CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis and evaluation of data in relation to the study questions, and the theoretical framework and empirical research on MOI policy implementation in African countries, in particular where there has been a change in MOI policy and/or in contexts where a second language has been adopted as an LOLT. The literature review and the conceptual framework have been integrated into the evaluation of the findings in order to assist the researcher to reflect on the study questions and formulate the conclusions and recommendations in the last chapter.

4.2 Data Analysis Plan

Data were first presented by instrument and by individual. The findings from the three data sets were then tabulated in search of emergent themes/patterns. In the second stage of the data analysis process, the findings were discussed in relation to the research questions, the literature review and the conceptual framework. The researcher then reflected on the study findings and crafted conclusions and recommendations.

4.3 Questionnaire Findings

In the first phase of the study, data analysis was organized and presented through the use of the SPSS statistical package for social scientists and the following analyses were done:

- Descriptive statistics where frequency tables and relevant charts were performed. Only the frequency tables have been presented in the report, since the charts and frequency tables present the same findings in different formats.
- Inferential statistics where cross-tabulations, including two-way tables, have been computed.

A summary of the findings is presented in tables for each question and brief explanations on the frequency tables are given. The questionnaire which was administered in the first phase of the research yielded the following information:

Personal and Background Information

1. **Name (optional)**

Participants preferred to remain anonymous and did not respond to this question.

1. **What is your home language?**

Table 1: Teachers' home languages

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa	18	66.7	66.7	66.7
	English	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

66, 7% of the teachers spoke isiXhosa as a home or first language, while only 33, 3 % spoke English as their home language. The latter could be expatriate teachers who have come to work in the Eastern Cape and can only communicate with learners whose LI is isiXhosa, in English

2. **Which other languages can you communicate in?**

This question complemented Question No.1 in that it was aimed at establishing the linguistic profiles of the study participants. There was a wide spread of languages that teachers in the sample schools could speak, viz. English, seSotho, Afrikaans and Indian languages.

Table 2: Other languages teachers can communicate in

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa	2	7.4	7.4	7.4
	English	16	59.3	59.3	66.7
	Afrikaans	2	7.4	7.4	74.1
	Other (specify)	7	25.9	25.9	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

3. Which grades do you teach?

The purpose of including this multiple-response question was to establish whether the grade at which one taught influenced teacher classroom language behaviour. For easier manipulation of the data on SPSS, the grades were split. 74, 1% of the teachers in the sample taught in Grade 10.

Do you teach Grade 10?

Table 3a Grade 10 teachers who participated in the study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	20	74.1	74.1	74.1
	No	7	25.9	25.9	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Table 3b: Grade 11 teachers who participated in the study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	22	81.5	81.5	81.5
	No	5	18.5	18.5	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

81, 5 % of the teachers taught in Grade 11.

Do you teach Grade 12?

Table 3c: Grade 12 teachers who participated in the study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	21	77.8	77.8	77.8
	No	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

77, 8 % of the teachers in the sample taught in Grade 12

4. Which subjects do you offer?

Table 4a: Teachers offering English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	10	37.0	37.0	37.0
	No	17	63.0	63.0	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

37% of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire offered English.

Table 4b: Teachers offering isiXhosa

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
	No	24	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

11,1% of the respondents in the survey were teachers of isiXhosa.

Table 4c: Teachers offering Business Economics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	6	22.2	22.2	22.2
	No	21	77.8	77.8	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

22,2% of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire were teachers of Business Economics.

Table 4d: Teachers offering Physical Science

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	No	26	96.3	96.3	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

3,7% of the respondents offered Physical Science.

Table 4e: Teachers offering Biology

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	2	7.4	7.4	7.4
	No	25	92.6	92.6	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

7,4% of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire were offering Biology in their schools.

Table 4f: Teachers offering History

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	4	14.8	14.8	14.8
	No	23	85.2	85.2	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

14,8% of the sample were History teachers.

Table 4g: Teachers offering Geography

29, 6% of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire were Geography teachers.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	29.6	29.6	29.6
	No	19	70.4	70.4	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Table 4h: Other subject(s) that you teach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		26	96.3	96.3	96.3
	Economics	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

3,7% of the teachers who took part in the survey offered Economics.

6. For how long have you been teaching?

This question was asked in order to establish whether teaching experience was a factor in language choice. Teachers with limited teaching experience (1-5 years) formed 7,4% of the sample, while the more experienced teachers (>5 years) comprised 92,5% of the sample.

Table 5: Teaching experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-5 Years	2	7.4	7.4	7.4
	6-11 Years	6	22.2	22.2	29.6
	12-17 Years	8	29.6	29.6	59.3
	18-25 Years	5	18.5	18.5	77.8
	26 Years and above	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

7. What is your highest qualification in the subject(s) that you teach?

Most of the teachers in the sample had first degrees (59,3%). Those with Matric and Masters each comprised 14,8% of the sample.

Table 6: Highest qualification in the subjects that one teaches

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Matric	4	14.8	14.8	14.8
	Bachelor's Degree	16	59.3	59.3	74.1
	Honours Degree	3	11.1	11.1	85.2
	Masters Degree	4	14.8	14.8	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

8. What is your professional qualification?

This question was included in the questionnaire in order to establish whether having been trained as a teacher influenced language choice in the classroom. All the participants in the study had a teaching qualification.

Table 7: Professional qualifications of participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	JSTC	2	7.4	7.4	7.4
	STD	3	11.1	11.1	18.5
	Higher Diploma in Education	11	40.7	40.7	59.3
	University Diploma in Education	2	7.4	7.4	66.7
	B.Ed	3	11.1	11.1	77.8
	PTC	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

All the teachers who participated in the study had professional teaching qualifications.

2. Contextual Factors Relating to the School

2.1 Name of School at which you are currently teaching (optional)

Only a few teachers responded to this question; this could mean that some teachers preferred not to divulge the identity of their schools.

2.2 Where is your school situated?

55,6% of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire taught in rural schools, while 44,4% taught in urban areas.

Table 8: Location of the schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Urban	12	44.4	44.4	44.4
	Rural	15	55.6	55.6	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

2.3 What home languages do your learners speak?

Table 9: Learners' home languages

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	IsiXhosa	27	100.0	100.0	100.0

According to the literature review, home language is a factor in school achievement (TIMSS, 1999; Simkin & Paterson, 2005; Threshold Project Report, 1990; Grade 6 Intermediate Phase Systemic Evaluation Report, 2005; Howie, 2002; Desai, 2003; Mwinsheike, 2003; Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2003; Yan, 2003; MacKay & De Klerk, 1996; Broom, 2004; Schlebusch, 2002; Malekela, 2006; Qorro, 2006; and Yohannes, 2009).

Although it was recorded on the questionnaires that all the pupils in the selected schools spoke isiXhosa, my visit to two urban-based schools showed that some of the learners were studying English as an LI, even though they were LI isiXhosa and Afrikaans speakers.

2.4 Which languages are spoken in the area in which your school is situated?

Table 10: Language(s) spoken in the area in which the school is situated

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	IsiXhosa	26	96.3	96.3	96.3
	Afrikaans	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

If the language used for teaching is the one spoken in the wider community, then it becomes possible for parents to support the education of their children and become more involved in the activities of the school. This question was asked to determine whether the teachers did take into account the learners' HL and the language spoken in the wider community when delivering lessons. Most of the teachers (96,3%) indicated that isiXhosa was the language spoken in the area in which their schools were situated, while 3,7% cited Afrikaans. The 3,7% Afrikaans-speaking pupils and a few black pupils studied English as an LI at school.

3. Questions Relating to Medium-of-Instruction Policy Implementation

3.1 Does the current MOI policy guarantee the use of all eleven languages in SA as MOI?

Questions 3.1 and 3.2 were asked to establish teachers' knowledge of current national MOI policy, as knowledge or awareness of the policy could influence their classroom language choices. Most of the teachers (77,8%) in the study knew about the 1997 multilingual MOI policy. However, 22,2 % of the respondents did not. Whereas knowledge about the existence of a new LIE policy does not presuppose a change in teacher language behaviour, a lack of knowledge of the current LIE is likely to result in teachers implementing LIE policy in the same manner in which they were implementing it before the promulgation of the 1997 policy.

Table 11: Teachers' knowledge of the current medium-of-instruction policy (MOI) provisions guaranteeing the use of eleven languages in South Africa as media of instruction.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	True	21	77.8	77.8	77.8
	False	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

3.2 **Does the current MOI policy allow the teacher to code-switch, i.e. the simultaneous use of more than one language during lesson delivery?**

3.3 Table 12: Teachers' knowledge of current MOI policy provisions on code-switching

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	19	70.4	70.4	70.4
	No	4	14.8	14.8	85.2
	Don't know	4	14.8	14.8	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Empirical research indicates that code-switching is used extensively to facilitate learning in contexts in which the teacher and pupils share a home language (Probyn, 2001; Adendorff, 1993; Setati, 2000). This question served two purposes: it indicated the teachers' awareness or interpretation of the LIE policy, whilst at the same time revealing the extent to which code-switching was used by the teachers who participated in the study. Most of the teachers (70,37%) could not provide an answer to this question, 14,8% agreed that the LIE policy allowed for code-switching, while 14,81% showed a lack of awareness about the fact that languages other than English and Afrikaans should be used for teaching and learning.

The 'No' and 'Don't know' responses (29,6% in all) revealed a lack of knowledge about current LIE policy provisions. These would be the teachers most likely to employ languages in the same manner they had prior to the introduction of the new policy, e.g. those who promoted English-only, irrespective of the context of the school(s) in which they taught. Teachers who employed other languages for teaching prior to the introduction of the 1997 LIE policy would be less likely to depart from this practice.

3.4 What is your school's language policy?

Table 13: School language policy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Only English, no other language is permitted for teaching	14	51.9	51.9	51.9
	English and any other shared language	11	40.7	40.7	92.6
	Learner's home language and a bit of English	2	7.4	7.4	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

School language policy should direct teachers on how they are expected to use language(s) for teaching. The respondents indicated that 51,9% of the high schools in the sample had an English-only policy, despite the fact that the schools in the sample were situated in an area in which isiXhosa was a language of wider communication. 40,7% permitted the use of English and any other language as MOI, while 7,4% opted for the use of learner's HL mostly plus a bit of English. In total, English and isiXhosa were accepted in 48,1 % (Options 2 & 3) of the schools.

The responses above reveal that, although the preferred LOLT in schools was English, teachers also accommodated the use of languages other than English, even though some might not even have been aware of the existence of a multilingual MOI policy.

3.5 Which language do you employ most when teaching the subject(s) that you offer at your school?

Table 14: Language(s) employed most when teaching

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English only	17	63.0	63.0	63.0
	English mostly and learners' home language	10	37.0	37.0	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

When asked to indicate the language they used mostly during lesson delivery, 63% of the teachers revealed that they used English only, while 37% indicated that they used English mostly and the learners' HL. None of the respondents chose the third option, i.e. "learners' home language mostly and English", an indication that home/local languages were not employed as fully-fledged LOLTs in an area in which isiXhosa was the most widely spoken language.

The contradiction is that, although 7,4% of the teachers in Table 13 above indicated that their school had adopted Option 3 (The learners' home language mostly, with a little English) as their language policy, when asked about what they did in practice, none indicated that they implemented this option. Possible explanations for this are that the schools had opted for an English-only policy, that teachers were not conversant with their schools' language policies, or that the schools' language policies had not been re-adjusted after 1997.

3.6 Why do you employ the language(s) you have selected in 3.4 above?

This question was aimed at establishing the reasons behind the teachers' choice of the language(s) of instruction they had identified in Question 3.4. The responses were then categorized. Factors that were identified as having an influence on language choice were:

Table 15:

Factors Influencing Teacher Language Choice	Examples
Resource provisioning	'Textbooks are written in English.
Teacher beliefs and perceptions of English	'English is a world language, it promotes nation-building and tolerance for diversity.'
School LIE policy	'Since the medium of instruction in my school is English, I prefer to teach in English.'
The subject being taught	'I teach English as a subject, I can't teach it through another language.'
Teacher characteristics and preferences	I'm a foreigner, and it's the only language I can communicate in.' `I teach English as a primary language, and I think learning a language can best be done by using it.'
Making the subject accessible to learners through employing English and the pupils' home languages.	'Pupils are not comfortable expressing themselves in English.' 'I translate and use what is familiar in their surroundings to promote understanding.' 'To promote understanding of content and develop their English language skills.' 'Learners do not understand English.' 'I have to explain some of the content in English.' 'Everybody understands isiXhosa, so I have to use isiXhosa to help them understand.' 'I have to explain some stuff in isiXhosa.'
Assessment Policy	'Pupils are taught and examined in English; I would be misleading them if I were to facilitate in the vernacular'
Teacher misconceptions	'English is an international MOI and is widely accepted; everybody understands English.' 'Using other languages would confuse learners.' 'To improve learner proficiency in English.'

74

3.7 Indicate the language(s) you <u>often</u> use to do the following. Put a tick in the relevant column.

Teacher responses revealed that they employed English mostly to achieve curriculum goals and manage their classrooms. English was used mainly for assessment (100%), error treatment and language development (96,3%), giving special information (92,3%), and building learner confidence (85,2%). These findings suggest that teachers devote a lot of their teaching time to developing their learners' English language skills, i.e. treating learner errors and building learner confidence in using English.

Table 16 a. Language(s) often used by teachers to Paraphrase a Point

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	21	77.8	80.8	80.8
	All (Xhosa/Se-Sotho/ English)	5	18.5	19.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

The results show that English was the language used most to paraphrase difficult aspects of the curriculum. 19, 2% of the teachers used English and indigenous languages for paraphrasing content. One of the respondents did not answer this question.

Table 16b: Language(s) often used to clarify or elaborate on a point I have been teaching

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	20	74.1	76.9	76.9
	All (Xhosa/Sesotho/English)	6	22.2	23.1	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

76,9% of the teachers used English to clarify or elaborate on aspects related to the curriculum. Only 23,1% used English and indigenous languages. One of the respondents did not answer this question.

Table 16c: Language(s) often used to substitute unfamiliar words

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa/seSotho	3	11.1	11.5	11.5
	English	18	66.7	69.2	80.8
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	5	18.5	19.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

English was the language most often used to substitute for unfamiliar words during lesson delivery (69,2%). Only 19,2% of the teachers used English and other languages. 11,5% of the teachers used isiXhosa and seSotho to substitute for unfamiliar English words. One of the respondents did not answer this question.

The language I use to emphasize something

Table 16d: Language(s) often used by teachers to emphasize something

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	18	66.7	66.7	66.7
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

To emphasise a point, 66,7% of the teachers used English. The remaining 33,3% used indigenous languages and English to emphasise important information.

Table 16e: Language(s) often used to stimulate discussion/engage with a topic

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	20	74.1	80.0	80.0
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	5	18.5	20.0	100.0
	Total	25	92.6	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

English was used by 80% of the teachers to stimulate discussion in class. Only 20% of the teachers used indigenous languages and English to stimulate discussion.

Table 16 f: Language(s) often used for repetition/reformulation, e.g. repeat a question or a statement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa/seSotho	1	3.7	3.8	3.8
	English	21	77.8	80.8	84.6
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	4	14.8	15.4	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

Indigenous languages were used by only 3,8% of the teachers for reformulations/repetitions. 80,8% of the teachers repeated or reformulated a question/statement using English. Only 15,4% code-switched for repetition/reformulation. One of the respondents did not answer this question.

Table 16g: Language (s) often used to promote understanding of content

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa/seSotho	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	English	22	81.5	81.5	85.2
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	4	14.8	14.8	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

81,5% of the teachers used English only to make the curriculum accessible to learners. 14,8% of the teachers used indigenous languages and English to help learners understand the content being taught. Only 3, 7% used indigenous languages for this purpose.

Table 16h: Language (s) often used to check the pupil's understanding of the subject matter

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	21	77.8	80.8	80.8
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	5	18.5	19.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

80,8% of the teachers checked the pupils' understanding of the subject matter in English. 19,2% used indigenous languages and English. One of the respondents did not provide an answer to this question.

Table 16i: The language(s) often used for exercises, assignments and homework

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	26	96.3	100.0	100.0
Total		27	100.0		

All the teachers (100%) carried out their assessments in English.

Table 16j: The language(s) often used to correct or develop learners' language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	26	96.3	96.3	96.3
	All (Xhosa/Sesotho/ English)	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Error correction aimed at developing learners' language was carried out mostly in English. Only 3,7% of the teachers used indigenous languages and English.

Table 16k: Language(s) often used to encourage learner participation in the lesson

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	21	77.8	80.8	80.8
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	5	18.5	19.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

80,8% of the teachers used English to encourage learners to participate in class. Only 19,2% used English and indigenous languages to encourage learner participation.

Table 16l: Language(s) often used to encourage learners to explain things to one another

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa/seSotho	1	3.7	3.8	3.8
	English	19	70.4	73.1	76.9
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	6	22.2	23.1	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

73,1% of the teachers promoted collaborative learning in English. Only 23,1% used English and indigenous languages to encourage learners to explain things to one another. IsiXhosa and seSotho were used by only 23,1 % of the teachers for this purpose.

Table 16m: Language(s) often used to build learner confidence

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa/seSotho	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	English	23	85.2	85.2	88.9
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

85,2% of the teachers used English to build learner confidence in class. IsiXhosa, seSotho and English were the second most used languages (11,1%), while IsiXhosa and seSotho were used by only 3,7% of the teachers.

Table 16n: Language(s) often used to give special information, e.g. make an announcement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa/seSotho	2	7.4	7.7	7.7
	English	24	88.9	92.3	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

92,3 % of the teachers gave special information such as announcements in English, and only 7,7% used indigenous languages. One of the respondents did not respond to this question.

Table 16o: Language(s) often used to address a serious issue

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa/seSotho	1	3.7	3.8	3.8
	English	21	77.8	80.8	84.6
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	4	14.8	15.4	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

80,8% of the teachers addressed serious issues in English, while only 3,8% used indigenous languages. 15,4% employed English and indigenous languages to address a serious issue.

Table 16p: Language (s) often used to maintain discipline, e.g. admonish a pupil

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa/seSotho	1	3.7	3.8	3.8
	English	19	70.4	73.1	76.9
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	6	22.2	23.1	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

73,1% of the teachers maintained discipline in class using English, while only 3,8% did so in indigenous languages. 23,1% used both indigenous languages and English.

Table 16q: Language(s) often used to respond to pupils' non-verbal behaviour

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	19	70.4	73.1	73.1
	All (Xhosa/seSotho/ English)	7	25.9	26.9	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

To respond to pupils' non-verbal behaviour in class, 73,1% of the teachers used English, while only 26,9% used indigenous languages and English to respond to such behaviour.

