

CHAPTER NINE

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations, and Limitations

9.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, a summary of the key areas of the study is provided. Conclusions drawn from the study are used to address the sub-problems (cf. Chapter One, Section 1.2.2) that initially were identified in relation to the main problem of the study, namely the role of CS in an educational setting (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 60). The sub-problems are dealt with chronologically, and at each stage it is stated whether or not each sub-problem has been addressed adequately, and whether or not the data confirm or refute each one of them. Consequently, the researcher would have dealt with the main problem of the study. Based on the findings of the study, a list of recommendations is then made. In conclusion, limitations of the study are articulated and implications for further research are suggested.

9.2 SUMMARY

This study investigated the role of CS in teaching and learning in four senior secondary schools in the north-eastern region of Botswana. CS in Botswana schools takes place between English and Setswana, despite the promulgation of the Botswana Government White Paper No. 2 of 1994 that English is the official LoLT from the second year of primary-school education onwards. Although CS is a common phenomenon that occurs in the utterances made by bilingual and multilingual speakers in formal and informal social occasions, such as a public address by a government official or a speech at a wedding, in educational settings it has not gained the same recognition. The reason is that the didactic and educational functions of this phenomenon are not clearly understood. It appears, for instance, that the use of CS in educational settings in Botswana is not, theoretically, viewed as a case of CS. Instead, it is the use of Setswana during lessons of subjects that are taught in 'English' to overcome the problem of a lack of full comprehension of the lesson among the learners caused by lack of a proficiency in English. Furthermore, CS in educational settings in Botswana takes place in contravention of the LiEP.

It was against this background that this study was undertaken: To establish if the phenomenon that occurs in Botswana classrooms really is CS as universally defined, or if it signals an underlying problem that may be due to a lack of proficiency in English on the part of the teachers, or the learners, or even both. In addition, the study sought to investigate whether CS facilitates learning or impedes it; whether its use does not suggest that the LoLT is inappropriate, and whether teaching and learning could not be more effective if Setswana were to be used, that is, the language that both the teachers and learners best speak and understand.

To investigate this phenomenon, the problem under investigation was analyzed in terms of six sub-problems outlined in Chapter One. Several research questions were formulated to address effectively these sub-problems (cf. Chapter 1, Section 1.3). An extensive review of related literature was undertaken to inform this study and to identify the theoretical framework within which the study should be undertaken (cf. Chapter Two). The MLF, associated with Myers-Scotton (1993a) and The MLP conceived by Kamwangamalu (1989a, 1990, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 267) were identified as the conceptual frameworks which informed the study.

The two models, although independently conceived, are virtually identical. The MLF distinguishes between the ML and the EL. The ML is the main language that plays the dominant role in CS while the EL is the guest language that takes on the morphological and phonological structure of the ML in CS. Theoretically, English is supposed to be the dominant language in the classroom that should determine CS but, in actual practice, it is Setswana that is the ML, with English becoming the EL. Essentially, the ML determines every aspect in CS (Kamwangamalu, 1989a, 1990, in Kamwangamalu, 1999). Similarly, the MLP states that in CS, only the ML determines whether constituents from the EL are acceptable or not.

The MM of Myers-Scotton (1993a) also informed the present study. This model claims that all linguistic choices, including that of CS, are indications of the social negotiation of rights and obligations that exist between participants in a conversational exchange (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 75; Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Mandubu, 1999: 8).

The MM allows CS to fulfil three main functions (Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Kamwangamalu, 2000, Mandubu, 1999) namely:

- CS as an unmarked choice: This is when CS is the expected pattern of language choice employed as a communicative strategy in a given linguistic exchange to serve a particular communicative function, usually inclusive in nature. There are two sub-types that fall under this category of CS – CS as a sequence of unmarked choices or CS as an unmarked choice. The former occurs as a result of a change in the situational factors during a conversational exchange. In the latter, situational factors hardly change during a conversational exchange (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 114).
- CS as a marked choice: This is when CS is the unexpected choice, to indicate the social distance among the participants in a given conversational situation. In such a case, CS is used to exclude deliberately some members present in a conversational situation. Here the speaker switches to a language that he or she knows that only a certain part of the audience will understand.
- CS as an exploratory choice: This is when the speaker initiates a conversation in one language, and if the party being addressed does not understand, CS takes place. The speaker switches to the most likely language that is intelligible to both parties. This form of CS is used where there is some degree of uncertainty about the choice of a mutual language.

In a classroom situation, it is CS as an unmarked choice (but not CS as a sequence of unmarked choices) and CS as an exploratory choice that often are used. The former refers to the use of Setswana during a lesson normally taught in 'English' for the teacher to include all the learners whose English comprehension may not be that good. The latter refers to a situation whereby the teacher initiates a conversation in English, sensing that some of the learners may not be following the utterance that he / she CS to Setswana. However, in the case of the classroom situation, the teacher is usually certain about the choice of a mutual language. CS as a marked choice is therefore not applicable in the present study.

