CHAPTER EIGHT

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous three chapters dealt with the analysis and presentation of the results derived from both the quantitative and qualitative research methods. The presentation included the selection of the data that provide answers to the research questions outlined in Chapter One of the study. In the present chapter, the research questions will be dealt with in their chronological order by using the data from both the quantitative (Chapters Five and Six) and qualitative (Chapter Seven) analysis commonly known as qual-quan, (cf. Chapter three, Section 3.2, paragraph 4). By so doing, the researcher will reveal whether the data complement or contradict one another. Below each research question, the data used from Chapters Five and Six will be referred to in terms of the applicable table number but they will not be reproduced. Each research question will be dealt with through the views of the teachers and the learners presented separately, followed by a summary that will demonstrate whether the views of the two groups of respondents concur or diverge. The research questions will be answered in chronological order, but the data from Chapters Five and Six, mainly presented in tabular form, will not necessarily be used in chronological order. Rather, the relevance of the data to the research question being answered will dictate which data to use at which stage.

Consequently, there will be cross-references between tables and within tables. The answers to the research questions will cumulatively address the main problem under investigation, namely *The role of* CS *in teaching and learning in selected senior secondary schools in Botswana*.

In this chapter the researcher will also review the literature discussed in Chapter Two in an attempt to provide some answers to some questions that emanated from the review. Because of the inter-relatedness of the research questions, some of the responses were found to be relevant to more than one research question. However, such responses were not repeated – the researcher only referred to them.

The main research questions that directed the collection of data for the study are as follows:

1. *What are the defining characteristics of the phenomenon of* CS*?*
2. *To what extent is CS used in educational settings in Botswana?*
3. *Can the phenomena in the classrooms of Botswana be called* CS*?*
4. *Question Four was divided into four parts, as follows:*
    - *What are the didactic consequences of* CS *in the schools?*
    - *Is* CS *educationally beneficial?*
    - *Does the use of CS in a classroom situation slow down the pace of teaching and learning to the extent that it is detrimental to content coverage within the prescribed time?*
    - *Is the practice of* CS *from English to Setswana in a classroom situation discriminatory to non-Setswana speakers?*
5. *Question Five was also divided into three parts as follows:*
    - *Does the use of* CS *in a classroom situation violate the LiEP in Botswana?*
    - *Is the LiEP in harmony with the practical realities of the classroom situation?*
    - *If this were the case, should the LiEP be revised to ensure that the LoLT promotes maximum delivery and acquisition of knowledge and skills development?*
6 *Does the current LiEP and practice promote negative perceptions about Setswana and other local languages?*

8.2 RESEARCH QUESTION ONE: WHAT ARE THE DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PHENOMENON OF CS?

This question was answered mainly through information from the literature review pertaining to what the other scholars said about what CS is. First, the MLF model (Myers-Scotton, 1993a) and the MLP (Kamwangamalu, 1989a, 1990, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 267) used as conceptual framework in the present study will be applied to the data drawn from the qualitative data collected through classroom observations to determine whether the phenomenon that transpires in the classroom is

CS as universally defined or not. If that is not the case, an attempt will be made to describe how the phenomenon that occurs in the classrooms of Botswana violates what constitutes CS according to various authors consulted in the literature review (Auer, 1984; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Kieswetter, 1995; Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Kamwangamalu, 1996, 2000; Heredia & Altarriba, 2001; Li, 2002; Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004). Second, in attempting to establish the function of this phenomenon in a teaching and learning situation, Hymes' SPEAKING mnemonic will be applied.

Several scholars (cf. Chapter Two, Section 2.3.1) essentially agree on the following as the defining characteristics of CS:

- In CS there must be at least two languages: the ML (dominant language) that plays the dominant role in CS and, as such, its syntactic structure is preserved or remains unchanged; and the EL (guest language), which takes the morphological and phonological structure of the ML and, as such, its syntactic structure is violated. Consequently, the internal constituent structure of the EL items conforms to the constituent structure of the host language.
- The speaker(s) who engage(s) in the two languages must be fluent in both.
- CS takes place when a speaker or speakers use(s) the two languages in the same conversation in conversational turns or within the same sentence of a turn.
- There is a difference between CS, CM, and borrowing: Whilst CS involves using two or more languages within the same conversational turn (inter-sentential CS) or within the same sentence of that turn (intra-sentential CS), CM refers to the use of linguistic units that contain morphemes from both languages (host and guest languages) within single words that have not been phonologically and morphologically integrated into the host language (Kieswetter, 1955: 22).
- Borrowing involves the use of borrowed words or phrases that are assimilated phonologically, morphologically, syntactically and lexically into the host language (Bokamba, 1988 and Herbert, 1994, in Kieswetter, 1995, 13-14 and 18-19 respectively).

Focusing on the classroom situation in Botswana, the main languages used are English and Setswana. In CS, English plays a lesser role and therefore, it is the EL; Setswana plays a major role in CS, and is the ML as its syntactic structure licenses the use of linguistic units from the EL. English is the official LoLT in the teaching of all school subjects except in the teaching of Setswana as a subject. Consequently, it is expected that the teaching of all subjects be done in English only, except in the teaching of Setswana, which is expected to be done in Setswana only. Yet, from the quantitative and the qualitative data collected through respectively questionnaires and lesson observations, it has been observed that CS between English and Setswana takes place in the classroom irrespective of the subject taught. However, there is more CS during lessons of content subjects than during lessons of language subjects. To some extent, CS also takes place in a Setswana class from Setswana to English, but not at the same rate as the use of Setswana during lessons of subjects taught in English, particularly content subjects.