3.8 Do you switch between languages when delivering your lessons?

Table 17: Code-switching during lesson delivery

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	6	22.2	22.2	22.2
	No	13	48.1	48.1	70.4
	Sometimes	8	29.6	29.6	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Contrary to what the respondents had indicated regarding languages they employed most when teaching (Table 14), the 'Yes' and 'Sometimes' responses combined (51,8%) indicated that code-switching was a common language practice in the classroom, and that the number of teachers who code-switched to make the curriculum accessible to learners slightly exceeded those who employed English only (48,1%).

3.8 If your response to Q 3.7 above was (a) or (c), then respond to the following statements by putting a tick next to the appropriate responses. Skip this question and answer No 9 if your response was (b) in No.3.7 above.

3.9 I code-switch for the following purposes:

Table 18a: I code-switch to make up for my pupils' lack of English language skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	51.9	53.8	53.8
	Not Applicable	12	44.4	46.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

In response to the statement above, the majority of the teachers (53,8 %) cited their learners' lack of English language skills as the main reason for employing other languages when teaching,

whereas only 46,2 % of the teachers indicated that the statement did not apply to them. The latter would be teachers who employed English only. The respondents indicated that 51,9% of the high schools in the sample had an English-only policy, despite the fact that the schools in the sample were situated in an area in which isiXhosa was the language of wider communication. 40,7% permitted the use of English and any other language as MOI, while 7,4% opted for the use of the learners' HL mostly, with a bit of English. In total, English and isiXhosa were accepted in 48,1 % (Options 2 & 3) of the schools.

The responses above reveal that although the preferred LOLT in schools is English, teachers also accommodate the use of languages other than English, even though some may not even be aware of the existence of a multilingual MOI policy.

Table 18b: I code-switch because some English words are new/unfamiliar to the pupils

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	11	40.7	40.7	40.7
Not Applicable	16	59.3	59.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

40,7% of the teachers code-switched when learners had a restricted vocabulary in English, whereas 59,3% did not. This indicated that even when learners were experiencing difficulties with English, some teachers stuck to English.

Table 18 c: I code switch to clarify/paraphrase a difficult point for my pupils

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	12	44.4	44.4	44.4
Not Applicable	15	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Some of the teachers (44,4%) made the subject matter more meaningful and accessible to their learners by expressing the difficult aspects in their own words using an indigenous language. This could be through either "inter-sentential or intra-sentential code-switching" (Myers-Scotton, 1993) . The remaining 55,6% indicated that the statement was not applicable to them.

Table 18d: I code switch when I can't think of an appropriate English word to use

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	10	37.0	37.0	37.0
	Not Applicable	17	63.0	63.0	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Only 37% of the teachers switched to another language when they could not think of an appropriate English word to use. The remaining 63% indicated that this statement was not applicable to them. This suggests that some teachers did not code-switch because they believed they had good English language skills and had no reason to code-switch.

Table 18e: I code switch to facilitate concept development, i.e. help learners understand content

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	12	44.4	46.2	46.2
	Not Applicable	14	51.9	53.8	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

46,2% of the teachers code-switched to facilitate concept development, whereas 53,8% did not. This could mean that a good number of learners who experienced difficulty in understanding the register of the subject were not accommodated by the teacher and were therefore left behind. One of the teachers did not respond to this question.

Table18f: I code switch when I can't present a point successfully in English because I lack the necessary vocabulary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	5	18.5	18.5	18.5
	Not Applicable	22	81.5	81.5	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

18,5% of the teachers code-switched when they experienced difficulty in using English as an LOLT. This is an indication that teaching in an L2 presents challenges for some teachers.

Table18g: I code switch for no specific reason

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Not Applicable	24	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Some teachers may not even have been consciously aware of the reasons that prompted them to code-switch. 11,1% of the teachers maintained that they code-switched for no specific reason.

Table18h: Excluding other languages, particularly in education, would not be in line with the country's Constitution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	4	14.8	14.8	14.8
	Not Applicable	23	85.2	85.2	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

14,8% of the teachers were aware of the provisions of the South African Constitution and were comfortable with using more than one language to make the curriculum accessible to learners.

85,2% of the teachers did not regard the provisions of the Constitution as motivation for them to code-switch.

The reasons advanced for code-switching were tallied and ranked to establish their order of importance for the participants. The most cited reasons for code-switching were:

- To make up for my learners' lack of English language skills (53,8 %.);
- To facilitate concept development (46,2%);
- To clarify /paraphrase a difficult point for my pupils (44,4%);
- Some English words are new and unfamiliar to the pupils (40,7%).

Responses to Question 3.8 indicated that code-switching was employed primarily as a "compensatory strategy" during lesson delivery in order to make the subject content accessible to learners who did not have the necessary (English) proficiency qualifications.

Answer question 3.9 only if your response to Q. 3.7 above was (b)

I use English only during lesson delivery and when conducting assessments for the following reasons:

(Please tick all applicable responses)

Table 19a: I use English only because, as a subject teacher, I am the primary role model of English for my pupils

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	11	40.7	40.7	40.7
	No	16	59.3	59.3	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

40,7% of the teachers perceived themselves as primary role models of English in the classroom, as opposed to 59,3% who did not. This suggests that for the former, good language skills form the basis of a sound education and that teaching a subject also means paying attention to language use.

Table 19b: I use English only to help my pupils understand the register (i.e. vocabulary used in the subject) of the subject that I teach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	9	33.3	34.6	34.6
	No	17	63.0	65.4	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

The reason stated above was chosen by 34,6% of the teachers, an acknowledgement that content written in English was not always accessible to learners, especially those studying in an L2. Some teachers believed that immersing learners in the language of the discipline would improve their understanding of the subject. A significant percentage (65,4%) of the respondents did not equate teaching in English with improving overall English language proficiency, an indication that they also used other languages for teaching.

Table 19c: I use English only because examinations are only in English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	29.6	30.8	30.8
	No	18	66.7	69.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

Only 30,8% of the teachers indicated that they employed English only for teaching and learning because examinations were set in English. An overwhelming 69,2% used other languages for teaching. This corroborates the finding in Table 19b above that languages other than English were employed for teaching.

Table 19d: **I use English only because parents expect their children to be taught in English**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	9	33.3	34.6	34.6
	No	17	63.0	65.4	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

Contrary to popular belief about parental expectations and languages of learning, teachers do not appear to be influenced by parental demands. Only 34,6% of the respondents chose parental expectations as a factor in the manner in which they used language in class. For the remaining 65,4% this was not an important factor.

Table 19e: I use English only because our school has chosen English as the medium of instruction and I have an obligation to observe this.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	10	37.0	38.5	38.5
	No	16	59.3	61.5	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

School language policy was chosen by only 38,5% of the respondents as a factor in the manner in which they implemented language policy, as opposed to the 61,5 % who did not. This is an indication that some teachers go against school language policy provisions and focus on making the curriculum accessible to the learner by using other languages.

Table 19f: I use English only because indigenous languages do not have the necessary vocabulary to teach some of the subjects, e.g. Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	6	22.2	23.1	23.1
	No	20	74.1	76.9	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

Those who advocate the use of English only in education in post-colonial contexts use the statement above as a justification for marginalizing indigenous languages and not using them as media of instruction (Bamgbose, 2004). Only 23,1% of the teachers in this study agreed with this view. This suggests that some teachers had the necessary vocabulary (in the teachers' and learners' home language) to conduct lessons and assess learners in their home languages. However, a significant percentage of the teachers (76,9%) used English and other languages to promote understanding of the content. Out of the 27 participants, 26 responded to this question. One of the respondents did not answer the question.

Table 19 g: I use English only because I do not know my learners' home languages

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	29.6	30.8	30.8
	No	18	66.7	69.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

In cases where there was a mismatch between teachers' and learners' home languages, 30,8 % of the teachers adopted an English-only policy. English and other languages were used in contexts where there was a match between the teacher's home language and that of his/her pupils.

Table 19h: I use English only because I was trained to teach my subject area in English only

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	10	37.0	38.5	38.5
	No	16	59.3	61.5	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

Teacher factors, such as past educational experience, could have an influence on language policy implementation. Although most high school teachers in South Africa were trained in either English or Afrikaans, 61,5% of the teachers who participated in this study used other languages to deliver the curriculum, and only 38,5% used English only.

Table 19i: I use English only because in most tertiary institutions in South Africa, the medium of instruction (MOI) is English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	10	37.0	38.5	38.5
	No	16	59.3	61.5	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

Articulation between high school and tertiary programmes was not a major concern for most of the respondents. By implication, the 61,5% who did not choose this option as a factor influencing their language choice used other languages, as opposed to the remaining 38,5%. This indicates that other languages are increasingly being used to promote understanding of content, regardless of the school's preferred MOI.

Table 19j: I use English only because the world of work demands high proficiency levels in English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	29.6	30.8	30.8
	No	18	66.7	69.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

There is a belief that the labour market in South Africa puts a high premium on English and that to ensure upward mobility, one must demonstrate good (English) language skills. Contrary to this belief, only 30,8% of the respondents chose this option from the list provided as a reason for using English only. This could mean that high school teachers do not see themselves as preparing young people for the world of work, and that this is instead perceived as the role of post-school or tertiary institutions.

Table 19k: I use English only because English is the only language that can serve as a medium of instruction (MOI) in multilingual South Africa

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	6	22.2	23.1	23.1
	No	20	74.1	76.9	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

Heugh (2000) cites the perception that indigenous languages are incapable of serving as MOI as one of the myths which perpetuate English linguicism in South Africa. The findings of the current study supported this view, as only 23,1% of the teachers chose this option from the list provided. The remaining 76,9% did not regard other languages as being incapable of serving as MOI.

Table 19l: I use English only because textbooks and other resource materials used in schools are written in English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	7	25.9	26.9	26.9
	No	19	70.4	73.1	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

One of the explanations forwarded by Phillipson (2005) for the unrivalled hegemony of English in developing countries is the fact that English is a resource-rich language. However, only 26,9% of the sample agreed with this view, as opposed to the 73,1% who did not regard this as a valid reason for using English only.

Table 19m: I use English only because English is an international language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	9	33.3	34.6	34.6
	No	17	63.0	65.4	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

The perceived supremacy of English as a world language was confirmed by only 34,6% of the teachers. 65, 4% did not support this view, an indication that teachers are aware of the fact that in South Africa, English is spoken only by a small percentage of the population.

Table 19n: I use English only because South Africa, being a multilingual country, uses English to facilitate communication among people who speak different languages

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	29.6	30.8	30.8
	No	18	66.7	69.2	100.0
	Total	26	96.3	100.0	
Total		27	100.0		

Only 30,8% of the respondents were of the view that English facilitates cross-cultural communication among those who speak different languages. The majority of the teachers (69,2%) did not agree with this statement, thus suggesting that other languages are used in South African classrooms for teaching and learning and to promote cross-cultural communication.

Table 19o: Although my students and I speak the same LI (mother tongue), I cannot use it successfully as a medium of instruction (MOI)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	26	96.3	100.0	100.0
Total		27	100.0		

One of the consequences of training teachers in an L2 is that they end up teaching in the language in which they received tuition whilst they were being trained, irrespective of whether there has been a change of language policy or not. All the teachers in the sample (100%), except one who did not respond to the question, confirmed the fact that they cannot teach in their L1, even though it is the same as that of the pupils they teach. This contradicts their responses to questions on code-switching practices and languages used most for teaching, in which they indicated that the LI/language of wider communication was used extensively in the classroom to make the curriculum accessible to learners whose English language skills were not well developed.

The most cited reasons for using English as an LOLT were: teachers whose L1 matched that of the pupils could not teach in the L1 (100%); subject and language teachers saw themselves as English language role models (40,7%); school language policy insisted on the use of English (38,5%); teachers were previously trained in English (38,5%); and it was the LOLT adopted by

tertiary institutions (38,5%). Contrary to the fact that the high school teachers used code-switching extensively to facilitate learning, they earnestly believed that indigenous languages could not serve as media of instruction and could only be used as a bridge to English. This is an indication that policy implementation can either fail or succeed because of the beliefs, perceptions and attitudes harboured by individuals who are expected to implement them.

Other reasons (items not listed on the questionnaire) provided by the respondents for using English only for teaching and assessment were: job promotion is dependent on high proficiency levels in English; English is the language of computers; it promotes racial tolerance; it is at the heart of effective leadership; and it also improves learners' English language skills.

Cross-tabulations

Data were subjected to further analysis using cross-tabulations. Cross-tabulations in inferential statistics are used in order to establish whether there are any associations between two variables. The following variables were cross-tabulated in order to find answers to the sub-questions, those concerned with school policy, the school situation, teaching experience, code-alternation practices, e.g. code-switching, and teacher qualifications. The following are results of the analysis:

Table 20: Cross-tabulation between teaching experience and language choice Cross tab

			Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?		Total
			English only	English mostly and learners' home language	English only
Number of years you have been teaching	1-5 Years	Count	1	1	2
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

	6-11 Years	% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	5.9%	10.0%	7.4%
		% of Total	3.7%	3.7%	7.4%
		Count	4	2	6
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	12-17 Years	% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	23.5%	20.0%	22.2%
		% of Total	14.8%	7.4%	22.2%
		Count	4	4	8
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	18-25 Years	% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	23.5%	40.0%	29.6%
		% of Total	14.8%	14.8%	29.6%
		Count	4	1	5
		% within Nnumber of years you have been teaching	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	23.5%	10.0%	18.5%
		% of Total	14.8%	3.7%	18.5%

26 Years and above	Count	4	2	6
	% within Number of years you have been teaching	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	23.5%	20.0%	22.2%
	% of Total	14.8%	7.4%	22.2%

Total	Count	17	10	27
	% within Number of years you have been teaching	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%

Cross-tabulations between teaching experience and choice of MOI revealed that teachers with limited teaching experience (1-5 years) used both the learners' home language and English equally (50% each) during lesson delivery. Teachers with between 6 and 11 years' teaching experience displayed a different pattern; they used English more (66%) than they did the learners' HL (33%), whereas teachers with between 12 and 17 years of teaching experience used both languages equally (50%). Between 18 and 25 years' teaching experience, teachers showed a preference for English (80%) and isiXhosa was employed less (20%). The same trend was evident with teachers who had 26 years' teaching experience and above; 66,7% employed English as opposed to 33,3% who used English mostly and the learners' home language. The general picture showed that teachers gravitated towards the use of English as a medium of instruction as they gained more teaching experience. This means that, considering the above trend, there is some positive association between teaching experience and use of English as a medium of instruction.

Table 21: Cross tabulation between professional qualification and preferred language of instruction.

			Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?		Total
			English only	English mostly & learners' HL	
State your professional qualification	JSTC	Count	1	1	2
		% within State your professional qualification	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	5.9%	10.0%	7.4%
		% of Total	3.7%	3.7%	7.4%
	STD	Count	1	2	3
		% within State your professional qualification	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	5.9%	20.0%	11.1%
		% of Total	3.7%	7.4%	11.1%
	Higher Diploma in Education	Count	9	2	11
		% within State your professional qualification	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	52.9%	20.0%	40.7%
		% of Total	33.3%	7.4%	40.7%
	University	Count	0	2	2

	Diploma in Education				
		% within State your professional qualification	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	.0%	20.0%	7.4%
		% of Total	.0%	7.4%	7.4%
	B.Ed	Count	2	1	3
		% within State your professional qualification	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	11.8%	10.0%	11.1%
		% of Total	7.4%	3.7%	11.1%
	PTC	Count	4	2	6
		% within State your professional qualification	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	23.5%	20.0%	22.2%
		% of Total	14.8%	7.4%	22.2%
Total		Count	17	10	27
		% within State your professional qualification	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%

The above question addresses the understanding of whether there exists any association between the variables of teaching qualifications of the respondent and the language of choice used when

the respondent presents his/her lessons in class. The following breakdown of the responses was determined from the cross-tabulation table for both responses, namely *English only* and *English & learners'* HL respectively: **(JSTC)** 50.0%, 50.0% ; *(STD)* 33.3%, 66.7%; *(Higher Diploma in Education)*; 81.8%, 18.2%; *(University Diploma in Education)*; 0.0%, 100.0%; *(B.Ed);* 66.7%, 33.3%; *(PTC)* 66.7%, 33.3%.

The responses reveal that the majority of teachers used English only, as compared to those who used English and home languages. These results suggest that there is a relationship between language choice and one's professional qualifications; they show that there is a preference for English amongst the teachers, irrespective of their qualifications.

Table 22: Cross tabulation between subjects offered and language of instruction.

			Which language(s) do you use most when teaching at your school?		Total
			English only	English mostly & learners' HL	English only
Do you teach English?	Yes	Count	6	4	10
		% within Do you teach English?	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	35.3%	40.0%	37.0%
		% of Total	22.2%	14.8%	37.0%
	No	Count	11	6	17
		% within Do you teach English?	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	64.7%	60.0%	63.0%
		% of Total	40.7%	22.2%	63.0%
Total		Count	17	10	27

	% within Do you teach English?	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%

In order to make the data easy to manipulate in SPSS for this multiple-response question, the subjects were considered individually when performing the analysis. The purpose of this question was to find out whether teachers of English as a subject employ English only when delivering lessons, or use other languages as well. 60% claimed that they used English only, whereas 40% used English and the learners' home languages. This means that the belief which informs their language practice is that one learns a language through having it modeled for him/her and through practice, but in instances where the learner experiences difficulties, the LI is employed to facilitate learning.

Table 23: Cross tabulation between Business Economics and teaching experience

			Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?		Total
			English only	English mostly & learners' HL	English only
Do you teach Business Economics?	Yes	Count	4	2	6
		% within Do you teach Business Economics?	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	23.5%	20.0%	22.2%
		% of Total	14.8%	7.4%	22.2%
	No	Count	13	8	21
		% within Do you teach business Economics?	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	76.5%	80.0%	77.8%
		% of Total	48.1%	29.6%	77.8%
Total		Count	17	10	27
		% within Do you teach business Economics?	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%

This question was asked to establish the language practice of teachers of content subjects such as Business Economics, Geography, and History. 66,7% of the teachers indicated that they offered Business Economics using English only, while 33,3 % used English mostly and the learners' HL. This is a similar pattern to the one observed when English (as a subject) was cross-tabulated with language of teaching. The general trend was that where there were language difficulties experienced by learners, the tendency was for teachers to use the learners' LI to make the curriculum accessible.

