = 0.02).

The results also show that the majority of the teachers whose HL is either Ikalanga (67%), or English (100%), or Others (60%) were **always** bothered by learners' CS to Setswana, but 50% of the teachers whose HL is Setswana were only **sometimes** bothered. The results indicate that there is likely to be more CS to Setswana in the classes of the teachers whose HL is Setswana than in the classes of the other teachers. However, HL had no significant influence on the teachers' views about the learners'

CS to Setswana because the differences were very small. Consequently, the results were not statistically significant.

With respect to Setswana classes, the majority of the teachers of Setswana, irrespective of teaching experience, HL, school location, subject taught, age, and fluency in speaking English, objected to the learners' CS. The results indicate that none of the independent variables above had a significant influence on the teachers' views. Consequently, none of the results was statistically significant. However, gender had an influence on the teachers' views: all male teachers of Setswana (100%) were **always** bothered by the learners' CS to English; but among the female teachers, only 53% were bothered. This is significant given that the proportion of male teachers who did not support CS to English is almost double the proportion of the female teachers who hold similar views.

The results suggest that the male teachers of Setswana are less tolerant of CS by the learners than the female teachers. The statistical test result ($p = 0.05$) shows that the relationship between gender and the teachers' views on CS in a Setswana class is statistically significant.

Furthermore, the majority of the teachers, irrespective of teaching experience, HL, gender, subject taught, age, fluency in speaking English and school location, were opposed to CS to a local language in class. There was no significant difference in the teachers' responses, hence the results were not statistically significant except for the influence of school location on the teachers' views: more teachers in peri-urban schools (83%) than in urban schools (57%) were bothered by the learners' use of other local languages in class. The results suggest that there is likely to be more CS to other local languages in class at the two peri-urban schools than at the two urban schools. This is consistent with the population of the learners because Ikalanga is the HL for the majority of the learners in the peri-urban schools (58% at S 3, and 74% at S 4); while Setswana is the HL for the majority of the learners in the urban schools (53% at S 1, and 49% at S 2). The statistical test result ($p = 0.01$) shows that the relationship between the teachers' views and school location on the learners' CS to a local language is significant.

The results show that generally, teachers were opposed to learners' CS, be it to Setswana, to English or to a local language. Notably, the results showed that teachers, irrespective of teaching experience, strongly objected to CS to a local language. The teachers whose HL is Setswana objected more to CS from English to a local language than to Setswana. Male teachers of Setswana objected more to CS to English than the female teachers did. Schools generally discouraged CS. There was more CS during the lessons of content subjects than during the lessons of language subjects. Teachers of all ages, the fluent and the moderately fluent, discouraged CS.

Table 5.6: Teachers' views on learners' language use in class (by gender) (RQ 5 ii)

	Boys		Girls		Both		Total		M Frq
Language use	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. CS to Setswana in a non-Setswana class?	7	12	5	9	45	79	57	100	12
2. Express themselves well in spoken English?	5	8	32	51	26	41	63	100	6
3. Express themselves well in written English	2	3	31	50	29	49	62	100	7

Please note: Only views of non-Setswana teachers.

The results in Table 5.6 above show that learners, irrespective of gender, CS to Setswana in class, as indicated by 79% of the teachers; were not competent in either spoken or written English. Nonetheless, girls better expressed themselves (in both spoken and written English) than boys. It was, however, not easy for the researcher to confirm these views as the lessons were largely teacher centred and, as such, the recorded discourse was mainly that of the teachers. The learners were mainly passive listeners and only took part occasionally when they were required to respond to a question. If they responded, they either code-switched to Setswana, which would or would not be allowed by the teacher, or they used English in the form of a one-word answer or a short phrase or even a short sentence. This issue will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Seven that covers the qualitative analysis of the data.

Again, as the study was limited to oral communication and the researcher did not have access to the learners' written work, it was not possible to confirm or refute the teachers' views regarding the learners' self-expression in written English, though

desirable. The results are significant in that CS signals that the learners have a problem with the language of instruction, namely, English.

The results suggest that the learners, irrespective of their gender, CS in class. While CS by girls may not necessarily be due to a lack of proficiency in English, it is likely to be the case with boys.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results show that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of gender, teaching experience, home language, fluency in English, age, school location and the nature of the subject taught, agreed that both boys and girls CS to Setswana in class. None of the independent variables above were of significant influence to the teachers' evaluation of the learners' CS based on gender, except age. Consequently, the statistical test results showed that the relationship between the aforementioned independent variables and the teachers' views is not statistically significant. However, the relationship between age and the teachers' views on the learners' CS to Setswana in class is statistically significant (p =0.02): more teachers of mature age (100%) and teachers of middle age (86%) than the younger teachers (63%) stated that both girls and boys CS in class. The results suggest that CS was more likely to occur in the classes of the middle-aged and the mature teachers than in those of the younger teachers.

The teachers' views differed on the learners' proficiency in spoken and written English. Generally, girls were considered more proficient in both spoken and written English than boys. However, the results on the influence of the independent variables on the teachers' views were not statistically significant, except for teaching experience. The majority of the well-experienced (73%) and the most experienced teachers (100%) stated that girls were more proficient in written English than boys, but 52% of the least experienced and 57% of the moderately experienced teachers stated that both boys and girls were proficient in written English. The relationship between the teachers' responses on the learners' self-expression in written English and teaching experience is statistically significant (p = 0.04). The results suggest that boys were less proficient in written English than girls were; and that the girls' CS did not necessarily imply a lack

of proficiency in English, whilst boys' CS may suggest a lack of proficiency in English.

Table 5.7: Teachers' views on their medium of lesson delivery (to show the extent of CS in the classroom) (RQ 2)

Language	N	%
1. English all the time	35	39
2. English and Setswana	32	35
3. *Setswana most of the time	10	11
4. *Setswana only	13	14
5. English and other local language(s)	1	1
Total	**91**	**100**

Please note: M Frq: Three Setswana teachers; ***** Setswana teachers only

The results in Table 5.7 above show that although just more than half the teachers (53%) do not CS, there is also evidence of CS in the classroom as 47% of the teachers stated that they code-switch between English and Setswana, as well as between English and other local language(s). However, the latter is almost non-existent as only one teacher stated that he code-switched between English and a local language.

The results suggest the occurrence of CS mainly between English and Setswana regardless of the subject taught. This is expected, given that apart from Setswana, no other local language is used in schools officially.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results show that the nature of the subject taught and home language had an effect on the teachers' responses: the majority of the teachers of content subjects (Biology: 67%, Home Economics: 57%, and History: 62.5%) stated that they CS between English and Setswana in class. However, 74% of the English (L and L) teachers and 54% of the teachers of Setswana respectively said that they use English only and Setswana only during their lessons, thereby suggesting that they do not CS. This also suggests that 26% of the English (L and L) and 46% of the teachers of Setswana also CS. The statistical test results show that the differences in the responses above are statistically highly significant (p = < 0.0001). The results suggest that for subjects taught in English, CS is more likely to occur during the lessons of content subjects than during the English (L and L) lessons. However, during the language lessons, Setswana

teachers were more likely to code-switch to English than the English (L and L) teachers would code-switch to Setswana.

