

## REFERENCES

Akinnaso, FN. 1993. Policy and experiment in mother-tongue literacy in Nigeria. *International Review of Education* 39(4):225–285.

Akmajian, A, Demers, RA, Farmer, AK & Harnish, RM. 1995. *Linguistics. An introduction to language and communication*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Alexander, N. 1997. Language policy and planning in the new South Africa. *African Sociological Review* 1(1):82–98.

Al Falasi, H. 2007. Just say "Thank you": a study of compliment responses. *The Linguistic Journal* 2:28–42.

Aljaafreh, A & Lantolf, JP. 1994. Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78:465–483.

Allwood, J. 1977. A critical look at speech act theory, in *Logic, Pragmatics and Grammar*, edited by O Dahl. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Alptekin, C. 2002. Towards intercultural communicative competence. *ELT Journal* 56(1):57–64.

Arva, VA & Medgyes, P. 2000. Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System* 28:355–372.

Austin, JL. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Babad, E. 2009. Teaching and nonverbal behaviour in the classroom. *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching* 21(9):817–827.

References

Babbie, E & Mouton, J. 2001. *The practice of social research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Babbie, E & Mouton, J. 2006. *The practice of social research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, LF. 1990. *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, C & Prys-Jones, S. 1998. *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bamgbose, A. 2001. World Englishes and globalization. *World Englishes* 20(3):357–363.

Bardovi-Harlig, K & Dörnyei, Z. 1997. Pragmatic awareness and instructed L2 learning: an empirical investigation. Paper presented at the AAAL 1997 Conference, Orlando.

Barona, A & Garcia, E. 1990. *Children at risk: poverty, minority status and other issues in educational equity*. Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Barry, D. 2002. Language equity and assessment in South African education. *Journal for Language Teaching* 36(1):105–117.

Bassey, M. 1999. *Case study research in educational settings*. London: Open University Press.

Bazzanella, C & Damiano, R. 1999a. Coherence and misunderstanding in everyday conversations, in *Coherence in spoken and written discourse*, edited by W Bublitz, U Lenk & E Ventola. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

References

Bazzanella, C & Damiano, R. 1999b. The interactional handling of misunderstanding in everyday conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31:817–836.

Becker, JA. 1982. Children's strategic use of requests to mark and manipulate social status, in *Language Development Volume 2: Language, Thought and Culture*, edited by S Kuczai II. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Berg, BL. 2004. *Qualitative research methods for social sciences*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Boston: Lavoisier.

Bertram, C. 2006. Exploring teachers' reading competences: a South African case study. *Open Learning* 21(1):5–18.

Beukes, A. 1992. The politics of language in formal education: the position of Afrikaans, in *Sociolinguistics for applied linguistics*, edited by IA Stevenson. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Beukes, A. 2004. The first ten years of democracy: language policy in South Africa. Paper presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> Linguapax Congress on Linguistic Diversity, Sustainability and Peace, 20–23 May, Barcelona, Spain.

Bilmes, J. 1992. Mishearings, in *Text in Context. Contributions to Ethnomethodology*, edited by G Watson & RM Seiler. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bloch, G. 2009. *The toxic mix: what's wrong with South Africa's schools and how to fix it*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1982. Learning to say what you mean in a second language: a study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics* 3(1):29–59.

References

- Blum-Kulka, S. 1987. Indirectness and politeness in requests: same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics* 11:131–146.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1989. Playing it safe: the role of conventionality, in *Indirectness in Cross-cultural pragmatics*, edited by S Blum-Kulka, J House & G Kasper. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1990. You don't touch lettuce with your fingers: parental politeness in family discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14:259–288.
- Blum-Kulka, S, House, J & Kasper, G. 1989. Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: an introductory overview, in *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies*, edited by S Blum-Kulka, J House & G Kasper. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S & Levenston, EA. 1987. Lexical-grammatical pragmatic indicators. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 9:155–170.
- Blum-Kulka, S & Olshtain, E. 1984. Requests and apologies: a cross-cultural study of speech act realisation patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics* 5:196–213.
- Blum-Kulka, S & Olshtain, E. 1986. Too many words: length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 9:155–170.
- Blum-Kulka, S & Weizman, E. 1988. The inevitability of misunderstanding: discourse ambiguities. *Text* 8:219–241.
- Bogdan, RC & Biklen, SR. 1982. *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theories and models*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bosco, FM, Bucciarelli, M & Bara, BG. 2006. Recognition and recovery of communicative failures: a developmental perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38:1398–1429.

References

Bosco, FM & Tirassa, M. 2010. Communication failure, in *The pragmatics encyclopedia*, edited by L Cummings. New York: Routledge.

Boxer, D. 2002. Discourse issues in cross-cultural pragmatics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22:150–167.

Braine, G. 1999. *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. London: Erlbaum.

Braine, G. 2010. *Non-native speaker English teachers*. New York: Routledge.

Broom, Y. 2004. *Reading English in multilingual South African primary schools*. *International Journal of Bilingual Education in Bilingualism*, 7:6.

Brown, HD. 2000. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: White Plains.

Brown, CL. 2007. Strategies for making social studies texts more comprehensible for English-language-learners. *The Social Studies* 98(5):185–188.

Buthelezi, Z. 2003. Researchers, beware of your assumptions! The unique case of South African education. Paper presented at the Multilingual Literacy Symposium, Edinburgh, Scotland, September.

Canale, M. 1983. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy, in *Language and Communication*, edited by J Richards & R Schmidt. London: Longman.

Canale, M & Swain, M. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1(1):1–47.

Chaiklin, S. 2003. The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction, in *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*, edited by E Kozulin, B Gindis, VS Ageyev & SM Miller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

References

Chesebro, JL & McCroskey, JC. 2001. The relationship of teacher clarity and immediacy with student state receiver apprehension, affect and cognitive learning. *Communication Education* 50(1):59–68.

Chick, K. 1989. Intercultural miscommunication as a source of friction in the workplace and in educational settings in South Africa, in *English across cultures. Cultures across English. A reader in cross-cultural communication*, edited by O Garcia & R Otheguy. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Christie, P. 1999. *The right to learn: the struggle for education in South Africa*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Pretoria: Raran.

Clerk, D & Rutherford, M. 2000. Language as a confounding variable in the diagnosis of misconceptions. *International Journal of Science Education* 22(7):703–717.

Cluver, AD de V. 1992. Language planning models for a post-Apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 16:105–136.

Cluver, AD de V. 1994. Die Taalbeleid in Suid-Afrika. *Die Taalgenoot*:6–7.

Coetzee-Van Rooy, AS. 2002. Cultural identity profiles of Afrikaans and Southern-Sotho learners of English: resource or hazard? *World Englishes* 21(1):63–82.

Coetzee-Van Rooy, AS. 2006. Integrativeness: untenable for world Englishes learners? *World Englishes* 25(3/4):437–450.

Coetzee-Van Rooy, AS & Verhoef, M. 2000. Perceptions of English proficiency: view from Southern Sotho speakers. *South African Journal of Linguistics supplement* 38:163–186.

*References*

Cohen, AD & Olshtain, E. 1993. The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly* 27(1):33–56.

Cohen, L & Manion, L. 1994. *Research methods in education*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. London: Routledge.

Cohen, L, Manion, L & Morrison, K. 2000. *Research methods in education*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. London: Routledge.

Cohen, L, Manion, L & Morrison, K. 2001. *Research methods in education*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. London: Routledge.

Collins, JW & O'Brien, NP (eds). 2003. *The Greenwood Dictionary of Education*. Connecticut: Greenwood.

Comer, J. 1986. Home school relations as they affect the academic success of children. *Education and Urban Society* 16:323–337.

Conrad, C. 2001. Second language acquisition. Available online at: <http://chris1066.tripod.com> (as on 21 September 2011).

Consolo, DA. 2000. Teachers' action and student oral participation in classroom interaction, in *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*, edited by JK Hall & L Stoops. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Consolo, DA. 2006a. Classroom oral interaction in foreign language lessons and implications for teacher development. *Linguagem & Ensino* 9(2):33–55.

Consolo, DA. 2006b. On a (re)definition of oral language proficiency for EFL teachers: perspectives and contributions from current research. *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing* 1:1–28.

References

- Consolo, DA. 2008. On student engagement in whole-class oral interaction: from classroom discourse and sociocultural aspects to implications for language learning. *A Journal of English Language* 41:41–60.
- Crandall, J. 1998. Collaborate and cooperate: educator education for integrating language and content instruction. *Forum* 36:2.
- Creswell, JW. 2003. *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, JW. 2005. *Educational research. Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, JW. 2007. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Sage.
- Creswell, JW. 2009. *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crystal, D. 1982. *What is linguistics?* London: Edward Arnold.
- Crystal, D. 1985. How many billions? The statistics of English today. *English Today* 1:7–11.
- Crystal, D. 2003. *English as a global language*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. 2003. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cummins, J. 1981. The role of primary language development in promoting success and language minority students, in *Schooling and Language Minority Students. A Theoretical*



*References*

*Framework*, edited by California State Department of Education. Los Angeles: California State Department of Education.

Cummins, J. 1999. *BICS and CALP: clarifying the distinction*. Opinion Papers: Educational Resources Information Centre.

Cummins, J. 2001. *Language, power and pedagogy: bilingual children in the crossfire*. London: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. 2003. BICS and CALP. Available online at:  
[www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/bicscalp.html](http://www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/bicscalp.html) (as on 10 June 2011).

Cummins, J. 2009. Putting language proficiency in its place: responding to critiques of the conversational/academic language distinction. Available online at:  
[www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/converacademlangdisti.html](http://www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/converacademlangdisti.html) (as on 3 June 2011).