Table 24: Cross-tabulation between History and language choice

			Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching?		Total
			English only	English mostly & learners' HL	English only
Do you teach History?	Yes	Count	3	1	4
		% within Do you teach History?	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	17.6%	10.0%	14.8%
		% of Total	11.1%	3.7%	14.8%
	No	Count	14	9	23
		% within Do you teach History?	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	82.4%	90.0%	85.2%
		% of Total	51.9%	33.3%	85.2%
Total		Count	17	10	27
		% within Do you teach History?	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%

| | | | % within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school? | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| % of Total | | | | 63.0% | 37.0% | 100.0% |

When History was cross-tabulated with language choice, 75% of the teachers claimed that they used English only when delivering lessons, whereas only 25% used English mostly and the learners' HL. As was the case with Business Economics, code-alternation was used by History teachers to promote learning, but there was a definite preference for English by these teachers.

Table 25: Cross tabulation between Geography and language of instruction

			Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?		Total
			English only	English mostly and learners' home language	English only
Do you teach Geography?	Yes	Count	4	4	8
		% within Do you teach Geography?	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	23.5%	40.0%	29.6%
		% of Total	14.8%	14.8%	29.6%
	No	Count	13	6	19
		% within Do you teach Geography?	68.4%	31.6%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	76.5%	60.0%	70.4%

		English only	English mostly & learners' HL	Total
Total	% of Total	48.1%	22.2%	70.4%
	Count	17	10	27
	% within Do you teach Geography?	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%

English and isiXhosa were used equally by teachers of Geography when delivering lessons. Unlike in History, where there was a tendency to use more English than the learners' HL, in Geography there seemed to be a balance between the use of English and isiXhosa.

Table 26: Cross-tabulation between school location and language of instruction

			Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?		Total
			English only	English mostly & learners' HL	English only
Location of your school	Urban	Count	9	3	12
		% within Location of your school	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	52.9%	30.0%	44.4%
		% of Total	33.3%	11.1%	44.4%
	Rural	Count	8	7	15
		% within Location of your school	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
		% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	47.1%	70.0%	55.6%
		% of Total	29.6%	25.9%	55.6%

		17	10	27
Total	Count			
	% within Location of your school	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	% within Which language(s) do you employ most when teaching at your school?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%

The cross-tabulation between the variables of school location and teacher language choice revealed that 75% of the urban-based (township and desegregated) schools in the sample used English only, possibly because of the linguistic profile of their learners, while 25% used English and the learners' HL. In rural contexts, 53,3% of the schools used English only, while 46,7% employed English and the learners' HL. This means that rural areas use isiXhosa more that urban-based schools, because learners in these schools speak and understand isiXhosa better than they do English. Also, isiXhosa is the language of wider communication in their environment.

Table 27: Cross-tabulation between teaching experience and code-switching

			Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?			Total
			Yes	No	Sometimes	Yes
Number of years you have been teaching	1-5 Years	Count	1	1	0	2
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	16.7%	7.7%	.0%	7.4%
		% of Total	3.7%	3.7%	.0%	7.4%
	6-11 Years	Count	2	3	1	6
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	100.0%

		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	33.3%	23.1%	12.5%	22.2%
		% of Total	7.4%	11.1%	3.7%	22.2%
	12-17 Years	Count	3	3	2	8
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	50.0%	23.1%	25.0%	29.6%
		% of Total	11.1%	11.1%	7.4%	29.6%
	18-25 Years	Count	0	2	3	5
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%

		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	.0%	15.4%	37.5%	18.5%
		% of Total	.0%	7.4%	11.1%	18.5%
	26 Years and above	Count	0	4	2	6
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	.0%	30.8%	25.0%	22.2%
		% of Total	.0%	14.8%	7.4%	22.2%

Total		Count	6	13	8	27
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	22.2%	48.1%	29.6%	100.0%
		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	22.2%	48.1%	29.6%	100.0%

Cross-tabulations between teaching experience and whether teachers code-switched or not were aimed at establishing whether there existed any association between the two variables. The following observations were made.

Teachers with 1-5 years' teaching experience used English and the learners' HL in the following manner:

1-5 years (16,7 %)

6-11years (33,3%),

12-17years (50%),

18-25 years (0%),

26 years and above (0%).

There was no noticeable code-switching trend for teachers whose experience ranged between 1 and 17 years, whereas more experienced teachers (18 years and above) did not code-switch at all. A possible explanation for this is that they have become more accustomed to using English only over the years.

Table 28: Cross-tabulation between teaching experience and language of assessment

			The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	Total
			English	English
Number of years you have been teaching	1-5 Years	Count	1	1
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	3.8%	3.8%
		% of Total	3.8%	3.8%
	6-11 Years	Count	6	6
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	23.1%	23.1%
		% of Total	23.1%	23.1%
	12-17 Years	Count	8	8
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	100.0%	100.0%

	18-25 Years	% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	30.8%	30.8%
		% of Total	30.8%	30.8%
		Count	5	5
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	19.2%	19.2%
	26 Years and above	% of Total	19.2%	19.2%
		Count	6	6
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	23.1%	23.1%
		% of Total	23.1%	23.1%
Total		Count	26	26
		% within Number of years you have been teaching	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%	100.0%

Whereas during lesson delivery teachers used other languages, all the teachers in the sample, irrespective of teaching experience, employed English only when conducting assessments.

Table 29: Cross-tabulation between professional qualifications and code-switching

| | | | Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson? | | | Total |
			Yes	No	Sometimes	Yes
State your professional qualification	JSTC	Count	0	1	1	2
		% within State your professional qualification	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	.0%	7.7%	12.5%	7.4%
		% of Total	.0%	3.7%	3.7%	7.4%
	STD	Count	1	1	1	3
		% within State your professional qualification	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	16.7%	7.7%	12.5%	11.1%
		% of Total	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	11.1%
	Higher Diploma in Education	Count	2	8	1	11
		% within State your professional qualification	18.2%	72.7%	9.1%	100.0%
		% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	33.3%	61.5%	12.5%	40.7%
		% of Total	7.4%	29.6%	3.7%	40.7%
	University Diploma in Education	Count	1	0	1	2
		% within State your professional qualification	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%

	% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	16.7%	.0%	12.5%	7.4%
	% of Total	3.7%	.0%	3.7%	7.4%
B.Ed	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within State your professional qualification	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	16.7%	15.4%	.0%	11.1%

	% of Total	3.7%	7.4%	.0%	11.1%
PTC	Count	1	1	4	6
	% within State your professional qualification	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	16.7%	7.7%	50.0%	22.2%
	% of Total	3.7%	3.7%	14.8%	22.2%
Total	Count	6	13	8	27
	% within State your professional qualification	22.2%	48.1%	29.6%	100.0%
	% within Do you switch between languages when delivering your lesson?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	22.2%	48.1%	29.6%	100.0%

Code-switching was highest amongst teachers with a UED (100%) qualification, PTC (83,7%) and JSTC (50%). These are older-generation professional teacher qualifications which were obtained at a time when there was fierce resistance to mother-tongue education in South Africa. Code-switching was employed least by those with an HDE qualification.

Table 30: Cross-tabulation between professional qualifications and assessment practices.

			The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	Total
			English	English
State your professional qualification	JSTC	Count	2	2
		% within State your professional qualification	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	7.7%	7.7%
		% of Total	7.7%	7.7%
	STD	Count	3	3
		% within State your professional qualification	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	11.5%	11.5%
		% of Total	11.5%	11.5%
	Higher Diploma in Education	Count	11	11
		% within State your professional qualification	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	42.3%	42.3%
		% of Total	42.3%	42.3%
	University Diploma in Education	Count	1	1

		% within State your professional qualification	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	3.8%	3.8%
		% of Total	3.8%	3.8%
	B.Ed	Count	3	3

		% within State your professional qualification	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	11.5%	11.5%
		% of Total	11.5%	11.5%
	PTC	Count	6	6
		% within State your professional qualification	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	23.1%	23.1%
		% of Total	23.1%	23.1%
Total		Count	26	26
		% within State your professional qualification	100.0%	100.0%
		% within The language I use for exercises, assignments and homework	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%	100.0%

Irrespective of teacher qualification, all the teachers in the sample used English only for assessment of learners, even though they employed code-alternation extensively, especially in rural and township schools, during lesson delivery.

The analysis above reflects that the preference of English over isi-Xhosa as the main MOI was largely influenced by the teachers' perceptions of indigenous languages (i.e. indigenous languages cannot be used as media of instruction as they do not have the necessary vocabulary to teach some of the subjects), and how the teachers themselves perceived their roles, both as subject teachers and as language teachers. Mazrui and Mazrui (1998, cited in Desai, 2000:175) assert that the negative attitudes of speakers of African languages towards their own languages stem from the fact that many languages in sub-Saharan Africa had an oral tradition until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with an absence of "linguistic nationalism", The Mazruis describe linguistic nationalism as the type of nationalism that concerns itself with the value of its own language, defends it against other languages, and encourages its use and enrichment (Mazrui, A.& Mazrui, A.,1998:5, cited in Desai, 2000:175). The question the Mazruis pose about linguistic scale is whether the scale of the linguistic constituency (i.e. the fact that, although there are languages spoken by some twenty million people, the majority of African languages are spoken by a few) can influence nationalistic sensitivity. Desai's response to this question is that minority language speakers in South Africa, for example, Tsonga, Ndebele, Swati, and Venda, are keen to assert their language rights, as opposed to isi-Zulu or isi-Xhosa speakers. The question of language attitudes remains a key challenge to the successful implementation of multilingualism in high domain areas such as education in South Africa. In a conversation between Desai and an imagined South African Audience (ISSAA), Desai argues that the key to African language development is through their use as media of instruction.

4.4.   Classroom Observations

The second phase of the research focused on teacher-learner interactions and language use in each of the lessons observed. Five high school teachers, who were purposively selected from the survey respondents, were observed in order to understand how they used language(s) for teaching, the effects of their choices on teaching and learning, and the factors that informed their classroom language practices. In the second phase of the study, data analysis was organized and presented individually. This entailed presenting the classroom language behaviour of each teacher comprehensibly, then moving the analysis on to the next individual. Excerpts from the lessons were analysed using pre-determined codes from the theoretical frameworks. Cohen et al. (2007) maintain that organizing data by individual preserves the coherence and integrity of the

individual's response. Issues arising across the individual participants and patterns of language use were identified.

The next section provides an in-depth analysis of the lessons that were observed. Translations of ideas expressed by the teachers in isi-Xhosa are provided in English and from isiXhosa into English for parts of the lessons that were delivered in the vernacular. My comments, coding, and interpretations are presented inside brackets in the selected extracts.

4.4.1 Analysis of History Lessons: Teacher A

This teacher's responses to the questionnaire survey reflected that she was aware of the provisions of the current multilingual language-in-education policy in South Africa. Her school's language policy allowed teachers to use English and any other language that the learners and the teacher shared. However, there was not much correlation between her responses in the questionnaire and how she employed the two languages during lesson delivery. For example, when asked about which language(s) she employed most when delivering a lesson, she chose Option 2, i.e. English mostly and the learners' home language. Her reasons for switching from one language system to another had to do with facilitating the aims of education, namely, to make up for the learners' lack of English language skills, some English words being new and unfamiliar to the pupils, clarifying or paraphrasing a difficult point for the pupils, and facilitating concept development. She also chose to code-switch when she could not think of an appropriate English word to use.

An analysis of the History lesson transcript reveals a marked departure from what she believed she was doing in class. She employed the learners' home language mostly and used English minimally to deliver lessons (Option 3 in Question 3.4. of the questionnaire). The History lessons were mainly presented in isi-Xhosa.

The lesson was structured in such a way that the sub-topics/headings were presented in English and the ensuing narrative given in isi-Xhosa, possibly to ensure that learners recognized the topics that were covered in class when doing their own independent reading. Despite the fact that the lessons observed were presented mostly in a language that learners and the teacher shared, there was minimal student-student interaction or teacher-learner communication. A possible explanation for this is that the teacher was at the centre of the process and did not create

opportunities for dialogue and negotiation of meaning. No opportunities were created for learners to read and write (except for the chalkboard summaries) in any of the two languages that the teacher used during lesson delivery, thus making it difficult for learners to develop proficiency and attain advanced special proficiency qualifications. It is highly unlikely, in a class where there is no constructive engagement amongst learners, that creative qualifications, e.g. openness, a critical sense, independence and teamwork, could be achieved.

The chalkboard summary, which captured mainly key phrases and ideas, was written in English only. It was at the introductory stage of the lesson that the teacher mostly employed English. As the lesson progressed, the narrative was increasingly presented in isi-Xhosa, with English complementing the isi-Xhosa. The teacher code-switched extensively in this lesson. For example, she would use isi-Xhosa and English within an utterance or present the discussion in isi-Xhosa and pepper it with a few English words. In some instances, the chosen English word would be given an isi-Xhosa structure, e.g. "benefiter/benefita". Although in the example cited above the root of the word is English (the new word is derived from "benefit"), such a word does not exist in English or in isi-Xhosa. The teacher made use of coined un-English/un-isi-Xhosa words. These words are commonly used by black L2 speakers of English, mostly in spoken or informal communication.

The teacher would use isi-Xhosa only to give instructions to pupils, to get a response from them, or to remind them about how what she was teaching related to a previous lesson. The following example illustrates how both isi-Xhosa and English were used by her during lesson delivery:

Extract 1.
Teacher: *In 1989 i-Communism collapsed, but ke (code-switching) it's only Cuba and what? He bethunana siyenzile le nto! (We've discussed this before!)*
(Teacher code-switches to isi-Xhosa and expresses her dismay at the learners' non-response to her question which has been phrased in English and isi-Xhosa.)
Class: No response.

Translations and repetitions were a common feature of the teacher's utterances. She would reiterate important points and paraphrase what she had said to ensure that there was common understanding, using any of the two languages. The example below is a case in point.

Teacher: *There were two main problems relating to the land. Most of the farms were owned by the white commercial farmers. Uyabona ke umhlaba wonke wawu 'own-wer' ngama- Bhulu.*
(You see, only whites owned land then.)
(Teacher code-switches/provides scaffolding.)

Uthi xa uhambayo ngapha ngako ma Queenstown usiya eRhawutini ufike amasimi apha koo-Ntshongwana nase Tabase engalinyangwa. Akukho ntoni?
(When travelling through Queenstown to Johannesburg one would notice that land belonging to the Ntshongwanas was lying fallow in rural areas such as Tabase. What had they not planted?)
(Teacher elaborates on previous point made above in isi-Xhosa.)

Class: *Kwa mbona (chorus answer).*
(They had not planted mielies.)
Literal translation was employed as a form of scaffolding mainly to emphasize, clarify or amplify a point. The following example illustrates clearly how the teacher accomplished this:
Extract 2.
Teacher: *During the Land Act of 1913, over a million people were forced to move from their land or houses.*
Kwathiwa hayi kuzokulinywa apha and lomhlaba ulinywa nje kufunwa nikwazi ukufumana i-flour, nifumane umgubo, nifumane ingxowa yombona, nifumane yonke into sukani kule ndawo niyohlala phana.
(Blacks were made to believe that if they agreed to be resettled, the land they were leaving behind would be utilized for their benefit. They would get mielies and maize meal from it.)

For the better part of the lesson the learners were silent and non-participatory and would either give a one-word response or provide a chorus answer. The teacher would ask a question and then answer it herself. The questions asked would mostly be close-ended questions that would not require learners to argue, engage in sustained communication, or solve a problem. When the learners asked questions they did so in isi-Xhosa and the teacher would respond either in English only, or use both English and isi-Xhosa (*scaffolding*). It appeared that there was a common understanding between the teacher and her learners that both languages should be used for

teaching and learning. The teacher did not sanction use of the learners' home language during her classes or promote the exclusive use of English.

Extract 3.

Student: *Kuthiwa yintoni i-IFP xa iphelele?*

(What does the acronym IFP stand for?)

(Again, a student asks a question in isi-Xhosa. This appears to be the norm in this class.)

Teacher: *The IFP is called the Inkatha Freedom Party (Teacher responds to a question asked in isiXhosa in English).*

Student: *Kula Communism nala Capitalism before ya yiyi Communism ne Capitalism babe 'fight(er)' for into yokuba ibe yinto eyi-one. Ngoku, apha e-S.A sifumane i-Communism okanye i-Capitalism? (Teacher code-mixes/provides scaffolding).*

(They were fighting for a single economic system before the introduction of Communism and Capitalism. Here in South Africa, which economic system are we following? Communism or Capitalism?)

Although the teacher would occasionally construct a full sentence in one language system, i.e. English, the patterns of language use in this lesson were no different from those observed in the Grade 12 History lesson above. There was extensive use of isiXhosa by the teacher, for example code-mixing and code-switching. The following example illustrates the extent to which isiXhosa and English were used within an utterance:

Extract 4.

Teacher: *We can say these are the Nobles and these are the Clergies, so the whole class is the members of the Third Estate. Kwezi members of the Third Estate from uZama to that boy, zii-Bourgeoisie, from there to uYomelelani zi-Peasants, you understand? So then if we are saying i-Third Estate consists of 90% that means aba bohlulelana ngo 10% to make u-100%. Niyaqonda moss i-percentage iphela ku 100 (code-mixing/scaffolding).*

(Teacher points at the front rows to illustrate that the two rows would constitute the Nobles and the Clergy and the remaining rows would be members of the Third Estate. From where Zama is seated (teacher pointing at Zama) to where that boy is seated, those would be the Bourgeoisie, and from there to where Yomelelani is seated those would be Peasants. Do you understand? So if

the Third Estate made up 90% of the population, the Clergy and Bourgeoisie made up only 10% of the population. I'm sure you understand that percentages add up to 100).

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *Not unless ke ayibalwa ngolu hlobo. So, if iphela ku 100%, it means when aba besenza 90%, that means aba benza bani? (Teacher code-mixes provides/scaffolding).*

U-100%.

That is, the Nobles and the Clergy.

(Unless it's not worked out like that. If it adds up to 100%, it means that if this group made up 90%, the other one made up which percentage?)

100%.

That is how the Nobles and the Clergy were represented in the population.

So yayi ngabona bantu baninzi (code-mixing/scaffolding to promote appropriation) in the population of France, the Nobles and the…(pause) I mean the Bourgeoisie and the Peasants but the Nobles and the Upper Clergy enjoyed ii- privileges at the King's palace and in Versailles.

Babehlala e-Versailles, u-Louis the 16th kumnandi be-braya besitya imali ye-state, but abantu bona behlupheka (Translation of previous utterance into isiXhosa and elaboration/scaffolding).

You understand?

(So it means the Peasants were in the majority but the Nobles and Upper Clergy enjoyed privileges that those who were in the majority could only dream of, at the king's palace and in Versailles. They lived in Versailles and had a good time, wasting state money while the masses lived in poverty).

Extract 5.

An example was provided by the teacher in isi-Xhosa to explain a concept that she had introduced in English. The teacher explained and translated (scaffolding) the concept "balance sheet" into isiXhosa within the context of the narrative. The following example illustrates this point:

Teacher: *Then emveni kokuba esibizile he also said to him (code-mixing) makathi draw-up a balance sheet.*

Kulapho kuvezwa khona imali ezisetyenzisiweyo (translation/scaffolding) zase France.