The results also show that there were more teachers whose HL is Setswana (42%) who stated that they CS during their lessons than those who said that they do not. Conversely, there were more teachers whose HL is Ikalanga (53% vs. 35%), English (67% vs. 33%), and Others (50% vs. 30%), who said that they use English only; suggesting that they never CS more than those who said that they do. Although there seems to be a difference in the teachers' views about CS in the classroom, HL did not influence the teachers' views that much as the differences in views are not that significant. Similarly, the statistical tests also confirmed the insignificance of these results. The results suggest that there is more CS to Setswana during the lessons of the teachers whose HL is Setswana than during the lessons of the other teachers.

The results also indicate that independent variables (school location, gender, teaching experience and fluency in speaking English) had no effect on the teachers' responses to CS in the classroom as the differences in their views were not significant. Consequently, the results were also statistically of no significance. However, the differences in the teachers' views based on age were significant: All the teachers of mature age (100%) said they always use English in class, suggesting that there may be no CS during their lessons. It should be noted that only 10% of the teachers were in this category. However, the views of the middle-aged teachers and the younger teachers were evenly split: Fifty percent of the former (middle-aged teachers) and 48% of the latter (younger teachers) stated that they always use English only, but the other 50% of the former and the other 48% of the latter said they CS. The results suggest that there is likely to be CS during the lessons of these two categories of teachers. The statistical test result ($p = 0.04$) confirmed that the relationship between age and the teachers' views on their CS to Setswana is statistically significant. Furthermore, during Setswana lessons, the majority of the younger teachers (67%) and the mature teachers (75%) used limited CS; but the majority of the middle-aged teachers (63%) did not CS. The results suggest that there was likely to be less CS in the Setswana classes taught by middle-aged teachers than in the classes of the other categories of teachers.

Table 5.8: Teachers' attitude towards allowing learners to CS in the classroom (RQ 2)

Feedback	Frq	%
1. I **never** allow my learners to cs to Setswana	14	17
2. I **seldom** allow cs to Setswana.	22	26
3. I allow my learners to cs to Setswana if **they have difficulty with English**.	27	32
4. *I only allow the use of Setswana in my class.	21	25
Total	**84**	**100**

Please note: MFrq: 10; * Setswana teachers only.

The results in Table 5.8 above show that the majority of the teachers of the subjects taught in English (58%) allowed CS in their classes, but 42% of the teachers never or seldom allowed the learners to CS during their lessons; the latter included Setswana teachers. The results suggest that Setswana is accepted as an alternative LoLT or MoI in the classroom even though this is not an official policy. However, not all the teachers were supportive of CS use in the classroom even though they were in the minority.

Influence of independent variables on the dependent variables

The analysis of the results indicated that teaching experience, the nature of the subject taught and home language had an effect on the teachers' responses; and that other independent variables (school location, gender, age and fluency in speaking English) had no influence on the dependent variables. The statistical test results showed that HL had no significant influence on the teachers' views. However, there was a significant tendency of relationship between the teachers' views and teaching experience, school location, gender and age. Furthermore, subject taught and fluency in speaking English had a significant influence on the teachers' views. The results were as follows:

The results showed that 50% of the teachers whose HL is Ikalanga, and 50% of the teachers whose HL is English (one teacher) seldom or never allowed CS to Setswana in class. This suggests that the other half of each group allowed CS. Conversely, 60% of the teachers whose HL is 'Others' and 44% of the teachers for whom HL is Setswana allowed CS in their classes; this suggests that 40% and 56% respectively

never code-switched. The differences in the opinion of the teachers by HL were not that significant, and consequently have no statistical significance. The results also showed that there was a significant tendency of a relationship between the teachers' views and teaching experience, school location, gender and age about the learners' CS in class: Sixty-eight percent of the inexperienced teachers and 65% of the moderately experienced teachers seldom or never allowed CS during their lessons, but 62% of the well-experienced and all the most experienced teachers (100%) allowed CS if learners had difficulty expressing themselves in English. The results showed that teachers with ten years' experience and fewer were reluctant to allow CS use, but those with more than ten years' experience were willing to allow CS if learners experienced problems with self-expression in English. This suggests that CS was less likely to occur during the classes of the former (teachers with less than ten years' expereince) than during the classes of the latter (teachers with more than ten years' expereince). The statistical test result was (p = 0.08).

In addition, the majority of the teachers in peri-urban schools (S 3: 61%; S 4: 50%) allowed their learners to CS to Setswana if they were unable to express themselves well in English; but the majority of the teachers in the urban schools (S 1: 59%; S 2: 76%) seldom or never allowed CS. The results suggest that there was likely to be more CS at peri-urban schools than at urban schools. The statistical test result was (p = 0.07). The results also indicate that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of gender (male 59%; female 56%), seldom or never allowed CS in their classes. However, the proportion of both male (41%) and female (44%) teachers who allowed CS was somehow significant even though fewer than 50% in each case. The results suggest that there were more teachers (male teachers) who did not allow CS than those who did. The statistical test result was (p = 0.08). Furthermore, more of the younger teachers (59%) and the middle-aged teachers (58%) were not keen to allow CS in their classes; but the majority of the mature teachers (75%) allowed CS if learners were unable to express themselves well in English. The results suggest that there was likely to be more tolerance of CS for specific instructional / educational functions during the lessons of the mature teachers than during the lessons of the middle-aged and the younger teachers. The statistical test result (p = 0.07).

The results further showed that the majority of the teachers of content subjects (Biology, Home Economics and History) allowed their learners to CS to Setswana in class if they had difficulty expressing themselves well in English; but 80% of the language teachers (English L and L) seldom or never allowed learners to CS in class. The results suggest that there was likely to be more CS during the lessons of the content subjects than during English (L and L) lessons. The statistical test result (p = 0.001) confirmed that the results above were statistically highly significant.

Furthermore, 57% of the fluent and 54% of the moderately fluent teachers were reluctant to allow CS in their classes, but 43% of the former (fluent teachers) and 46% of the latter (moderately fluent teachers) allowed CS. The results suggest that there were more teachers, irrespective of fluency in English, who discouraged CS than those who condoned it. Again the views of both the fluent and the moderately fluent were very similar and were statistically highly significant (p = 0.001).

Table 5.9: Teachers responses on when learners are allowed to CS in the classroom (RQ 2)

CS in class	Frq	%
1.Learners are allowed to express themselves in Setswana in class **only when speaking**.	40	58
M Frq	29	42
Total	**69**	**100**

Please note: Non-Setswana teachers only.