9.3 CONCLUSIONS

This section highlights the conclusions drawn from this study that are presented in two main areas. First, conclusions will be drawn about the presence of CS in the classroom, the teachers' and learners' attitudes towards its use, the functions of CS in the classroom, and its didactic and educational effects. These conclusions will demonstrate the effects of CS on teaching and learning. Second, conclusions will be drawn about the implications of CS for the LiEP, and the effect of the present LiEP on the use of Setswana and other local languages in teaching and learning.

The conclusions, drawn from the responses to the research questions and observations that the researcher had made during lessons, are presented to deal with the following sub-problems: **The first sub-problem:** *Not enough is known about the didactic value of CS in educational settings*, was addressed by the responses to Research Questions 2 and 4 (i) and (ii).

9.3.1. The prevalence of CS in the classroom

The study has confirmed that CS occurs in the classrooms of the four senior secondary schools in the North-East region of Botswana; and that it takes place mainly between English and Setswana. Its use was more common during lessons of content subjects than during lessons of language subjects. CS was used, irrespective of the subject taught, the school setting (urban or peri-urban), the teachers' gender, teaching experience, age of the teachers, the teachers' HL, and teachers' fluency in English. Similarly, CS occurred in the classroom, irrespective of the learners' academic ability, gender, the class level that was taught (Form / grade), the learners' HL, and the learners' fluency in English. Both the teachers and learners CS even though the latter were discouraged from CS by their teachers. Both had positive views about CS in class; and they regarded CS as a strategy that facilitated communication in the classroom, especially when the official language of education -- English -- was not effective. Hence, it promoted teaching and learning.

CS is prevalent during the lessons of content subjects (History, Home Economics, and Biology) and minimally occurs during lessons of language subjects -- English (L and L) and Setswana). While teachers of English (L and L) restricted CS to the exchange

of greetings at discourse-initiation stage and rarely CS during the formal part of the lesson, teachers of content subjects CS through all the stages of lessons. The teachers of English (L and L) were aware of their primary role: to promote a proficiency in English Language among the learners, hence their minimal use of CS. The teachers of content subjects were concerned more about ensuring that their learners understood the content of their subjects than about language development among the learners, hence the prevalence of CS during their lessons.

As it is the case with English (L and L) lessons, CS during Setswana lessons was less frequent. However, it was the different forms of borrowing, namely nonce borrowing, and borrowing proper that were mostly used. CM was hardly used.

9.3.2. The teachers' attitude towards CS

Although the teachers CS, they often do not allow their learners to CS. This was more evident during the lessons of the language subjects (English and Setswana) than during the lessons of the content subjects. Furthermore, the teachers of Setswana were more opposed to CS by their learners than the teachers of the other subjects, even though they freely CS during their lessons. In addition to CS, the teachers of Setswana used nonce borrowing and borrowing proper more than the teachers of the other subjects. The borrowed words were mainly from English and sometimes, from Afrikaans, with a few instances from other African languages such as Zulu and Northern Sotho.

9.3.3 The learners' attitude towards CS

The learners had no objection to their teachers' use of CS, even though they were opposed more to CS during Setswana lessons than CS during the lessons taught in 'English'. The learners shared the latter view with their Setswana teachers. This suggests that, because Setswana is the language that both the teachers and the learners spoke and understood well, both groups of respondents did not find it necessary to use English during a Setswana lesson; hence their objection to CS to English during Setswana lessons.

9.3.4 CS to a local language

Although CS takes place between mainly English and Setswana, minimal CS to a local language such as Ikalanga, also takes place. This was revealed by the quantitative data, but not the qualitative data. While the majority of the teachers were opposed to CS to a local language, the learners were not.

9.3.5 Functions of CS in the classroom

a. Content subjects

CS is used to perform a number of functions -- educational and social -- with the former revealing the didactic value of CS in the classroom, as well as its setbacks. CS during the lessons of content subjects was used primarily as a teaching strategy. These teachers were concerned more about promoting the understanding of the lesson content among the learners than about the learners' proficiency in the official LoLT (English). They used all forms of CS and, by extension, also allowed the learners to do the same.

CS was used by these teachers to serve a number of social functions. These are summarized below.

- CS as an expressive function: when a teacher signals impatience with the class for not responding to a question posed, to show annoyance, or to encourage the learners to participate in the learning process;
- CS as a deferential strategy;
- CS to display linguistic versatility;
- CS to emphasize an aspect;
- CS as a strategy for neutrality;
- CS to perform a phatic function at discourse-initiation and -closure stages : to exchange greetings and to dismiss the class at the end of the lesson;
- CS to perform an informative function: to communicate housekeeping matters before the formal part of the lesson begins; and
- CS to amuse the learners.

b. English (L and L)

Because of the minimal use of CS during the lessons of English (L and L), its functions (both educational and symbolic), were minimal, too. CS as an educational function was used to facilitate teaching and learning as is the case during the lessons of content subjects. It was also used to clarify a point by repeating in Setswana part of the lesson material already presented in English. CS was also used to perform the following social functions:

- CS used to perform a psychological function: when used sarcastically; and
- CS used to mark group / ethnic identity.

c. Setswana lessons

CS during Setswana lessons was used more for social functions than for educational purposes. To perform an educational function, CS was used to present part of the lesson content. However, as previously stated, it was mainly borrowing rather than CS that was used during the presentation of the lesson material.