Because u-Necker wathi makwenziwe ezo zinto kwathwa makagxothwe because uveza amahlebo enziwayo e-Versailles apho bahlala khona, the Nobles and the Clergy.

(After summoning them he instructed them to draw up a balance sheet. The balance sheet would reflect state expenditure. Because Necker had insisted that this be done, he was dismissed. The balance sheet would have revealed a lot about the lavish lifestyle enjoyed by the Nobles and the Clergy).

Word coinage was also a common feature of this lesson. Examples of this phenomenon would be words such as "enjoy-wa", "aligner", and "uyi-mention-nileyo". During the History lesson the teacher developed the learners' vocabulary and promoted concept development (appropriation), as illustrated in the following examples:

Extract 6.

Teacher: *So one of the philosophers advised Louis the 16th to summon the States General, to call the States General (The teacher substitutes "summon" with "call" to ensure that learners understand the concept). I--States General must assemble masikhe sidibane (Translation).*

I-tax yase France was paid by the members of the Third Estate. Bona babe exempted (code-mixing/scaffolding) from paying the tax.

(They were exempted from paying taxes.)

Xa kuthiwa (code-mixing) you are exempted it means sukuyenza into ethile (Translation/scaffolding).

So they were not paying the tax, and they condemned that.

In terms of qualification analysis, although the History lessons were delivered in code-switching/code-mixing mode, this developed the learners' proficiency qualifications to a limited extent. For example, vocabulary development was achieved through translations and word substitutions and paraphrases. However, the teacher asked close-ended questions to which she received one-word or chorus answers. Generally, learners were uncommunicative and the lessons were not interactive. She provided answers to her questions when she could not get responses from learners. In a classroom climate such as the one described above, creative qualifications such as independence and openness, creativity and constructive cooperation, which are much needed in the workplace, cannot be realized by learners. English became a barrier to learning, and code-alternation, though aiding learning, took up a lot of the time allocated for the History period.

4.4.2 Analysis of Business Economics Lessons: Teacher B

The Business Economics teacher consistently adopted an English-only approach throughout the lessons in Grades 11 and 12. Classroom interaction among the students and between the teacher and students in this multilingual classroom was exclusively in English, and this despite the fact that the teacher under observation shared a home language with a number of learners in his classes. The vignette below illustrates this clearly.

Extract 1.

Teacher: *Now, I want someone also to remind us… (incomplete utterance) because if we are having conflict you need to solve it, although we said that there are steps in solving problems because conflict can also be taken as a problem, it is a problem.*

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *Thank you very much. Now, can someone remind us of the first step in solving a problem in an organization? Yes?*

Student: *You must identify the problem.*

Teacher: *If you want to solve that conflict also, you identify the problem.*

Student: *You identify decision factors.*

Teacher: *You need to generate ideas and compose those ideas and link them.*

Student: *Collect and analyse the possibilities*

Teacher: *Guys, remember we said that you develop different ideas*

 (The teacher is re-capping to encourage reciprocity).

 Once you've got those ideas, take the best idea that can actually solve the problem. And now I think there's another step.

Student: *Implement the selected solution.*

Teacher: *Yes, we've already identified that one. Ok, fine, guys, what is important is that from those ideas, we said that you selected the best idea that can help to solve the problem, and once you've selected the best ideas, you implement so…and the last is also…?*

Class: *Evaluate.*

Teacher: *But guys, before we actually do anything, I want us to write a few lines about what conflict is, that is conflict management. (The question asked is not quite clear here.)*

 Yes?

Teacher: *What is conflict, just generally?*

Learner: Conflict refers to different ideas that people have about a situation. It is differences that people may have.

Grammatical errors that the learners committed were largely ignored throughout the lessons. The teacher focused on getting ideas across without bothering about the grammatical correctness of utterances. The following example illustrates this clearly:

<u>*Extract 2.*</u>
Teacher*: That's the first thing that came into your mind. It's all about promoting a business. What else do you think you as an entrepreneur need to do when promoting a business?*
Yes, Bongani?
Student*: As in marketing is to link as to combine to be consumers and service provider.*
(The answer provided is unintelligible. Instead of trying to work out, by providing the necessary scaffolding, what the learner was trying to say, the teacher provided the expected response. The learners' ZPD may not develop to a cognitively higher level/appropriation of content may not be possible).
Teacher*: Ok, thank you very much. Marketing is also about creating demand for goods and services.*

As in the History lessons discussed above, there was extensive teacher talk in this lesson and not much teacher-learner and learner-learner interaction and reciprocity, possibly because the teacher adopted an English-only approach and teacher-centred techniques when delivering lessons to learners who were mostly L2 speakers of English. English proficiency qualifications were not achieved, mainly because all the explanations and assessments carried out in class were in one language system, English. There was no vibrant discussion of issues related to the topic, nor were questions of clarity raised; thus one can conclude that creative qualifications were not developed in this environment as the teacher turned a blind eye to glaring errors made by learners.

4.4.3 Analysis of Geography Lessons: Teacher C

How this Geography teacher used language in this township school had a lot to do with his personality, i.e. character and mannerisms, and the context of the school. As illustrated in the examples below, he used township lingo/colloquial language at times to get his message across. Consequently, the mood in his classes was relaxed and communication was not constrained. He used code-switching liberally, and word coinage was a common feature of classroom discourse.

Extract 1.

Teacher: *Planting the same thing every year, okay, that's point number 1.*

Two, we are involved in subsistence farming but we want to improve our needs so that singa – 'feysi' (face) poverty indlala (word coinage and translation to ensure appropriation of content) indeed.

Yes.

Also, government andithi moss sinabo noo-Ceba (translation and code-switching).

(We have councillors.)

So they must make it a point that… the government is giving us intoni? (code-mixing/scaffolding).

Seeds.

What else? What if the government brings the seed and then there are no people to use it? The seed, what if the people in urban areas who are not good at farming receive seeds from the government? So who is gonna use it?

(The teacher asks a high-order question which requires learners to speculate and solve a problem.)

Learner: *They will not plant the seeds because they do not have the skills.*

Teacher: *Ja, because of that rural urban migration we said that we are practising subsistence farming. I think u-Sindiswa if ndimva kakuhle uthi (The teacher code-switches/re-states the learner's response in order to raise learners' ZPD to a higher level).*

(If I understand Sindiswa well.)

They must form groups, isn't?

Learners: *Yes,*

Teacher: *kuthiwa yintoni? (Code-switching).*

(What is it called?)

Silence

Teacher: *Community garden, you get what I am saying?*

Learners: *Yes.*

Teacher: *Not for selling for themselves uya-understander (word coinage) and they must also use the surrounding school. Do you get what I am saying? They must also use… or the schools must have plants to serve their community okay? … Right, let's move on guys, right?*

We are going to deal with agriculture as a primary activity, let us look now at ii-factors promoting agriculture in South Africa.

The teacher employed code-alternation (code-switching and code-mixing) extensively during lesson delivery.

<u>**Extract 2.**</u>

Teacher: *I think she is referring to migration' cos we said when we were dealing with aging, is that right, because the young are leaving the rural areas to urban areas, searching for better opportunities.*

0kay, right, the government now is providing the 'style' (Township lingo meaning 'money') but we do not know what we are going to do.

Singa maxhegwaza angasena kuya ndawo (code-switching).

(We are old and cannot go anywhere else.)

(Teacher amplifies the point he had made before to promote appropriation of content)

Here is a challenge, ukhona ke ngoku wena kula lali, umcimbi (township lingo for 'money') uyawubona ukuba unjani uza kuthini? (code-mixing).

(You live in this area and you've got money. What are you going to do?)

Come on. (Teacher encourages participation/reciprocity).

Learners: *(silence)*

Teacher: *So, South Africa has a dual agricultural economy, we are having subsistence and commercial farming, right.*

(Teacher reads from the textbook, translates and explains the content when he cannot get the required response.)

Subsistence farming is characterized by use of traditional farming methods.

Subsistence farmers do not produce high yield… even farmers that are involved in that kind of farming, they do not produce high yield, right, as they provide only for themselves. So there is no need for high yield. There is no surplus 'cos they are doing this for their families.

Andithi na xa nithetha mos kwi - local community kuya nkinqwa, andithi kuthwe khawuyo kundicelela umbona phaya kulo bani, utshintshe ngo-mealie-meal, and yes, that's good. (Translation/scaffolding)

(In the local community the bartering system is used a lot. One would be sent to the neighbours to exchange mielie-meal for some other foodstuff.)

Right, they do not produce high yields as they provide only for their families so there is no need for high yield because they are just providing only for ii-families and their local communities.

As in the previous lesson, the teacher used English as a MOI, but also employed code-switching and translated some phrases. He asked probing questions based on the case study in order to assist students make meaning of the text and relate it to the day's topic.

Extract 3.

Teacher: *Read the case study okay. Firstly, masimamele kuqala.*
(Teacher code-mixing to capture learners' attention.)

(Let's listen first.) Sizongena now kwi ntoni? (What are we going to discuss?) mining and we have kwelinye icala agriculture in South Africa. (Mining and agriculture.) Now let us look at mining as an example of a primary activity, but here is the case study, which means that the mining industry in South Africa has problems, problems that are faced by i- mining industry itself. Here is the case, let us read the story, we are going to answer u-Question 5 and there is a star next to u-Question 5. Niyambona andithi? (code-switching) (Can you see Question5?) Now, kuthiwa (it is stated in the extract…) 'Gold Miners Returning Home to Die'. Listen, you have to develop an attitude, it can be positive or negative but those miners return home to die. Oh my God, gold miners return home to die.

What is the problem, before you-read ntoni? The story.
Do you get what I'm saying? You must first understand the topic, now you are going to be fast in reading the what?The case study. Do not just read pr………pr…pr… no, you must understand the main theme of the case study.

You have to understand first what the topic "Gold Miners Return Home to Die" means. Mhh what is the problem in the mines because I think i-mining plays a major role in our economy in South Africa (silence).

What is the problem now, because the topic says " Gold Miners Return Home to Die"?

(The teacher's question remains unanswered, and to encourage participation and reciprocity, he asks the learners to identify the problem in the case study).

Oh my God, Oh my Jesus, at the age of 59 Mr. Mobetshe grows sorghum and maize in a village in Lesotho.

Now you are going to get me the answers? (Teacher encourages learners to respond to his question).

Learners: *No response.*

Teacher: *Okay, the time is up, 10 minutes is up; the time is 10 past nine, okay. Now firstly, before we attempt the question, let us give a summary. Anyway the topic says, "Gold Miners Return Home to Die". What are the causes of that, what are the causes of that situation, because the gold miners return home to die? Ey, that's a blind statement (township lingo).*

What are the causes?

Learner: *They are out of work.*

Learner: *They are sick and cannot work. (The teacher has allowed learners enough time to think about the question. They then provide the appropriate responses).*

Teacher: *It's okay, class, that is a nice summary. So I want us to attempt Question 5.*

Khe sizame ukuba singakwazi na ukumphendula (translation/ scaffolding).

Question 5, what is the question there? (Code-switching).

Teacher: *He has received compensation. Ugule esemsebenzini, he was sick while he was at work. (Translation from isi-Xhosa into English/scaffolding).*

Do you get what I'm saying? So he applied for i- compensation, (code-mixing) but there was no answer, what else?

Learner 1: *I think the causes are i-polluted air underground.*

Learner 2: *Because of heat.*

Teacher: *Guys, listen; the topic says "Gold Miners Return Home to Die". What are the causes of that situation?*

Anika ndiphenduli

(You have not answered my question).

Yes?

Learner: *I think, Sir, because of i-pollution in the mines and when they return home they cannot get help to help them. (appropriation of content).*

Teacher: *You are coming to the point*

(The teacher encourages learners to respond by providing positive feedback/reciprocity).

Learner: *It is the mistreatment of the managers of the mine workers because of the air pollution, that fuel under the mine, then somebody catches the tuberculosis and then that person is told to remain even if he is under treatment. So they return home to die because they try to do something to provide for their families, then it is eroded by drought. (appropriation of content).*

Teacher: *Yes, Nyembezi.*

As in the History lesson, extensive code alternation was employed in this lesson in which the textbook was used as a resource. Learners read the case study in groups and discussed the accompanying questions amongst themselves in isi-Xhosa and English. Although reserved and non-participatory in the early stages of the lesson, they participated enthusiastically as the lesson progressed. Proficiency qualifications received attention in the lesson, as both the teacher and learners read and discussed the case study using both isiXhosa and English.

4.4.4 Analysis of Geography Lessons: Teacher   D

This expatriate teacher adopted an English-only policy for teaching, and throughout his lessons classroom interaction was in English only. The fact that learners could bring the teacher's incorrect spelling to his attention, as reflected in the example below, was an indication that correct English language usage was of paramount importance to the learners and the teacher.

 Extract 1.
Teacher: *No questions, I asked you a question I expect you all to know.*

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *I don't want you to tell me stories.*

Student: *Your spelling of longitude is wrong.*

Teacher: *Where?*

Student: *You put M instead of N.*

Teacher: Why, do you think all my answers are right?

To stimulate discussion and steer the debate towards application of the theory the teacher asked open-ended questions that prompted learners to challenge each others' views. This activated the learners' ZPD.

Extract 2.

Teacher: Do you agree with what this theory of dual economy is proposing? Do you agree that this theory is in operation today?

Mhmm…

Yes or no? Do you agree? Do you agree with what is happening? Now tell me, it looks like it's a gloomy picture. Hey?

(The problem-solving approach adopted by this teacher generates discussion and stimulates the learners' thought processes. This in turn raises their ZPD/achievement levels).

Learner: I disagree with that.

Teacher: Why do you disagree? (Teacher asks an open-ended question to set everybody thinking about how to apply the theory.)

Learner: Because some rural areas are far away from Mthatha. They are developed, like i-Zimbane Valley, Sir.

Teacher: Which place?

Learner: It's not far away.

Teacher: Zimbane is this one (pointing to the place referred to on the map). Isn't it?

Class: Yes.

Learner: Can I attack him?

Teacher: Yes, attack him if you don't agree.

Learner: Here we are talking about rural areas, like if you see, those areas which are far away from town, like Mqanduli, Xhora (tape inaudible as learners are all talking at the same time)… They are more developed, you see.

In the whole class discussion on rural development, which later on took the form of a debate, the teacher stimulated discussion on the topic by asking divergent questions, as illustrated in the example below. The questions asked and the examples given to amplify the point being made by

the teacher related to the learners' environment and personal experiences. Given that the school is situated in a rural setting, learners could make inferences and use examples from their rural experience.

Extract 3.

Teacher: *Rural areas, if you can remember that. I'm sure you remember but you have forgotten the name of the theory, follow the dual economy theory. You understand?*

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *Ok, tell me, do you think this theory has been successful? Do you think the rural areas have been developed because of this theory or this model? Do you think the rural areas of South Africa have been developed because of this model? Yes, Molo?*

Molo: *Some of the rural areas have been developed. If you can see around here, Mthatha, there are RDP houses and toilets that had been made.*

Teacher: *RDP houses and toilets?*

Student: *Yes.*

Teacher: *Yes, at the back.*

Student: *They are not.*

Teacher: *You agree that there's nothing had been done. Something has been done.*

Class: *Has been done, but it's not enough.*

Teacher: *Not enough?*

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *What has been done?*

Student: *There are toilets, there are RDP houses. Water has been given to rural areas but…*

Teacher: *Were there RDP houses before elections?*

Extract 5.

Although the development of the learners' English language skills was not the teacher's main concern, he would sometimes facilitate communication by extending the learners' vocabulary, e.g. provide the appropriate word/s at a time when the student could not come up with the required word. The example below illustrates this clearly.

Teacher: *What type of toilets is there?*

Class: Zii-RDP toilets.

Teacher: What toilets?

Class: Flush toilets.

Class: Yes.

Teacher: There is a flushing of water there. Is that what you are talking about? Is there water for the flush toilets?

Class: No, no.

Teacher: Like you have in the cities.

Class: No, there's no water.

Student: It's just a toilet that's built with blocks.

Teacher: It's a pit toilet. Ok, Lawrence. I'll come to you (vocabulary development/scaffolding).

Lawrence: I agree with you, some of the rural areas are developed, because let's face it, in the olden days the rural areas didn't have electricity, didn't have roads. Now they are improving. We have electricity, we have roads. We have better roads than we had before.

Teacher: Before.

(Although this is a one-word response from the teacher, it is aimed at expanding the learners' ZPD by encouraging them to compare the prevailing situation in South Africa with what the conditions were like before the democratic government came to power. The teacher's response demonstrates reciprocity and appropriation.)

Class: Yes. And there's no need for ii-………what do you call it?

Teacher: Flush toilet. (The teacher provides the required word/scaffolding)

English………flush toilet system.

The teacher used English for different purposes in his lessons, for example prompting and encouraging his pupils to apply a theory they had discussed in a previous lesson, asking probing questions and stimulating debate and discussion.

Extract 6.

Teacher: Who can add to that? Make an attempt. Think about what I told you before. Yes, nobody? (Teacher prompting and encouraging learners.)

Teacher: Ok, tell me, do you think this theory has been successful? Do you think the rural areas have been developed because of this theory or this model? Do you think the rural areas of South Africa have been developed because of this model? Yes, Molo.

(The teacher asks open-ended/divergent questions to stimulate debate.)

Class: *Yes, uqalile ke ngoku.*

(Learner not sanctioned by the teacher for switching to isiXhosa, a language that he himself does not speak. Although the teacher does not speak isiXhosa as a home/first language, he made it a point of using the few Xhosa words he knew during lesson delivery.)

Teacher: *Think about what we've done. Theories that we've done, the dual economy, look at the location of these places, RDP houses, these RDP houses, are they in the rural area, or close to the city or in the city?*

(Teacher requires application of theory studied and steers the discussion towards the right direction by asking thought-provoking questions that can lead to the expansion of the learners' ZPD.)

Teacher: *So what you are saying is that the one in the city has got better roads, accessible roads. People can reach their houses.*

(The teacher is paraphrasing the learner's unintelligible/incomplete response. He is concerned with meaning, not correctness of utterance.)

Class: Yes.

Teacher: *Ok, right. So what does that tell you now about the theory? What theory are they using now?*

Yes, Sihle.

The excerpts from the Geography teacher's lessons demonstrate the teacher's attempts to enhance learner proficiency, adaptability and creative qualifications. There was vibrant discussion and debate amongst the learners who asked questions and challenged some of the responses. The teacher asked questions aimed at improving learner vocabulary, paraphrased, prompted and asked open-ended questions. That there was a non-participant observer in this class did not stop learners from engaging with the topic, making critical comments, evaluating each others' responses and citing examples from their own rural experience. There was constructive cooperation amongst learners. This was how the teacher conducted his lessons from Grades 10-12.