The results in Table 5.9 above show that CS was limited to oral communication. This suggests that CS is used as a strategy to facilitate spoken communication in class where there is a problem communicating in English.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

Although the results showed that teaching experience and the nature of the subject taught had an effect on the teachers' responses, and that other independent variables had no effect on the teachers' views on when learners were allowed to CS, statistical test results indicated that the teachers' age had an influence on their opinions. Hence the results were statistically significant. Teaching experience and subject taught also somewhat influenced the teachers' opinions. HL, school location, gender, and fluency

in speaking English had no influence of statistical significance to the teachers' views. The results were: more middle-aged teachers (65%) than the younger teachers (50%) and the mature teachers (50%) allowed learners to CS when speaking in class. The reason could be that the middle-aged teachers perceived CS as a teaching and learning strategy that increased learner involvement in the lesson; the other teachers perhaps perceived it as an impediment to language development. The statistical test result shows that the relationship between the teachers' views and age is significant (p = 0.02). Similarly, the results also showed that more teachers of content subjects than the teachers of English (L and L) allowed their learners to CS to Setswana when speaking in class (Biology: 76%, Home Economics: 86% and History: 75% vs. 36%). It is self-evident that the relationship between the nature of the subject taught and the teachers' views is statistically highly significant (p = 0.006).

The results also show that the majority of the teachers in all categories of experience (except the inexperienced teachers) allowed their learners to CS to Setswana in class only when speaking. The results confirm that there was likely to be less CS in the classes of the least experienced teachers than in the classes of the more experienced teachers. The statistical test result (p = 0.09) shows that there was a significant tendency for a relationship between teaching experience and the teachers' opinion on when learners were allowed to CS. However, HL, school location, gender, and fluency in English had no significant influence on the teachers' views about when they allowed their learners to CS in class. The results suggest that CS was used by teachers to explain the lesson, and by learners to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the subject taught. The statistical test results showed that the relationship between the teachers' views and the four independent variables stated above was statistically not significant.

Table 5.10: Teachers' views on causes of CS by teachers and learners (RQ 3)

	Agree		**Disagree**		**Not Sure**		**Total**		**M Frq**
Proficiency in English	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. Teachers' CS in class **is not due** to a lack of proficiency in English.	52	65	10	12	3	18	80	100	14
2. Learners' CS in class **is due** to a lack of proficiency in English.	62	77	10	12	9	11	81	100	13

The results in Table 5.10 above show that the majority of the teachers agreed that the teachers' CS to Setswana in class did not signal their lack of proficiency in English and that the learners' CS signalled their lack of proficiency in English as 65% and 77% indicated respectively.

The results suggest that the teachers CS to Setswana in class to assist the learners who have difficulty following a lesson presented in English, but not because they themselves have problems with self-expression in English. They also allow the learners to CS to Setswana to overcome language difficulty and to be able to participate in the lesson. Therefore, CS in the classroom is used as an educational strategy more for the benefit of the learners than for the teachers.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results showed that gender and teaching experience had a significant influence on the teachers' views about the dependent variables in Table 5.10 above: the proportion or number of female teachers who were of the opinion that *teachers'* CS was not due to a lack of proficiency in English was more than double the number of male teachers who was of the same opinion. The statistical test results revealed that the relationship between the teachers' responses and gender was highly significant ($p = 0.003$). In addition, the majority of both male and female teachers agreed that *learners'* CS was due to a lack of proficiency in English (82% vs. 71%). However, the results were not statistically significant. Similarly, the relationship between the teachers' views and teaching experience was statistically significant ($p = 0.02$). In both cases, there were more teachers (most experienced) who agreed with the views as indicated in Table 5.10 above than the other teachers. The other independent variables (subject taught, HL, age, school location and fluency in speaking English) had no significant influence on the teachers' views, and therefore also were not statistically significant.

Table 5.11: Reasons for teachers' use of CS in class: (RQ 4 ii)

Reasons	N	%
1. Increased learner participation	16	23
2. Better lesson comprehension	35	51
3. Promotion of Setswana as the national language	3	4
4. Promotion of learner attention	17	25
5. All of the above	2	3
6. None of the above	17	25

Please note: Total percentage not provided as respondents could choose more than one item.

The results in Table 5.11 above represent only the views of the teachers of subjects taught in English. These teachers (about 75% of them) use CS in the classroom with varying degrees and for various reasons. The main reason is to address a problem of comprehension (and communication) in English for teaching and learning to take place. The least popular reason for CS in the classroom is to promote Setswana as a national language. The results suggest that the majority of the teachers CS during their lessons for pedagogical reasons.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results showed that the nature of the subject taught had a significant influence on the teachers' views: the majority of the teachers of content subjects stated that they CS mainly to promote comprehension of the lesson by learners, but only a minority of the teachers of English (L and L) shared the similar view. The results suggest that teachers of content subjects were more concerned about the learners' comprehension of the subject content than about improving their learners' proficiency in English. They viewed the latter as the role of the teachers of English. The minimal use of CS during English (L and L) lessons suggests that the English teachers were concerned about the promotion of proficiency in English language among the learners. The relationship between the nature of the subject taught and the teachers' views on the following dependent variables was statistically highly significant:

- The use of CS to increase comprehension of the lesson among learners (p = 0.001);
- to capture learner attention (p = 0.005); and

- to increase learner participation ($p = 0.001$)

The results also indicated that age and school location had a significant influence on the teachers' views: the younger teachers code-switched more than the middle-aged and the mature teachers: viz 13:87, 30:70 and 50:50. The results suggest that the younger teachers were more likely to use CS in class to address the problem of comprehension (and communication) than the middle-aged and the mature teachers. The statistical test results showed that there was a significant tendency of relationship between age and the teachers' CS to capture learners' attention ($p = 0.07$). Furthermore, school location had a significant influence on the teachers' views that they do not CS to perform any of the tasks outlined in Table 5.11 above. The results show that there is a significant tendency of relationship between school location (urban or peri-urban) and the teachers' views ($p = 0.09$): more teachers at urban schools than at peri-urban schools stated that they did not CS in class. The results suggest that CS was more likely to occur in peri-urban schools than in urban schools. This also suggests that the problem of a lack of proficiency in English was more acute in peri-urban schools than in urban schools. Other results on the influence of school location on the teachers' views had no statistical significance. Similarly, the results on the influence of gender, teaching experience, HL, and fluency in speaking English had no statistical significance.

Table 5.12: Instances when teachers allow learners to code-switch to Setswana in the classroom (RQ 4 ii)

CS to Setswana	N	%
1. Ask a question	12	17
2. To respond to teacher's question	13	19
3. To summarize a lesson	2	3
4. To discuss class tasks	15	22
5. All the above	19	28
6. None of the above	35	51

Please note: Total and percentage could not be given as respondents could choose more than one option.