The social functions of CS in Setswana lessons were similar to those outlined above in addition to the following:

- CS used as a positive reinforcement;
- CS used to show the teacher's level of education;
- CS used to demonstrate authority or annoyance;
- CS used owing to the nature of the topic being discussed;
- CS used to show linguistic versatility.

9.3.6 Didactic consequences of CS

The educational use of CS has positive and negative didactic consequences.

a. Positive didactic consequences

The positive functions of CS to Setswana are that it:

- enhances lesson understanding among the learners;
- promotes learner participation in the learning process through group and class discussions; and
- facilitates communication in the classroom.

During a lesson that requires the use of English, Setswana plays a supporting role. Because Setswana is understood well by the majority of the learners, explaining part of the subject content, or explaining some concepts that may not be readily understood if they were to be explained in English, or repeating a question in Setswana, often prompts the learners to respond. Similarly, English may play a supporting role, albeit limited, during Setswana lessons. For instance, the teacher may borrow a word from the guest language (English) to express an idea or concept that does not have an equivalent in the host language (Setswana); or if it did have, was often in a form of a long phrase.

b. Negative didactic consequences

CS has negative didactic consequences, as well. These are listed below:

- CS indirectly creates complacency among learners to strive to acquire fluency in English. The learners were reluctant to participate when the teacher addressed them in English, or they were called upon to contribute to the lesson, even when they knew the answer to the teacher's question. However, when the teacher CS to Setswana, the learners responded in Setswana. The learners were not keen to participate in English but waited for the right opportunity when the teacher CS to Setswana, so that they, too, could respond in Setswana.
- While its use did not affect the teachers' fluency in English, CS had a negative effect on the development of a proficiency in English among the learners. It contributed to a lack of confidence in speaking English among learners (even though they self-rated their English proficiency highly).
- Similarly, acquisition of proper terminology of concepts in Setswana was affected, as well, in that it was common for Setswana teachers to use borrowing even where it was unnecessary to do so. As a result, learners also took a cue

from their teachers to CM or use borrowing or CS even though many Setswana teachers discouraged this practice.

- Further, while CS facilitates communication in the classroom, it results in the distortion of English as the target language and, to some extent, Setswana as the national language. The end result is that learners are not adequately skilled in either language.

9.3.7. Educational effects of CS

CS also has positive and negative educational effects.

a. Positive effects

The main positive effects are that:

- CS to Setswana promotes teaching and learning because it promotes lesson comprehension among the learners.
- It enables learners to participate in the learning process by allowing them to CS to Setswana when responding to the teacher's question, when asking a question, and when discussing class tasks.
- CS promotes the expansion of vocabulary by allowing the creation of new words by way of related processes such as borrowing. This is usually the case where words refer to concepts considered 'new' in the borrowing language, or words referring to concepts considered 'foreign' to the culture of the speakers of the host language.
- Similarly, because the use of the standard variety of Setswana is mandatory during Setswana lessons, sometimes the use of certain words or expressions may not be readily understood. Therefore, by means of CS to English, or any form of borrowing, the teacher is able to use familiar English words or expressions to promote the understanding of the explanations of concepts among learners.
- Further, CS promotes the use of Setswana in education (for instance, the use of Setswana idiomatic expressions in CS) and points to the fact that Setswana and other indigenous languages can be used effectively for educational purposes.

Consequently, positive didactic consequences yield positive educational benefits.

b. Negative effects

The main negative educational effects of CS are that:

- From a language development point of view, constant CS creates a permanent habit of using Setswana in a lesson that is supposed to be taught in English, or vice versa.
- The use of CS creates a complacency among the learners regarding the use of English in class. The learners often choose to remain silent even if they know the answer to the teacher's question, knowing that their silence would be interpreted to mean that they either did not understand the question or that they were unable to express themselves. As soon as the teacher CS to Setswana, the learners seized the opportunity to answer in Setswana.
- CS to Setswana is one of the contributory factors to a lack of fluency in the target language (English) among learners. Yet learners need it as English is the language of school-leaving examinations, of further studies and training and, eventually, the language of work. In addition, extensive CS may be detrimental to the acquisition of fluency in either English or Setswana as the learners may become accustomed to the interchangeable use of at least two languages in one speech event and eventually fail to sustain a conversation in one language when required. Similarly, during Setswana lessons, the use of CS does not promote fluency in Setswana, especially among learners for whom Setswana is not a HL.

The second sub-problem: *The occurrence of CS in a classroom situation suggests a lack of proficiency in English as a Second Language among the learners and maybe also among the teachers, and it is therefore problematic as a LoLT was addressed by Research Questions One and Three.*

The data revealed that the characteristics of CS as identified in Chapter 2 (cf. section 2.3.1) clearly indicate that the phenomenon that occurs in the classroom is CS; but the

extent of its use is not consistent with one of the characteristics, namely, that the speaker who CS should be fluent in both languages at his / her disposal.

CS by the teachers during the classes taught in 'English' served two purposes:

1. First, to demonstrate that the teacher is fluent in both English and Setswana, and
2. second, to accommodate the learners' lack of proficiency in English. When the teachers used English only, they were generally fluent in English.