Examining the data from the classroom, the researcher will seek to establish if the phenomenon that occurs in the classrooms in Botswana conforms to the characteristics of CS outlined above. The examples will be drawn from several lessons in the subjects observed in the study, and, more specifically, from those that have been transcribed (cf. Addendum C).

As already demonstrated from the presentation of the qualitative data in the previous chapter, the data collected from the classroom reveal several incidents of CS involving mainly English and Setswana (cf. Extracts 11, 12, 16 – 21 for CS to Setswana; and Extracts 22 and 23 for CS to English). Extract 37 below provides an example of CS in the classroom during a Biology lesson.

Extract 37: Biology lesson

Te: …We mentioned that the globule molecules **tse e leng gore di dule le** the
Which were removed with
filtrates, remember **ha re <u>expecta</u> go bona** a filtrate to the tissue fluid. **Gakere**?

here we expect to see *isn't it so*?

C: **Ee**.

Yes.

Te: **Ee! Ke rile** that is equivalent or similar to the tissues fluid.

Yes, I said……..

Now **ke yone e e leng gore re a go e bitsa re re ke the** filtrate.

it is the one which we are going to call ……..

The extract above shows that CS mainly takes place between English and Setswana. The teacher can choose to initiate the discourse either in English and then switch over to Setswana (cf. line 1 above); or vice versa (cf. line 4 above) within the same sentence or from one sentence to the other. This flexible use of English and Setswana demonstrates the teacher's fluency in both languages. The example also shows that the ML is Setswana and the EL is English as the verb used in the extract **expecta** (line 2) is a result of nonce borrowing. An English verb *expect*, which has been affixed with the Setswana suffix **–a** so that it assumes the morphological structure of Setswana. Therefore, the syntactic structure of Setswana remains unchanged while that of English is violated because English does not form verbs by using **–a** as suffixes. The result is that the internal constituent structure of English conforms to the constituent structure of Setswana. Extract 38 below from Transcription 1 (Biology lesson) demonstrates the use of English verbs that have taken the morphological and phonological structure of Setswana to conform to its syntactic structure when used in a sentence.

Extract 38: Biology lesson

(Lines 98 -102)

Te: **Ga tweng**?

What are you saying?

Ln 6: ( ) further explains in Setswana

Te: **Ee**.

Yes.

Ln 6: ( ) **… go patchiwa.**

… *to patch.*

Te: Go **patchiwa ha kae**?

Where do we patch?

(Lines 134 - 135)

Te: **Ga le itse**? Le teng la high blood! **Ee, ka re jaanong motho yoo o ka advisiwa**

You don't know? It is there of…! Yes, I am saying that person can be advised

gore a je eng thata, **a seka a ja eng thata**? **Ke yone potso yame**.

that he / she should eat more of what, and less of what? That is my question.

(Lines 142 - 146)

Te: **Go raya gore** instead of getting … **go raya gore** in other words, water can be

It means that……..... it means that……

diverted … instead of the person urinating frequently, the person can remove faeces frequently.

C: [LAUGHTER, SOME SHOWING SURPRISE.]

T: **Nnyaya, mme ke botse potso ele nngwe hela hela**. Ha motho a tsenywe ke mala

No, let me ask one question only. If a person has diarrhoea

go a diragala gore a urineite kgapetsa?

Does it happen that he / she should urinate frequently?

(Lines 169 - 173)

Te: **Ee**! So **batho ba** ( ) will always be advised not to take in a lot of proteins, but

Yes! … these people …….

to take in a lot of roughage **jaaka a ne a bua … Ka goreng**? **Ka gore mpa e ta a**

……like he was saying…why? Because the stomach will be

tala … **e tala ee…**what can be removed very fast but **go sa forme** a lot of toxic

full … it will be full yes…….. but without forming ……

material **eleng** the urea; **ke a utwala**?

which is …..; Am I understood?

C: **Ee**.

Yes.

The following English verbs, which appear in the extract above and have already been presented in Chapter Seven, have assumed Setswana suffixes as a result of nonce borrowing so that they conform to Setswana morphological structure in the sentences in which they have been used:

1. Go patch-**iwa** (lines 101 - 102)
   To be patched
2. Advis-**iwa** (line 134)
   To be advised
3. Urene**ite** (line 146)
   Urinate
4. Form-e (line 171)
   Form

The use of English verbs in this manner was not unique to the Biology class. Other teachers also used them in the teaching of other subjects, as exemplified by the following:

1. **o appear –a** (Home Economics)
   she appears
2. **a chusa** (Home Economics)
   when choosing
3. **go prioritaez-a** (Setswana)
   to prioritize
4. **Clean-ang** (History)
   You (plural) clean

CS is also classified as either inter-sentential, or intra-sentential, or emblematic (tag-like). All these forms of CS were used during the lessons as illustrated and explained in the previous chapter (cf. Extracts 11, 12, 16 - 20, 22 and 23). Both the teachers of content and language subjects employed all three the forms of CS. Contrary to the observation made by Moyo (1996) that more competent bilinguals tended to use intra-

sentential CS, while less competent bilinguals tended to use inter-sentential CS in the form of emblematic switches, this was not the case in the present study. It was observed that the teachers employed all three the forms of CS, yet none displayed a lack of proficiency in English.