The results in Table 5.12 above show that the learners were allowed to code-switch in class to perform different tasks. However, they did not code-switch as much as the teachers did as indicated earlier in Table 5.11. This supports an earlier observation that teachers code-switch but discouraged their learners from doing so. The results suggest

that CS was used more by the teachers than by the learners, and that it was largely meant to facilitate communication in the classroom due to the learners' inability to express themselves in English as mentioned. However, not all teachers allowed CS by learners even though nearly half of the teachers (49%) allowed their learners to CS.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results show that gender, subject taught, fluency in speaking English and age had a significant influence on the teachers' views about the dependent variables contained in Table 5.12 above. There was a relationship of statistical significance between the teachers' responses and gender: both the male and female teachers allowed their learners to CS, but more male teachers than female teachers did not allow their learners to CS. The proportion or number of male teachers who did not allow CS was almost double the proportion of teachers who allowed it (60% vs. 38%).

The statistical tests confirmed that the relationship between gender and tolerance (by female teachers) for learners' CS was statistically significant ($p = 0.03$); and the relationship between gender and less tolerance for learners' CS (by male teachers) was statistically highly significant ($p = 0.005$).

The results on the relationship between subject taught and the teachers' views about CS in the classroom were significant: CS was more permissible during the lessons of content subjects than during English (L and L) lessons. The statistical test results showed that the relationship between subject taught and the teachers' views on allowing learners to CS when asking a question was statistically significant ($p = 0.04$): only 6% of the teachers of English (L and L) allowed this practice, but for content subjects the percentage was more (Biology: 29%; History: 13%; and Home Economics: 28%). Similarly, the relationship between subject taught and the teachers' views on the learners' CS to respond to the teacher's question was also statistically highly significant ($p = 0.006$): 3% of English (L and L) teachers allowed learners to CS when responding to a teacher's question, but for Biology and History it was 24% and 25% respectively; and for Home Economics teachers, it was 43%. Therefore, the results suggest that the nature of the subject taught (language or content) influenced the teachers' attitude towards CS in the classroom.

Furthermore, age had a significant influence on the teachers' views about when they allowed CS in their classes: more mature teachers (50:50) than the other teachers allowed their learners to answer in Setswana in class, with the least CS occurring during the classes of the middle-aged (10:90) than during the classes of the younger teachers (21:79). The learners were also allowed to CS when asking a question in class, and the least CS once again took place during the lessons of the middle-aged teachers (10:90) when compared with CS taking place during the lessons of the younger teachers and the mature teachers (25:75) in each case. Statistically, there was a significant tendency towards a relationship between age and the teachers' views about the learners' CS when asking and answering a question in class ($p = 0.07$). In addition, the results also showed that the few middle-aged teachers who condoned CS allowed it all the time, but more teachers of younger ages and the mature ages occasionally allowed it. For instance, 5% of the middle-aged teachers stated that they allowed learners to CS to perform all the classroom functions listed in Table 5.12 above but none of the younger teachers and the mature teachers allowed CS at the same frequency. The results were statistically significant ($p = 0.03$).

It was noted previously that more of the younger teachers and of the middle-aged teachers than the mature teachers stated that they code-switched in class. However, on learners' CS, fewer of the younger teachers and the middle-aged teachers allowed it, but the proportion of mature teachers who allowed it was the same as those who did not allow it: (younger: 87:46; middle-aged: 70:53, mature: 50:50). This suggests that although CS was used as a mode of interaction between teachers and learners, among the younger and the middle-aged teachers, it was an instructional strategy used or allowed to ensure comprehension during lessons, but not necessarily a strategy that learners could always use to participate in the lesson. However, for the mature teachers, CS was a two-way strategy used to facilitate lesson comprehension, and to enable learners to participate in the lesson, as well.

Similarly, fluency in speaking English had a significant influence on the teachers' views on some of the dependent variables listed in Table 5.12 above. Statistically, the relationship between fluency in speaking English and the teachers' views on the learners' CS to ask a question and to answer the teacher's question was statistically highly significant ($p = 0.001$) and significant ($p = 0.01$) respectively: almost the same

proportion of the teachers fluent in English and the teachers moderately fluent in English stated that they allowed CS when learners asked questions (16% vs. 17%) and when learners answered a question in Setswana (14% vs. 17%). The results were significant in that the fluent teachers were not expected to condone CS. However, the results indicated that CS was a communication strategy allowed by the teachers in their classes, regardless of their fluency in English, to enable learners to participate in the lesson. This suggests that teachers recognized that the learners' lack of competency in spoken English prevented them from participating in the lesson. Therefore, allowing CS was a way of overcoming the difficulty in communication. The other results showed that fluency in speaking English had no significant influence on the differences in the teachers' responses.

The results also showed that teaching experience, HL and school location had no significant influence on the teachers' views about the learners' CS. Therefore, the relationship between these independent variables and the teachers' views about the dependent variables listed in Table 5.12 above was not statistically significant.

Table 5.13: Teachers' views on the educational benefits of CS in a Setswana class (RQ 4 ii)

CS in a Setswana class	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure		Total		M Frq
In Setswana class I sometimes:	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. Use English to clarify a point.	21	84	3	12	1	4	25	100	0
2. Allow learners to explain in English.	8	36	14	64	0	0	21	100	4

Please note: Only the views of Setswana teachers.

The results in Table 5.13 above show that the majority of the teachers of Setswana (84%) CS to clarify a point, but they did not allow their learners to CS even when they had difficulty explaining themselves in Setswana, as stated by 64% of the teachers. The results show that CS also takes place in Setswana classes; and that the teachers freely code-switched as and whenever they wished, but the learners were not allowed to freely code-switch. The results also show that some Setswana teachers, even though they were in the minority, recognized the value of CS, which is to facilitate teaching and learning,

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results showed that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of teaching experience, age, school location, gender, HL and fluency in speaking English, stated that they sometimes CS to English to clarify a point. All Setswana teachers considered themselves to be fluent in English. The results also showed that fluency in speaking English and subject taught had no influence on the teachers' views about allowing learners to CS to English during Setswana lessons. However, the majority of the teachers in all the categories of experience, except the least experienced, who were also the younger teachers, did not allow learners to CS to Setswana. The results suggest that during the lessons of younger and inexperienced teachers there was likely to be more CS to English than during the lessons of other teachers. However, the differences in the results were not that significant. Similarly, school location and gender had no significant effect on the differences in the teachers' responses. None of the results above was statistically significant. Statistical tests were not applicable to the nature of the subject taught as the dependent variables specifically referred to Setswana as a subject only.