The use of CS by the learners signalled their lack of proficiency in English. Therefore, CS was used mainly to facilitate communication in the classroom when the use of English only could not do so effectively. The teachers mainly used CS in class not because they had a problem with self-expression in English, but to enable the learners to follow the lesson. CS used in this way was as a teaching strategy to benefit the learners. The teachers were mindful that they were required to teach in English only. However, faced with the 'language barrier' that impeded (teaching and) learning, they resorted to CS to overcome this barrier. The data -- both quantitative and qualitative -- confirmed that the teachers' use of Setswana during the lessons taught in 'English' was due to a lack of proficiency in English among the learners, not among the teachers.

CS to English during Setswana lessons was not that necessary as both the teachers and learners spoke and understood Setswana well. The use of English by mainly teachers was to mark their educational level and the ability to speak the prestigious language (English) rather than to facilitate communication. However, in rare cases, the teacher used it to name a concept foreign to Setswana.

Evidence from classroom observations indicates that the phenomenon that occurs during the lessons of the language subjects (English - L and L and Setswana) may be called CS, even though during Setswana lessons, there is more use of CM and borrowing than CS. However, regarding the lessons of the non-language subjects (Biology, History, and Home Economics), the phenomenon that occurs in these classes cannot, in most cases, be regarded as CS. Instead, it was merely the simultaneous use of the two languages as and when the need arose. The use of the two languages in this

way was guided more by the need to bridge the communication gap caused by the lack of proficiency in English among the learners than an unconscious use of the two languages driven by fluency in them, which is often the case in many CS situations. The study found that, while in many CS situations the main language used was easily identified and a large part of the utterance was made in it, this was not the case during the lessons of the content subjects. It was more use of Setswana and less use of English. Consequently, it was not readily clear that the 'legitimate' LoLT was English. In fact, one could mistake Setswana as being the LoLT in the teaching of these content subjects.

The present study has demonstrated that in the case of the classroom, CS use signals that the learners are not proficient in English. CS is used as a communication strategy to ensure that the knowledge that the teacher imparts is received and understood by the learners. Also, CS is used by the learners to participate in the learning process. This confirms Kamwangamalu's observation that, in education, CS carries a stigma (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 60), and that it signals a lack of proficiency in the language being used, in this case English, as used by the learners. Therefore, the phenomenon that occurred in the Botswana classrooms during the lessons of the content subjects was mere instruction in Setswana in place of English. It was an attempt by the teacher to overcome the language problem that the learners experienced regarding self-expression and comprehension of English.

The study also demonstrates that CS is initiated and encouraged unconsciously by the teachers of the content subjects. When the learners, taking a cue from the teachers, responded in Setswana, the teachers did not object to the learners' CS. However, there was some effort on the part of the English (L and L) teachers to discourage the learners from CS to Setswana in class. Similarly, during Setswana lessons, the teachers discouraged their learners from CS to English, but they themselves CS freely and also engaged in borrowing.

Furthermore, the teachers whose HL is Setswana CS more to Setswana than the other teachers. Similarly, the teachers whose HL is Ikalanga CS more to English during Setswana lessons than the other teachers. Female teachers of the subjects taught in 'English' also CS more to Setswana than their male colleagues. Similarly, the male

teachers of Setswana CS more to English than their female colleagues. Consequently, during the lessons of the subjects taught in English, the female teachers whose HL is Setswana CS more to Setswana than the other teachers. Also, during Setswana lessons, the male teachers whose HL is Ikalanga, CS more to English than the other teachers did.

The study suggests that the senior-secondary school learners are not proficient in oral communication in English -- the language they not only use to write their senior school-leaving examinations, but also the language they require for admission to tertiary institutions, such as the University of Botswana. This implies that it is wrong for the tertiary institutions to assume (as they seem to currently do) that their new entrants are fully equipped with English language skills that would enable them to pursue their studies effectively and efficiently in English (cf. *The University of Botswana's Communication and Study Skills Unit Handbook*, 2007).

The third sub-problem: *CS from English to Setswana in a classroom situation may be discriminatory against non-Setswana speakers*, was addressed by Research Question Four.

The quantitative data revealed that CS in the classroom does not take into account that there are some learners who may not be proficient in Setswana. The learners -- both speakers and non-speakers of Setswana -- viewed CS during the lessons of the subjects taught in 'English', as discriminatory against these learners. This is because these learners did not share the educational benefits that the Setswana-speaking learners reaped from CS. While qualitative data also confirmed this view, the learners affected did not raise any objection when Setswana was used during lesson delivery.

The fourth sub-problem: *The use of CS in a teaching and learning situation seems to be in conflict with the LiEP of Botswana*, was addressed by Research Question 5 (i, ii, and iii).

The data revealed that CS in the classroom is in contravention of the LiEP of Botswana because the LiEP states that English is the official LoLT for the teaching of all the subjects (apart from Setswana and French) from the second year of primary school

onwards. The study showed that the violation was more apparent during the lessons of the content subjects than during the lessons of the language subjects. The use of CS during lessons of subjects taught in 'English' unintentionally demonstrated that it was possible to teach these subjects in Setswana, even though the LiEP does not make provision for so doing. The same can be said about the local language, where and when it was used. While the teachers are of the opinion that CS helps in addressing an educational problem, they are inadvertently creating another problem -- a language-development problem. CS means less practice in using English, which then results in a lack of fluency in spoken English.