4.4.5 Analysis of English Lessons: Teacher E.

This teacher offers English as a second language at a rural high school to learners with whom he shares a home language. He adopted an English-only policy in this lesson and switched to isi-Xhosa only once to confirm that learners had understood what he had said. Creative and proficiency qualifications were not developed in this lesson as there was no sustained interaction between the teacher and the learners. Learners were passive and did not contribute to the lesson, thus making it difficult to conclude that they had understood the lesson. This was a teacher-dominated lesson in which communication was one-way. The teacher asked close-ended questions to which he received one-word answers.

Extract 1.

Teacher: The shorter version for the word memorandum is the word memo, I think we all know.
Class: Yes.
Teacher: To answer question No.2, which was asked earlier on, what is the purpose of writing a memorandum? Because in our definition we have said it is a written message, then question No.2, which we asked earlier on, is why does one write a memorandum? What are the purposes of writing a memorandum or a memo?
(Teacher answers this question himself after not receiving a response.)
Teacher: One writes a memorandum in order to inform the employees of a company about the company policies. That is the purpose of … (Tape inaudible). Let us take a school situation, the SRC president for example wrote a memo to inform students of a particular school about the policies of a particular school. That is one of the reasons why memo is important. Secondly, to communicate the decision of other… (Incomplete utterance).
Thirdly, you write a memo in order to inform or to remind about the events at that particular institution if it happens to be an institution. Also, one can write a memo to convey instruction. And lastly, to confirm matters discussed in a meeting.
Let us say that the Student Representative Council of this school had a meeting, and in that particular meeting there were decisions that were taken, and the students at large need to be informed about such decisions that have been taken using a memo.

How does one go about drawing up a memo? This is the layout for a memo (teacher writes on chalkboard). The date is of utmost importance, anything written down is important to write a date, for an example, if you are writing a letter and it is a formal or informal letter, that letter must have a date. So in the case when one writes a memo there must be a date, and when writing a date in a memorandum you must write it in full. For example, what date is it today?

Class: 18 September 2007.

Teacher: You write it in full, instead of writing it like this, 18-10-2007, are we together?

Class: Yes.

Teacher: So one thing that a memo must have is a date. Again, to whom are you writing this memo? You write TO: and the initials of that person and the occupation of that person.

Why is it important to have such specifications? (Rhetorical question) Because, let us say it is a company, we might have two or three people having the same surname within the company, for an example, if it is this institution you might have maybe two Damonis. So it is important for people to specify the occupation of that person.

Sivene? (Does this make sense?)

Class: Yes.

Teacher: Again, you need to write the person to whom the memo is addressed, and again, write… the memo and even with that particular somebody those specifications must be there. Let us say From: Mrs Dyantyi (RCL-President). It might happen that, much as this memo is addressed to this particular person, there are other people to whom Mrs Dyantyi would like to get hold of and love to read what is written. Are we together?

Class: Yes.

Teacher: We have this CC. What does it stands for?,Who can tell us? Yes, Sisipho.

Student: CC stands for carbon copy.

Teacher: Very good, Sisi. That is your list under CC. These are the names of other people you would love to read this. Are we together?

Class: Yes.

Teacher: You just write the names. Mr A. Goxa CC. You list the names of people to whom you would like to get hold of this memo. Equally important is the subject, that is, what will be in the content of the memo. Let's say maybe Mrs N Dyantyi would like to tell us about the Annual

General Meeting, you write that under the subject, that is, before we read what is in the memo we must know what we are to read about, the annual general meeting. Are we together?

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *Please note that the meeting scheduled for 19 October has been postponed. The meeting will now be held on 25 October at 14:00 hours. What you need to know is that when writing a memorandum you use full sentences. Are we together?*

Learners: *Yes.*

But, much as that is the case, we discard, we do not include, we exclude any irrelevant or unnecessary information.

Teacher: *Are we together?*

Learners: *Yes.*

Teacher: *That is all I need, excluding that unnecessary information. Are we together?*

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *When you've done that, don't forget to sign at the end, the signature of a person who wrote the memo. That's how one goes about writing a memorandum. Are we together?*

Class: *Yes.*

Extract 2.

As in the previous lesson, communication was mostly one-way in this Grade 12 literature lesson. The teacher occasionally asked good anchor questions that required learners to analyse what the characters in the play said, but received one-word responses most of the time. He then provided the required response and offered explanations to a generally quiet and uninvolved class. He provided the meanings of difficult and unfamiliar words and summarised the scenes in the play after reading extracts from the text.

Teacher: *My other question to you is did the witches succeed in corrupting him?*

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *They do succeed in stripping him off of his good character, they do succeed in making him evil, and they do succeed in making Macbeth to be like them, so now we no more speak of good Macbeth but evil Macbeth, which is precisely why in this second half of the play it is Macbeth who now goes to the witches. He goes to them because he is no different to them; he is as evil as the witches are. I hope you all understand.*

(Instead of using scaffolding in the form of prompts, paraphrases, clarification, etc., the teacher provides the correct response, thus depriving learners an opportunity to expand their ZPD and improve their proficiency, adaptability and creative qualifications.)

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *Good, alright, on page 111 where we get the second witch speaking. We have said now it's Macbeth who seeks the witches, not vice versa. The second witch says by speaking of my thumb something wicked is going to happen. The word 'wicked' means evil (language/vocabulary development). So the second witch feels pain in her thumb and she says something evil may come, and who may come?*

Class: *Macbeth.*

Teacher: *The witch refers to Macbeth as evil because they have succeeded in stripping him off of his humanity. Now they have made him to be like them, to be evil. And then Macbeth comes in and he says, "How now you… (Teacher reading from the text) what is it you do?" And then I want us to compare the way Macbeth addresses the witches when he first saw them in Scene 3 (Silence, no response).*

Now he is kind of speaking roughly.

(Teacher reads from the play and interprets the relevant lines from the text for his learners.)

You see now, he's being rude, and he's being demanding, but when he first came across the witches in Scene 3, he was soft and kind. Right?

Class: *Yes.*

Teacher: *Macbeth made demands to the witches. There is something that we've learnt from what Macbeth says to the witches, "Thou who untie the wings…churches." That's what the witches do. So the witches are able to destroy that which is good and natural.*

Class: *Yes.*

4.5 Focused Interview Findings

In the focused interviews, the aim was to encourage the key informants to be reflective about their classroom practice and establish why they implemented the MOI policies in the way they did during classroom observation. The aim was also to understand what informed their classroom language behaviour. Open coding was used in search of emergent themes in the interview data.

4.5.1 Teacher A

Two teachers, one from a rural high school and the other from an urban desegregated high school, participated in the last stage of the research, i.e. the focused interviews. My justification for selecting these two teachers for the focused interviews was the learner linguistic composition of their classes, the situation of their schools, their enthusiasm about the subject of my investigation, and the fact that they shared an L1 with most of their learners, although they were teaching in different contexts.

Both teachers endorsed the use of English as an LOLT at high school. The History teacher (Interview 1), whose school is situated in a rural context, indicated she used English mainly as MOI. She also supported the use of isiXhosa for teaching, especially in rural schools where learners have considerable challenges with English and are more proficient in isiXhosa than in English. According to this teacher, code-switching would make the content accessible to learners and improve their levels of achievement. This is how she responded when asked about her classroom language choices:

Extract 1.
Interviewer: In your view, which language(s) should be used as LOLT at secondary school?
Interviewee: Thank you, Ma'am. I think we must use English. But because we are teaching in rural areas we have to code-switch from English to the vernacular which is used in their homes. (Context is of utmost importance in LIE implementation.)

Interviewer: You mentioned rural areas. Why should you use both English and isiXhosa?You have just said it should be English, then you said 'we are teaching in rural areas', which is true, that is where you are teaching. Why would you have to use both languages?

Interviewee: The problem is that learners from rural areas are not like learners from Model C schools. They understand their home language better than English, but they do understand English. But the problem is that they understand their mother tongue better than English because they grew up with their parents who are not that much educated.

(The teacher identifies learner profiles and school context as factors in teacher language choice in the rural school where she teaches. The teacher displays inconsistency here, although she uses the LI extensively to promote understanding, she endorses the use of English as an LOLT. The fact that black pupils are more proficient in their mother tongue than in English is viewed as a challenge in an education system which values and uncritically supports English. A question that arises from this teacher's response is why one would need to be more proficient in an L2 in order to use it for learning, when the learner is more proficient in the LI. Parental support would also be readily available, since the school system would be utilizing a language that is widely spoken in the community in which the school is situated.)

Extract 2.

This teachers viewed the English language as a barrier to learning but linked it to learner achievement. In classroom-based summative assessments, she recommended that only English be employed as external examinations were set in English, although as Grade 12 History markers they accommodated other languages when marking at Provincial level.

Interviewer: So that would be your motivation for saying the media of instruction should be both English and isiXhosa. And how do you think this could be implemented, the use of a dual medium of instruction, that kind of thing? How do you think this could be implemented in high school particularly?

Interviewee: I think we have to use it when you explain something that you see... when you are teaching that, now they do not understand what you are saying. Then as a teacher you have to code-switch, (pause)... to use their mother tongue in order for them to understand better what you are trying to explain to them.

(Although multilingualism is perceived as a problem, isiXhosa is used extensively to promote and support learning.)

Interviewer: Would that be restricted to teaching only or do you also do the same when assessing them?

Interviewee: No, we don't do that when assessing them. We assess them in English and sometimes you can see even if they are writing that when answering and when marking their scripts that they did not understand this question. They understand it on their own, but they fail to understand it

properly, but if it was put in their language, that means isiXhosa, then they would answer better, then they would earn better marks in their assessment.

(The teacher acknowledges that English is a barrier to learning for L2 learners and affects learner achievement. Learner performance would improve greatly if the content were presented in isi-Xhosa, the learner's LI. The teacher showed insight into the limiting effect of using an L2 only in assessment when teaching had been in code-switching mode.)

Interviewer: *Do I understand you well when you say that teaching should be in both languages but when you are doing assessment you will stick to English, is that what you are saying?*

Interviewee: Yes.

(The teacher shows inconsistency once more when she suggests that teaching should be in code-switching mode and assessment in English only.)

Interviewer: *Why stick to English only when assessing, I would have thought that teaching and assessment are two sides of the same coin?*

Interviewee: *No, the problem is with assessment or with … (inaudible) because English is the language which is used in our schools so we cannot assess them in isi-Xhosa while we are teaching History, but if you are teaching them in isiXhosa that means you can strictly assess then in isi-Xhosa. That's the problem. We cannot assess them in isi-Xhosa because there are no question papers set in isiXhosa at national level.*

(Although the current MOI policy suggests that any of the official languages may be used for teaching, an enabling environment that makes it possible for teachers to implement the multilingual policy fully has not been created. IsiXhosa is used as a bridge to English, i.e. to facilitate learner understanding of History content which is presented in English, but assessment is carried out in English only. Resource materials are written in English and examinations set nationally are in English only.)

Extract 3.

This teacher was of the view that her classroom language practices were in keeping with the provisions of the current multilingual LIE policy because her use of the learners' HL facilitated learning and helped her students remember most of what was learnt. However, she felt that the current MOI policy needed to be revised, and that if English were to be used effectively as an MOI, a strong (English) language foundation needed to be laid at the General Education and

Training Band (GET) to ensure that by the time learners reached the Further Education and Training (FET) Band there would be no need for teachers to use other languages (HL) for teaching. Like Teacher B, she was of the view that employing English as an LOLT improved one's proficiency in English. When asked to give her personal commentary regarding the investigation, she responded as follows:

Interviewer: *We are coming to the end of our interview. Are there any comments or observations that you would want to make about this investigation? Are there any comments or insights that you can share with me as far as this investigation is concerned? Any comments that you would like to raise?*

Interviewee: *One thing that I would like to say is, I think the multilingual language policy that was promulgated needs to be revised, more especially in the GET Band because, if the Department (DOE) wants the teachers to teach properly in English throughout, that must be implemented at the GET Band. So when they (learners) come up to the FET Band, that is, high school, they must be ready. They must understand that everything that they want to say they must say in English. Whatever they want to explain they must explain in English. So there must be good English teachers down there at the GET Band for them to give them a good practice.*

(Problems associated with teaching in an L2 were superficially understood to be emanating mainly from poor teaching in the lower levels, when the problem is quite complex. The teacher's comments suggest that languages other than English are used for teaching in the GET Band and that when the learners reach high school, they cannot use English successfully for learning. To ensure consistency and continuity between the GET and FET Bands, the issue of which languages should be used for teaching must be articulated clearly.)

Interviewer: *In the same vein, you would expect that if what you are talking about is implemented, even high school teachers would have to stick to one language system?*
Interviewee: Yes, if it was implemented in the GET Band there would be no problem.

(The teacher displays insight into how language policy is implemented in the lower classes. English is employed as an MOI by teachers who cannot use it effectively as an MOI and she

regarded this as a source of the problems that learners experienced with English when they reached the FET Band. Learners are not prepared adequately to use English for learning in the GET Band.)

Interviewee: Learners would be answering their questions freely. One wouldn't have to code-switch from English to isiXhosa if the necessary English foundations were laid in the GET Band. (This teacher seems to be using isi-Xhosa grudgingly for teaching. By implication, isiXhosa cannot be used as a fully-fledged LOLT; it can only be used as a bridge to English.)

Interviewer: So by implication, you are saying you wouldn't be code-switching if the group of students had a firm grounding in English at the FET Band. You wouldn't have to code-switch?

Interviewee: You don't have to. You don't have to explain any terms in isiXhosa if they could understand English (Code-switching is used to provide access to the curriculum). They would be so able to answer questions freely in English because they understand the tenses, and everything. They would be able to answer without problems.

Interviewer: So you reckon these challenges that they have in English are challenges that could have been tackled at the lower level.

Interviewee: Yes.

Interviewer: Thank you.

4.5.2   Teacher B.

The Business Economics teacher from a desegregated school was of the view that LIE policy should be context-based, and that other languages should be used for teaching and learning as this would improve achievement levels. The use of other languages for teaching and learning was inevitable because of the challenging nature of the OBE-NCS curriculum for both the teacher and the learner. In practice, he used English only for teaching and assessment.

Extract 1.

Interviewer: In your view, which language(s) should be used as LOLT at secondary school?

Interviewee: English, most definitely, Ma'am, although some teachers may be challenged when it comes to English.

Interviewer: I find the point that you are making about teachers being challenged at times, very interesting. Can you explain that?

Interviewee: Ja, now they are challenged because if you look at the way language is a barrier in terms of explaining the new syllabus and things like that…So there are language barriers somewhere there even. Take for instance concepts that are new; they were not in the old syllabus, but they have been incorporated into the new syllabus. Therefore now you need to go an extra mile even in preparing the lesson to make it understandable to the learner. Take for instance when dealing with contracts. You don't know the language of lawyers as a teacher. Then you need to explain. Take an example about the plaintiff. We don't know such things, but at the end of the day you need to go back to the roots and you get those examples and you need to present. So it is a challenge according to the new syllabus because there is lots of research also in your plan as a teacher that you need to do before you can actually present to the learners.

(OBE-NCS is seen as a more challenging curriculum/approach in terms of content and language demands for both teachers and students, use of other languages inevitable.)

Extract 2.

Extracts 2 and 3 below reflect that the teacher's choice of LOLT is heavily influenced by factors such as the national Department of Education's (DOE) assessment policy and learner profiles.

Interviewer: But if you were teaching in a different context would you use isi-Xhosa?

Interviewee: Yes, I would have used isi-Xhosa depending… provided that the learner, or maybe we've got a challenge of English, maybe to a specific learner whether can use maybe isi-Xhosa explaining that. Maybe that… a short statement not maybe, to actually present because at the end of the day you know that these learners will be tested in English. Therefore now you don't want to deprive them of… (inaudible) also by not understanding.

(This teacher would only use isi-Xhosa briefly in instances where learners had a challenge with English. The fact that they would be tested in English forced this teacher to teach in English only.)

Extract 3.

The teacher endorses the use of other languages for teaching and learning as this would improve achievement levels. Contrary to what he says, in his class he sticks to English only because he believes that his learners do not have a language (English) problem by virtue of their home backgrounds.

Interviewer: As far as classroom language practices are concerned, ... in your view which languages should be employed as media of instruction at high school, particularly in schools situated in urban areas?

Interviewee: Ja, most definitely it... it must be English, but in a way knowing our cultural background as people that are disadvantaged. In some instances I would rather support the logic that teachers at least if they are given time they must be in a position to express themselves... even using other languages will help learners understand, I think. That's my opinion.

Interviewer: So if I understand you well, you are advocating for the use of not only English in the classroom but also other languages.

Interviewee: Other languages, yes. They must, they need to claim in a way to...because we are actually depriving the progress of students.

(English is seen as a barrier to learning and the teacher advocates the use of other languages for teaching and learning. In practice, he used English only for teaching and assessment, an indication that there was a gap between beliefs and practice.)

If we are saying it must be strictly English knowing very well that some learners are not coming from a background that would actually make them understand (English), even to analyse what we are trying to explain as teachers. So it would be very difficult for some learners to cope.

Extract 4.

In the classroom observations, he religiously used English throughout. For this teacher, mastering a subject is closely tied up with knowing the register/jargon of that subject (which happens to be in English, as there are no textbooks written in indigenous languages).

Interviewee: No, it's because well the... according to the prescribed laws of the country there's no way that you as a teacher can go to class knowing very well that your study or your learning area requires the use of English. Then you strictly... you need to present in English although it is well known that at least your learners can mostly understand what you are saying.

This teacher adopted an English-only approach during lesson delivery, and even though acutely aware of the challenges of some of his L2 learners, he still gave unwavering support for an English-only policy.

Extract 5.

According to this teacher, an English-only policy should be adopted in a desegregated school.. Code-switching should be used in cases where English is a barrier to learning and when learners need further explanation on a particular aspect of the syllabus.

Interviewer: Are you by implication saying that in your situation your students can understand English, so there would be no need for you to use isi-Xhosa?

Interviewee: There is no need at all because of where they are coming from. You know like in rich communities, also rich families, so they do understand English, and yes, our environment requires that.

(For this teacher, the fact that some of the pupils in his class are LI and others L2 speakers of English is not an issue. He assumes that all the learners in his class have the required English competence because of their home background, hence their parents' decision to enrol them at the former Model C school.)

Otherwise if I were to present maybe in another platform maybe where they need some extra explanation not in class, then maybe I would use isi-Xhosa in those situations. But where you feel that this learner has got maybe a language barrier then you are bound to go back to mother language definitely if you want the learner to understand.