The data from the classroom therefore shows that CS was used by the teachers across the different subjects as defined in Chapter Two (cf. Section 2.3.1). The data generally conformed to all the characteristics of CS in that CS essentially involved English and Setswana. Although in the classroom English is supposed to be the main language and therefore the dominant language in CS, in actual fact the reverse is true; it is mainly Setswana that licences how CS should take place. English is the EL as previously explained (cf. Section 8.2 above). The teachers were generally fluent in both Setswana and English, and the two languages were used mainly in the same conversation inter-sententially or intra-sententially. Furthermore, Setswana as the ML had its syntactic structure preserved, while that of English, the guest language, was violated such that the morphosyntactic structure of English was affected. The end result was that the English constituent structure conformed to the morphosyntactic structure of Setswana. However, in some cases, especially during the lessons of the content subjects, there was extensive use of Setswana in lieu of English, the official LoLT. It was this excessive use of Setswana during the lessons of the subjects that were supposedly taught in 'English' that the researcher found problematic. In a CS situation, the language of the event should be easily identified. However, in many of the classes in the content subjects, it was not so easy to identify English as the LoLT because of the simultaneous use of both English and Setswana throughout the duration of the lesson. This issue will be further dealt with under Research Question Three that addresses whether the phenomenon that occurs in the Botswana classrooms can rightly be referred to as CS.

Moyo (1996) further asserted that CS constituted a register that could be described as a third variety of a given profession or vocation. The researcher, however, does not share this notion as already described in Chapter Two (Section 2.5). Instead, she shares the view of Akindele and Letsoela (2001) that CS is used as a teaching strategy. What emerged from the present study is that, what may be regarded as new vocabulary is, in fact, words that are a result of nonce-borrowing or borrowing proper. However,

Moyo qualified his observation by stating that often such words are used in informal conversations. The present study focuses on CS in a formal environment such as the classroom, so the use of such vocabulary would only be limited to spoken communication; but not be used in written communication. Furthermore, what Moyo described as the speaker's affiliation to dual cultures as a result of CS is, in fact, the use of CS to show one's educational level, as was the case during Setswana lessons when teachers CS.

8.3 RESEARCH QUESTION TWO: TO WHAT EXTENT IS CS USED IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS IN BOTSWANA?

This research question was answered by analyzing the teachers' responses to the questions contained in Tables 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, 5.19, and 5.20 (cf. Chapter Five); and the learners' responses to the questions contained in Tables 6.4, 6.14, 6.15, 6.18, and 6.19 (cf. Chapter Six). The questions were mainly on CS between English and Setswana. The teachers were asked about:

- their attitude towards CS in general;
- the extent to which they CS in the classroom;
- instances when they allowed their learners to CS;
- when the learners CS without being sanctioned by the teacher; and
- the teachers' CS to a local language.

8.3.1. Teachers' responses

a. Attitude towards CS

The results showed that there were more teachers than not, irrespective of the subject they taught, who did not approve of the learners' CS in class. However, the extent of disapproval varied between teachers of content subjects and teachers of language subjects. This was indicated by 54% of the teachers of subjects taught in 'English', 64% of Setswana teachers, and 69% of all the teachers in the study (irrespective of the subject taught) who disapproved of CS to a local language, such as Ikalanga (cf. Table 5.5). The results suggest that although CS is used, some teachers, irrespective of the subject they teach, do not support its use by the learners. The results also showed that

Setswana teachers strongly disapproved of the learners' CS to English, more than the teachers of subjects taught in English disapproved of CS to Setswana. In fact, none of the Setswana teachers said CS use during Setswana lessons did not bother them. Only a few teachers of the subjects taught in English (3%), indicated that the practice did not bother them. The results further revealed that the majority of the teachers objected more to CS from English to a local language than to Setswana, and even than from Setswana to English. This suggests that CS to a local language was more unlikely to take place than CS to either Setswana or to English. Again the results suggest that CS was more likely to occur during classes taught in English than during Setswana classes.

b. CS from English to Setswana

The results also showed that there were more teachers (53%) who said they do not CS from English to Setswana in a class taught in English, and from Setswana to English during a Setswana lesson than those who said they do (47%). One teacher further stated that he CS between English and a local language (cf. Table 5.7). The results suggest that although CS is used in the classroom, not all the teachers are in support of its use. The results also showed that there were more teachers who allowed their learners to CS to Setswana or to English in their classes (58%). However, 42% of the teachers said they never allowed their learners to CS during their lessons. Twenty-five percent of these were teachers of Setswana; and 17% were teachers of subjects taught in English. The results imply that Setswana is used as an alternative LoLT in the classroom even though there is no official pronouncement on this practice. This practice signals the presence of CS in teaching and learning.

Furthermore, the results showed that CS was limited to oral communication as stated by 58% of the teachers of the subjects taught in 'English' (cf. Table 5.9). This seemed to suggest that CS was strictly a strategy for facilitating spoken communication in class essentially where there was a problem of communication in the official language of instruction. The other 42% were Setswana teachers who stated that learners were allowed to use Setswana in both speaking and writing as was expected.

c. CS from Setswana to English (during a Setswana lesson)

The results (cf. Table 5.13) showed that the majority of the teachers of Setswana (84%) CS to English during their lessons to clarify a particular point that seemed unclear when explained in Setswana. However, 64% of them said that they did not allow their learners to CS to English even if they had difficulty explaining themselves in Setswana. The results showed that CS also took place in Setswana classes; and that the teachers freely CS, as and whenever they needed to during the lesson. However, the same dispensation was not extended to the learners, as shown by only 36% of teachers who admitted that they allowed the learners to CS to English in their classes. However, some Setswana teachers, even though they were in the minority, recognized the value of CS in class, namely that it served to facilitate teaching and learning by either the teacher or the learner where the LoLT (English for subjects taught in English and Setswana during Setswana lessons) in use was not effective.

d. CS to a local language

CS to a local language minimally occurred as stated by the 63% of the teachers (cf. Table 5.19). Ikalanga was given as the main local language to which CS took place, as stated by 96% of the 78 teachers who responded (cf. Table 5.20). This was expected, given that Ikalanga is the language of the area in which the research was based, spoken by over 50% of the teachers. This suggests that in rare cases, CS also involved a local language.