Cummins, J, Harley, B, Swain, M & Allen, P. 1990. Social and individual factors in the development of bilingual proficiency, in *The Development of Second Language Proficiency*, edited by B Harley, P Allen, J Cummins & M Swain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J & Swain, M. 1986. *Bilingualism in education: aspects of theory, research and practice*. London: Longman.

Cummins, J, Swain, M, Nakajima, K, Handscombe, J, Green, D & Tran, C. 1984. Linguistic interdependence among Japanese and Vietnamese immigrant students, in *Communicative competence approaches to language proficiency assessment: Research and application*, edited by C Rivera. London: Multilingual Matters.

References

Daly, A & Brown, J. 2007. Lecturer communication in a multicultural higher education context, in *Student success in international education: proceedings of the 2007 ISANA international Conference*, 27–30 November, Adelaide, South Australia.

Dasgal, M. 1985. The relevance of misunderstanding, in *Dialogue. An interdisciplinary approach*, edited by M Dasgal. Amsterdam: Bejamins.

Dasgal, M. 1999. Introduction: some questions about misunderstanding. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31:753–762.

Dasgal, M & Berenstein, I. 1987. Two modes of understanding: comprehending and grasping. *Language and Communication* 7(2):139–151.

Dash, P. 2004. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure: a definitional analysis with implications for classroom teaching. *Asian EFL Journal* 6(3):1–17.

De Kadt, E. 1992. Requests as speech acts in Zulu. *South African Journal of African Language* 12(3):101–106.

De Kadt, E. 2002. Gender and usage patterns of English in South African urban and rural contexts. *World Englishes* 21(1):83–97.

Denscombe, M. 2007. *The good research guide*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. New York: Open University Press.

Denzin, NK & Lincoln, YS. 1998. *The landscape of qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Denzin, NK & Lincoln, YS. 2000. *Handbook of qualitative research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Sage.

Department of Basic Education. 2010. The status of the language of learning and teaching

*References*

(LoLT) in South African public schools: a quantitative overview. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 1994. *South Africa's new language policy: the facts*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 1997. *Language in education policy*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 1999. *Language-in-education implementation plan*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2002. *Revised national curriculum statement*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Desai, Z. 2001. Multilingualism in South Africa with particular reference to the role of African languages in education. *International Review of Education* 47(3&4):323–39.

Deterding, D & Kirkpatrick, A. 2006. Emerging South-East Asian Englishes and intelligibility. *World Englishes* 25(3/4):391–409.

Deumert, A. 2010. Tracking the demographics of (urban) language shift – an analysis of South African census data. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31(1):13–35.

De Wet, C. 2002. Factors influencing the choice of English as language of learning and teaching (LoLT) – a South African perspective. *South African Journal of Education* 22(2):119–124.

*References*

- De Wet, C & Niemann, S. 1998. The status of mother tongue education in South Africa – a comparative perspective. Paper presented at the 10th World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, 12–17 July, Cape Town.
- Donald, D, Condy, J & Forrester, J. 2003. Literacy development: lessons learned from a pilot project in South Africa. *The Reading Teacher* (56):484–492.
- Dörnyei, Z & Thurrell, S. 1994. Teaching conversational skills intensively: course content and rationale. *English Language Journal* 48(1):40–49.
- Dulay, H, Burt, M & Krashen, S. 1982. *Language 2*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dunn, WE & Lantolf, JP. 1998. Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and Krashen's *i + 1*: Incommensurable Constructs; Incommensurable Theories. *Language Learning* 48(3):411–442.
- Du Plooy, GM. 1995. *Introduction to communication: communication research*. Kenwyn: Juta.
- Dwyer, C. 1991. *Language, culture and writing*. Working paper 13. Berkeley: Center for the Study of writing, University of California.
- Eisenstein, M & Bodman, JW. 1986. 'I very appreciate': expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics* 7:167–185.
- El Samaty, M. 2005. Helping foreign language learners become pragmatically competent. *Proceedings of the 10th TESOL Arabia Conference* 9:341–351.
- El-Sayed, A. 1991. Towards an international standard of English in the Arab world: an ethno-sociolinguistic perspective. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* XVII:155–167.

References

Elder, C. 1993. Language proficiency as predictor of performance in teacher education. *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing*:72–95.

Elder, C. 2001. Assessing the language proficiency of teachers: are there many border controls? *Language Testing* 18(2):149–170.

Ellis, G. 1996. How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal* 50(3):213–218.

Ellis, R. 2002. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. 2004. The definition and measurement of explicit knowledge. *Language Learning* 54:281–318.

Ellis, R, Loewen, S & Basturkmen, H. 2003. Focussing on form in the classroom. *SAALT: Journal for Language Teaching* 37(2):149–163.

Ely, M & Rashkin, A. 2005. *Dictionary of music education*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.

Evans, R. 2005. *Explaining low learner participation during interactive television instruction in a developing country context*. PhD thesis, University of Pretoria. Pretoria.

Evans, R & Cleghorn, A. 2010. 'Look at the balloon blow up': student teacher-talk in linguistically diverse Foundation Phase classrooms. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 28(2):141–151.

Farrell, TSC & Martin, S. 2009. To teach standard English or world English? A balanced approach to instruction. *English Teaching Forum* 2:1–7.

Farrell, TSC & Tan, S. 2008. Language policy, language teachers' beliefs, and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics* 29(3):381–403.

References

Fillmore, C. 1981. Pragmatics and the description of discourse, in *Radical pragmatics*, edited by P Cole. New York: New Academic Press.

Fillmore, LW & Snow, C. 2000. What teachers need to know about language. Available online at: <http://www.cal.org/resources/teachers/teachers.pdf> (as on 21 September 2011).

Fleisch, B. 2008. *Primary education in crisis: why South African schoolchildren underachieve in reading and mathematics*. Cape Town: Juta.

Flowerdew, J. 1988. Speech acts and language teaching. *Language Teaching* 21(2):69–82.

Foley, A. 2002. South African education and the dilemmas of multilingualism. *English Academy Review* 19(1):51–64.

Foley, A. 2008. Mother-tongue education in South Africa. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 38:165–190.

Foster, EM. 1952. *A passage to India*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Fraser, B. 1993. No conversation without misinterpretation, in *Pretending to communicate*, edited by H Parret. Berlin: De Guyter.

Fromkin, V & Rodman, R. 1993. *An introduction to Language*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Gagnè, RM. 1992. *Principles of instructional design*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace.

Garcia, EE. 1993. Language, culture, and education. *Review of Research in Education* 19:51–98.

References

Garton, AF. 1995. *Social interaction and the development of language and cognition*. New York: Psychology Press.

Gass, S & Selinker, L. 2001. *Second language acquisition: an introductory course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gee, J. 1990. *Social linguistics and literacies: ideology in discourses*. London: Falmer.

Gee, J. 1994. New alignments and old literacies: critical language awareness and the 'new work order', in *Thinking work*, edited by P O'Connor. Sydney: Albsac.

Gee, J. 1996. *Social linguistics and literacies: ideology in discourses*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Taylor & Francis.

Gee, J. 2000. The new literacy studies: from 'socially situated' to the work of the social, in *Situated literacies: reading and writing in context*, edited by D Barton, M Hamilton & R Ivanic. London: Routledge.

Gee, J, Hull, G & Lankshear, C. 1996. *The new work order: behind the language of the new capitalism*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Goethe, JW. Die wahlverwandschaften. Available online at: [www.klassiker-der-weltliteratur.de/wahlverwandschaften.htm](http://www.klassiker-der-weltliteratur.de/wahlverwandschaften.htm) (as on 24 September 2010).

Golafshani, N. 2003. Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report* 8(4):597–606.

Goldenberg, H & Goldenberg I. 2008. *Family therapy. An overview*. Melmont: Thomson Brookes/Cole.

Gore, J. 2001. Beyond our differences: a reassembling of what matters in teacher

References

education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2):124–135.

Gore, J, Griffiths, T & Ladwig, J. 2001. *Productive pedagogy as a framework for teacher education: towards better teaching*. Paper presented at AARE conference, Freemantle, December.

Gottlieb, M. 2000a. Foundations of e-learning. *Communication Project Magazine* 3(1):1–5.

Gottlieb, M. 2000b. Portfolio practices in elementary and secondary schools, in *Learner directed assessment in ESL*, edited by G Ekbatani & H Pierson. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Graddol, D. 2006. *English Next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. London: British Council.

Grice, H. 1968. Utterer's meaning, sentence-meaning and word-meaning. *Foundations of Language* 4:225–242.

Grice, H. 1975. Logic and conversation, in *Syntax and semantics 3: speech acts*, edited by P Cole & J Morgan. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Grobler, J. 1988. *A decisive clash?* Pretoria: Arcadia.

Gumperz, J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J & Cook-Gumperz, J. 1982. Interethnic communication in committee negotiations, in *Language and social identity*, edited by J Gumperz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J. 2004. *Authentic assessment and productive pedagogies in pre-service*



*References*

*teacher education*. Paper presented at AARE conference, Melbourne, November.

Hammersley, M & Atkinson, P. 1983. *Ethnography: principles in practice*. London: Tavistock.

Harland, T. 2003. Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and Problem-based Learning: linking a theoretical concept with practice through action research. *Teaching in Higher Education* 8(2):263–272.

Harmon, DA & Jones, TS. 2005. *Contemporary education issues: elementary education. A reference handbook*. Santa Barabara, CA: ABC-Clio.

Hartshorne, K. 1995. Language policy in African education: a background to the future, in *Language and social history: Studies in South African socio-linguistics*, edited by R Mesthrie. Cape Town: David Philip.

Healy, M & Perry, C. 2000. Comprehensive criteria to judge validity and reliability of qualitative research within the realism paradigm. *Qualitative Market Research* 3(3):118–126.

Heller, M. 1999. *Linguistic minorities and modernity. A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.