Notwithstanding the above, the use of Setswana in classrooms and, to a limited extent other local languages, shows that these languages have a role to play in education.

The use of English during Setswana lessons also constitutes a contravention of the LiEP of Botswana because the teaching and learning of Setswana is to be done exclusively in Setswana. The quantitative data also revealed that CS to a local language takes place in the classroom, though to a limited extent.

The study further showed that the LiEP is not consistent with the practical realities of the classroom situation, because what takes place in most of the classrooms is different from that which is stated in the LiEP. As previously mentioned, in the classroom, the teachers CS to Setswana and allow the learners to also CS in recognition of the latter's lack of proficiency in English.

The reality of the classroom situation is that the prescription by the LiEP that English be the LoLT needs revision because it impedes learning. The learners are not confident enough to express themselves freely in English in the presence of their peers. Further, they sometimes fail to comprehend fully what is being said by the teacher unless he / she CS to Setswana and repeats the same information. The learners' participation is seriously hampered by their inability to express themselves in English. Therefore, the LiEP does what it was *not* intended to do: it acts as a barrier to communication and to learning, instead of facilitating them.

While the LiEP calls for the exclusive use of English as the LoLT in the teaching and learning of all the subjects except Setswana, the reality in the classroom is that Setswana is used in the teaching of almost all the subjects and, in particular, the content subjects. CS in the classroom suggests that there is an underlying problem of a lack of proficiency in the language of instruction, English, hence CS to Setswana is used to rescue the situation. However, during Setswana lessons, the researcher observed that CS by Setswana teachers may be habitual and intended to display their linguistic versatility. The use of CM and different forms of borrowing, particularly nonce borrowing and CS (though minimal) was unnecessary as all the learners in a Setswana class had a good understanding of Setswana. In most cases, utterances made in English or naming concepts in English could have been done in Setswana without creating any misunderstanding.

The study has shown that the revision of the LiEP is necessary to ensure that the LoLT promotes maximum delivery and acquisition of knowledge and skills development. The respondents called for the official recognition of Setswana as an alternative LoLT, as a language well spoken and well understood by the majority of the teachers and the learners, the language in which maximum content delivery and acquisition of knowledge and skills development can take place. In addition, teachers whose HL is Ikalanga or 'other' languages also called for a revision of the LiEP to make provision for the inclusion of other local languages in education. However, a revision of the LiEP that allows for the teaching of all subjects to be done entirely in Setswana and not in English so that English is only learnt as a second or foreign language, was not supported by both the teachers and learners. The study has shown that the LiEP that prescribes English as the only LoLT, is inadequate. Therefore, a partial revision of the LiEP to include Setswana and other local languages, but not its complete overhaul, is necessary. The result would be a partial introduction of MTBBE.

Both the teachers and learners concurred that although the learners hardly speak without CS, more boys than girls CS to Setswana in class; and girls were more proficient in both spoken and written English than boys. Therefore, CS by girls may not necessarily be due to a difficulty in self-expression in English, but it was likely to be the case with boys.

The learners rated their teachers' proficiency in English highly, but rated their teachers' writing and reading skills higher than their speaking skills. The learners' evaluation of the teachers' proficiency in English was almost consistent with the teachers' self-evaluation, even though a few learners did say that some teachers were not fluent in spoken English, hence their use of CS in the classroom. All the teachers regarded themselves to be proficient in English. The researcher shares the same view as the teachers.

Regarding the teachers' language use, both the male and the female teachers CS to Setswana during lessons taught in 'English'; and both groups expressed themselves well in spoken English. However, the male teachers CS more than their female counterparts, yet they also express themselves better in spoken English. Therefore, CS use by the male teachers does not necessarily suggest a lack of proficiency in English. In addition, during Setswana lessons, both the male and the female teachers CS in class. However, female teachers do not CS as often as their male colleagues do.

Although CS occurs across all the subjects, it occurs the least during Setswana lessons, and among the different subjects taught in English, it occurs the least during English (L and L) lessons. The Biology teachers CS more than the teachers of other subjects taught in English. With respect to the teachers' proficiency in English and Setswana, the History teachers were apparently the most proficient in English, and the language teachers (the majority being Setswana teachers) were said to be the most proficient in Setswana.

The teachers supported the view that Setswana, as a national language, should serve as the LoLT at primary-school level (the majority of them are teachers whose HL is Setswana), but the learners supported its use at all levels of education alongside English because of the status of English as a national language. However, regarding the possible use of the other local languages in education, the teachers and learners held contrasting views. The former (teachers) supported their use in schools for teaching and learning (the majority of them are teachers whose HL is Ikalanga and teachers whose HL falls under 'Others'), but the latter (learners) disapproved. Therefore, the majority of the teachers and learners supported the view that the LiEP should be revised to include Setswana as the LoLT. In addition, the teachers supported

the revision of the LiEP to include other local languages in education, but the learners did not agree. Both the teachers and learners are fully in support of the continued use of English as the LoLT. They recognize its important role in their educational and professional lives, both nationally and internationally.