Table 5.14: Teachers' views on the effect of CS on teaching and learning pace (RQ 4 iii)

	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure		Total		M Frq
Effect of CS on teaching	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. CS during the lesson is a waste of teaching time.	8	10	53	69	16	21	77	100	17

The results in Table 5.14 above show that the majority of the teachers were of the view that CS did not slow down the pace of teaching and learning; and therefore had no adverse effect on curriculum coverage. The results suggest that although the teachers had positive views about CS, not all them code-switched, hence some were not sure about its effect on teaching and learning.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results show that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of HL, subject taught, school location, gender, teaching experience, age, and fluency in speaking English, did not view the use of CS as a waste of teaching time. However, only the results of the

effect of teaching experience and fluency in speaking English on the teachers' views were significant. The results were such that although teachers, irrespective of teaching experience, did not agree that CS had an adverse effect on teaching time, there was a significant difference between the proportion of the well-experienced teachers and the other teachers (89% vs. 69%, 54% and 60%). The statistical test result (p = 0.005) showed that the relationship between teaching experience and the teachers' views about the effect of CS on teaching time was highly significant**.** Similarly, the results on the effect of fluency in speaking English on the teachers' views were significant. The majority of both the teachers fluent in English and the teachers moderately fluent in English agreed that CS did not waste teaching time. This confirms an earlier view that both categories of teachers code-switched and allowed their learners to code-switch. The results suggest that the majority of the teachers were of the opinion that CS had an educational value and did not merely constitute a repetition of lesson material previously presented in English. The relationship between fluency in speaking English and the teachers' views is statistically significant (p = 0.01).

The results of the effect of other independent variables (gender, age, HL, subject taught, school location) on the teachers' views were not statistically significant. The results suggest that both male and female teachers of all age groups, regardless of their HL, and teaching either content or language subjects in urban and peri-urban schools, were likely to code-switch and to allow CS in their classes.

Table 5.15: Teachers' views on the didactic consequences of CS in the schools (Q4 i)

	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure		Total		M Frq
Didactic effect of CS	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. Learners understand better when I explain some lesson parts in Setswana.	35	64	13	24	7	13	55	100	14
2. Using both English and Setswana prevents proficiency in English among the learners.	30	37	33	40	18	22	81	100	13

Please note: Item 1 excludes views of Setswana teachers.

The results in Table 5.15 above show that the majority of the teachers were of the view that CS to Setswana improved understanding of the lessons and further did not prevent the development of proficiency in English among learners. The results suggest that

teachers viewed CS, be it to Setswana or to English, as a positive teaching strategy. The results also suggest that while some teachers were only concerned about the educational benefits of CS, others (although in the minority) were apprehensive about the effect of CS use on language development. The latter view is held by 37% of the teachers.

Influence of independent variables on the dependent variables

The results show that the nature of the subject taught and HL had a significant effect on the teachers' views about the didactic consequences of CS in schools. The majority of the teachers of English (L and L) stated that CS had negative effects on the learners' proficiency in English, but teachers of content subjects said it had no adverse effect on the proficiency in English, even though the opinion of the Home Economics' teachers was evenly divided (English: 62% vs. History: 57%; Biology: 50% and Home Economics: 40%). The results suggest that, from the point of view of language development in English, the language teachers did not support CS, but the teachers of the content subjects did not have any objection as their primary focus was more on understanding the content among the learners, and less on the improvement of proficiency in the target language. The relationship between subject taught and the teachers' views on the effect of CS on English proficiency among learners was statistically significant ($p = 0.04$). However, there were no significant differences in the teachers' responses on the effect of the nature of subject taught on the teachers' views about CS to improve comprehension of the lesson. The majority of the teachers, regardless of the nature of subject taught, agreed that CS enhanced understanding the content of the lessons. Consequently, the results had no statistical significance.

The results also show that the differences in the teachers' responses by HL regarding the effect of CS on the comprehension of the content of the lesson were significant: the majority of the teachers, for whom Setswana, Ikalanga and those whose HL falls under 'Others', whose HLs were one of the indigenous languages, agreed that CS promoted understanding of the lessons, but all the teachers whose HL is English, which is also the LoLT or MoI (100%) disagreed. The results show that HL influenced the teachers' opinion. Furthermore, differences in the proportion of teachers who agreed by HL were significant (Setswana: 79%; Ikalanga: 45%; and 'Others': 53%). The results suggest that the teachers for whom Setswana is a HL were likely to CS to Setswana

during their lessons whilst the teachers for whom Ikalanga is a HL were less likely to CS to Setswana during their lessons. The statistical test results ($p = 0.03$) showed that the relationship between HL and the teachers' views on the effect of CS on the learners' comprehension of the lessons were statistically significant. However, the results on the effect of HL on the teachers' views about the effect of CS on proficiency in English among learners were not that significant.

The results also showed that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of fluency in speaking English, age, school location, teaching experience, and gender, agreed that CS enhanced teaching and learning. The differences in the teachers' responses were not significant; therefore, none of the five independent variables above had an influence on the teachers' views. The statistical tests results were also not statistically significant.

Table 5.16: Teachers' views on the educational benefits of CS (RQ 4 ii)

	Agree		**Disagree**		**Not Sure**		**Total**		**M Frq**
Effect of CS on T and L	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. CS between English and Setswana promotes teaching and learning	41	54	18	24	17	22	76	100	18

The results in Table 5.16 above indicate that the majority of the 78% of the teachers who gave a definite answer held positive views about the effect of CS on teaching and learning. The 22% who were non-committal suggest that they did not CS in their classes. The results suggest that the majority of the teachers viewed CS (especially between Setswana and English) as educationally beneficial; and are therefore likely to use it.

Influence of independent variables on the dependent variables

The results show that there were differences in opinion between teachers of content subjects and English (L and L): the former (Biology: 58%; History: 57%; Home Economics: 75%) agreed that CS promotes teaching and learning, but the latter -- English (L and L) did not support CS (38% disagreed; 29% agreed), and viewed the practice to be at odds with the main objective of their department. However, the majority of Setswana teachers (73%) held positive views about CS in general. Their

response was unexpected, given the assumption that as teachers of a language subject, they would discourage CS. The results suggest that the use of CS was least likely to occur in the English (L and L) lessons than in the lessons of the other subjects, including Setswana. Therefore, there were no significant differences in views between Setswana teachers and the teachers of content subjects. The results were therefore statistically not significant.

Furthermore, other independent variables, namely school location, age, teaching experience, gender, HL, and fluency in speaking English had no influence on the teachers' responses; and the majority of the teachers shared the view that CS promotes teaching and learning. The results suggest that CS is a common occurrence in the classroom. Therefore neither the differences in the teachers' responses nor the results stated above were statistically significant.

Table 5.17: Teachers' attitude towards CS for instructional purposes (RQ 5 i)

	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure		Total		M Frq
Teacher's CS	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
I have no problem CS during my lessons.	34	45	35	47	6	8	75	100	19

The results in Table 5.17 above show that there was no significant difference in the proportion of the teachers who found CS problematic, and those who did not (47% vs. 45%).