Heller, M & Martin-Jones, M. 2001. *Voices of authority: education and linguistic difference*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Henning, E, Van Rensburg, W & Smit, B. 2004. *Finding your way in qualitative research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

References

- Heugh, K. 1995. The multilingual school: modified dual medium, in *Multilingual Education for South Africa*, edited by K Heugh, A Siegrühn & P Plüddemann. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
- Heugh, K. 1995b. Disabling and enabling: implications of language policy trends in South Africa, in *Language and social history: Studies in South African socio-linguistics*, edited by R Mesthrie. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Heugh, K. 2010. Language and literacy: lessons from Ethiopia for Africa and the world. *Review of Education, Skills Development and Innovation*:6–8.
- Hinnenkamp, V. 1999. The notion of misunderstanding in intercultural communication, in *Proceedings of the 5th Nordic Symposium on Intercultural Communication*, edited by J Allwood. Gothenburg.
- Hinnenkamp, V. 2001. Constructing misunderstanding as a cultural event, in *Culture in Communication*, edited by A Di Luzio, S Günthner & F Orletti. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hinnenkamp, V. 2003. Misunderstandings: interactional structure and strategic resources, in *Misunderstandings in social life: Discourse approaches to problematic talk*, edited by J House, G Kasper & S Ross. London: Longman.
- Hofmeyr, J & Hall, G. 1996. *The National Teacher Education Audit: Synthesis Report 5*. Johannesburg: Edupol.
- Holtgraves, T. 2007. Second language learners and speech act comprehension. *Language Learning* 57(4):595–610.
- Horne, TJ. 2005. Education and language transferees. *Education Africa Forum* 5:40–45.

References

House, J. 2003. English as a lingua franca: a threat to multilingualism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4):556–578.

Howie, SJ. 2002. *English language proficiency and contextual factors influencing Mathematics achievement of secondary school pupils in South Africa*. Enschede: University of Twente.

Hugo, AJ & Nieman, M. 2010. Using English as a second language of instruction: concerns and needs of primary school teachers in South Africa. *Journal for Language Teaching* 44(1):59–69.

Hyde, M. 1998. Intercultural competence in English language education. *Modern English Teacher* 7(2):7–11.

Hymes, D. 1967. *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, D. 1972a. Models of the interaction of language and social life, in *Directions in sociolinguistics*, edited by J Gumpres & D Hymes. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Wilson.

Hymes, D. 1972b. On communicative competence, in *Sociolinguistics*, edited by JB Pride & J Holmes. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hymes, D. 1979. On communicative competence, in *The communicative approach to language teaching*, edited by CJ Brumfit & K Johnson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

International English Language Testing Score. Available online at:  
[www.testpreppractice.net/IELTS/average-ielts-score-1.aspx](http://www.testpreppractice.net/IELTS/average-ielts-score-1.aspx) (as on 8 March 2011).

Illiterate. 2000. *Sunday Times*. 16 April:4.

References

- Ismail, N & Idris, KN. 2009. The effects of classroom communication on students' academic performance at the International Islamic University Malaysia (iiu). *UNITRA e-Journal* 5(1):37–49.
- Jansen, JD. 2009a. The language of research, in *First Steps in Research*, edited by JG Maree. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Jansen, JD. 2009b. The research question, in *First Steps in Research*, edited by JG Maree. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Jenkins, J. 2006. Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a *lingua franca*. *TESOL Quarterly* 40(1): 157–181.
- Jenkins, J. 2009. *World Englishes. A resource book for students*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, RB & Onwuegbuzie, AJ. 2004. Mixed method research: a research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher* 33(7):14–26.
- Kaburise, PK. 2005. Speech Act Theory and communication: a UNIVEN study. PhD thesis, University of Pretoria. Pretoria.
- Kachru, B. 1981. Socially realistic linguistics: the Firthian tradition. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 31:65–89.
- Kachru, B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistics realism: the English language in the outer circle, in *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*, edited by R Quirk & HG Widdowson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. 1986. *The alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B. 1988. The sacred cows of English. *English Today* 4(4):3–9.

References

Kachru, B. 1991. Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today* 25:3–13.

Kachru, B. 1992. Teaching world Englishes, in *The other tongue: English across cultures*, edited by B Kachru. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois: 355–365.

Kachru, B. 1997. World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17:66–90.

Kachru, B, Kachru, Y & Nelson, CL. 2009. *The handbook of world Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kamper, GD, Mahlobo EB & Lemmer, EE. The relationship between standardised test performance and language learning strategies in English second language: a case study. *Journal for Language Teaching* 37(2):164–178.

Kamwangamalu, NM. 2000. A new language policy, old language practices: status planning for African languages in a multilingual South Africa. *South African Journal of African Languages* 20(1):50–60.

Kaschula, RH & De Vries, I. 2000. Indigenous languages and the Internet: with LitNet as a case study. Paper presented at the International Conference for Southern African Languages, Gabarone, July.

Kasper, G. 1989. Variation in interlanguage speech act realisation, in *Variation in second language acquisition Volume 1: Discourse and pragmatics*, edited by S Gass, C Madden, D Preston & L Selinker. Clevedon & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Kasper, G. 1992. Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research* 8(3):203–231.

References

- Kasper, G. 1997. The role of pragmatics in language teaching education, in *Beyond methods: Components of second language teacher education*, edited by K Bardovi-Harlig & B Hartford. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kasper, G. 2001. Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics, in *Pragmatics in Language teaching*, edited by KR Rose & G Kasper. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G. 2005. Pragmatics in second language learning, in *Handbook of research in second language learning and teaching*, edited by E Hinkel. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Kasper, G & Rose, KR. 1999. Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 19:81–104.
- Kasper, G. & Rose, KR. 2001. *Pragmatics in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G & Ross, S. 2003. Repetition as a source of miscommunication in oral proficiency interviews, in *Misunderstanding in social life. Discourse approaches to problematic talk*, edited by J House, G Kasper & S Ross. Harlow: Longman/Pearson Education.
- Katt, JA, McCroskey, JC, Sivo, SA, Richmond, VA & Valencic, KM. 2009. A structural equation modelling evaluation of the general model of instructional communication. *Communication Quarterly* 57(3):239–258.
- Kaye, P. Evaluating speaking – the IELTS speaking test. Available online at: <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk> (as on 10 October 2011).
- Kendall, S, Lin, G & Perkins, L. 2006. Cross-cultural discourse of giving and receiving gifts. *International Journal of Communication* 16(1–2):103–112.

*References*

Killen, R. 2003. *Effective teaching strategies: lessons from research and practice*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Tuggerah, Australia: Social Science press.

King, L & Jordaan, H. 2005. Reading comprehension in second language learners. *SAILED NEWS* 25(2):13–14.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2007. *World Englishes. Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Klaassen, RG. 2002. The international university curriculum. Challenges in English medium Engineering education. PhD thesis, Delft University, Delft.

Knobel, M & Lankshear, C. 2004. *New literacies: changing knowledge and classroom learning*. London: Open University Press.

Koester, AJ. 2002. The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. *System* 30:167–184.

Koike, DA. 1989. Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: speech acts in interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal* 73(3):279–289.

Koshik, I. 2002. Designedly incomplete utterances: a pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35(3):277–309.

Kramsch, C. 1986. From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal* 70(4):366–372.

Krashen, S. 1976. Teachers of English to speakers of other languages. *TESOL Quarterly* 10(2):157–168.

References

- Krashen, S. 1981. *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. 1985a. *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. California: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. 1985b. *The input hypothesis: issues and implication*. London & New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S. 1987. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. London & New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S & Brown, C. 2007. What is academic language proficiency? *Singapore Tertiary English Teachers Society (STETS) Language and Education Review* 6(1):1–4.
- Krefting, L. 1991. Rigor in qualitative research: the assessment of trustworthiness. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 45(3):214–222.
- Kreuz, RJ & Roberts, RM. 1993. The empirical study of figurative language in literature. *Poetics* 22:151–169.
- Kurhila, S. 2001. Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33:1083–1110.
- Lane, DR & Shelton, MW. 2001. The centrality of communication education in classroom computer-mediated-communication: toward a practical and evaluative pedagogy. *Communication Education* 50:241–255.



References

- Language Task Group (LANGTAG). 1996. *Towards a national language plan for South Africa: final report of the Language Task Group (LANGTAG)*. Pretoria: Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology.
- Leedy, PD & Ormrod, JE. 2010. *Practical research: planning and design*. 9<sup>th</sup> edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Lemmer, EM. 1995. Selected linguistic realities in South African schools: problems and prospects. *Educare* 24:82–96.
- Lenake, JM. 1993. Die toekomstige status en funksies van die inheemse Afrikatale: Suid-Sotho, in *Perspektiewe op taalbeplanning vir Suid-Afrika*, edited by PH Swanepoel & HJ Pieterse. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Leonard, DC. 2002. *Learning theories, A to Z*. Westport, CT: Oryx.
- Leung, C. 2001. English as an additional language: distinct curriculum focus or diffused curriculum concerns. *Language and Education* 15(1):33–55.
- Lewis, EG. 1981. *Bilingualism and bilingual education*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Liddicoat, AJ. 2000. Everyday speech as culture: implications for language teaching, in *Teaching languages, teaching cultures*, edited by A Liddicoat & C Crozet. Melbourne: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.
- Liddicoat, AJ, Crozet, C & Lo Bianco, J. 1999. *Striving for the third place: intercultural competence through language education*. Canberra: Language Australia.
- Liebling, G. 1988. Means to an end: children's knowledge of directives during the elementary school years. *Discourse Processes* 11:79–99.