(Model C schools must teach in English only, and maybe code-switch only out of class when learners experience difficulties.)

Interviewer: If you were teaching in a different context other than…High School where you are teaching at the moment, would you use isiXhosa for teaching?

Interviewee: Not in class, maybe perhaps when you are actually explaining certain things, where learners are challenged, a lot of them. I would not specifically use isi-Xhosa when presenting something that is going to… (Sentence incomplete).

(Although supportive of code-alternation, particularly code-switching, he would employ it minimally in certain contexts, only to assist his pupils to access the curriculum. IsiXhosa would be used in out-of-class consultations. Switching to isiXhosa would be one way in which the teacher responds to individual learner needs while providing access to the curriculum. The teacher assumes that all former Model C learners are from environments that are supportive of their

English language development and that in an urban environment the practical thing to do is to offer tuition in English.)

.

Extract 6.

Teacher- and learner-related factors were cited by the interviewee as reasons underpinning his choice of Language of Learning and Teaching (LOLT), in this case English, whilst at the same time being supportive of a multilingual policy. Other reasons cited by this teacher for supporting English only were that it is an international language and that in the world of work, English was the most commonly used language. It also boosted the learner's confidence and the teacher's proficiency in English.

Qorro (2009), argues that all these are good reasons for learning English as subject, not using it as an LOLT. This teacher indicated that having both L1 and L2 learners in one class presented immense challenges, but he took care of the challenges that student diversity presented him with by employing active learning strategies such as group work and oral presentations.

Interviewee: The fact that I'm using English only?

Interviewer: Yes.

Interviewee: It is because we are also training these people to be better citizens.
(This statement demonstrates the perceived power of English.)

> *To have confidence also in the near future so that at the end of the day if they are in the environment where they are expected to use English only so they can be in a position to express themselves without feeling that maybe they will make some mistakes and being embarrassed. So, it's helping on both sides. Also it's developing you as a teacher so that your professional competence can also improve by not using both languages specifically in class.*

(The teacher's motivation for using English only was that this would improve his learners' proficiency levels and his own.)

Interviewer: Looking at the profile of your students, I've noticed that you have students who are English L1 and English L2 in your class. You have students who speak English as a first language, as well as students who speak English as a second language. How do you deal with linguistic diversity in class?

Interviewee: Ja, it is a big challenge because you know that cultural diversity that we are having in our institution. Other learners you know end up suffering. Take for instance there is a learner who's not sure on how to actually, express himself or herself in class. You know those learners end up being shy, I do understand that. You know, like you end up maybe asking them and then you end up directing the question to them, although you are not supposed to. But because of the fact that you know they are shy but you want to hear them talk. It is a challenge also to them and to us.

(Using more than one language for teaching at a desegregated school would be a challenge because one might end up excluding learners who do not speak the indigenous language.)

Interviewer: Are there specific strategies that you use, for example when you want them to open up in class?

Interviewee: Ja, there are specific strategies like the oral presentations. You give them the topic or whether you need them to go and research. Take for instance my Grade 8s, like take for instance last week I had to give them something on research, they didn't understand anything about that but I told them that it is South Africa is declared as a country that is going through a recession currently. They must go and research about that. So it is…possible you know in a way.

Extract 7.

When asked about challenges experienced by teachers in urban schools in the implementation of a multilingual policy, this teacher indicated that he accepted multilingualism-in-education in principle, although he felt implementing it would be a mammoth task because learners are assessed exclusively in English and rural-urban migrations necessitate that urban-based schools accommodate linguistically under-prepared learners in English.

Interviewee: Hayi, in actual fact, or even if that is the case there is that policy of that nature, I don't think it can be relevant for some of the … opinion to actually say that. We know at the end of the day that it is not realistic even if they say let's use all other languages in presenting. But at the end of the day, when these learners are tested, they are tested in what?In English. Therefore now, it means that we need to make it a point that we use English as our medium of instruction if we were to use that. I said we can use that in certain instances where you have a language barrier or maybe there's a certain Afrikaner student in your class not actually understanding. Then if you got the opportunity of improving understanding or maybe luckily you as a teacher you don't have

any challenge in Afrikaans then you can explain that. But to use all of them because of that cultural diversity, when do you finish up the lesson if you were to use all these languages in one lesson? Let's say someone understands isi-Xhosa, someone understands Sotho, someone understands that. When will you finish the whole thing?

(Linguistic diversity at classroom level is a challenge for the teacher.)

Extract 8.

According to this teacher, language support for L2 learners who are not performing well academically in multilingual settings is at the core of learner success, particularly for learners with low levels of proficiency in English, but he would not know what kind of support to give them in order to improve, except send them to libraries.

Interviewer: Are there any comments you would like to make or anything you would like to bring to my attention regarding the topic?

Interviewee: Ja, Ma'am, not specifically, but there is something I would like to highlight,

because I don't know what can be done to actually assist rather…say learners/students who are coming from these disadvantaged areas because we even do get them in our (urban/multi-cultural/multilingual) schools. Then I don't know what the government together with people who are in authority can do to make it a point that those people (learners) are granted the opportunity of making it a point that they understand (what they are taught in school). Take for instance, opening libraries and places where they can go and develop their (English) language skills.

4.6 Emergent Themes from the Three Data Sets

In the next stage of the data reduction process, the focus was on identifying emergent themes and patterns from the three data sources. The objective of this exercise was to establish whether there were common or different themes/patterns emerging from the three data sets and to theorise about the findings. The table below presents key findings from the three data sets, as well as emergent themes/patterns.

Table 31: Data Presentation from the Three Data Sets: Emergent Patterns and Themes

Data Source	Emergent Patterns/Themes
Questionnaire	The preferred MOI at high school is English, in rural and urban contexts. *(Confirmation of the perceived hegemonic status of English in a post-colonial education context/Other languages remain devalued despite promulgation of the 1997 multilingual policy).* Although many teachers are aware of the existence of a multilingual LIE, implementation patterns have not changed as a result of the introduction of the 1997 LIE policy. *(Policy resistance/Absence of change management structures within the Department of Education to support multilingual policy implementation/negative teacher attitudes towards multilingual policy.)* Code-switching and other multilingual practices such as translation are used extensively in rural and township contexts to facilitate learning. (*Learning in an L2 is a challenging exercise/The L1 is a valuable resource for teaching and learning/Indigenous languages are capable of serving as MOI.)* An English-only policy is adopted in desegregated schools because of the linguistic profiles of learners in these schools. *(At operational level, contextual factors shape/influence language policy implementation/ resistance to policy change.)* Assessment is carried out in code-switching mode whilst teaching had been in code-switching mode. *(Policy implementation is characterized by inconsistencies and contradictions/Context shapes policy implementation.)*
Classroom Observations	There is a gap between teacher beliefs about LIE policy implementation and how the policy is actually implemented. (*Implementers' beliefs influence policy implementation.)* An English-only policy is adopted in a desegregated school, even though the

	teacher and most of the learners are LI isi-Xhosa speakers. (*Policy resistance/Contextual factors such as the linguistic profile of learners influence policy enactment.*) There was extensive teacher talk and minimal interaction in a rural high school classroom, despite the fact that teaching was done in code-switching mode. *(Teacher pedagogic expertise influences how languages are used for teaching and learning.)* In township and rural schools, code-alternation is used extensively to facilitate learning *(English is not the only language that can serve as an MOI/Teachers are acutely aware of the challenges their learners face as a result of studying in an L2/Teachers are aware of the fact that learners have the necessary vocabulary in their LI that can help them understand the subject matter/Teachers find it easier to explain the content in a language that they share with their learners.)* Learner-centred methodologies used by an expatriate teacher in a rural high school promoted vibrant discussions and quality teacher-learner interactions. *(Teacher pedagogic expertise influences how languages are used for teaching and learning.)* English lessons conducted in English-only at a rural high school were marked by one-way communication and non-participation by learners. *(Learning in an L2 is a challenge for learners whose L1 is not English/Learning in an L2 does not advance one's understanding of the subject matter, especially if one has not had a good grounding in the language/Learners who have low proficiency levels in the L2 become self-conscious and choose not to display their linguistic insecurities.)*
Focused Interviews	Teacher A English should remain the MOI at high school, but in rural schools learners' home languages should also be utilized because learners understand their LI

better than they do English.

(Context is a factor in language policy development and implementation/Inconsistent argument - if learners are more proficient in the LI, why not advocate for the use of the LI as the main LOLT?)

English is a barrier to learning.

(Learning in an L2 is a challenging experience.)

For English to be used effectively as an MOI at high school, a strong English language foundation needs to be laid at the GET Band. High school teachers would then stick to one language system and not code-switch.

(Policy implementation should be properly coordinated at all the different levels within the system; Isi-Xhosa is used grudgingly as a bridge to English/The early introduction of learners to English would solve language difficulties experienced by L2 learners.)

Assessments should be done in English only, even if teaching had been in English and other languages.

(Policy implementation is marked by inconsistencies.)

Employing English as an LOLT improves the English proficiency levels of teachers and learners.

(L2 teachers sometimes experience difficulties in using English as an LOLT.)

Teacher B

LIE policy development and implementation should be context-based.

(Teaching should be conducted in languages that learners understand.)

In desegregated schools, only English should be used for teaching.

(Teachers/schools should take linguistic diversity into account when crafting school LIE.)

Other languages should be used for teaching and learning to improve learner achievement. However, in a multilingual urban setting one would exclude other learners if he were to code-switch to the vernacular.

(Implementing a multilingual LIE policy is a challenge in multilingual settings.)

The teacher employs English only at the desegregated urban school and

	would code-switch minimally, in out-of-class consultations in a different context. (*Implementing a multi-lingual LIE policy is a challenge in multi-lingual settings.*) Using English only for teaching and learning improves teacher and learner proficiency levels. (*Practice makes perfect.*) English is a barrier to learning for L2 learners, even in urban multilingual schools. Language support programs should be put in place to counter this. (*Studying in an L2 is an arduous task.*) Language policy implementation is shaped by learner profiles and the DOE assessment policy which promotes English only. (*LIE policy implementation is complicated - is influenced by a host of factors, some of which are beyond the control of the teacher.*)

The following are common themes on teacher language policy understandings and enactment that were identified in the three data sets:

1. Contextual factors and implementers' beliefs and attitudes are key issues in language policy implementation. The different implementation patterns in rural and urban contexts can be attributed mainly to these factors.

2. There are practical concerns that implementers have to take into account when implementing LIE policies, e.g. DOE assessment policy and linguistic diversity in their classrooms.

3. Language policy implementation is marked by inconsistencies and contradictions, e.g. English remains the preferred medium of instruction in post-colonial contexts, despite teacher awareness of the difficulties experienced by their learners (and by some teachers) because an L2 has been chosen as an LOLT.

4. The successful implementation of policy depends on consistency and coordination at the different levels within the system. Efficient policy implementation at primary school level would reduce some of the challenges experienced by teachers and learners at this level.

This implies that efficient monitoring and evaluation of how the policy is implemented at different levels of the school system would ensure success.

5. IsiXhosa is a valuable resource for teaching and learning and possesses the necessary vocabulary to promote cognitive understanding.

There are differences in the manner in which subject teachers and the language teacher in this study implemented LIE policy. The former used isiXhosa liberally, while the latter, motivated by the concern that one cannot teach a language through another language, stuck to English. The urban-rural differences with regard to LIE policy implementation are driven by the hegemonic status of English, contextual and teacher factors.

4.7. Interpretation of the Findings in Relation to the Study Questions, Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

In the second stage of the data analysis, findings were interpreted in relation to the study questions and conceptual framework.

4.7.1. How Teachers Understand and Interpret Language Policies in Practice

Teachers' language choices in different classroom contexts are to a great extent influenced by their past social and educational experiences, as well as the values, beliefs and attitudes that they were socialized into by society and the formal education system. Heugh (2000) states that the discriminatory apartheid system socialized blacks into devaluing themselves, their culture and languages. This view is similar to Phillipson's theory of linguistic imperialism which conceptualises English hegemony and linguicism as sub-sets of cultural imperialism. Years of linguistic imperialism and a discriminatory apartheid system could be possible explanations for English being the preferred MOI, regardless of the fact that teachers in the study viewed it as a barrier to learning. Teachers' responses in the three phases of the study confirm the hegemonic status of English in an African context.

Responses to Questions 3.1and 3.2 of the questionnaire, which were aimed at finding out the teachers' knowledge and awareness of the current national language-in-education policy and its provisions, revealed that teacher conceptualizations of MOI policy ranged from acknowledging

the fact that South Africa has a multilingual language-in-education-policy on which school policies should be based, to recognizing English as the only official language of instruction in the FET Band. However, teacher awareness of the multilingual policy does not translate to new language practices in the classroom. Teacher B, whose learners are mostly LI Xhosa speakers, is convinced that implementing a multilingual policy would be a challenge in urban settings and uses English exclusively for teaching, and would use other languages if he were to teach in a different setting. In the desegregated urban school, language practice has not changed since the introduction of a new National LIE policy. Although schools are now open to all racial groups, LIE policy implementation does not reflect the racial composition of the schools. This constitutes resistance to change.

Although aware of the provisions of the current national MOI policy, for some teachers, English was seen as a powerful and seemingly innocent instrument for communication which opened up opportunities for one in the labour market, and indigenous languages were perceived as not having the potential to serve as MOI. This is an indication of the powerful position that English occupies in the minds of some teachers in post-colonial contexts. Teachers in rural and township schools were found to be more accommodative and provided scaffolding through code-alternation in order to promote learner understanding of content. Teacher A put the blame squarely on primary and senior primary school teachers for the poor English language skills of high school pupils.

Selective LIE policy implementation was explained in a number of ways by the teachers who were maintaining the status quo, i.e. implementing the policy in the same manner that it was implemented prior to the promulgation of the 1997 LIE policy, depending on the context of the school. For example, they avoided code-switching because during their training they had been introduced to a body of knowledge which made them specialists in their fields in a second language (i.e. English). Consequently, it became quite a challenge for them to convey new knowledge to their students in a different language. As part of the imperialist agenda, there is a concerted effort by the English-speaking countries from which developing countries import most of their teaching-learning materials, to dominate the publishing industry and produce English-only materials, and to promote an anglicized education system based on English values and belief systems. This is what Phillipson (2005) refers to as cultural imperialism, of which linguistic

imperialism is a component. The belief that knowledge can be conveyed in only one language system (English) has its roots in the manner in which the colonized were introduced to formal education. Whereas African education valued its own languages and transmitted what was later labeled as informal education in the vernacular (Bamgbose: 2005), English was introduced into the African education system with the sole aim of colonization through evangelism. It is colonial socialization and the psychologically damaging apartheid system that have resulted in Africans seeing little value in their own languages except for inter-ethnic communication.

Another justification for using English only was that when learners progressed to the next level they were expected to have acquired certain competences/skills and the register used in each of the Learning Areas. The teachers' understanding seemed to be that failure to equip learners with expected knowledge and skills would hold them back in their studies, as South African tertiary institutions mainly promote a bilingual approach by either teaching in English or in Afrikaans or using both languages as MOI. Their understanding was that it was in the school system that the necessary foundation for excellence in education would be laid, and by promoting monolingualism (i.e. teaching in English only) they wanted to ensure a smooth transition from the school system to tertiary education, thus facilitating curriculum and language articulation between secondary and tertiary programmes. They equated success in the school system with possession of above average English proficiency skills, an indication that teachers, other than imparting the subject matter, were indirectly or unconsciously promoting the agenda of the apartheid government, i.e. by promoting "state-imposed monolinguals" (Smolicz & Secombe in Phillipson, 2000:165) or linguicism through the provision of a supposedly African education system using a foreign language. According to Phillipson (2005:55) linguicism, refers to "ideologies and structures where language is the means for effecting or maintaining an unequal allocation of power and resources", and can either be conscious or unconscious, overt or covert.

State-imposed monolingualism is promoted by several role-players, such as School Governing Bodies (SGBs), who are tasked with taking decisions on school language policies, and teachers in the schools through their language choices during lesson delivery and the teaching-learning resources they use, and this has resulted in cultural and linguistic suppression in the name of stability through uniformity and little or non-existent liberty (Smolicz & Secombe in Phillipson,

2000:164). Language is a vehicle for cultural transmission; it nurtures language and in turn is nurtured by culture. Failure to use one's HL alienates the speaker from his/her cultural roots, and does not create stability. The marginalization of African languages in the South African education system reflects the unfair promotion of English at the expense of African languages in high-domain functions such as education and government, and can only result in partial participation in the socio-political and economic life of a country's citizens.

Qorro (2009:59) cites the following as reasons that policy-makers and parents advance for the continued use of a foreign language of instruction in countries such as South Africa, where the majority of the population speak an African language: globalization, English is an international language and is essential for science, technology and the labour market; most school literature is written in English, whereas African languages cannot be used as MOI as they are not well-developed; proficiency in English is a ticket to a good qualification and a good-paying job; there are too many indigenous languages, consequently English should be used to maintain national unity; English would die if it were not used as an MOI; using English as an LOLT improves one's proficiency; and changing the LOLT would be a waste of money, an already scarce resource. Most of the reasons stated above are similar to those advanced by the teachers in this study. Qorro (2009:59) suggests that these are good arguments for English Language Teaching, but not for using English as MOI. According to Qorro, Teacher B. in the interviews expressed a belief shared by many teachers when he stated that by pursuing an English-only agenda, he was creating an opportunity for improved proficiency not only for himself but for his learners as well. This is how he expressed this view:

Interviewer: Okay, I understand. As we said at the beginning, I noticed that you use English mostly when you teaching. What impact does that have on teaching and learning?
Interviewee: It has a real impact because they learn to express themselves you know they……
Interviewer: Yes.
Interviewee: It is because we are also training those people to be better citizens (my emphasis). To have confidence also in the near future so that at the end of the day if they are in the environment where they are expected to use English only so they can be in the position to express themselves without feeling that maybe they will make some mistakes, and being embarrassed. So

it's helping on both sides. Also, it's developing you as a teacher so that your professional competence can also improve by not using both languages specifically in class (my emphasis).