8.3.2. Learners' responses

Learners were also asked about their attitude towards CS in general; the extent of their own CS in class; the extent of the teachers' CS, be it from English to Setswana or vice versa; and the extent of the teachers' CS to a local language. Their responses were as follows:

- The results showed that, generally, the learners' opinion about the teachers' CS was positive (Table 6.4).
- Thirty-nine percent of the learners said they had no objection to the teachers' CS from English to Setswana, but 23% objected. Similarly, 42% of the

learners stated that they did not object to the teachers' CS to a local language; but only 27% objected. However, there were more learners who stated that they did not support CS from Setswana to English in a Setswana class than those who said they had no objection (36% vs. 34%).

- The results suggest that the majority of the learners did not object to CS to either Setswana or to a local language, but they seemed to have a problem with CS to English in a Setswana class.
- Furthermore, the majority of the learners indicated that they supported the teacher's CS for the promotion of learning.

The results (cf. Table 6.14) showed that the number of learners who stated that they sometimes CS from Setswana to English in a Setswana class and those who said they never do was almost the same (55: 56). The results suggest that CS occurs in a Setswana class and that both the teachers and learners used it. However, the teachers were reluctant to extend the same dispensation to learners (cf. Table 6.15), as indicated by 58% and 62% respectively. CS to a local language also took place, as stated by 53% of the learners. However, this form of CS was not as common as CS to Setswana or to English as evidenced by 47% who said it did not occur (cf. Table 6.18). Ninety percent of the learners named Ikalanga as the local language to which some teachers normally CS in class (cf. Table 6.19). This is not unexpected, given the fact that Ikalanga is the home language of the majority of the learners (over 46%) and is further spoken by 70% of the learners, including those for whom it was not a HL. The other local languages were hardly used in class.

The results suggest that although CS in the classroom was mainly between English and Setswana, at times it also involved a local language, Ikalanga.

8.3.3 Summary of teachers' and learners' attitudes towards CS

The results showed that generally the teachers CS and also allowed the learners to CS, and that CS takes place during the lessons of subjects taught in "English" as well as during Setswana lessons. Where CS was allowed, it was restricted to spoken communication only. Generally, the teachers' and the learners' attitudes towards CS were positive even though the former (teachers) expressed concern about its use by the

learners. This was contrary to the findings by Lawson and Sachdev (2000) from their study of CS in a university environment in Tunisia. They found that the general attitudes towards CS in a formal learning environment, like the classroom, were negative. In the present study, both the teachers and learners viewed it as educationally beneficial. However, Setswana teachers felt more strongly about its use by the learners than the teachers of the other subjects. In fact, most of the Setswana teachers said that CS during Setswana lessons bothered them, while very few of the other teachers, indicated that the practice did not bother them (64% vs. 3%). The results also suggest that CS also involved a local language, such as Ikalanga. This shows that although no other local language besides Setswana is taught or used officially in the school system, the usefulness of these languages in education cannot be denied.

The results further revealed that, on the one hand, the majority of the teachers objected more to CS from English to a local language than from English and Setswana. On the other hand, the majority of the learners did not object to CS to either Setswana or a local language, but they seemed to have a problem with CS to English in a Setswana class.

The results also showed that both the teachers and the learners agreed that there was CS during Setswana lessons even though some of the teachers said that they did not allow it. The same view was confirmed by the learners, namely that the majority of the teachers of Setswana did not allow their learners to CS. This was ironic; if teachers CS, they should allow their learners to do likewise.

8.3.4 The qualitative data

The data from the observations of the lessons also confirmed the teachers' and the learners' responses that there is CS irrespective of the subject taught, the school setting (urban or peri-urban), the teachers' gender, and the class level (grade) taught. A similar observation was made by Akindele and Letsoela (2001). The data revealed that even though CS was used across the different subjects, its prevalent use was found more during the lessons of the content subjects than during the lessons of the language subjects (cf. Addendum C). The reason for this could be that CS in a lesson on a

language subject would be contrary to the objective of language development that is primary in such lessons. However, during lessons of content subjects, the primary objective is to ensure the comprehension of the contents of the lessons among learners.

The LiEP of Botswana states that all subjects, apart from Setswana, should be taught in English. Despite this formal policy, CS to Setswana was found to be a common occurrence in the classroom. It mainly occurred during the lessons of content subjects (Biology, Home Economics, and History) than during the lessons of language subjects (English and Setswana). Apart from being used to greet the learners and to convey housekeeping matters at the beginning of the lesson, CS was also used to present the lesson material, as illustrated in Chapter Seven: Extract 6: Biology, Extract 7: Home Economics, Extracts 18 and 20-21: History. CS in an English (L and L) lesson occurred at discourse initiation stage to greet the learners, but during the course of the lesson its use was minimal (cf. Extracts 11-13 and Extract 30 respectively). Conversely, during Setswana lessons, CS occurred from Setswana to English as demonstrated in Extracts 22-23 and 32-36, also referred to in Chapter Seven.

a. CS during the lessons of content subjects

Evidence from classroom observations showed that CS was more prevalent during the lessons of the content subjects. For instance, during the Biology class, the teacher initiated the discourse by greeting the class in Setswana, and called them to order in preparation for the formal part of the lesson (cf. Extract 1). As soon as the formal part of the lesson began, she switched to English; and as the lesson progressed, she CS to Setswana but still delivering the academic content of the lesson (Extract 6). Throughout the lesson, the teacher maintained the same style of alternating between the use of English and Setswana. The extract (and Extract 7, as well) shows that although the lesson was supposed to be conducted in English, CS was used throughout the duration of the lesson. At discourse finalization stage, the teacher switched back to Setswana (cf. Extract 4).