*References*

- Lightbown, PM. 2000. Anniversary article: classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 21(4):431–462.
- Lightbown, PM & Spada, N. 1999. *How languages are learnt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lightbown, PM & Spada, N. 2006. *How languages are learnt*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindholm-Leary, KL. 2001. *Dual language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Linell, P. 1995. Troubles with mutualities: towards a dialogical theory of misunderstanding and miscommunication, in *Mutualities in dialogue*, edited by I Marková, CF Graumann & K Foppa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M & Porter, P. 1985. Group work, interactive language talk and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly* 19(2):207–228.
- Mahlobo, EB. 1999. Contextual and learner factors in the development of English second language proficiency. PhD Thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Malherbe, EG. 1977. *Education in South Africa*. Volume 2. Johannesburg: Juta.
- Marcu, D. 2000. Perlocutions: the Achilles' heel of speech act theory. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32:1719–1741.
- Maree, JG. 2009. *First steps in research*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Maree, JG & Van der Westhuizen, C. 2007. Planning a research proposal, in *First Steps in Research*, edited by JG Maree. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

References

Marland, M. 2001. Language across the curriculum comes to life. Available online at: <http://www.literacytrust.org.uk> (as on 21 September 2011).

Matthews, PH. 1997. *The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Maxwell, JA. 1992. Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review* 62(3):279–298.

Mayan, MJ. 2001. *An introduction to qualitative methods*. Edmonton, AB: Qual Institute Press.

McCarthy, MJ & Carter, RA. 1995. Spoken grammar: what is it and how can we teach it? *English Language Teaching Journal* 49(3):207–219.

McCroskey, JS. 1992. *An introduction to communication in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Burgess International.

McCroskey, JC, Richmond, VP & Bennett, VE. 2006. The relationships of student end-of-class motivation with teacher communication behaviors and instructional outcomes. *Communication Education* 55(4):403–414.

McCroskey, JC, Richmond, VP & McCroskey, LL. 2006. *An introduction to communication in the classroom: the role of communication in teaching and training*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

McCroskey, JC, Valencic, KM & Richmond, VP. 2004. Toward a general model of instructional communication. *Communication Quarterly* 52(3):197–210.

References

McCroskey, LL. 2003. Relationships of instructional communication styles of domestic and foreign instructors with instructional outcomes. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 32:75–96.

McHoul, A & Rapley, M (eds). 2001. *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: a casebook of methods*. London: Continuum.

McKay, SL. 2002. *Teaching English as an international language: rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McLean, CA. 2007. Establishing credibility in the multilingual classroom: when the instructor speaks with an accent. *New directions for teaching and learning* 11:15–24.

McMillan, JH. 2008. *Educational research: fundamentals for the consumer*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Boston: Pearson Education.

McMillan, JH & Schumacher, S. 1997. *Research in education: a conceptual introduction*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Addison-Wesley Longman.

McMillan, JH & Schumacher, S. 2001. *Research in education: a conceptual introduction*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Merriam, SB. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, SB. 2002. *Qualitative research in practice: examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mey, JL. 2001. *Pragmatics. An introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

References

Meyer, D. 1997. The languages of learning: current practice and its implication for language policy implementation. *Journal for Language Teaching* 31(3):226–235.

Miles, MB & Huberman, AM. 1984. Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: toward a shared craft. *Educational Researcher* 13(5):20–30.

Miles, MB & Huberman, AM. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage.

Ming-Chung, Y. 2004. Interlinguistic variation and similarity in second language speech act behavior. *The Modern Language Journal* 88(i):102–119.

Moerk, EL. 1992. *A first language taught and learned*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Moerman, M. 1988. *Talking culture: ethnography and conversational analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mohan, B. 2001. The second language as medium of learning, in *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity*, edited by B Mohan, C Leung & C Davison. New York: Longman/Pearson.

Mohlala, T. 2007. Fun with words. *The Teacher* 12(3):9.

Moodley, V. 2010. Code-switching and communicative competence in the language classroom. *Journal for Language Teaching* 44(1):7–22.

Moon, J. 2000. *Children Learning English*. Oxford: Macmillan.

References

- Morgan, AK & Drury, VB. 2003. *Legitimising the subjectivity of human reality through qualitative research methods*. Available online at: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-1/morgan.html> (as on August 2010).
- Mottet, TP, Richmond, VP & McCroskey, JC. 2006. *Handbook of instructional communication: rhetorical and relational perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mouton, J. 1996. *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Mouton, J. 2001. *How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies – a South African guide and resource book*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Myburgh, O, Poggenpoel, M & Van Rensburg, W. 2004. Learners' experience of teaching and learning in a second or third language. *Education* 124(3):573.
- Myers-Scotton, C & Bernstein, J. 1988. Natural conversations as a mode for textbook dialogue. *Applied Linguistics* 9(4):372–384.
- Nakata, Y. 2010. Improving the classroom language proficiency of non-native teachers of English: what and how? *RELC Journal* 41(1):76–90.
- National Education Policy Investigation. 1992. *Language report of the NEPI language group*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Nassaji, H & Swain, M. 2000. A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness* 9(1):34–51.
- Nayar, PB. 1994. Whose English is it? Available online at: <http://berkeley.edu./cwp/TESL-EJ.html> (as on 3 June 2011).

*References*

Nel, N & Swanepoel, E. 2010. Do the language errors of ESL teachers affect their learners? *Per Linguam* 26(1):47–60.

Nelson, GL, Carson, J, Batal, MA & El Bakary, W. 2002. Cross-cultural pragmatics: strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics* 23(2):163–189.

Neo, T & Neo, M. 2004. Classroom innovation: engaging students in interactive multimedia learning. *Campus-Wide Information Systems* 21(3):118–124.

Neuman, LW. 1994. *Social research methods. Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Newman, F. 1996. *Authentic achievement: restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nieuwenhuis, J. 2007. Introducing qualitative research, in *First Steps in Research* edited by JG Maree. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Nieuwenhuis, J. 2009. Qualitative research techniques, in *First Steps in Research*, edited by JG Maree. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Nunberg, G. 2000. Will the internet always speak English? *The American Prospect*, 11(10):40–43.

Nuthall, G. 2005. The cultural myths and realities of classroom teaching and learning: a personal journey. *Teachers College Record* 107(5):895–934.

Ohlstein, E & Blum-Kulka, S. 1985. Degree of approximation: non-native reactions to native speech behaviour, in *Input in second language acquisition*, edited by SM Gass & C Madden. Rowly, MA: Newbury House.

References

Osakwe, RN. 2009. Dimensions of communication as predictors of effective classroom interaction. *Communication Science* 3(1):57–61.

Paikeday, TM. 1985. *The native speaker is dead!* Toronto & New York: PPI.

Papai, ND. 2000. Literacy development through content based instruction: a case study. *Working papers in Educational Linguistics* 16(2):81–96.

Parkinson, J. 2003. The effect of tertiary study at an English medium university on the written English of speakers of Black South African English. *Journal for Language Teaching* 37(2):249–267.

Patton, MQ. 2002. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearson, E. 1986. Agreement/disagreement: an example of results of discourse analysis applied to the oral English classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 74:47–61.

Pohl, G. 2004. Crosscultural pragmatic failure and implications for language teaching. Available online at: <http://www.usq.edu.au/opacs/sllt/4/Pohl04.html> (as on 23 September 2009).

Povolná, R. 2009. Pragmatic awareness and its role in teacher education. *Vienna English Working Papers* 3:111- 113. Available online at: <http://anglistik.univie.ac.at/views/current-issue> (as on 20 May 2011).

Prah, K. 1995. *African languages for the mass education of Africans*. Bonn: Education, Science and Documentation Centre.



References

Probyn, M. 2001. Teachers' voices: Teachers' reflections on learning and teaching through the medium of English as an additional language in South Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 4(4):249–266.

Quirk, R. 1990. Language varieties and standard language. *English Today* 21:3–10.

Ramirez, JD & Merino, BJ. 1990. Classroom talk in English immersion, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs, in *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling*, edited by R Jacobson & C Faltis. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ramirez, JD, Yuen, SD, Ramey, DR & Pasta, DJ. 1991. *Final report: longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children*. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Reagan, TG. 1985. Language planning in South African education. A conceptual overview. *Journal for Language Teaching* 19:71–87.

Reddy, V & De Kadt, E. 2006. Thinking about language and gender: a South African perspective. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24(4):417–423.

Research Education in South Africa (RESA). 1998. *The struggle against apartheid education: towards people's education in South Africa. RESA paper no. 3*. Colchester: University of Essex.

Reynolds, A & Elias, P. 1991. *What is good teaching: a review of the literature*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Reynolds, ED. 2009. The need for a comprehensive SLA theory: what place does that theory have in TEFL? *Interfaces* 3(1):1–27.

References

- Riley, P. 1984. Understanding misunderstandings: cross-cultural pragmatics failure in the language classroom. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 7(2):127–44.
- Ritchie, J & Lewis, J. 2003. *Qualitative research practice. A guide for Social Science students and researchers*. London: Sage.
- Roberts, C, Moss, B, Wass, V, Sarangi, S & Jones, R. 2005. Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Medical education* 39:465–475.
- Roberts, CM. 2004. *The dissertation journey – a practical guide to planning, writing and defending your dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Rose, KR. 1999. Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong, in *Culture in second language teaching and learning*, edited by E Hinkel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rymes, B. 2009. *Classroom discourse analysis: a tool for critical reflection*. New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Sage, S. 2003. *Supporting language and communication. A guide for school support staff*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Salkind, NJ. 2006. *Exploring research*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Savignon, SJ. 1985. Evaluation of communicative competence: the ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines. *The Modern Language Journal* 69(2):129-134.
- Scarcella, R & Brunak, J. 1981. On speaking politely in a second language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 27:59–75.

*References*

Schegloff, EA. 1987. Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. *Linguistics* 25:201–218.

Schegloff, EA. 1992. Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 97:1295–1345.

Schirmer, JM, Mauksch, L, Lang, F, Marvel, K, Zoppi, K, Epstein, RM, Brock, D & Pryzbylski, M. 2005. Assessing communication competence: a review of current tools. *Family Medicine* 37(3):184–92.