An exclusive LiEP, such as the present one, gives an impression that Botswana can be developed only through the English language. Furthermore, its lack of provision for the teaching of other languages gives the false impression that Botswana is a monolingual country, whilst the the opposite is true. There are at least 25 languages spoken in the country, including English and Setswana (Webb & Kembo-Sure, 2000: 47; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004; Molosiwa, 2006: 16; Batibo, 2006).

The fifth sub-problem: *The current LiEP of Botswana promotes English at the expense of Setswana and does not promote knowledge acquisition and skills development*, was addressed by Research Question Six.

The study has shown, mainly through quantitative data that owing to the status of English in the LiEP, Setswana and the other local languages are perceived as languages in which meaningful teaching and learning cannot take place as much as it would if English were to be used. Generally, the teachers' and the learners' perceptions about using Setswana in education were positive. The teachers were of the view that Setswana should not be used during Setswana classes only, but should be used even in the teaching of the other subjects. However, some teachers are still apprehensive about using Setswana for teaching and learning outside Setswana lessons. Similarly, the learners were generally positive about the use of Setswana for teaching and learning, even though they were of the opinion that it was easier for them to learn new concepts in English than in Setswana. They also did not support its use as the LoLT except during Setswana classes.

Despite the teachers' support for the inclusion of the local languages in the LiEP, on the one hand the majority are still apprehensive about their effectiveness in teaching and learning. For instance, they neither used these languages nor allowed the learners to use them in class because the LiEP did not give this provision. They were also of the view that their use negatively affected the development of English proficiency

among the learners. Despite these negative perceptions, some teachers were of the view that these languages had a role to play in education as allowing the learners to use them in class increased class participation.

On the other hand, the learners' views about the use of the other local languages in education were negative, as previously stated. They did not view their use or CS to them as educationally beneficial. For instance, they did not think that it was easier for them to learn in their own language than in English, and viewed their use as negatively affecting their acquisition of proficiency in English. As a result, they objected to the teachers' use of a local language in class, and said it was unnecessary and of no educational value.

While the teachers were of the view that Setswana has the potential to function effectively in education, it was largely perceived as a HFIC language with limited ability to function in a HFFC. However, concerning the local languages, both the teachers and learners were in agreement that they are purely low-function languages, even though a few teachers were of the view that they could function as high-function languages.

The study has therefore established that the current LiEP that promotes only English creates negative perceptions about the use of Setswana and the other local languages, such as Ikalanga, in education. They are viewed as languages that are not fit for use in education.

The sixth sub-problem: *The use of CS in a classroom situation wastes instruction time and does not promote knowledge acquisition and skills development*, was addressed through Research Question four (iii).

The study has shown that CS in the classroom did not waste instruction time or slow down the pace of content delivery. There was no serious repetition of the lesson content because it did not involve the presentation of the lesson material first in one language, and then its repetition in the other language. Rather, the lesson presentation involved a systematic alternating use of both English and Setswana as the lesson progressed. Where there was repetition, it was minimal and inconsequential as it only

served to clarify a point made earlier. Because CS facilitates communication, knowledge acquisition took place, but confidence in speaking English did not improve. Hence, language development (English) was compromised. CS to Setswana therefore facilitated the acquisition of knowledge in the form of the subject content, but at the expense of acquisition of a proficiency in English. Consequently, CS has no adverse effect on the curriculum coverage.

In conclusion: the study has responded to a recommendation made by a number of scholars, among them Tshinki (2002); Kamwangamalu (2000); and Webb (2002) who called for further research to be conducted on CS in the classroom to establish whether or not it occurs; whether the stigma it carries as indicating a lack of proficiency in English as the LoLT is justified; and whether what occurs in the classroom in this connection can be rightly referred to as CS. The findings of this study outlined above have addressed these concerns.

9.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has investigated the role of CS in teaching and learning at four senior secondary schools situated in the North-East region of Botswana. The study has established that CS is a common occurrence in the classroom and that its use is largely due to a lack of proficiency in English among the learners. Therefore, the teachers use it and allow its use to address a language deficiency problem that negatively affects teaching and learning. The study has also established that the excessive use of CS in the classroom inadvertently breeds a problem of language development. While CS facilitates teaching and learning, it does not promote a proficiency in English among the learners. Furthermore, its use is a violation of the LiEP of Botswana. Based on the foregoing, the following recommendations are made, which are presented in two sections. The first section comprises a list of recommendations on CS in the classroom; and the second a list of recommendations on the LiEP.