The use of Setswana at discourse initiation stage to exchange greetings, to perform housekeeping matters, to call the class to order, and also at discourse finalization stage to communicate non-academic issues, suggests that Setswana is the language to use

when communicating socio-educational matters in the classroom. However, the teacher was aware that English was the expected language to use when delivering the lesson, hence he / she switched from Setswana to English as soon as the formal segment of the lesson began. This practice was short-lived as the teacher switched back to Setswana during the course of the lesson (Extract 6). In addition, social utterances, such as 'asides' (Extract 8) or admonitions (Extract 9) were made in Setswana as previously presented in Chapter Seven.

The same pattern of CS use was also observed during the lessons of other content subjects as already demonstrated in the previous chapter (cf. Extracts 2, 5 and 7 for Home Economics and Extract 3 for History). However, it is worth noting that there was minimal use of CS and other related concepts such as borrowing or CM during this particular History lesson compared to other lessons of content subjects. This was an exception but not the norm as evidenced during the other History lessons observed.

b. CS during English (L and L) lessons

The situation was different during English (L and L) lessons. There was minimal CS and often Setswana was limited to the exchange of greetings at discourse initiation stage (Extract 10). The teacher greeted the class in Setswana, but instead of responding in Setswana, the learners responded in English. Thereafter, the main language of communication was English. Evidence shows that the learners had understood the rule, namely that communication was in English only, even though the teacher would CS to Setswana. If any CS was employed, it was during the development stage of the lesson. The most frequently used form of CS was emblematic CS (Extract 12) in the form of a tag **ga ke re**, which has no English translation but is used to imply that the listener is following what is being said, or is in agreement. It has a phatic function and its use is not in any way linked to the speaker's proficiency in English or the lack of it. Rather, it occurs in the speech of Setswana speakers regardless of what language is being used. The discourse finalization was done in English, and no CS was used (cf. Extract 13).

c. CS during Setswana lessons

CS during Setswana lessons, be it grammar or literature, was minimal. Greetings were always exchanged in Setswana; and the introduction of the lesson was also made in Setswana with a gradual infusion of borrowing (Extract 14). During the development stage of the lesson, minimal CS was employed (cf. Extracts 22 and 23). Evidence from the classroom showed that Setswana teachers engaged borrowing (nonce borrowing and borrowing proper) more than CS (cf. Extracts 32, 33-36 and 42). At the end, the lesson was concluded in Setswana (Extract 15).

The data therefore revealed that, during the lessons of the content subjects, CS was used throughout; whilst during English (L and L) lessons, it was limited to greetings at discourse initiation stage and was used minimally thereafter. Contrarily, during Setswana lessons, CS was not used at discourse initiation and finalization stages: its use was during the development stage of the lesson. However, the use of borrowing was more significant than the use of CS.

8.3.5 Functions of CS in the classroom

(a) CS to deliver the lesson content

The extent of CS use also revealed its functions. Observation revealed that CS was used to deliver the lesson content, as well as for social functions. These functions are further explained below.

CS use for delievering the lesson content was prevalent during the lessons of content subjects than during the lessons of language subjects. Often the teacher initiated the discourse in English, be it an explanation or a question. Recognizing that what he / she is saying may not be readily comprehensible to the learners, he / she then switched to Setswana as the lesson progressed. Thereafter, the alternate use of the two languages continued throughout the lesson (cf. Chapter Seven, Extract 6 for a Biology lesson and Extract 25 for a Home Economics lesson). Owing to the teacher's switching to Setswana, the learners understood this to mean that they, too, could respond in Setswana. The teacher did not object to the learners' use of Setswana, and the lesson progressed through the use of the two languages. All three the forms of CS -- intra-

sentential CS, inter-sentential CS, and emblematic CS -- were employed during the discourse. The prevalent use of CS in this way implied that it was used mainly as a teaching strategy (Adendorff, 1993; Akindele & Letsoela, 2001). The primary concern for the teachers of these subjects was to promote understanding of the lesson content among learners because they knew that the learners' English language proficiency was inadequate.

During English (L and L) lessons, CS was also used to facilitate teaching, even though minimally so (cf. Chapter Seven Extract 11). Both intra-sentential and inter-sentential CS were used in the discourse. The former (intra-sentential CS) is used to complete a sentence that is used to explain the content of the lesson, and the latter (inter-sentential CS) is used to emphasise the message presented in the previous sentence uttered in English. During the lesson, the learners' utterances are limited to brief answers in English, or responses denoting agreement or disagreement through the use of either 'yes' or 'no' in a chorus (Arthur, 2001). It appears that during the lessons of English (L and L), the rule is well understood that participation on the part of the learners is in English only. Once again, only the teachers have the prerogative to minimally CS or even to employ borrowing. The same freedom is not extended to the learners. CS was also used to repeat in Setswana for clarification purposes, the lesson material already presented in the LoLT (cf. Chapter Seven, Extract 30). This way CS is used instructionally.