Schmidt, R. 1992. *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*. Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Centre.

Schmidt, R. 1993. Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics, in *Interlanguage pragmatics*, edited by G Kasper. USA: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, RW & Richards, JC. 1980. Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 1(2):129–157.

Scott, P. 1998. Teacher talk and meaning making in Science classrooms: a Vygotskian analysis and review. *Studies in Science Education* 32(1):45–80.

Scott, D & Usher, R. 1999. *Researching education-data, methods and theory in educational enquiry*. London: Cassell.

Seale, C, Gobo, G, Gubrium, JF & Silverman, D. 2004. *Qualitative research practice*. London: Sage.

Searle, JR. 1965. What is a speech act?, in *The philosophy of language*, edited by J Searle. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

References

Searle, JR. 1969. *Speech acts*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, JR. (ed). 1971. *The philosophy of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Searle, JR. 1979. A classification of illocutionary speech acts. *Language in society* 5:1–24.

Seedhouse, P. 1994. Linking pedagogical purposes to linguistic patterns of interaction: the analysis of communication in the language classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 32(4):303–320.

Seedhouse, P. 1996. Learning talk: a study of the interactional organisation of the L2 classroom from a CA institutional discourse perspective. PhD thesis, University of York, United Kingdom.

Seedhouse, P. 1997. The case of the missing 'no': the relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning* 47(3):547–583.

Seedhouse, P. 1998. CA and the analysis of foreign language interaction: a reply to Wagner. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30:85–102.

Seedhouse, P. 1999. The relationship between context and the organisation of repair in the L2 classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 37(1):59–80.

Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. 2005. Conversation analysis as research methodology, in *Applying Conversation Analysis*, edited by K Richards & P Seedhouse. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

References

Seidlhofer, B. 2009. Common ground and different realities: world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes* 28(2):236–245.

Selvi, AF. 2007. A multifactorial sociolinguistic analysis of business naming practices in Turkey. Master's dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Shingler, JD. 1973. Education and political order in South Africa, 1902–1961. PhD thesis. New Haven: Yale University.

Short, D. 2002. Language learning in sheltered social classes. *TESOL Journal* 11:18–24.

Silverman, D. 2005. *Doing qualitative research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Sage.

Simonds, CJ. 2001. *Reflecting on the relationship between instructional communication theory and lecturers' practices*. Available online at: <http://findarticles.com/p/articles> (as on 31 October 2009).

Singh, P. 2002. Pedagogising knowledge: Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 23(4):571–582.

Singh, P. 2009. Trawling through language policy: practices and possibilities post-1994. *Language Learning Journal* 37(3):281–291.

Singh, P & Doherty, C. 2004. Global cultural flows and pedagogic dilemmas: Teaching in the global university contact zone. *TESOL Quarterly* 38(1):9–42.

Skinner, B. 1953. *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan.

Skinner, B. 1957. *Verbal behaviour*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

References

Slavin, RE. 2003. Evidence-based education policies: transforming educational practice and research. *Educational Researcher* 31(7):15–21.

Smith, LE. 1983. English as an international language: no room for linguistic chauvinism, in *Readings in English as an international language*, edited by LE Smith. Oxford: Pergamon:7-11.

Sridhar, KK & Sridhar, SN. 1992. Bridging the paradigm gap: second language acquisition theory and indigenized varieties of English, in *The other tongue: English across cultures*, edited by BB Kachru. Urbana: University of Illinois Press:91–107.

Statistics South Africa. 2001. *Census in brief*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

Statistics South Africa. 2004. *Primary tables, South Africa*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

Steinberg, S. 1995. *Communication studies – an introduction*. Landsdowne: Juta.

Strauss, JP, Van der Linde, HJ, Plekker, SJ & Strauss, JWW. 1999. *Education and manpower development* (19). Bloemfontein: University of the Orange Free State. Research Institute for Educational Planning.

Street, B (ed). 1993. *Cross cultural approaches to literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sugawara, K. 2009. Speech acts, moves, and meta-communication in negotiation: three cases of everyday conversation observed among the Gui former-foragers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41:93–135.

Tanck, S. 2002. Speech act sets of refusal and complaint: a comparison of native and non-native English speakers' production. *TESOL Working Papers* 4(2):1–22.

References

Tannen, D. 1984. *Conversational style*. New Jersey: Norwood.

Tannen, D. 1991. *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow.

Tannen, D. 1992. *That's not what I meant! How conversational style makes or breaks your relations with others*. London: Virago.

Tashakkori, A & Teddlie, C. 1998. *Mixed methodology: combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Sage.

Tashakkori, A & Teddlie, C. 2003. *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research*. London: Sage.

Taylor, DS. 1988. The meaning and use of the term 'competence' in linguistics and applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 9(2):148–168.

Teddlie, C & Tashakkori, A. 2003. Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioural science, in *The Handbook of mixed methods in the social and behavioural research*, edited by A Tashakkori & C Teddlie. London: Sage.

Ter-Minasova, S. 2003. Linguistic aspects of intercultural communication. *Journal for Language Teaching* 37(2):300–306.

Terre Blanche, M & Durrheim, K (eds). 2002. *Research in practice: applied methods for the social sciences*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Tesch, R. 1990. *Qualitative research. Analysis types and software tools*. London: Routledge.

References

Teven, JJ & Hanson, T. 2004. The impact of teacher immediacy and perceived caring on teacher competence and trustworthiness. *Communication Quarterly* 52(1):39–53.

*The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. 1996. Pretoria: Government Printer.

*The People of South Africa Population Census 1996*. 1998. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Thomas, J. 1983. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4(2):91–112.

Thomas, J. 1995. *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Thomas, L. 1996. Language as power: a linguistic critique of US English. *The Modern Language Journal* 80(2):129–40.

Thomas, RM. 2003. *Blending qualitative and quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Thomas, WP & Collier, VP. 2002. *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Washington DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.

Thomas, WP & Collier, VP. 2003. The multiple benefits of dual language. *Educational Leadership* 61(2):61–64.

Thwala, N. 2007. Fun with words. *The Teacher* 12(3):26.

Tomlinson, B. 1994. Pragmatic awareness activities. *Language Awareness* 3(3&4):221–236.



References

Trim, JLM. 2005. *The Role of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in Teacher Training*. Lecture delivered in Graz, September 2005. Available online at: <http://www.ecml.at/document/press/trim.pdf>. (as on 5 May 2011).

Trosborg, A. 1994. *Interlanguage pragmatics. Requests, complaints and apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Turnbull, W. 2003. *Language in action: psychological models of conversation*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

UNESCO. 1968. The use of vernacular languages in education, in *Readings in the sociology of language*, edited by JA Fishman. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

UNESCO. 2001. Statistical database. Available online at: <http://stas.uis.unesco.org> (as on 5 May 2008).

UNESCO. 2001. The plurality of literacy and its implications for policies and programmes. Available online at: <http://unesco.org> (as on 5 May 2008).

UNESCO. 2007. Education for all global monitoring report: literacy for life. Available online at: <http://unesco.org> (as on 5 May 2008).

Uys, AHC. 2006a. English medium of instruction: a situation analysis. *South African Journal of Education* 27(1):69–82.

Uys, AHC. 2006b. *Modelling a language course for English second language medium of instruction teacher-trainees*. Potchefstroom: North-West University.

Uys, AHC, Van der Walt, JL & Botha, SU. 2005. A scheme for training effective English second language medium of instruction teachers. *Journal for Language Teaching* 39(2):321–336.

References

- Uys, AHC, Van der Walt, JL, Botha, SU & Van der Berg, R. 2006. An integrated course for English medium of instruction teacher trainees in South Africa. *Journal for Language Teaching* 40(2):68–86.
- Van der Walt, C. 2007. A World Englishes perspective in English language teacher training: rejection and reluctance. *Journal for Language Teaching* 41(1):101–114.
- Van Louw, C. 1998. Onderwys as terrein vir verknegting of bemagtiging. *Karring* 14:2–3.
- Van Zyl Slabbert, F, Malan, C, Oliviers, K & Riordan, R. 1994. *Youth in the new South Africa: towards policy formation*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Verdonik, D. 2010. Between understanding and misunderstanding. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42:1364–1379.
- Vermeulen, LM. 2001. Language of learning and teaching (LoLT): perceptions of teachers in the Vaal Triangle. *Perspectives in Education* 19(3):133–146.
- Vinjevold, P. 1999. Language issues in South African classrooms, in *Getting learning right: report of the President's Education Initiative Research Project*, edited by N Taylor & P Vinjevold. Johannesburg: Joint Education Trust.
- Vygotsky, LS. 1962. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, LS. 1986. *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, LS. 1978. *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological process*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Webb, VN. 1992. Konflik in die Suid-Afrikaanse samelewing, en die rol van taal. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 32:104–123.

*References*

Webb, VN. 1999. Multilingualism in democratic South Africa: the over-estimation of language policy, in *Comparative perspectives on language and literacy*, edited by L. Limage. Dakar: UNESCO.

Weideman, A & Van Rensburg, C. 2002. Language proficiency: current strategies, future remedies. *Journal for Language Teaching* 36(2):152–164.

Weigand, E. 1999. Misunderstanding: the standard case. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31:763–785.

Weizman, E. 1999. Building true understanding via apparent miscommunication: a case study. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31:837–846.

Weizman, E & Blum-Kulka, S. 1992. Ordinary misunderstanding, in *Current advances in semantic theory*, edited by M Stamenow. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Widdowson, HC. 1998. Context, community and authentic language. *TESOL Quarterly* 32(4):705–716.