Influence of independent variables on the dependent variables

The results show that there was a significant difference in the teachers' responses by the nature of subject taught. Among the subjects taught in English, the majority of the English (L and L) teachers (74%) and Home Economics teachers (60%) objected to CS, but the majority of the Biology teachers (56%) and those of History (71%) had no problem regarding CS in their classes. There was not much of a significant difference in views among the teachers of content subjects. However, among the language subjects, the nature of the subject taught had an influence on the teachers' views: Setswana teachers held different views from those of English (L and L). The former did not object to CS, but the latter did (55% vs. 74% respectively). The result on the

relationship between the teachers' views and subject taught is statistically significant ($p = 0.04$).

On the contrary, the results show that there were no striking significant differences about CS during lessons in the views among teachers by gender, school location, age, teaching experience, HL and fluency in speaking English. In this regard, none of the six independent variables had a significant influence on the teachers' views. Therefore, the results were not statistically significant.

5.5 TEACHERS' VIEWS ON THE ROLE OF SETSWANA IN EDUCATION

Table 5.18: Teachers' views on the effects of Botswana's LiEP on the use of Setswana in education (RQ 6)

	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure		Total		M Frq
Setswana in education	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. Setswana should be used during Setswana lessons only.	34	43	40	51	5	6	79	100	15
2. Using Setswana in class is a sign of national pride.	27	33	36	44	18	22	81	100	13

The results in Table 5.18 above show that there were more teachers who supported the use of Setswana in non-Setswana classes than those who were opposed to it (51% vs. 43%). The results suggest that the majority of teachers, although not by many, were of the view that Setswana, as a national language, had a role to play in education. However, the proportion of those who were opposed to its use signifies that some teachers were apprehensive about using Setswana for teaching and learning other subjects apart from Setswana.

Once again, more teachers did not view the use of Setswana in class as a sign of national pride (44% vs. 33%). Nonetheless, this view could not be said to be popular as fewer than half the respondents subscribed to it. The results suggest that the use of Setswana in class is purely didactic – to overcome a communication problem, not to promote it deliberately as a national language.

Influence of independent variables on the dependent variables

The results indicated that gender, subject taught, school location and fluency in speaking English had a significant influence on the teachers' responses to the use of Setswana in education: 56% of the male teachers did not support the use of Setswana (LoLT) to teach other subjects apart from Setswana as a subject, but 58% of the female teachers supported it. The results also showed that 62% of the male teachers disagreed with the view that the use of Setswana in class was a sign of national pride, but 39% of the female teachers were in agreement. Almost a third (32%) of the female teachers were not sure of what their opinions were. These could be teachers who do not teach Setswana and may not be concerned about the promotion of Setswana as a national language. The results suggest that the male teachers were opposed to Setswana assuming a similar role to that of English in education, but the female teachers were supportive of its use as a LoLT. The statistical test results showed that the differences in the teachers' responses above were statistically highly significant ($p = 0.009$).

The results above are not consistent with the earlier results that male teachers tended to CS more than the female teachers. Given their rate of CS during their lessons, one would have expected the male teachers to support Setswana use in the teaching of other subjects. This implies that male teachers were satisfied with the informal use of Setswana in class, in the form of CS to address specific language problems during lessons of subjects taught in English. On the other hand, female teachers seemed to favour the official use of Setswana as the LoLT even for subjects currently taught in 'English'.

The results also showed that the teachers of the two language subjects (English and Setswana) held opposite views: 68% of the English (L and L) teachers supported the view that Setswana should never be used in class except during Setswana lessons, but 73% of Setswana teachers disagreed. In addition, 83% of the Setswana teachers agreed that using Setswana in class was a sign of national pride, but 64% of the English (L and L) teachers were not of the same opinion. Each group 'jealously' guarded their subject. In the researcher's view, the English (L and L) teachers viewed the use of Setswana outside Setswana lessons as reducing the importance of English in the curriculum; and the Setswana teachers viewed the use of Setswana outside Setswana

lessons as promotion of Setswana in the curriculum. Furthermore, the majority of the teachers of content subjects also supported the use of Setswana in the teaching of other subjects, even though the History teachers' views were evenly divided. The results suggest that the teachers of the other subjects taught in 'English' were more likely to CS to Setswana during their lessons than the teachers of English (L and L). The results are consistent with earlier results stated above (cf. Table 5.4 above). However, these teachers specifically supported the use of Setswana as the LoLT in primary schools. The majority of the teachers of content subjects (Biology: 61%; and History: 71%) did not view the use of Setswana as a mark of national pride. Fifty seven percent of the teachers in Home Economics were not sure, while more disagreed (29%) than agreed (14%).

The results showed that subject taught influenced the teachers' opinion in that only Setswana teachers supported the view that using Setswana in class was a sign of national pride. The teachers of English (L and L) and content subjects, who also taught in 'English', did not support this view. The views of Setswana teachers are not unexpected, given that it is also within their mandate to promote Setswana as a national language. The results suggest that the teachers of the subjects taught in 'English' CS to Setswana, not to promote Setswana as a national language, but to overcome the language problem that their learners experienced as had been observed. The results above were statistically highly significant ($p = 0.003$), showing that the relationship between the teachers' responses and the nature of the subject taught is highly significant.

Furthermore, the results showed that 61% of the teachers at S 1 and 63% of the teachers at S 3 supported the use of Setswana for teaching other subjects, but at S 2 and S 4, 50% and 53% respectively were of the view that Setswana should only be used during Setswana lessons. Although schools within the same location had divergent views, the differences in opinion were not that significant. Hence the results were not statistically significant. The results further showed that 42% and 70% of the teachers at S 2 and S 4 disagreed with the view that using Setswana in class was a sign of national pride, but at S 1 and S 3 33% and 47% agreed respectively. It was noted that a significant number of teachers at S 1, S 2 and S 3 were non-committal, hence the low number of those who gave a definite opinion. The results were, however, somehow

significant in that the majority of the teachers at S 4 were clearly opposed to the idea that using Setswana in class suggested showing national pride. The results were not unexpected as Setswana was used less as a home language but more as a national language. Naturally, a significant proportion of the teachers who spoke Ikalanga as HL, had more of an affinity for their own language than for Setswana. The statistical test result (p = 0.06) showed that there was a significant tendency of relationship between school location and the teachers' responses on using Setswana to demonstrate national pride.