During Setswana lessons, CS use was very minimal; rather it was the different forms of borrowing -- nonce borrowing and borrowing proper, as well as CM as demonstrated in the previous chapter (cf. section 7.8) that were used more (for instructional purposes). The use of CS or any of its related concepts was during the formal part of the lesson (cf. Extract 22 and 23). None of the teachers observed used English at discourse-initiation stage to greet the class or to discuss housekeeping matters with their classes. Similarly, at discourse-closure stage, the teacher wound up the lesson in Setswana, including dismissing the class. In some instances of CS use or borrowing or CM, it seemed the teacher compensated for some deficiency in Setswana terminology to name or explain a particular concept, especially where reference was being made to a concept or situation originally foreign to Setswana culture. A similar observation was made by Hussein (1999) from his study on the use of CS in a university

environment in Jordan. He observed that, because his informants were studying Arabic, they switched to English where English terms had no Arabic equivalents, especially for scientific concepts. In the researcher's view, this is not CS, but nonce borrowing. This also confirms the observation made by Kembo-Sure and Webb (2000: 123) that words that refer to technology often prompt the use of nonce borrowing or even borrowing proper. In this way, CS was used as a deferential strategy (Appel & Muysken, 1987), when the speaker realizes that he / she lacks knowledge of the language being used or lacks facility in that language on a certain topic being discussed. This practice occurred in the Setswana lessons as soon as the formal part of the lesson had begun until the lesson had ended. The teascher reverted to Setswana in order to conclude the lesson.

b. CS is used to perform social functions

CS was used to perform the following social functions in the classroom:

- To exchange greetings at the initial stage of the lesson and to dismiss the class at the final stage of the lesson (cf. Extract 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13 in Chapter 5). This was observed during the lessons of subjects taught in English. This is similar to CS use for closure (Blommaert (1992, in Kamwangamalu, 2000); Nwoye (1992, in Moodley, 2001); Martin-Jones, 1994);
- to perform housekeeping matters at the beginning of the lesson (cf. Extract 2 and 3);
- to signal exasperation (cf. Extract 8 above): this is an expressive function of CS (Myers-Scotton, 1993a);
- to show impatience and to admonish the class (cf. Extract 9 above): a phatic function (Myers-Scotton, 1993a);
- to check if learners are following the lesson (cf. Extract 26): (Arthur, 2001; Adendorff, 1993; Akindele & Letsoela, 2001); and
- to amuse the class (cf. Extract 27).
- To communicate in a sarcastic way (Extract 31, lines 5-6).
- to show one of the phatic functions, namely group identification or group membership / solidarity (Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Nwoye (1992, in

Moodley, 2001; Kieswetter, 1995; Flowers (2000, in Moodley, 2001; Akindele & Letsoela, 2001; Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Moodley, 2001): This was the most common form of CS and was used mainly when teachers initiated the discourse in Setswana to greet their classes. This is a marker of group identification -- to show group membership or group solidarity -- by the teachers with their learners; namely, that they were members of the same linguistic community. Setswana as a national language is spoken by almost all learners even though it is not a MT for a significant proportion of them, as previously explained in Chapter Six. When CS is used in this way, it is said to be a *sequential unmarked choice* within Myers-Scotton's MM (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 114; Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Molosiwa, 2006). However, because it occurs in a class that is supposed to be taught in English, CS becomes a marked choice.

- to demonstrate ethnic identity (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Myers-Scotton, 1993a): This form of CS use was very rare, except in an instance in which one English Language teacher opted to use the local language (Ikalanga) to greet his class. Although 18% of the teachers and 46% of the learners said Ikalanga was their HL, it was generally not used during the lessons observed.
- to serve as a positive reinforcement in the form of a praise after a learner had given a correct answer (cf. Extract 33) -- CS use this way serves a phatic function;
- to show the teacher's level of education (cf. Extract 32). In the latter instance, Moyo (1996: 27) observed that CS use in this way may mark 'some ambivalent ethnic identity, which usually indicates the speakers' dual affiliation to the two cultures'. However, the researcher concurs with Gibbons (1983), Kieswetter (1995), Moodley (2001), and Tshinki (2002) that the speakers (and teachers) used CS as a sign of their educational level or social identity or even prestige (Tshinki, 2002) rather than as a sign of 'ethnic identity'.
- to show authority and / or annoyance (cf. Extract 35);
- CS as a strategy for neutrality (cf. Extract 32);
- and owing to the topic discussed (Blom & Gumperz, 1972, in Gumperz & Hymes, 1986; Hoffman (1991, in Tshinki, 2002; Gxilishe, 1992 and

Elridge, 1996, in Moodley, 2001; Moodley, 2001; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Tshinki, 2002) (cf. Extracts 32 and 36).

In addition to the above social functions, CS can also be used as follows:

- CS as a deferential strategy: this is when the addressee responds to the first speaker in the language he / she deems appropriate for the occasion instead of the language used by the first speaker (Myers-Scotton, 1993). This form of CS was used minimally, such as when the teacher initiated his question in English, but did not get any response from the learners. Therefore, he decided to repeat the same question in Setswana. One learner responded to the question in English even though the teacher had repeated the question in Setswana (cf. Extract 30). This form of response was an exception rather than a rule. The learner seemed to have understood that English was the appropriate language of communication during this lesson. This form of CS use was observed during a History lesson as well as during an English (L and L) lesson.
- to show emphasis (Gumperz & Hymes, 1986; Hoffman (1991, in Tshinki, 2002); Gila, 1995; Kieswetter, 1995; Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Ncoko (1998, in Moodley, 2001; Moodley, 2001; Tshinki, 2002): The same example in Extract 30 can serve as an illustration of the use of CS to show emphasis. The teacher CS to Setswana to repeat a question asked initially in English.