Wierzbicka, A. 1992. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: the semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wierzbicka, A. 2003. *Cross-cultural pragmatics – the semantics of human interaction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Wiggins, G & McTighe, J. 1998. *Understanding by design*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiggins, G & McTighe, J. 2005. *Understanding by design* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

*References*

- Wolcott, HF. 1992. Making a study "more ethnographic", in *Representation in ethnography*, edited by J van Maanen. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolfson, N. 1989. *Perspectives. Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Wong, J. 2000. Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics* 21(2):244–267.
- Wu, S. 2007. Pragmatic failure in consecutive interpreting. *Canadian Social Science* 3(4):51–54.
- Yan, L & Zhuang, Y. 2010. Reflections on the nature of pragmatic failure. *US-China Foreign Language* 8(1):1–7.
- Yano, Y. 2001. World Englishes in 2000 and beyond. *World Englishes* 20(2):119–131.
- Yin, R. 2009. *Case study research: design and methods*. Singapore: Sage.
- Yus, F. 1999. Misunderstandings and explicit/implicit communication. *Pragmatics* 9(4):487–517.
- Zaefferer, D. 1977. Understanding misunderstanding: a proposal for an explanation of reading choices. *Journal of Pragmatics* 1:320–346.
- Zhang, Y. 2005. Pragmalinguistic failure and English language teaching. *Sino-US English Teaching* 2(9):28–38.
- Zuengler, J, Ford, C & Fassnacht, C. 1998. Analyst eyes and camera eyes: theoretical and technological considerations in 'seeing' the details of classroom interaction. Available online at: <http://cela.albany.edu/analysteyes/index.html> (as on 2 May 2009).

## Addenda

### Addendum A: The Inferential Model

The Inferential Model of communication proposes that learning to communicate successfully involves acquiring a variety of beliefs or "presumptions", and a system of "inferential strategies", which the speaker and the hearer must share (Akmajian et al 1995:353). These presumptions allow us to presume certain helpful things about the speaker/hearer. The inferential strategies include steps taken to help us explain how hearers arrive at the most likely meaning of an utterance. The hearer is thus able to infer the intended message of uttered words by drawing these inferences by means of certain strategies (Akmajian et al 1995:368). This will help the hearer to determine speaker intent, and provides the basis for successful communication.

According to this model there are four presumptions that need to be in place, viz.:

Linguistic Presumption:	It is presumed that the hearer is capable of determining the meaning of an expression in its context.
Communicative Presumption:	It is presumed that a speaker is speaking with a specific communicative intent.
Presumption of Literalness:	It is presumed that a speaker is speaking literally, unless there is evidence to prove otherwise.
Conversational Presumptions:	It is presumed that the speaker's remarks will be relevant, sincere, true, appropriately informative and provable.

When people share the above presumptions in communication, the chances of communication being successful are fairly good. This success is based on the fact that the hearer has certain expectations of how a speaker will speak and the speaker has certain expectations of how a hearer will interpret. For example, a speaker can speak literally and directly – the words s/he utters mean exactly what s/he intends, without any added or ambiguous meaning. What is said is thus contextually appropriate.

A speaker can also speak non-literally – mean something other than what his words mean, e.g. when making use of irony, sarcasm or figures of speech. What is said will then be judged contextually inappropriate.

A speaker can also speak indirectly (will mean more than s/he says directly), e.g. "Have you finished reading?" asking whether s/he has finished reading, but implying to ask in addition whether the light can be switched off.

The distinction between direct and indirect, and literal and non-literal speech is simply that when we speak directly and literally our words mean just that which is spoken, e.g. "I have blue ribbons in my hair". When we speak indirectly and/or non-literally, our words mean more, or something other, than that which is spoken, e.g. "I feel blue". It is not possible to feel blue, literally. Therefore, a person uttering these words in this context must mean something other than his words, namely feeling depressed.

For each of the above forms of communication there are inferential strategies which the speaker/hearer regularly uses to ensure success in communication. An inference is the "ability to derive additional knowledge from the original knowledge base" (Fromkin & Rodman 1993:490), and a strategy is a method or tool applied by the hearer to understand each type of communication. These inferential strategies, therefore, are used by the speaker or hearer to ensure successful communication.

Since communication is so complicated, we need notions like "intended inference", "shared contextual beliefs" and "presumptions" to explain what words mean (Akmajian et al

1995:354). Akmajian et al (1995) further state that all of these rely on the following "inferential strategies" for communication, viz. the direct strategy, the literal strategy, the non-literal strategy and the indirect strategy, which will be explained below:

### **The Direct Strategy**

This strategy enables the hearer to infer, from what is being said, what the speaker is directly communicating. If s/he mishears the words, the message will not be understood.

There are four steps to be taken:

- Step 1        Recognising what expression is uttered
- Step 2        Recognising which meaning of what is uttered is relevant
- Step 3        Recognising what the speaker is referring to
- Step 4        Recognising the speaker's intent

### **The Literal Strategy**

This strategy enables the hearer to infer, from what the speaker is directly communicating, what s/he is literally communicating.

There are two steps to be taken, following from step 4:

- Step 5        Recognising the contextual appropriateness for speaking literally
- Step 6        Recognising the speaker's intent to speak literally

A hearer who follows these strategies (steps 1–6) can infer what the speaker is literally and directly communicating. If the hearer is correct in this inference, communication will have been successful. If not, the hearer will revert to the **Non-literal Strategy**. Then contextual inappropriateness enables the hearer to infer that the speaker is communicating non-literally.

This requires that two alternative steps need to be taken, following from step 4:

- Step 5        Recognising contextual inappropriateness for speaking literally
- Step 6        Recognising that the speaker is communicating non-literally

If a hearer reaches step 6 correctly, communication will have been successful. However, if not, the **Indirect Strategy** will be followed. This strategy enables a hearer to infer that a speaker is communicating indirectly. Indirect acts can be performed either literally or non-literally.

There are two steps to be taken, following from step 6:

- Step 7        Recognising contextual inappropriateness for speaking directly and initiating a search for the indirect message
- Step 8        Recognising that the speaker is communicating indirectly

When the hearer reaches step 8, communication will have been successful. These steps are explained in figure 1 on the next page.



**Figure 1: Inferential strategies for communication (Inferential Model [Akmajian et al 1995])**





**Addendum B: Observations**

**Observational field notes: Misunderstandings in an instructional setting**

**Participant:**

**Subject:**

**School:**

**Grade:**

**Date:**

**Time:**

**Length of period:**

.....

**Notes**

.....

**Reflection**



**Addendum C: Observation checklist**

**Observation checklist: Misunderstandings in an instructional setting**

**Participant:**

**Subject:**

**School:**

**Grade:**

**Date:**

**Time:**

**Length of period:**

.....

**OBSERVATION CHECKLIST**

v1

**Determine the type and frequency of errors made which may lead to misunderstandings in the classroom.**

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| 1 | Yes   |
| 2 | No    |
| 3 | Other |

- Vocabulary  v2
- Word order  v3
- Sentence structure  v4
- Choice of words  v5
- Pronunciation  v6
- Enunciation  v7
- Concord  v8
- Tenses  v9
- Sentence length  v10
- Requests  v11
- Apologies  v12
- Directives  v13
- Thanks  v14
- Other  v15



## Notes

.....

## Reflection



## Addendum D: International English Language Testing Score (IELTS)

### IELTS Speaking band descriptors (public version)

Band	Fluency and coherence	Lexical resource	Grammatical range and accuracy	Pronunciation
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>speaks fluently with only rare repetition or self-correction; any hesitation is content-related rather than to find words or grammar</li> <li>speaks coherently with fully appropriate cohesive features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses vocabulary with full flexibility and precision in all topics</li> <li>uses idiomatic language naturally and accurately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a full range of structures naturally and appropriately</li> <li>produces consistently accurate structures apart from 'slips' characteristic of native speaker speech</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a full range of pronunciation features with precision and subtlety</li> <li>sustains flexible use of features throughout</li> <li>is effortless to understand</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>speaks fluently with only occasional repetition or self-correction; hesitation is usually content-related and only rarely to search for language</li> <li>develops topics coherently and appropriately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a wide vocabulary resource readily and flexibly to convey precise meaning</li> <li>uses less common and idiomatic vocabulary skilfully, with occasional inaccuracies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a wide range of structures flexibly</li> <li>produces a majority of error-free sentences with only very occasional inappropriacies or basic/non-systematic errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a wide range of pronunciation features</li> <li>sustains flexible use of features, with only occasional lapses</li> <li>is easy to understand throughout: L1 accent has</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>speaks at length without noticeable effort or loss of coherence</li> <li>may demonstrate language-related hesitation at times, or some repetition and/or self-correction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses vocabulary resource flexibly to discuss a variety of topics</li> <li>uses some less common and idiomatic vocabulary and shows some awareness of style and collocation, with some inappropriate choices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a range of complex structures with some flexibility</li> <li>frequently produces error-free sentences, though some grammatical mistakes persist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows all the positive features of Band 6 and some, but not all, of the positive features of Band 8</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is willing to speak at length, though may lose coherence at times due to occasional repetition, self-correction or hesitation</li> <li>uses a range of connectives and discourse markers but not always appropriately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>has a wide enough vocabulary to discuss topics at length and make meaning clear in spite of inappropriacies</li> <li>generally paraphrases successfully</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a mix of simple and complex structures, but with limited flexibility</li> <li>may make frequent mistakes with complex structures, though these rarely cause comprehension problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a range of pronunciation features with mixed control</li> <li>shows some effective use of features but this is not sustained</li> <li>can generally be understood throughout, though</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>usually maintains flow of speech but uses repetition, self-correction and/or slow speech to keep going</li> <li>may over-use certain connectives and discourse markers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>manages to talk about familiar and unfamiliar topics but uses vocabulary with limited flexibility</li> <li>attempts to use paraphrase but with mixed success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>produces basic sentence forms with reasonable accuracy</li> <li>uses a limited range of more complex structures, but these usually contain errors and may cause some comprehension problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows all the positive features of Band 4 and some, but not all, of the positive features of Band 6</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>cannot respond without noticeable pauses and may speak slowly, with frequent repetition and self-correction</li> <li>links basic sentences but with repetitious use of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is able to talk about familiar topics but can only convey basic meaning on unfamiliar topics and makes frequent errors in word choice</li> <li>rarely attempts paraphrase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>produces basic sentence forms and some correct simple sentences but subordinate structures are rare</li> <li>errors are frequent and may lead to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses a limited range of pronunciation features</li> <li>attempts to control features but lapses are frequent</li> <li>mispronunciations are frequent and cause some</li> </ul>