9.4.1 Recommendations on CS in the classroom

1. The teaching of English should be revisited to address the problem of a lack of proficiency in English among the learners. This should be done if English is to be an effective LoLT, not only at the level of senior secondary schools, but as early as at primary-school level.
2. The re-introduction of Mother Tongue Education (MTE) at primary school level should be considered consistent with international practice based on the findings of research carried out in different parts of the world that Mother Tongue plays a very important role in concept formulation at this level of education.
3. The teachers should not only discourage the learners from CS, but should not CS either, if they do not want the learners to CS.
4. Setswana teachers should desist from teaching Setswana in English. Consequently, the simplification of Setswana concepts should be done by explaining them in Setswana, but not in English. Their use of English during Setswana lessons inadvertently creates a negative perception about Setswana, namely that it is more difficult to learn in it than in English.
5. The extent of CS use in the lecture halls of the University of Botswana and its effects should also be investigated. The same should be done in other tertiary institutions in Botswana.
6. Recognizing that CS as a teaching strategy cannot be eliminated completely in a bilingual set-up, and that it has an important educational role to play in the classroom, it is important to identify those aspects or topics of the syllabus that could be better presented in Setswana than in English. In this way its use will be minimized and controlled.
7. The Communication and Study Skills Unit of the University of Botswana, charged with the responsibility of improving university students' communication skills in English, should undertake a needs analysis to establish the extent of the inadequacy in English proficiency among the new entrants to

address this problem. Further, needs analyses should also be done for each level of study to design courses to specifically address the unique deficiencies in a proficiency in English at each level.

8. Although Setswana is not the main focus of this study, the research has indicated that the present Setswana syllabus does not effectively address learner competence in Setswana. It assumes that Setswana is a first language for all the learners studying it. However, the majority of the learners in the study spoke Setswana as their second language. In this regard, Setswana should be taught as a first language, and as a second language, as well. The former should be offered to learners for whom Setswana is a HL; and the latter to learners for whom Setswana is not HL. A leaf should be borrowed from the Cambridge Overseas School Examination Council that offers English as a first language *and* as a foreign language to its candidates. The learners whose HL is not Setswana cannot be expected to appreciate the intricacies of this language in the same way as those speakers for whom it is a first language would. For instance, some idiomatic and proverbial expressions, innuendoes, and jokes may be beyond the comprehension of learners who speak Setswana as a second language.

9.4.2 Recommendations on the LiEP

1. The current LiEP or its implementation should be examined to establish if it does not stifle learning.
2. Provision should be made in the LiEP for the use of CS in education in recognition of its important instructional role. However, the use of CS should be controlled lest it takes over as the defacto LoLT.
3. There should be strict adherence to the LiEP if there is sincerity about assisting the learners to attain a proficiency in English. The education officers should ensure that the LiEP is properly implemented. If this is not done, they should devolve this responsibility to Management of the School in each case.

4. The MoE should revise the LiEP to accommodate, where appropriate, the use of Setswana in teaching and learning.
5. The revision of the LiEP should ensure that the use of Setswana in High Function (Formal Contexts) is increased. It should not only serve as a national language but also as a second official language. For instance, it should be used more in education as an alternative LoLT. Furthermore, it should be used in science and technology, in the courts and other legal proceedings, government administration and commerce. If Setswana, like English, is used in official functions, it will truly have a meaningful function instead of being merely a symbolic national language as is currently the case.
6. The revision of the LiEP should also take on board the more effective teaching of English, so that an adequate proficiency in it is achieved if the learners are to function effectively in an environment that requires the use of English.
7. The LiEP should be revised to make provision for the teaching of local languages as per Recommendation No. 18 of the NCE 2 (1993). This important national issue should not be left to the discretion of local communities to request the teaching of these languages. The Ministry of Education should play a leading role in this regard. This could be done by enlisting the services of volunteer workers from within the communities concerned. Their remuneration could be in the form of an honorarium or exemption from paying the recently-introduced school fees for their children.
8. Regional education authorities or the Management Boards of schools should be empowered to implement the recommendation on the teaching of local languages without waiting for a formal request from the parents, as espoused above. Furthermore, the views of the teachers whose HL is Ikalanga, and those teachers whose HL falls under 'Others' should be heeded in academic matters as these are the representatives of their communities.
9. International Mother Tongue Day which is celebrated in February every year should be observed on the school calendar to instil, among young pupils, a

sense of pride in their respective mother tongues. Teaching young people to be proud of speaking their HLs at school will go a long way in assisting them to realize that these languages are as important as Setswana (the national language) and English (the official language).

10. The revision of the LiEP should be done within the framework of the revision of the country's language policy. This process should include representatives of all the key stakeholders. To this effect, a Commission, with clear Terms of Reference (ToR), should specifically be set up and be tasked to undertake this assignment. In this fashion, it will be ensured that the language policy is not imposed on the people as they took part in its design and therefore have ownership.
11. In planning the country's language policy, a leaf should be borrowed from Webb's framework for strategic planning (2002: 39-40), reproduced as Addendum A, which outlines constituent factors underlying the design and implementation of a language planning policy in practice. These factors are identified as: a vision; a mission; the problem identification; goals; information; the implementation thereof; and the control and evaluation phases. In a nutshell, the framework states the following:
 - That first and foremost, policy development has to have a direct link with the country's vision, based on the country's Constitution. In the case of Botswana, the language policy should be in harmony with the country's *Vision 2016*, which is a long-term vision through which the country set targets for itself to have achieved by the year 2016. Some of the pillars of Vision 2016 state that Botswana shall be an educated and informed nation; and that (Vision 2016, 2004: 9): "*no citizen of the future Botswana will be disadvantaged as a result of gender, age, religion or creed, colour, national or ethnic origin, location, language or political opinions*".
 - It should also be in harmony with Government's mission that deals with the broad goals of the government, as espoused in *Vision 2016* of Botswana.