- CS as a strategy for neutrality (Myers-Scotton, 1993a): this form of CS is used when the speaker employs two codes at the same time because he / she realizes that the use of each of the two codes has its own value in terms of the costs and rewards which accrue with its use. The speaker avoids speaking only one code so as not to commit himself / herself to a single Rights and Obligations Sets (RO Sets) (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). While the use of CS in this way gives the speaker a dual identity, it also serves as a strategy for neutrality. In a class that is taught in English, the use of Setswana gives the speaker the benefits of using both languages. This form of CS is common in the classroom, especially during the lessons of content subjects (cf. Chapter Seven, Extract 29). Setswana teachers also employed

> this form of CS as well as borrowing (cf. Extracts 32). The teacher CS back and forth between English and Setswana or vice versa. This form of CS is not only a strategy for neutrality but is also a display of linguistic versatility. In addition, the use of CS in this way is meant to encourage the learners to participate in the learning process (Adendorff, 1993; Arthur, 2001).

Consequently, CS can either be from English to Setswana during the classes of subjects taught in 'English'; or it can be from Setswana to English in a Setswana class. The former was more prevalent during the teaching of content subjects (History, Home Economics and Biology) than during the teaching of English (L and L). It should also be noted that during English (L and L) classes, CS was used minimally both for educational and social functions. The explanation for this scenario was that the teachers of English were required to be exemplary in assisting the learners to acquire proficiency in English. This included teaching in English and also encouraging their learners to speak English. CS during their classes was viewed as behaviour that was contrary to the objectives of English (L and L) teaching.

Although the respondents stated that there was limited CS to a local language, the qualitative data did not support this. None of the teachers used the local language to present the lesson content or even asked a learner to respond in Ikalanga, except for two isolated incidents. One teacher greeted his class in the local language (Ikalanga) to show ethnic identity or to show solidarity (Molosiwa, 2006) as already mentioned above; and another teacher of Setswana asked a learner if he wanted to respond to the teacher's question in Ikalanga. However, the offer was declined and the learner responded in Setswana.

The teachers used both discourse-related CS and participant-related CS (Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2004). The former organizes conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance and, in the latter, switches correspond to the preferences of the individual who performs the switching or those of co-participants in the conversation (Auer, 1984, 1998, in Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004: 502). Teachers used *discourse-related* CS as the lesson progressed to make asides (Extract 8), to quote, or even to move in and out of the lesson. They used

participant-related CS when they anticipated that the learners would not readily understand what was being said in English, and therefore CS to the language which the majority of the learners understood. While Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain also observed that the learners used these two patterns of CS, as well, the researcher however observed that, in the present study, it was mainly *participant-related* CS that the learners used to respond to the teacher's questions during the lessons of the subjects taught in 'English'. This was largely because there was minimal active learner participation in the learning process. Participant-related CS suggested that both the teachers and the learners appreciate the importance of communicating in the language in which they were fluent.

The qualitative data also confirmed the quantitative data that during Setswana lessons, it was the different forms of borrowing that were mainly used and less of CS. This scenario is due to a number of factors, among them the teachers'level of education, a lack of Setswana words which could precisely describe a particular concept due to its origin and as a result of language contact. Furthermore, like during lessons taught in English, both the teachers and learners used both discourse-related CS and participant-related CS during Setswana lessons because of their fluency in Setswana. Discourse-related CS is used to mark the content of a meta-linguistic comment (or to set off an aside) or to mark a topic shift (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004).

The question to address, therefore, is whether language use during the lessons of the subjects that were taught in 'English' can rightly be referred to as CS as espoused by different scholars and also reiterated earlier in Chapter Two. This question is answered in detail in the next research question.

8.4 RESEARCH QUESTION THREE: CAN THE PHENOMENON IN BOTSWANA CLASSROOMS BE CALLED CS?

This research question can be dealt with on the basis of the teachers' and learners' responses to the questions contained in Table 5.10 and Table 6.8 respectively (cf. Chapters Five and Six). Both questions probed whether the use of Setswana by teachers and learners in class was due to an inability to express themselves well in English or not.

The majority of the teachers (65%) were of the view that their CS to Setswana during the lessons of subjects taught in English did not signal a lack of proficiency in English. In the teachers' view, they CS to Setswana in class to assist the learners who have difficulty following a lesson presented in English, not because they themselves have problems with self-expression in English. While 41% of the learners attributed the teachers' CS to a lack of fluency in English, 36% did not think so. In addition, nearly a quarter of the learners (23%) did not provide a definite view on why teachers CS to Setswana in class. On the learners' CS to Setswana, the majority of both the teachers (77%) and the learners (63%) shared the view that this signalled a lack of proficiency in English. While the learners' opinion regarding their CS to Setswana in class was very clear (that the learners CS to overcome a language problem), it was not so clear regarding that of the teachers.

The results suggest that the learners CS in class mainly because they were unable to express themselves well in English. Therefore, they switch over to Setswana to overcome this difficulty. Consequently, the teachers' CS in class is mainly to accommodate the learners' English language deficiency. The use of CS in this way is regarded as an accommodation strategy (Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Kamwangamalu, 2000). The views of the learners about the teachers' CS somehow confirm this notion even though a sizeable proportion of the learners (41%) thought otherwise. Examples from lesson observations also confirm this assertion as demonstrated already in the previous chapter (cf. Extracts 6, 7 and 29).