Band	Fluency and coherence	Lexical resource	Grammatical range and accuracy	Pronunciation
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• speaks with long pauses</li><li>• has limited ability to link simple sentences</li><li>• gives only simple responses and is frequently</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• uses simple vocabulary to convey personal information</li><li>• has insufficient vocabulary for less familiar topics</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• attempts basic sentence forms but with limited success, or relies on apparently memorised utterances</li><li>• <del>makes numerous errors except in memorised</del></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• shows some of the features of Band 2 and some, but not all, of the positive features of Band 4</li></ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• pauses lengthily before most words</li><li>• <del>little communication possible</del></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• only produces isolated words or memorised utterances</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• cannot produce basic sentence forms</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• speech is often unintelligible</li></ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• no communication possible</li><li>• <del>no rateable language</del></li></ul>			
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• does not attend</li></ul>			

**Addendum E: Focus group interview protocol**

**Interview protocol: Misunderstandings in an instructional setting**

**Time of interview:**

**Date:**

**Interviewer: L de J**

**Interviewee(s):**

**Venue:**

.....

**Questions:**

To establish rapport and allow participants to relax, a few general questions about their lessons and teaching are asked. This is followed by the leading question:

1. Do you find that learners sometimes misunderstand you/How often do misunderstandings occur in a typical lesson? If so, how would you deal with such misunderstandings?

The following questions were added where relevant to keep the interview flowing:

2. How do you know that a misunderstanding has occurred/What do learners do to indicate that they do not understand?
3. How often do learners indicate their misunderstanding?
4. How often do learners react non-verbally to a possible misunderstanding? Can you describe these?
5. What do you do to make sure that learners do understand?
6. What factors do you think play a role in these misunderstandings? What do you think could be possible reasons for these misunderstandings?
7. How often is the misunderstanding related to language ability? How do you know?

8. How often is the misunderstanding related to factors other than language? Can you provide examples? For example, do you think that your culture or the learners' culture plays a role in their misunderstanding you?

.....

**Reflection**



**Addendum F: Questionnaire**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MISUNDERSTANDING IN AN INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING**

Please fill or mark the appropriate space.

**SECTION A – BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION**

1 Respondent number

2 Gender:

1 Male	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------

2 Female	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------	--------------------------

3 Grade of class \_\_\_\_\_

4 Type of school:

1 Public school (Afr)	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Public school (Eng)	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Private school (Afr)	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 Private school (Eng)	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

5 Mother tongue/Home language: .....

6 Time of lesson: \_\_\_\_\_

7 Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION B**

8 I encounter incidents of misunderstanding in my classroom.

9 I try to determine the source of learners' misunderstanding.

**For office use only**

V1

V3

V4

V5.1

V5.2

V5.3

V5.4

V5.5

V6

V7

V8

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

V8



								<b>V9</b>							
10 I recognise that a misunderstanding has occurred when I see non-verbal Behaviour such as frowns and shrugs.															
								<b>V10</b>							
11 I recognise that a misunderstanding has occurred when I see non-verbal behaviour such as blank stares, other.															
								<b>V11</b>							
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">1 Strongly disagree</th> <th style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">2 Disagree</th> <th style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">3 Neutral</th> <th style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">4 Agree</th> <th style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">5 Strongly agree</th> </tr> </thead> </table>										1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree	
1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree											
12 Learners indicate their misunderstanding through asking questions.								<b>V12</b>							
13 Learners misunderstand because of their lack of vocabulary in the target language.								<b>V13</b>							
14 Culture plays a role in learners' understanding in the classroom.								<b>V14</b>							
<table style="display: inline-table; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1 Yes</td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> </tr> </table> <table style="display: inline-table; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2 No</td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> </tr> </table> <table style="display: inline-table; border: 1px solid black;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3 Uncertain</td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> </tr> </table>	1 Yes		2 No		3 Uncertain										
1 Yes															
2 No															
3 Uncertain															



	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree		
15 Misunderstandings occur because of my skills in explaining the work.						V15	
16 Misunderstandings occur only when the language I use is too difficult for the learners to understand.						V16	
17 Misunderstandings occur because of my skills in giving instructions.						V17	

**Addendum G: Ethics certificate (UP)**

Clearance number: AL 08/11/01

Date approved: 28 September 2011

Chairperson of ethic committee: Prof L. Ebersohn

(Certificate only available in hard copy)

**Addendum H: Ethics approval (GDE)**



**UMnyango WezeMfundo  
Department of Education**

**Lefapha la Thuto  
Departement van Onderwys**

**Enquiries: Nomvula Ubisi (011)3550488**

**Re: Approval in Respect of Request to Conduct Research**

<i>Date:</i>	<i>25 November 2008</i>
<i>Name of Researcher:</i>	<i>De Jager Lizette Johanna</i>
<i>Address of Researcher:</i>	<i>9 Tiger Road</i>
	<i>Monument Park</i>
	<i>Pretoria</i>
<i>Telephone Number:</i>	<i>0124604740/0835542088</i>
<i>Fax Number:</i>	<i>0124205637</i>
<i>Research Topic:</i>	<i>Misunderstanding in the classroom: the relationship between the oral proficiency of teachers and the learning experience</i>
<i>Number and type of schools:</i>	<i>15 Secondary Schools</i>
<i>District/s/HO</i>	<b>Gauteng North</b>

**Office of the Chief Director: Information and Knowledge Management**

Room 501, 111 Commissioner Street, Johannesburg, 2000 P.O.Box 7710, Johannesburg, 2000  
Tel: (011) 355-0809 Fax: (011) 355-0734

This letter serves to indicate that approval is hereby granted to the above-mentioned researcher to proceed with research in respect of the study indicated above. The onus rests with the researcher to negotiate appropriate and relevant time schedules with the school/s and/or offices involved to conduct the research. A separate copy of this letter must be presented to both the School (both Principal and SGB) and the District/Head Office Senior Manager confirming that permission has been granted for the research to be conducted.

*Permission has been granted to proceed with the above study subject to the conditions listed below being met, and may be withdrawn should any of these conditions be flouted:*

- 1. The District/Head Office Senior Manager/s concerned must be presented with a copy of this letter that would indicate that the said researcher/s has/have been granted permission from the Gauteng Department of Education to conduct the research study.**
- 2. The District/Head Office Senior Manager/s must be approached separately, and in writing, for permission to involve District/Head Office Officials in the project.**
- 3. A copy of this letter must be forwarded to the school principal and the chairperson of the School Governing Body (SGB) that would indicate that the researcher/s have been granted permission from the Gauteng Department of Education to conduct the research study.**
- 4. A letter / document that outlines the purpose of the research and the anticipated outcomes of such research must be made available to the principals, SGBs and District/Head Office Senior Managers of the schools and districts/offices concerned, respectively.**
- 5. The Researcher will make every effort obtain the goodwill and co-operation of all the GDE officials, principals, and chairpersons of the SGBs, teachers and learners involved. Persons who offer their co-operation will not receive additional remuneration from the Department while those that opt not to participate will not be penalised in any way.**
- 6. Research may only be conducted after school hours so that the normal school programme is not interrupted. The Principal (if at a school) and/or Director (if at a district/head office) must be consulted about an appropriate time when the researcher/s may carry out their research at the sites that they manage.**
- 7. Research may only commence from the second week of February and must be concluded before the beginning of the last quarter of the academic year.**
- 8. Items 6 and 7 will not apply to any research effort being undertaken on behalf of the GDE. Such research will have been commissioned and be paid for by the Gauteng Department of Education.**

## **Office of the Chief Director: Information and Knowledge Management**

Room 501, 111 Commissioner Street, Johannesburg, 2000 P.O.Box 7710, Johannesburg, 2000  
Tel: (011) 355-0809 Fax: (011) 355-0734

9. *It is the researcher's responsibility to obtain written parental consent of all learners that are expected to participate in the study.*
10. *The researcher is responsible for supplying and utilising his/her own research resources, such as stationery, photocopies, transport, faxes and telephones and should not depend on the goodwill of the institutions and/or the offices visited for supplying such resources.*
11. *The names of the GDE officials, schools, principals, parents, teachers and learners that participate in the study may not appear in the research report without the written consent of each of these individuals and/or organisations.*
12. *On completion of the study the researcher must supply the Director: Knowledge Management & Research with one Hard Cover bound and one Ring bound copy of the final, approved research report. The researcher would also provide the said manager with an electronic copy of the research abstract/summary and/or annotation.*
13. *The researcher may be expected to provide short presentations on the purpose, findings and recommendations of his/her research to both GDE officials and the schools concerned.*
14. *Should the researcher have been involved with research at a school and/or a district/head office level, the Director concerned must also be supplied with a brief summary of the purpose, findings and recommendations of the research study.*

The Gauteng Department of Education wishes you well in this important undertaking and looks forward to examining the findings of your research study.

Kind regards

Pp Nomvula Ubisi

CHIEF DIRECTOR: INFORMATION & KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

<b>The contents of this letter has been read and understood by the researcher.</b>	
<b>Signature of Researcher:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	

**Office of the Chief Director: Information and Knowledge Management**

Room 501, 111 Commissioner Street, Johannesburg, 2000 P.O.Box 7710, Johannesburg, 2000  
Tel: (011) 355-0809 Fax: (011) 355-0734

**Addendum I: Letters of informed consent: participants**



**Department of Humanities Education**

**Faculty of Education, Groenkloof Campus, University of Pretoria, PRETORIA, 0002**

**Republic of South Africa**

**Tel: +27 12 420 5639 Fax: +27 12 420 5637**

.....