The results also showed that 49% of the fluent and 50% of the moderately fluent teachers supported the view that Setswana should be used in the teaching of other subjects. However, the remaining 50% of the moderately fluent teachers were opposed to the use of Setswana as a LoLT. The results are significant in that the moderately fluent teachers were expected to support the use of Setswana in the teaching of other subjects, while the fluent teachers were not expected to be supportive it. The results above were statistically highly significant (p = 0.001). In addition, 48% of the fluent teachers did not view the use of Setswana in class as a sign of national pride, but 40% of the moderately fluent teachers viewed it as such. The results suggest that the moderately fluent teachers were more likely to use Setswana in their classes than the teachers more fluent in English. However, the differences in the teachers' views were not that significant. Consequently, the results were not statistically significant.

However, teaching experience, HL and age had no significant influence on the teachers' views on the two dependent variables contained in Table 5.18 above. The majority of the teachers with the least experience and 50% of those with the most experience had similar views, but those in the middle categories shared similar views, as well. In addition, only the well-experienced teachers (50%) viewed the use of Setswana in class as a sign of national pride. The results suggest the following: The teachers with six to15 years' experience were more likely to CS to Setswana in class than the least and the most experienced teachers. However, although the majority of the teachers mainly used Setswana in class to compensate for the learners' lack of competency in English, the majority of the well-experienced teachers used it for pedagogical as well as reasons of national identity.

The results also showed that 49% of the teachers whose HL is Setswana and 63% of the teachers whose HL falls in the category 'Others', supported the view that Setswana should be used in the teaching of the other subjects, but 62% of the teachers whose HL is Ikalanga and the two teachers whose HL is English (100%) were not in support of this view. The results suggest that the former group supported a wide use of Setswana in the curriculum; but the latter did not support this notion. As previously alluded to, the teachers whose HL falls under 'Others' appear to have accepted Setswana as a national language even though their languages are not taught in the schools. These teachers were very few (11), and accounted for only 13% of the teachers who participated in the study. Furthermore, the majority of the teachers, irrespective of HL, did not view the use of Setswana as a sign of national pride. This suggests that the majority of the teachers used Setswana purely for didactic reasons but not for its status as a national language.

The results also showed that 57% of the younger teachers did not support the view that Setswana should be used to teach other subjects; but 55% of the middle-aged and 63% of the mature teachers supported this view. The results suggest that the younger teachers were less likely to CS in their classes than the middle-aged and the mature teachers. However, the differences in the teachers' opinion were not that significant. The results also showed that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of age, disagreed with the view that using Setswana is a sign of national pride; even though the views of the mature teachers were evenly divided (44%). This suggests that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of age, used Setswana purely for pedagogical reasons.

The results expressed on the influence of teaching experience, HL and age on the teachers' views about the use of Setswana as the LoLT and using Setswana to demonstrate national pride were not statistically significant.

5.6 TEACHERS' VIEWS ON THE ROLE OF OTHER LOCAL LANGUAGES IN EDUCATION

Table 5.19: Teachers' use of local languages in class (RQ 2)

	Always		Sometimes		Never		Total		M Frq
Local languages in T and L	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
Teachers use other local languages to ensure learners' understanding.	6	8	43	55	29	37	78	100	16

The results in Table 5.19 above show that CS to a local language also occurred in the classroom as indicated by 63% of the teachers. The results suggest that, in addition to CS between English and Setswana, CS may also take place to a local language.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variable

The results showed that the differences in the teachers' opinions about the use of local languages were not significant; hence none of the six independent variables (teaching experience, fluency in speaking English, subject taught, HL, age, and gender) had a significant impact on the teachers' views. Furthermore, teachers at the two urban schools held a different opinion than those at the two peri-urban schools viz. that local languages were not used in class as indicated by 60% and 52% of the teachers at S 1 and S 2 respectively, and that local languages were used in class as indicated by 87.5% and 89% of the teachers at S 3 and S 4 respectively. The results suggest that CS to a local language was more likely to occur at the two peri-urban schools than at the two urban schools. However, it is important to note that a significant number of the teachers whose HL is Ikalanga (47%), the main local language of the area, denied that a local language was used in class. Hence the results above are not statistically significant.

Table 5.20: Local languages often used in class (RQ 2)

Local Languages	N	%
1. Ikalanga	75	96
5. Sebirwa	1	1
6. Setswapong	2	3
Total	**78**	**100**

M Frq: 22

The results in Table 5.20 above show that Ikalanga is the main local language often used in the classroom. These results were not unexpected, given that Ikalanga is the language of the area and a home language for over 25% of the teachers and more than 50% of the learners (cf. Table 4.5 and Table 4.14 in Chapter 4).

Influence of independent variables on the dependent variables

All the independent variables, namely gender, teaching experience, subject taught, home language, fluency in speaking English, age and school location, had no effect on the teachers' responses. Furthermore, by school location, the proportion of the teachers who stated that Ikalanga, as the local language, was often used in the classroom, was higher at the two peri-urban schools (S 3 and S 4) than at the two urban schools (S 1 and S 2) (31% and 31% vs. 21% and 18% respectively). The results suggest that Ikalanga was more likely to be used in the classroom at the two peri-urban schools than at the two urban schools. However, the results were not that significant. None of the results (that is to say, the influence of all seven the independent variables on the dependent variable contained in Table 5.20) above were statistically significant.

Table 5.21: Teachers' views on the effect of Botswana's LiEP on other local languages (RQ 6)

	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure		Total		M Frq
Local languages in education	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
1. I have no problem when a learner uses his / her local language in class.	13	17	58	75	6	8	77	100	17
2. There is no need to use other local languages in class besides English.	25	32	37	47	16	21	78	100	16
3. I sometimes use the learners' local language in class to ensure understanding of the lesson.	28	36	45	58	4	5	77	100	17
4. Allowing learners to use their local language in class does not help them improve their spoken English.	51	69	14	19	9	12	74	100	20
5. Allowing learners to use their local language does not increase class participation.	17	23	29	40	27	37	73	100	21

The results in Table 5.21 above show that the majority of the teachers have negative perceptions about the use of the learners' local language in class as shown by the following:

- They neither used nor allowed learners to use their local language in class to enhance understanding their lessons as indicated by 75% and 58% of the teachers respectively.
- They agreed that allowing the learners to use their specific local language negatively impacts on attaining fluency in English as indicated by 69% of the teachers. Interestingly, a similar question was asked earlier about CS between English and Setswana, and teachers stated that CS to Setswana did not have a negative impact on English proficiency among the learners. One is therefore compelled to ask: Why would CS to a local language negatively affect English proficiency if CS to Setswana does not? This question will be addressed in Chapter Eight.

Despite the negative perceptions of CS to a local language expressed above, there were some teachers who saw the need to use it in education. As examples, the following:

- Forty seven percent (47%) of the teachers indicated that there was need to use other local languages in class besides English, even though almost one-third (32%) had reservations about it.
- Forty percent (40%) of the teachers agreed that allowing learners to CS to their local language in class increased class participation, even though 23% did not agree.