- Internal and external factors that may facilitate / impede the realization of the country's vision and mission regarding language planning and policy should be identified and their impact determined.
- The language policy should be formulated as a legally-binding document, with clear goals or objectives that are consonant with the country's vision and mission. Any possible obstacles that should need to be addressed, should be identified and articulated clearly.
- The implementation strategies that will be followed to achieve the policy objectives should be stated clearly. These should include spelling out who will implement the policy, how, the time frame, and the resources required. The strategy should include how Government and the Ministry of Education should address anticipated problems.
- After implementation, control and evaluation mechanisms should be put in place to establish the extent to which the language policy has fulfilled the country's vision and mission. In this way, feedback would be provided to the authorities on the effectiveness of the language policy.

A LiEP formulated within the framework of the aforementioned language-planning model is likely to be effective. As the language plan would have been designed in consultation with key stakeholders, and have been enshrined in a legal document, its implementation is likely to be taken seriously as the language policy (and the LiEP) would not be construed as a policy imposed on the people. Because the people would have taken part in its design, they would feel or be obliged to own and honour it. This would be a progressive step from the current language policy that is not explicitly stated but is only understood, inferred, and observed in practice (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004). It is only mentioned in different government documents such as the Constitution of Botswana; the two reports of the NCE of, respectively, 1977 and 1993; the government's national development plans, education's curricular materials, and in the media during discussions of language-related issues (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004).

The study has shown that the current perceptions that Setswana and other local languages should not be used as LoLT are a result of language planning that did not follow the process as stated above. If these negative perceptions are allowed to continue, Botswana will be a nation without a culture as observed by the first president

of Botswana, Sir Seretse Khama, when he said ‘A nation without culture is a nation without soul’.

The LiEP should strike a balance between the retention of culture and the acquisition of English, which is vital, for the people to also be global citizens. The aim of the education system in general, and of the teaching of English, in particular, should not be to produce a “half-baked” learner who is not knowledgeable and skilful and can hardly express him / herself in English; rather, the learner should confidently express him / herself in English as well as Setswana.

9.5 LIMITATIONS OF AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

A number of limitations were encountered during the study that warrant further research. Some were beyond the scope of the present study, and others were a result of problems that were experienced during the data-collecting phase. These include the following:

1. Although the study sought to investigate CS by both the teachers and learners, the utterances made by the learners were limited. This is because the lessons were generally teacher-centred. The teacher was the main speaker while the learners were passive participants. There was minimal learner participation in the development of the lesson even when the teacher tried to engage the class by posing questions. Perhaps teaching that involved learner-centred activities rather than the traditional lecturing method should be used more in an effort to encourage active learner participation.
2. Because the study was limited to oral communication, it was not possible for the researcher to establish the effect of CS on the learners’ written communication, that is, whether the promotion of lesson understanding translated into enhanced performance in their written work such as during tests or examinations.
3. The researcher should have had access to the learners’ written work, so it was not possible to confirm or refute the teachers’ views regarding the learners’ self expression in written English.



4. The study established that learners' participation in the lesson increased if the teachers CS to Setswana. It also established that, at other times, CS did not yield any positive results. This indicates that the learners' participation in the learning process is not solely determined by their ability or inability to use the official language. There could be other underlying problems such as a learner's interest in a particular subject or topic, the learner's ability, and how difficult or easy he / she perceived a particular subject to be. This was, however, beyond the scope of this study, and further research should possibly address it.
5. The study only focused on the senior secondary schools in the North-East region, therefore its findings cannot be generalized. Similar studies should be undertaken in senior secondary schools situated in other regions of the country (and in primary schools) to see if these studies will produce similar results.
6. The study only focused on the three content subjects (History, Home Economics, and Biology) apart from English and Setswana as language subjects. Therefore, the findings may not necessarily apply to the other school subjects. The study should be extended to include other school subjects to establish the extent of CS use during their lessons and the consequences thereof.
7. The study showed that girls were more proficient than boys in both spoken and written English. As already stated, it was not easy for the researcher to confirm these views as the study was limited to oral communication. In addition, learner utterances were limited. Further research could establish whether or not gender had any significant effect on learners' acquisition of an adequate proficiency in English.
8. Further research is necessary to establish whether there is any discrepancy in the performance of learners whose home language is Setswana as opposed to other learners whose HL is another local language. It is important to further establish whether there is a need to design two kinds of syllabi -- one for first-language speakers of Setswana, and the other for learners who speak Setswana as a second language.

9. Further research is necessary to establish the effect of CS use on the learners' academic performance.

9.6 CONCLUSION

The study has demonstrated that there is CS in the classrooms of Botswana senior secondary schools, mainly from English to Setswana. The underlying factor for this practice is mainly because learners have not acquired proficiency in English. In that regard, CS is used as a strategy to facilitate communication where the LoLT is not effective. A number of conclusions have been drawn and recommendations made regarding CS in the classroom and the LiEP of Botswana. It is hoped that the educators and policy makers will consider these conclusions and recommendations and chart a way forward to address the lack of proficiency in English among the learners in Botswana senior secondary schools. Consequently, learners who are confident enough to express themselves in English will be produced, hence their chances of succeeding in their studies and eventually in the vocational world will be increased.