**05 May 2009**

Dear Participant

**LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE RESEARCH PROJECT ON:  
MISUNDERSTANDING IN AN INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING**

You are invited to participate in a research project on **misunderstandings that occur in the classroom**. The aim of my study is to investigate the occurrence of misunderstanding in the classroom.

The main question driving this research is:

**To what extent are misunderstandings the result of English second language (L2) student teachers' oral proficiency?**

The following sub questions will further guide the study:

- How/when do misunderstandings occur?
- What level of oral proficiency is required to ensure understanding?
- What strategies do student teachers employ to compensate for distorted/ambiguous communication?



As a participant, you are asked to present a lesson of approximately 45 minutes for your internship at the school where you are placed. This lesson will be observed and **video recorded**. These observations and recordings will be done in such a way as to be as non-disruptive to your classroom practice as possible. The recordings will be scrutinised and divided into sections in order to search for misunderstandings. The sections where misunderstandings occur will be analysed and described in the final results. You may receive the results if you so wish.

You are also asked to take part in a **focus group interview before** the recording of your lesson which will probably last about an hour. The interview will be conducted as a discussion about your awareness of misunderstandings, their type and their causes. To ensure the accuracy of responses, the interview will be recorded using an audio and video recorder. The interviews will be transcribed and participants who wish to review these transcripts before they are included in the study are welcome to do so. It might also be necessary for a **follow up interview** to clarify or expand on certain aspects which I may have identified. You are also asked to complete a **questionnaire** which will serve to inform the interview questions. If you are interested you will have the opportunity to receive the final written results if you so wish.

Participation is entirely **voluntary** and no one will be coerced or manipulated in any way to participate or provide certain information. You may at any time decide to withdraw if you feel you no longer wish to be part of the study and your wishes will be respected. The information provided by you will then also be withdrawn from the study.

All information gathered during the questionnaires, interviews and video recordings will be kept in the strictest confidence and will only be used for the purposes of the research. You are not required to provide your name or contact details and will remain **anonymous** by choosing a pseudonym.

The findings of this study will be presented in a doctoral thesis, articles and conference presentations. The thesis will, therefore, become public domain for scrutiny by examiners and other academics. However, I am bound by rules of integrity and ethical conduct as prescribed by the University of Pretoria and promise to abide by those rules. I will thus use the data collected for the purposes of research only.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please sign the accompanying letter as a declaration of your consent and that you participate in this project willingly and that you understand that you may withdraw from the research project at any time. Participation in this phase of the project does not

obligate you to participate in follow up individual interviews, however, should you decide to participate in follow-up interviews your participation is still voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. You will also have the opportunity to review the findings prior to publication and be able to provide advice on the accuracy of the information.

Yours sincerely

L J de Jager

PhD student

Tel: 012 420 5527

Cell: 083 554 2088

Dr R Evans (Supervisor)

Tel: 012 420 4272



## LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT

I, ..... have read the information contained in the *Invitation to Participate* and would like to voluntarily participate in this research study. I am aware of what is expected of me and that I have the right to withdraw at any time should I so wish, without having to provide a reason.

By signing this form, I give consent to the recording of any discussions relevant to this study and to the video recording of the lesson that I will present. I acknowledge that I am participating of my own free will and have not in any way been forced, manipulated or coerced into taking part.

.....  
Signed: participant

.....  
Date

Tel. ....

Email: .....

**Addendum J: Letters of assent: learners**



**Department of Humanities Education  
Faculty of Education, Groenkloof Campus, University of Pretoria, PRETORIA, 0002  
Republic of South Africa  
Tel: +27 12 420 5639 Fax: +27 12 420 5637**

.....

**05 May 2009**

Dear Learner

**LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE RESEARCH PROJECT ON:  
MISUNDERSTANDING IN AN INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING**

Sometimes when we want to find out something, we ask people for information to help us explain what we need to know. We then do what is called a project. I would like you to take part in this project so that you can help me find out what I need to know.

Let me tell you about the project first. This project will give me the chance to find out what kinds of misunderstandings happen during a lesson in class and what the possible reasons for them are. To help me do this I need to video record a lesson where you will be in class.

I would like to ask you to be part of this project as your parents/guardians/caregivers have already agreed that you can be part of this project if you want to. If you don't want to you don't have to. Everything was explained to your parents/guardians/caregivers and they said you could take part if you wanted to. You can talk to them or your teacher or any other adult you trust first before you decide if you want to take part or not.

This is what will happen: I will video record the lesson and so people will be able to see your face and hear your voice if I decide to show the video footage at discussions. If you wish to, you may choose a pseudonym and I promise not to tell anyone your name. You can also decide to let me use your real name if you want to. Just let me know.

If you do not want to ask or answer questions during the lesson, you don't have to. If you do, all of your answers will be kept private. No one, not even someone in your family or any of your teachers will hear your answers.

You can ask any questions about this project any time. If you agree to take part and you have questions later that you didn't think of now, you can phone me at 083 554 2088 or Dr Evans at 012 420 4272, or you can ask me when I visit your school next time.

You do not have to take part in this project. No one will be upset or angry if you don't want to do this. If you don't want to be in this project you just have to tell me. You can say yes or no and if you change your mind later you can quit any time. It's up to you.

Writing your name here means that you agree to take part in this project and that you know what will happen during the project. You also agree that I can take video recordings of you during the project and share these images during discussions as well as reports that I write about the project. If you decide to quit the project, all you have to do is tell me<sup>14</sup>.

Signature of learner: ..... Date: .....

Name: .....

Name of parent/guardian/caregiver: .....

Tel.: .....

Email: .....

---

<sup>14</sup> Letter template provided by Prof. L Ebersöhn

**Addendum K: Letters of consent: parents**



**Department of Humanities Education**

**Faculty of Education, Groenkloof Campus, University of Pretoria, PRETORIA, 0002**

**Republic of South Africa**

**Tel: +27 12 420 5639 Fax: +27 12 420 5637**

.....  
**05 May 2009**

Dear Parent/Guardian/Caregiver

**LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE RESEARCH PROJECT ON:  
MISUNDERSTANDING IN AN INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING**

I am conducting research on **speech act performance and misunderstandings that occur in the classroom**. The aim of my study is to investigate the reasons for the occurrence of misunderstanding in the classroom.

The main question driving this research is:

**To what extent are misunderstandings the result of English second language (L2) student teachers' oral proficiency?**

The following sub questions will further guide the study:

- How/when do misunderstandings occur?
- What level of oral proficiency is required to ensure understanding?
- What strategies do student teachers employ to compensate for distorted/ambiguous communication?

My focus in this study is on the student teacher interacting with the class in which your child is a learner. The student teacher will present a lesson to the class which will be video recorded. As such your child may be video recorded. Although I am not concerned with the biographical detail of any child as such, I will study **facial expressions and gestures, as well as verbal responses** as they relate to the student teacher and the learning that takes place in the classroom.

Participation is entirely **voluntary** and no one will be coerced or manipulated in any way to participate or provide certain information. A participant may at any time decide to withdraw if they feel they no longer wish to be part of the study and their wishes will be respected. In such an event the child will still remain in the class and not lose out on any teaching and/or learning, but will be placed outside of the line of vision of the camera and not be recorded. The information provided by the child so far will then also be withdrawn from the study.

All information gathered during the video recordings will be kept in the strictest confidence and will only be used for the purposes of the research. Participants are not required to provide their names or contact details and will remain **anonymous** throughout the study by choosing a pseudonym. Where possible, faces will be blocked out, unless this causes important information to be lost. Permission will be requested from you and your child before using any video footage in presentations.

The findings of this study will be presented in a doctoral thesis, articles and conference presentations. The thesis will, therefore, become public domain for scrutiny by examiners and other academics. However, I am bound by rules of integrity and ethical conduct as prescribed by the University of Pretoria and promise to abide by those rules. I will thus use the information for the purposes of this study only.

If you are willing to allow your child to be present in class during the filming of the lesson, please sign the accompanying letter as a declaration of your consent and that you allow your child to be present as part of this project willingly and that you understand that you may withdraw your child from the research project at any time.

Yours sincerely

L J de Jager

PhD student

Tel: 012 420 5527

Cell: 083 554 2088

Dr R Evans (Supervisor)

Tel: 012 420 4272



**LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT**

I, ..... have read the information contained in the *Letter of Informed Consent* and give permission that my child may be captured on video during a lesson presented by the student teacher. I am aware of what is expected of my child and that I have the right to withdraw my child at any time should I so wish, without having to provide a reason.

By signing this form, I give consent to having any verbal and/or non-verbal information possibly provided by my child relevant to this study video recorded. I acknowledge that I am allowing my child to be present voluntarily and that I have not in any way been forced, manipulated or coerced into giving that permission.

.....  
Signed: Parent/Guardian/Caretaker                      Date

Name: .....

Tel.: .....

Email: .....



**Addendum L: Permission: access to schools**



24 April 2009

Dear Principal

**Permission to conduct research in your school**

Thank you for allowing me access to your school and to the student teachers involved in my research. I really appreciate your goodwill and support.

As stated in our informal meeting, the learners and parents in the classes involved have all received letters of information and letters of consent. As soon as all these signed letters have been received, I will start with the research.

Please be assured of my ethical conduct at all times. If you require further information, please contact me or my supervisor.

Regards

L J de Jager  
[lizette.dejager@up.ac.za](mailto:lizette.dejager@up.ac.za)  
0835542088

Dr. R Evans  
[revans@postino.up.ac.za](mailto:revans@postino.up.ac.za)  
0124204272