Implicit in this statement is the acknowledgement that some teachers and learners may not be sufficiently proficient in English to use it as an LOLT, and that English has a civilizing role to play in education. Mlama and Materu (1978), cited in Qorro (2009), argue on the basis of their research that learners' low levels of English proficiency can be attributed to the fact that primary school teachers are themselves not proficient in the English language. Research in some Tanzanian secondary school classrooms reflects that most secondary school teachers and pupils are not sufficiently proficient to employ English for teaching and learning (Mlama & Materu, 1978; Brock-Utne, 2001, 2005, 2007; Vuzo, 2005 cited in Qorro, 2009). In Ethiopia, the secondary data analysis of the Grade 8 National Assessment examinations revealed that the use of the LI as an LOLT resulted in better achievements in Science and Mathematics, and that there were no significant differences in cases where English was used as an LOLT (Yohannes, 2009:189). These findings seem to support Qorro's view that there is a difference between studying a language as a subject and using it as a LOLT. Mwinsheike (2009:223) also argues that the pervasive use of coping strategies, such as code-switching, safe talk and negative reinforcement (punishment), in Tanzanian secondary Science classrooms indicates a serious problem, that the majority of teachers and pupils were unable to express themselves clearly in English. According to Mwinsheike (2009:223), the findings suggest that "the use of Kiswahili tends to promote performance and minimize the differences among students, while for English it is the opposite and for code-switching midway." Although one should generalize with caution, the similarities between the Tanzanian situation and what prevails in South African classrooms cannot be overlooked. The language question has become a vicious cycle, as graduates from the school system are expected to further their education at tertiary institutions in a language in which they can barely function. The proliferation of extended programmes and language support initiatives in Higher Education in South Africa is testimony to the fact that, without a sound basic education that is delivered in a familiar language, graduation/throughput rates for black students will remain appallingly low.

Teachers who "appropriated" the multilingual policy partially (i.e. through code-alternation), advanced the following reasons for employing other languages. Code-switching facilitated learning by promoting understanding, and the context of their schools often dictated which languages would match the profile of their learners. They used isi-Xhosa as a bridge to English, the familiar language aiding memory. Moreover, the learners' diverse English language proficiency levels and the teachers' own challenges with English at times necessitated that other languages be employed as LOLT. The reasons advanced by teachers for code-switching indicate that, contrary to popular belief, indigenous languages have the potential to serve as fully-fledged media of instruction. The University of Limpopo's BA in Contemporary English and Multilingual Studies (CEMS) programme, which is a dual medium degree in Northern Sotho and English, provides concrete evidence that any language can serve as an LOLT, even though there may be challenges with terminology for technical terms (Karabo Keepile, 16 April 2010). One major is taught and assessed in English, while the other major is taught and assessed through the medium of Se-Sotho sa Leboa. The design of the programme ensures that students reap the educational and cognitive benefits of studying in their own LI (Tlowane, 2009).

4.7.2. Practice as a Reflection of Teachers' Sense-making of LIE Policy

Practice often reflects the understandings, beliefs, attitudes and values underpinning one's interpretation of a situation. An analysis of how the teachers' understanding and interpretation of MOI policy translated into practice revealed that in some rural and township schools, language policy was customized to suit the context in which schooling took place. Isi-Xhosa was only employed in cases where the teacher felt there was a need to clarify key concepts or difficult aspects in the curriculum. The teachers' understanding seemed to be that a language that learners were familiar with facilitated thinking. They coined un-English words with distinguishable English roots, which one often hears in informal conversations amongst young people, and township lingo (Teachers A and C).

The relationship between language and thought has been well documented by social constructivists such as Vygotsky whose theory emphasizes that learning is a meta-cognitive social process and is situated, occurs when learners are actively engaged in collaborative activities, and the teacher acts as a 'scafffolder' who provides challenging learning materials in order to direct

learners to the ZPD (Pritchard, 2005:111). Although teachers may be consciously aware of this relationship, and are expected to be implementing a learner-centred approach that is informed by a constructivist philosophy of education, there seemed to be reluctance or even resistance by some teachers (e.g. Teacher B's interview responses) to utilize the familiar language fully, or even partially, for teaching, because of the linguistic profile of the classes and the belief that learners' English language skills can only be honed by the sole use of English as a medium of instruction.

4.8. How Teachers Implemented LIE Policies in Practice

Teaching is a highly contextualized and complex human activity that is usually informed by educational principles, such as the mother-tongue principle (teaching in a language that the child is familiar with), prefacing one's lesson with information that the child already knows and linking it with new information. It therefore becomes extremely important that the school does not negate the child's life experiences, including his/her home language, as these are the very experiences on which new learning depends. By employing the learners' home languages, even if this is only done partially, educators are observing and acknowledging the importance of their learners' needs and their prior knowledge in the teaching and learning environment. In that sense education becomes the key to unlocking the mystery that life is for the learner. By denying learners an opportunity to use the linguistic tools (home language) with which the home and the community have armed them during the socialization process, schools are reinforcing the idea that the new knowledge and skills learners have acquired/learnt in their communities and in their languages are worthless. This could do a lot of psychological damage to the learner. The Grade 6 Intermediate Phase Systemic Evaluation Report (2005:133) recommends pair work, small group work, projects and group assignments as some of the strategies that teachers could employ to enhance pupil participation. In addition to these participatory strategies, the language of instruction should be one in which learners and teachers are proficient.

4.8.1 Code-Alternation and School Context

Code-alternation (code-switching, code-mixing, translations and repetitions, township lingo, coining of new un-English words) was employed extensively by teachers in rural and urban township schools who shared a home language with their pupils, to facilitate learning, concretize

abstract information, and encourage learners to construct their own knowledge and apply new knowledge to solve real-life problems.

Differences within similar contexts were observed, e.g. where the teacher shared an LI with his/her learners and where there was a mismatch between the teacher's home language and that of the learners. In a rural context where the teacher shared a HL with her pupils the learners' home language was used more often than English as a medium of instruction, although there was a belief by the teacher under observation that she was using English as a LOLT. Although she used a language that her learners were familiar with, the teaching strategies she adopted did not promote active learning and did not contribute to knowledge construction. In another rural school, where there was a mismatch between the teacher's home language and that of his learners, an English-only policy was upheld. The teachers who offered English as a subject employed English only, whereas those who used English as an MOI for content subjects used isiXhosa as well to make the subject accessible to learners.

Researchers such as Adendorff (1993), Slabbert and Finlayson (1999), Moyo (2000), and Setati et al. (2002) view code-switching as aiding learning, particularly in situations where learners have limited proficiency in the official language of instruction. Teacher B, who teaches in an urban desegregated school, displayed a similar attitude to code-switching. Code-switching functions include making the curriculum accessible to learners, facilitating classroom management, eliciting student response and promoting interpersonal communication (Holmarsdottir, 2006). Teachers in rural and township schools applied certain aspects of the policy by employing English and isiXhosa for teaching in varying degrees.

The strategies of code-alternation (code-mixing, code-switching and translations and repetitions) were implemented extensively during classroom observations in rural and township schools for educational reasons, such as clarifying difficult concepts, making up for learners' poor language skills, and promoting concept development. However, in some instances (e.g. rural contexts where the teacher shared a HL with her pupils) the learners' home language was used more often than English as a medium of instruction. Contrary to popular belief, the extensive use of code-switching reflects the capability of isiXhosa to serve in high-domain functions, e.g. education.

Studies on medium-of-instruction policy implementation also raise the question of whether content teachers should regard themselves as English language teachers too. Brock-Utne (2005:563) is of the view that developing learner proficiency in English should be the language teacher's responsibility and that content teachers should also employ other languages to facilitate learning. Brock-Utne's proposal is a direct challenge to the notion of Language across the Curriculum (LAC), which ELT programmes present as a panacea for the language struggles experienced by L2 learners.

4.8.2. The Disjuncture between Policy and Practice

The disjuncture between policy and practice was noticeable when questionnaire responses in classroom observations and interview responses were compared. For example, teachers in rural and township schools indicated in the survey questionnaire that they used English and other languages for teaching, and there was evidence to the effect that the strategies of code-alternation (code-mixing, code-switching and translations) and repetitions were used extensively to promote learning. Observations of the five teachers showed that the most frequently used supporting strategies in rural and township schools by teachers who shared an L1 with their learners were code-switching, translations, repetitions and township lingo. In a rural school situation where the teacher did not speak the learners' L1, the teacher, who was a foreign national, made use of examples from the pupils' own lives/surroundings, used visual materials, paraphrased his questions, gave his students more waiting time to reflect on the question, and did some vocabulary development work to extend his pupils' vocabulary in English.

Profiling learners raises the teacher's sensitivities to learner needs and compels him/her to attend to the identified needs in various ways, e.g. scaffolding. The scaffolding and the interactive teaching strategies used by the expatriate teacher paid off handsomely, judging from the quality of the interactions that took place in his classroom and the questions that he and the learners raised. The 1999 Malawian IEQ Report revealed that the mismatch between the teacher and pupils' home language compelled teachers to use a colonial language as a MOI. This appears to be the reason behind Teacher C's exclusive use of English. As a foreign national, he found that English was the only language in which he could communicate meaningfully with his pupils. This illustrates that

even within rural contexts language policy is not implemented uniformly, possibly because of teacher language profiles and deployment policies that the Eastern Cape Department of Education follows. Although Teacher A and Teacher D taught in similar contexts, their classroom language practices were remarkably dissimilar.

In an urban desegregated school, the teacher promoted an English-only agenda, despite the linguistic composition of his class and the fact that he shared an LI with most of his learners who had differential levels of proficiency in English. The teacher at the urban multilingual school (former Model C) who went through the three phases of the study, recommended the use of code-switching for out-of-class consultations when explaining difficult aspects of the subject, especially to meet the demands of the OBE-NCS curriculum, assessment policy and changing learner profiles brought about by rural-urban migrations. He displayed some uneasiness about employing a language other than English in a desegregated school. This teacher recommended an English-only policy for urban multilingual high schools, as implementing a multilingual policy would be quite a challenge in classes where there were L1 and L2 learners. The dominance of English was taken for granted by this teacher. He believed that language support programmes and the use of interactive/participatory teaching strategies would raise pass rates and throughputs in urban multilingual schools.

4.8.3 Teacher-related Factors and LIE Policy Implementation

In a rural high school, the gap between the teacher's beliefs on how she was implementing MOI policy and her actual practice was also evident. For example, she used isiXhosa more than English as a medium of instruction, even though she was of the view that she was using English as an LOLT.

Teacher attitudes and beliefs came out as important factors in the implementation of an English-only language policy. The anomaly here was that although the current national MOI policy in South Africa is aimed at promoting multilingualism through additive bilingualism, some teachers continued to use English exclusively (as was expected before 1997), even though they shared an LI with most of their pupils (Teacher E), while others employed English and indigenous languages to facilitate learning (Teacher A), an indication that the gap between policy and practice

is fuelled by factors such as teacher attitudes, misconceptions, beliefs and out-of-class concerns, resulting in uneven LIE policy implementation.

Teaching English as a subject in an L2 context proved to be as demanding as using English as an LOLT. For example, Teacher E, who offered English as a subject at his school from Grade 10-12, employed English throughout his lesson in which a transmission style of teaching was adopted. However, learner responses were limited to silences, one-word or very short answers. This finding partially corroborates Arva and Medgyes' research (2000) in which they found that native and non-native English teachers generally used English only when teaching, employed autocratic pedagogical methods, and were not so rigid when it came to their students' use of language in class. In Teacher E's class, however, English was used exclusively by the teacher and learners. Hornberger and Chick (2001:42) contend that safe talk, silence and chorusing, which are strategies that do not necessarily facilitate learning, were employed in classrooms as far apart as South Africa and Peru to avoid embarrassment on the part of the teacher should (s)he give a wrong answer. In the case of this teacher, who had a good command of the English language, his insistence on English only had a lot to do with the fact that he was teaching English as a subject. In the Grade 12 History class, where there was extensive use of isiXhosa by the teacher, there was limited teacher-pupil interaction, despite the fact that the teacher and her pupils shared an LI**.** Responses to the teacher's questions were chorus answers, one-word answers or dead silences. The teacher asked mostly close-ended questions and received one-word answers. The following interaction fragment illustrates the one-way communication pattern which characterized this lesson:

Teacher: *On Saturday it was Women's Day. I-Women's Day is the day on which 20 000 women marched in 1956, zilwela ukuphathwa kakubi kwabafazi in Pretoria.*
(The women were demonstrating against the oppression of women by the government.)

That is why it is celebrated as Women's Day in S.A. It was on the 9th of August, so all the women marched to Pretoria. So ezo- apartheid laws, they tried to put them back and i-business leaders… where the government made further reforms, because they thought…the on-going process and S.A's poor image overseas were based on the business because iyaziwa moss overseas that i-S.A

is the apartheid country and kulapho kukho ntoni? (What was the prevailing situation in South Africa at the time?)

(The question, though asked in isiXhosa has not been phrased clearly enough for learners to understand what is expected of them.)

Class: *No response.*

Teacher: *Ku-practizwa khona ii-racist policies. Kulapho abantu abamnyama, the Coloureds, Indians, Blacks, etc were not given the right to vote. (Racist policies were practiced and Blacks, Coloureds, Indians were barred from voting.)*

So i-image yabo babe yibonile ukuba iyo-denteka.

(They were concerned about the negative publicity, even overseas, and they were afraid that more countries will support blacks, will impose economic sanctions kuthwe mabanga nikezwa mali, abavunyelwa banikezwe zimali because of apartheid laws.)

(They would not be granted loans and were therefore worried that more countries would impose economic sanctions against them, thus leading to great suffering for the country.)

So they were afraid that more countries would support ii- economic sanctions, so i-S.A isafarishe. (South Africa would suffer because of the sanctions.)

That is white South Africa, I'm talking about.

There were financial trade-offs in 1985 when the government made clear that it had no intentions to make any right kwi-policy yakhe, no matter it includes banks sigqushalaza sithinina.

(The government maintained its position despite the protests.)

Ii-banks za-overseas they cancelled ii-loans for them, ukuze u-survive in our days kufuneka ii-loans. I-S.A ibolekwe i-15 million izomane iyibhatala, so zonke ezo nto zapheliswa.

(Overseas investors cancelled the loans they'd granted to South Africa.)

One needs money to survive. The 15 million rand that had been granted to South Africa was cancelled.

But overseas banks cancelled loans for S.A and the value of the rand collapsed. Because babengafumani loans, i-value ye-rand le siyisebenzisayo ya- dropper, (translation) as a result i-JSE was forced to close for a period of a few days, where kwenziwa khona ii-shares.

(That is the place where they sell shares.)

Ningayi bhidisi ne New York Stock Exchange

(Do not confuse it with the New York Stock Exchange.)

There was a NYSE which was formed in 1929 but there was a JSE ekhona apha e-S.A. So i-MK, the military wing of ANC, attacked the South African police stations, government buildings nezinye ii-important places, for example in Cape Town there was a place called i-Koeberg kulapho kwenziwa khona umbane (Where they generate electricity).

So i-MK got a chance yokuba ibhombhishe (code-mixing) that place, even in Durban and in Pretoria. So in Cape Town, Durban … air force got into Pretoria, kule-air force ndithe ii-whites they were recruiting ii-white males to join the military i-MK was having that anger that phana emajonini (in the military) most of the whites were soldiers that's why ke ngoku ba fomisha

(That is why they established…) the air force military yabo, then the United Nation by the time besisenza i-Africa sithe kukho i-clause kwi UN-Charter ethetha nge-Declaration of the Rights of Man. You understand moss.

(Teacher checking learner understanding.)

Class: *Yes.*

The extract above illustrates that the quality of interactions during lesson delivery is determined not only by the use of a familiar language between the learner and the teacher but also by the educator's teaching style. In Teacher D's class (situated in a rural context) there was less rigidity when it came to language use. Learners were not sanctioned for using their mother tongue when they needed to during class discussions, because the teacher's focus was on learners' understanding of key concepts in the subject. The expatriate teacher would occasionally use an isiXhosa phrase, maybe as a way of showing his acceptance of his learners' HL. There was vibrant class discussion and the teacher used only English at this rural school as his knowledge of the learners' home language was limited to basic conversational Xhosa. He used interactive techniques, such as question-and-answer method and problem-solving, as teaching strategies. Learners disagreed with each other, asked questions and gave critical responses to their teacher's questions.

4.9. Teachers' Classroom Language Choices and Their Effects on Teaching and Learning

4.9.1. Attainment of Learning Outcomes

Outcomes-based (OBE) education, which was first introduced in South Africa as Curriculum 2005, has its roots in educational objectives, competency-based education, mastery learning and criterion-referenced assessment (Van der Horst & MacDonald, 2005:7). It is designed around

critical cross-field outcomes (CCFOs) from which learning outcomes (LOs) are derived, and places a high premium on team work, effective communication, problem solving, academic literacy skills, critical thinking, the effective use of technology, and understanding the world as a set of related systems (Killen, 2000:187). These are complex high-order skills which require high levels of proficiency in the chosen language of instruction. When instruction is in an L2 or a foreign language, as it is the case with the majority of black learners (Alexander, 1989), learning outcomes are partially attained or not attained at all, and this further perpetuates mediocrity and inequalities in the education system. In OBE, the envisaged learner is an active participant in the learning process, a problem-solver, an effective communicator, a productive worker, a critical and purposeful thinker, a responsible person, and a self-directed independent learner (Van der Horst et al., 2005:214). The notion of "active learning", which is central to OBE, rings hollow if learners cannot construct knowledge or engage in critical reflection because they do not possess proficiency qualifications.

When teachers who are expected to provide the necessary scaffolding in order to assist learners reach their ZPDs, are linguistically handicapped (i.e. cannot use the LOLT successfully to deliver the curriculum), classroom-based activities, such as designing and implementing authentic teaching and learning activities, giving constructive and meaningful feedback, asking questions at the different levels of Bloom's taxonomy and responding to learner needs, become difficult to accomplish. Consequently, learners are exposed to an impoverished education that stifles the development of proficiency, creativity and adaptability qualifications.

4.9.2   Teaching Strategies, Classroom Interaction and Language Choice

Teaching involves the exchange of ideas between the educator and learners, and amongst learners themselves. This necessitates that the educator promotes a classroom climate which allows for two-way communication. The teacher uses language for various purposes, for example, to explain, ask questions, clarify concepts, elaborate, give feedback, assess learners, analyse, compare and contrast, and maintain discipline in order to promote learning. Learner-centred techniques and strategies, such as question-and-answer, whole-class discussions, problem-solving, cooperative learning and small group work, are used by the educator to facilitate learning. Learners use

language mainly to make sense of the subject matter, create new knowledge, solve problems and engage constructively with their teacher and the other learners.

In contexts where learning takes place in a language that learners are not familiar with, classroom interaction is compromised. In a comparative study of Tanzanian secondary schools using Kiswahili and English as media of instruction, Brock-Utne (2006) revealed that in classrooms where English-only was employed there was apathy, grave silence, and indifference. Learners obeyed, kept quiet or looked afraid. In contrast, in classrooms where Kiswahili was used as an LOLT, there was constructive cooperation and vibrant discussion. The lesson pace was fast and questions and answers were spontaneous. There was a relaxed mood, and the teacher developed the learners' critical abilities. In return, the pupils taught their teacher a thing or two, asking challenging questions and using many and long sentences, with the teacher consciously developing their vocabulary through a familiar language. The study was undertaken in a country where Kiswahili is spoken by over 90% of the population. Each language (Kiswahili and English) was employed as a fully-fledged MOI and code-switching was not employed as a bridge to English. In a South African township school in which English was offered as an additional language, classroom discourse was constrained, despite the teachers' use of code-switching to facilitate learning (Probyn, 2001).