The results suggest that local languages were viewed as having a minimal role or no role to play in education, and were regarded largely as LFIC languages. The responses by some teachers that they were not sure about the effects of the use of a local language in class suggest that these were the teachers who never CS to the learners' local language as it was not officially permissible to do so, or because they did not speak it.

Influence of independent variables on dependent variables

The results showed that home language, subject taught, and gender had a significant effect on the teachers' views about the dependent variables contained in Table 5.21 above: The majority of the teachers did not CS to a local language to enhance understanding of the lesson, except for 60% of the teachers whose HL falls in the category 'Others', who stated that they sometimes CS to a local language in class. The results were unexpected in that the teachers whose HL is Ikalanga were expected to use their HL that the majority of the learners also spoke and understood, and not the teachers whose HL falls under 'Others'.

The teachers' views differed on the need to use a local language in class. Among the language subjects, 50% of the teachers of English (L and L) said that there was no need to use it, but 86% of the teachers of Setswana disagreed and pointed out a need for it. The results suggest that, as previously explained, the English (L and L) teachers were protective of the use of English in education; but the teachers of Setswana, as one of the indigenous languages in Botswana, also supported the use of other local languages in education. Similarly, among the teachers of subjects taught in English, 43% of the History teachers held similar views as the English (L and L) teachers, but 60% of the Home Economics teachers and 44% of the Biology teachers shared similar views as those of the Setswana teachers. The results also indicated that the opinion of the

English (L and L) teachers was different from the rest of the other teachers who teach their subjects in English (except for 43% of the History teachers). This also suggests a protectionist tendency among the English (L and L) teachers.

Despite the teachers' negative perceptions about the use of a local language in class, the results show that among the teachers who gave a definite answer (a significant number of them were not sure), there were more teachers, irrespective of subjects taught, who agreed that allowing the learners to use a local language in class increased class participation. Similarly, the majority of the teachers whose HL is Setswana, or Ikalanga, or 'Others', shared the same view, except for the two teachers whose HL is English and who were opposed to this practice. The results on the effect of HL on the teachers' views show that the teachers whose HL is one of the indigenous languages were positive about the use of local languages in education, but the two teachers whose HL is English had negative views on the use of local languages in class.

The majority of both the male teachers and female teachers also shared the same sentiments. While the majority of female teachers (57%) found it unnecessary to use a local language in class, besides English, the male teachers' opinions were evenly divided on the issue (36% agreed that it was necessary, and the other 36% stated that it was unnecessary).

The results suggest that, generally, the majority of the teachers, irrespective of subject taught, HL and gender, had more negative than positive perceptions about the use of local languages in class. By subject taught, this negative perception was more evident among the teachers of English (L and L) than among the teachers who taught content subjects as well as the teachers who taught Setswana. This suggests that the English (L and L) teachers were less likely to CS to a local language than the teachers of the other subjects. The teachers whose HL is any of the indigenous languages (Ikalanga, or Setswana, or 'Others') were more receptive to the idea of using a local language in class than teachers for whom English was a HL. The results suggest that the former (teachers whose HL is any of the indigenous languages) were more likely to use a local language in class as long as they could speak it and it was intelligible to the learners. The results also suggest that these teachers did not use a local language in class because it was not yet officially permissible to do so, not because they were overly

concerned about the fact. By gender, the results suggest that the both male and female teachers largely viewed the local languages as languages with a limited educational role. However, the female teachers were more negative towards the use of a local language in class than their male colleagues. Therefore, they were less likely to CS to a local language in class.

The results on the influence of subject taught, gender and HL on the teachers' views on allowing learners to CS to a local language to increase class participation were significant, and also statistically significant. The relationship between subject taught and HL and the differences in the teachers' responses on allowing learners to CS to a local language to increase participation, was statistically significant ($p = 0.02$, and $p = 0.03$ respectively). Similarly, the relationship between home language and the differences in the teachers' responses to the learners' use of a local language in class is statistically significant ($p = 0.03$). There was also a significant tendency for a relationship between HL and the differences in the teachers' responses on allowing learners to CS to a local language to increase participation ($p = 0.06$). Further, there was a significant tendency for a relationship between subject taught and the differences in the teachers' responses to the need to use other local languages in class ($p = 0.09$). Other results had no statistical significance.

The results suggest that, although the majority of the teachers had negative perceptions about the use of local languages in education generally, some recognized that, potentially, these languages could enhance teaching and learning. The results also suggest that currently, these teachers do not CS to a local language as the LiEP does not cover such a provision, not because they did not recognize some of the educational benefits of using a local language for teaching and learning. However, they acknowledge the negative effect of allowing the use of a local language in class on the development of a proficiency in English.

Furthermore, the effect of teaching experience, age, fluency in speaking English and school location on the teachers' views on the dependent variables contained in Table 5.21 above was investigated but found to be of no significance. The results (indicated that the majority of the teachers, irrespective of all the independent variables stated above, disapproved of CS to local languages in class. They found their use

unnecessary and stated that allowing learners to use them negatively impacted on the learners' attainment of a proficiency in English. However, on a positive note, the majority of the teachers, irrespective of the length of their teaching experience, age, fluency in speaking English, and school location agreed that allowing learners to CS to their local language increased class participation. None of the results above was statistically significant.

5.7 SHORT SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The teachers' responses discussed above have shown that both the teachers and the learners CS in the classroom. The teachers generally had a positive attitude towards CS in the classroom, but they supported its use more by teachers than by learners. They viewed its use by teachers as a way of addressing the problem of a lack of full competence in English among the majority of their learners which, in their view, negatively affected teaching and learning. The teachers' views suggest that they believed that they had acquired a proficiency in English, therefore their CS was not due to a lack of proficiency in English. Furthermore, although both boys and girls CS, in the teachers' views, boys CS more than girls, and the latter were more fluent in English than the former.

The results also showed that the teachers whose home language is English or Ikalanga consistently shared the same views; and the teachers whose HL is Setswana or 'Others' also consistently shared similar views on issues relating to language use in the classroom. It was also noted that, generally, the teachers whose HL falls in the category 'Others', were positive about the use of Setswana. This suggests that they have accepted it as a national language. The teachers whose HL is Ikalanga were generally negative about the use of Setswana (LoLT); while teachers whose HL is Setswana were consistently negative towards the use of other local languages, such as Ikalanga in education. The teachers whose HL is English were opposed to the use of both Setswana and a local language in class.

Furthermore, the results showed that while the independent variables did not have much influence on the teachers' views in the case of most of the dependent variables,

where there was an effect, there often was a relationship between experience and age. The results also showed that generally, gender and fluency in speaking English did not indicate much of a difference in the teachers' views, but the nature of the subject taught and school location influenced the teachers' views to some extent.

Having presented the teachers' responses, the learners' responses are presented in the next chapter in a similar fashion.