In the present study, in cases where English and isiXhosa were used simultaneously, classroom interaction was constrained and limited mostly to one-word answers, even though there was extensive code-alternation by the teacher. This pattern was also observed in a classroom in which English was offered as a subject (English Additional Language). Students communicated minimally by giving mostly one-word answers, and there was no sustained interaction either in English or isiXhosa, their first language. Studying History as a subject is about the development of nationalism/national pride, learning from the mistakes and follies of others, and developing a sense of identity. It is questionable whether learners can have well-developed critical thinking skills when they cannot make sense of what is in a History textbook written in a language they do not understand well, or are taught predominantly in isiXhosa and yet are assessed in English only. Qorro (2009:72) contends that teaching learners in a foreign language has detrimental effects on the learner's self-confidence, alienates high school and university graduates from society, and

leads to failure and apathy. In the present study, the questionnaire findings showed that some of the teachers who adopted English as an LOLT devoted much of their time to building learner confidence in using English in class. One doubts if this would be the case if a familiar language were used for teaching and learning, or if learners and teachers had the required proficiency levels in English to use it as an LOLT.

In a township high school where English and code-alternation, including township lingo, were employed by the teacher, classroom interaction was not constrained. In an urban multi-cultural school, there was an attempt by the learners to communicate in English, even though vibrant and spontaneous discussions were not a common occurrence. Learners asked questions and attempted answers to their teacher's questions in English. The teacher's focus was not on the production of accurate utterances but on meaning and he often did not bother about oral error correction. The mood was relaxed, and even though the seating arrangement was for group work, in the few times I was in his class I saw no evidence of this taking place.

However, in a rural high school where the teacher did not share the learners' HL, but employed interactive teaching techniques and used English only, a different pattern of language use was observed. Pupils displayed a remarkable sense of confidence in using the language of instruction (English), engaged with the teacher, corrected and critically reviewed each other's responses. This suggests that, besides context, teacher characteristics such as home language, teaching competence, the use of interactive teaching strategies, and personality influence classroom group dynamics and language choice.

4.9.3 Alignment Between Teaching and Assessment Practices

An anomaly that the current study revealed was the fact that in some rural contexts (Teacher A focused interview transcript), although teaching and learning took place in code-switching mode, assessment was conducted only in English. Although she acknowledged the efficacy of using other languages for assessment, and gave the marking of external Grade 12 national exams subjects such as History as a case in point, Teacher A did not adopt this as part of her assessment strategy. She displayed inconsistency in the manner in which she used language for teaching and

assessment. Her moment-to-moment scaffolding in class, though done rarely, was conducted in both isiXhosa and English. This oversight points to a lack of policy coordination between the national Department of Education (DOE), the provincial education department, the district offices and schools, as well as concerns by the teacher that learners needed to get used to providing their responses in English as external examinations would be set in English.

Assessment, whether formative or summative, has always been regarded as the flip side of teaching, and if there is no alignment between teaching and assessment, this puts learners at a disadvantage as they may not have the necessary English vocabulary to express their answers. Teachers B, D and E showed consistency in their approach to teaching and assessment by employing English only for teaching and assessment.

The alignment between teaching and assessment is an aspect requiring urgent attention from teachers. For example, the policy could give direction on how much code-switching should be allowed, how learners could be assisted in gaining the necessary vocabulary to answer questions in English when discussions in class were mostly in code-switching mode, and whether some assessments cannot be done in the learners' home languages.

4.10 Why Teachers Implemented MOI Policies in the Ways Evident in the Study

The reasons advanced by teachers for their classroom language behaviour can be explained by drawing on Phillipsons' (2005) English linguistic imperialism theory, social constructivism and qualification analysis, and by demonstrating how in the South African education system, English has been entrenched for decades through symbolic policy formulation and engagement of intermediaries or "actors" such as government officials and teachers in the promotion of English and marginalization of indigenous languages. The questionnaire, classroom observations and focused interviews gave the researcher an opportunity to reflect on classroom language practices of teachers and relate them to the literature, qualification analysis and Phillipson's English linguistic imperialism theory.

4.10.1 English Linguistic Imperialism in the South African Education System

Desai (2001:323) maintains that language policy can either enable or deny citizens the opportunity to participate in the political, educational, social and economic life of one's country. In South Africa, language policy has perpetuated inequalities since colonization, the apartheid era and even after the promulgation of a multilingual LIE in post-apartheid South Africa. This has resulted in learners being exposed to unequal educational experiences because the language issue has been highly politicized. Consequently, there has not been full-scale use of indigenous languages in areas such as education because of the government's lack of political will (Mda, 2004).

The unequal treatment and marginalization of African languages in South African classrooms has its roots in English linguistic imperialism. Currently and in the past, LIE policies have promoted linguicism through selective resource provisioning for the dominant language, while African languages remained marginalized. This has produced a vicious cycle in which black senior government officials and teachers who were products of a system that devalued their languages have now become instruments for promoting the very language that was used to discriminate against them. All official communication by the DOE in the form of policies, strategy documents and action plans are written in English, thereby sending a clear message that not all official languages are equal.

The findings reveal that some teachers, even though they may share the same L1 as their learners, experience guilt or conflict when using isiXhosa, like Teacher B. However, another group of teachers is accommodative of other languages, and this is evident in their judicious use of the strategy of code-switching to mediate learning. Some teachers may be constrained by the fact that they do not speak the same L1 as their learners.

Education, which is a form of socialization, is a powerful tool for transmitting values, attitudes, beliefs, skills and knowledge through language. When the socialization of the majority of the people in a country takes place in a foreign language and the indigenous languages are mainly used as a bridge to English, a great deal will be lost or sacrificed, and the value system being imparted to learners will most likely be foreign. In Mondli Makhanya's words, "language is more

than just a communication tool" (Sunday Times, 24 January 2010). It forms the bedrock of a society's group culture and identity.

4.10.2 Intended and Unintended Consequences of LIE Policy

The current schooling system in South Africa was initially planned along racial lines and social class. Well-resourced schools were the preserve of whites, while under-resourced schools which provided an impoverished education for the majority of the population were attended by blacks. The history of language planning in South Africa and its consequences is outlined in the introductory chapter of this thesis. The effects of a divisive schooling system can still be felt long after the promulgation of a multilingual LIE aimed at redressing imbalances of the past and widening access to education. Private and Model C (desegregated) schools continue to adopt and support an English-only policy. It is only recently that indigenous languages are being offered as subjects in these schools. These schools continue to produce sterling Matric results because of their staffing profiles, resources, unequivocal support for English, and selective admission policies that favour learners who have a sound foundation in English. The few black learners attending these schools perform well academically because they are in a supportive (English) learning environment. The opposite is true for the majority of learners in black schools who write the same examination that pupils from well-resourced schools sit for, in English, despite having been taught in a code-switching mode. Their performance in Matric does not compare with that of their counterparts in well-resourced schools. Contrary to the intended consequences of the language-in-education policy, it has perpetuated inequalities which have translated into high drop-out and failure rates in black schools and the production of high school graduates who do not have the proficiency skills needed by the labour market.

Qualification analysis shows how the school system and the labour market reinforce the importance of overall proficiency in English, and how they reject and exclude those with limited proficiency in English. In terms of qualification analysis, general proficiency qualifications (being able to read and write, use a computer, etc.), which are taught in basic education, lay the foundation for special proficiency qualifications (special skills needed in a vocation). The inability to read and write perpetuates the cycle of poverty in that it excludes one from participating

actively in the mainstream economy because one has not acquired the special proficiency and creative qualifications that an industrializing economy requires.

Ideally, general proficiency skills should be taught in the home language to promote the acquisition of these skills in a second or third language. Without sound initial literacy skills in the HL, it becomes difficult for learners to master literacy skills, special proficiency and creative qualifications in a first or second language, i.e. English. The poor English language skills of L2 learners limit their chances of furthering their studies after Matric or participating meaningfully in the economy, thus sentencing them to a cycle of poverty and under-achievement. During the interviews, Teacher B displayed an "uncritical acceptance" of English and associated the language with progress and success.

4.10.3. The Role of Intermediaries in English Linguistic Imperialism

Publishers, DOE officials nationally, in the provinces and districts, as well as teachers in the schools are key agents of linguistic imperialism in the South African education system. Each of these actors has a different role to play in the promotion of English in education. Book publishers promote linguicism through marketing teaching-learning materials written in English and mainly about English. Recent developments in the publishing industry include the translation of class readers from English into isiXhosa. Although some of the stories may have a cultural bias for speakers of indigenous languages in South Africa, the initiative is commendable since it introduces black learners to the written form of their languages at an early age. An ideal situation though would be to have teachers and parents forming writing teams.

One of the roles of DOE officials is to raise awareness about government policies, monitor and evaluate implementation of policies by teaching personnel. The policies, strategies and plans are written in English exclusively and no attempts are made to make them available in the languages spoken by the teachers. Teachers are at the tail-end of policy implementation; and at times some implement policies uncritically, while others adapt them to suit their circumstances. Reason 1 ("As a subject teacher I am the primary role model for my students") demonstrates that some teachers are gate-keepers whose role is to create a positive image of the English language by

promoting its exclusive use in the school system and refraining from using it simultaneously (code-alternation) with other languages.

4.10.4. Social Constructivism, Qualification Analysis and LIE Policy Implementation

Initial professional teacher training should prepare teachers for the world of work and contribute to the development of different perspectives on teaching. Pratt (forthcoming) describes a perspective on teaching as an interrelated set of beliefs and intentions that directs and justifies teachers' intentions and classroom practices. In a country in which the majority of black teachers have been recipients of an impoverished education, teacher trainees were short-changed in terms of pedagogic and content knowledge and were not afforded an opportunity to become reflective practitioners. This created a vicious cycle in that not only did they under-value their languages but also continued to teach for under-achievement in under-resourced schools.

From Vygotsky's theory one can deduce that good teaching practice is anchored in accurate profiling of learners, learner engagement, setting meaningful and authentic tasks, providing the necessary scaffolding to ensure that learners appropriate content, and being a good facilitator. Therefore, if a teacher cannot perform these teaching-learning functions on which good teaching should be based, this affects education negatively. In classrooms where there is limited constructive engagement, the teaching-learning process is compromised and pupils cannot appropriate ideas and concepts. Consequently, the learners' ZPD cannot be raised or expanded, nor can the teacher appropriate ideas from their learners. The transmission style of teaching, characterized by excessive teacher talk and less pupil engagement, does not promote the learners' ZPD.

The language question in black education compounds the problem of under-prepared teachers in that the language-in-education policy in post-colonial South Africa remains based on an L2, a language in which teachers and pupils alike experience considerable challenges. In the context of this study, social constructivism seems to suggest that teaching which is not transformative, even though a familiar LOLT may have been used, does not expand the learners' ZPDs. Neither does it lead to the appropriation of content. The poor performance of learners can thus be partly explained as resulting from the teachers' lack of pedagogic expertise and inability to mediate

learning using language. The majority of high school graduates exit the education system without having acquired the necessary proficiency, adaptability and creative qualifications which would enable them to participate meaningfully in the economy. In a sense, the government does not get a good return on its investment in education.

4.11 Reflections on the Findings

Currently, most African learners in South Africa are subjected to an early transition subtractive bilingualism model in the school system. They only learn in the mother tongue in the first few years of their schooling before a switch is made to English, which they speak as a second if not a foreign language. With the advent of multi-racial/Model C schools after 1994, and the emergence of an affluent black middle class, the so-called Black Diamonds, a small number of African learners is taught in English from Grade 1 up to university. The high Matric pass rates that white Afrikaans and English L1 learners achieve can be attributed to a great extent to the fact that they study in their LI from Grade 1 to university. The sterling Matric results of the well-resourced desegregated former Model C schools can also be attributed to the fact that black learners find themselves in an immersion situation in which they have no choice but to use English. The downside of such a situation for black pupils is the negative effect it has on their first language. Generally, although they can understand and speak their first language, they cannot use it for reading and writing.

The majority of African children who live mainly in rural and township areas are taught briefly in their indigenous languages and a switch to English as MOI is made even before they have fully mastered their own home language. In so doing, the school and the parents are doing those learners a disservice as they end up being proficient in neither the L1 nor the L2. When these learners get to the General Education and Training (GET) Band and the Further Education and Training (FET) Band, the language that the education system reinforces is their second language, English. International studies, such as TIMSS, have yielded results which show that the performance of L2 learners is considerably below that of L1 peers, although countries such as Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore and the Philippines, which do not use the LI as MOI, outperformed S.A in the test. These findings suggest that factors other than language, e.g.

inadequately trained teachers, low attendance figures and lack of equipment, also have a bearing on achievement.

Prinsloo (2009) contends that strong literacy foundations in the 5-10 years of a child's life are critical in laying the foundations for future academic success and that language has an impact on learner performance. Prinsloo argues that the poor performance of South African Grade 6 learners in the International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) is directly related to the MOI issue and that it is in the Foundation Phase that literacy needs to be strengthened. Prinsloo cites a 2007/2008 HSRC literacy teaching evaluation study conducted in Limpopo Province in which the findings indicated that learners did not read and write sufficiently at school. Literacy instruction was not good, there was a lack of integration between Learning Areas and learning support materials, nor did poor home and community environments aid literacy development. The study concluded that the introduction of a first additional language should not be delayed; nor should mother tongue teaching be done away with too soon, as this could impede the development of both languages and leave learners struggling academically for the rest of their school careers. These findings complement those of the Threshold Project which confirmed that second language learners of English usually do not have the necessary vocabulary to handle content learning when they switch from an African language to English in Std 3. The studies also indicate that there would not be any dependence on a foreign language as an LOLT if a strong literacy foundation were laid at the primary school level. Teacher A in the current study made a similar recommendation during the interviews, although her focus was on English, not the learners' home language.

The improvement of access, retention and success in the entire education system, reduction of drop-out rates, and the raising of throughput rates, could be achieved through an additive bilingualism model that focuses on strengthening literacy skills in indigenous languages (isiXhosa and se-Sotho which are regional languages in the Eastern Cape). English and Afrikaans could be offered as subjects to ensure that learners were proficient in more than one language. However, how the teachers, who are implementers of policy, "appropriate" the policy depends largely on their convictions about the efficacy of multilingualism, and the kind of training and support that they receive at operational level. This would entail embarking on language consciousness raising

for teachers and revisiting teacher deployment policies to ensure that their linguistic profiles matched those of the learners.

On the basis of the participants' responses during the three phases of this research, the literature review on LIE, and more especially the Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa (LOITASA) and Threshold Project findings, the 2007/2008 HSRC Grades R-4 literacy evaluation study in the Limpopo Province and other small-scale studies on LIE implementation, my view on the very complicated and complex issue of LIE implementation in post-colonial states is that South Africa should go beyond symbolic policy crafting and implement the multilingual policy which was promulgated in 1997 by revisiting its teacher placement, materials development and assessment policies. This would result in increased teacher morale and improved learner performance. According to Barker (1993:125), additional advantages of bilingualism are that bilingual children tend to be more sensitive in social situations requiring careful communication and display creative abstract and critical thinking skills.

South Africa should draw lessons from the LOITASA research which has revealed that in Tanzania, L2 learners experience learning difficulties when they switch from Kiswahili to English at secondary school. South Africans can now bridge the gap between policy and practice by employing indigenous languages as fully-fledged MOI in the school system, as suggested by Alexander (1995:80), Desai (2001), and Heugh (1995:86), and allow L2 learners to study English as a subject.

Desai (2001:323) proposes a two-pronged approach for schools with a homogenous profile that would entail using indigenous languages and English as media of instruction. Such a strategy would ensure success and access to education and also meet the demands of globalization (Desai, 2003:47). The delayed transition model of bilingualism that Desai is suggesting ensures that learners acquire sufficient literacy in their home language before the introduction of a second language as a medium of instruction. The literacy skills they would have obtained in the first language would then be transferred to a second language learning situation. Second language learners would then study English as a subject for a much longer period before its introduction as a medium of instruction. This would ensure a smoother and less wasteful transition from high

school to university than is currently the case. Alternatively, indigenous languages in monolingual contexts could be employed throughout secondary school, although this would be met with resistance from parents, learners and teachers and would require consciousness-raising for communities on language issues in education. This would result in increased pass rates and an improved quality of education as learners would be studying in a familiar language which was supported by their home and greater social environment.

Heugh (2000:24) contends that the vocabulary to teach various subjects in the languages that learners are most familiar with is available, as demonstrated by the extensive use of code-switching in most African classrooms. The findings of the current study also confirm this view, although not very many teachers use indigenous languages for assessment purposes. Banda (2000: 51) contends that South Africa's additive bilingualism policy is "unlikely to succeed as long as role models, learners and their parents see little utility in languages other than English." There is concrete evidence from the few small-scale studies, such as LOITASA and the present study, that English is not the sole medium of instruction in most schools, especially in rural monolingual contexts, despite what parents, learners, officials and many teachers would like to believe. What remains is for policymakers and educators to bridge the gap between policy and practice by allowing research evidence to reshape policy.

4.12 Conclusion

For some scholars the source of African learners' language problems is largely the unequal relationship between English and indigenous languages (Alexander in Phillipson, 2000:170). I am of the view that the uncoordinated manner in which the LOLT is implemented in contexts where learners and teachers speak the same indigenous languages is a contributory factor in learner achievement in the school system. For example, in the current study it emerged that learners are taught in a code-switching mode but are assessed in English only. This is a disservice to the learners, since they might know the answer but are unable to present it correctly in the "required language". The practice of sanctioning learners for using their LI to respond to examination and test questions compromises the validity of the inference made from tests and examinations for a very large number of learners in the school system.

South Africa has a number of regional languages, isiXhosa and Se-Sotho being the most widely-spoken African languages in the Eastern Cape. One can conclude on the basis of the research evidence presented above that schools in the Eastern Cape, where isiXhosa and se-Sotho are languages of wider communication, could employ these languages as MOI and offer English as a subject. No one model would suit every context; for example, urban-based high schools could employ English mostly to cater for the multilingual composition of the classes, and isiXhosa and Se-Sotho could be studied as subjects. Depending on whether teachers and learners shared an LI, the delayed transition model could also be implemented in urban multilingual schools. The LOITASA project and the University of Limpopo's CEMS programme have clearly demonstrated that languages grow from use in all the high domains of public life, including education.