Evidence from classroom observations shows that the phenomenon that occurs during the lessons of language subjects -- English (L and L) and Setswana could be called CS, even though it has been demonstrated in answering the previous question that, during Setswana lessons, there was more borrowing than CS. However, regarding lessons of content subjects (Biology, History, and Home Economics), the phenomenon that occurs in those classes can, in most cases, not be regarded as CS. Looking at the way in which English and Setswana was used in the classroom in which this study was situated, and by applying the standard definition of CS, it is evident that in the majority of the cases, the data were more than merely the simultaneous use of the two languages as and when the need arose, than CS as defined in Chapter Two. The use of the two languages in this way was guided more by the need to remove the communication

barrier caused by a lack of proficiency in English among learners than an unconscious use of the two languages driven by fluency in them, which is often the case in many situations in which CS takes place. A similar observation was made by Molosiwa (2006) that CS use in this context was influenced by the need to compensate for some (language) difficulty. Webb (2002: 58) observed that '… sociolinguists call the use of two languages in the same context with the same function code-switching.' This could be either in the case when discourse is initiated in one language and the same information is repeated in another language without adding any new meaning, such as in the dual instruction approach (Martin-Jones and Saxena, 2001); or it could be when one language (such as Setswana) is used where the authorized LoLT (English) is failing due to the learners' lack of proficiency in it. However, during Setswana lessons, where CS was used, it was more due to the teachers' display of their fluency in English than due to a lack of understanding of Setswana among the learners. In answering Research Question Three, the nature of the phenomenon that occurs in the classroom will be further examined through the respondents' views, and also according to the analysis of the qualitative data obtained by means of lesson observations.

Using the transcribed lessons as specific references, it is evident that the teachers of English (L and L) make use of all three the forms of CS during their utterances as already demonstrated in Extracts 11 and 12 in the previous chapter. In Extract 11, there is the use of both *intra-sentential* **jaaka eng**? (line1), meaning '*like what*?' and *inter-sentential* CS **Ba ne ba bua nnete** (line 2 meaning '*they were telling the truth*'). The former is a dependent clause used to complete a sentence initially coined in English, and the latter is in the form of an independent clause or a sentence that follows another sentence constructed in English only. In Extract 12, the teacher uses emblematic CS in the form of the tags **ga ke re** (line 8), implying '*is that so?*' and **Ee**, (line 9) meaning *yes*.

In Extract 22 (Setswana), Intra-sentential CS in the form of the phrase **there is a reason for that** (line 4) a joining word **so** (line 7) n -- used to join two independent clauses to form one sentence -- are examples of intra-sentential CS used to complete a sentence constructed initially in Setswana. Furthermore, in Extract 23 (line 1), inter-sentential CS has been used as alternate sentences are expressed in English and Setswana.

Looking at the examples from the transcriptions of the content subjects, while there is the use of all three the forms of CS cited above, generally there is more use of Setswana than English (by the teachers) even though the requirement is that these subjects be taught in English. There is a tendency for these teachers to utter an entire sentence or sentences in Setswana even though English is the prescribed language of instruction. This form of CS led Akindele and Letsoela (2001) to observe that although teachers CS at any point in the lesson, they tended to CS inter-sententially rather than intra-sententially. The researcher concurs with the first observation, but does not share the view of the latter because from the present study it emerged that what these two scholars refer to as inter-sentential CS is, as already explained above, a presentation of the lesson material in Setswana during lessons of subjects that were taught in 'English' to help the learners to understand the lesson content. This form of language use is not CS *per se*; rather it is simply the use of another language where the prescribed language is failing to achieve the intended objective. Similarly, the learners, taking a cue from the teacher, also respond in Setswana. The teacher does not object to the learners' use of Setswana, and their exchange continues in Setswana as illustrated in the previous chapter (cf. Chapter Seven, Extract 6, lines 5-6 and Extract 39 in the present chapter).

Furthermore, looking at the transcribed lessons for content subjects, notably Biology and Home Economics (cf. Chapter Seven, Section 7.4) and using the sentence as a unit of calculation, it was found that these lessons contained more Setswana than English words, yet the LoLT was supposedly English. The discourses contained more instances of intra-sentential CS than other forms of CS.

Furthermore, while there was some effort by the majority of the English (L and L) teachers to discourage the learners from CS to Setswana in class, the same attitude was not observed in almost all the classes of the content subjects. As already explained in the previous chapter, one English Language teacher explicitly stated that he does not condone the use of any other language in class besides English (cf. Extract 24), even though on entering the classroom, he greeted the learners in their local language, Ikalanga. This could be interpreted to imply that informal exchanges, such as greetings, can be exchanged in either Setswana or Ikalanga, but the formal lesson content should be presented in English only. However, in the view of the researcher,

this is not CS, but the teacher using either of the two languages to establish rapport with his class. During Setswana lessons, while the majority of the teachers discouraged the learners from CS to English, they themselves freely CS and also engaged borrowing as demonstrated in the previous chapter.

Furthermore, looking specifically at the amount of CS use during the transcribed lessons for each of the subjects (cf. Addendum C), the data show that there was more use of Setswana than English in the lessons of content subjects than in the lessons of language subjects. The details of each transcribed lesson have already been presented in the previous chapter (cf. Sections 7.4.1 - 7.4.3 for content subjects and 7.5.1 - 7.5.2 for language subjects).

In analyzing a sentence as a unit of calculation, the following was evident:

- Biology (cf. Transcription 1): Even though, overall, there were more English sentences used than Setswana sentences, nonetheless the use of Setswana was significant during the lesson. The discourse initiation (introduction) and finalization (conclusion) were mainly in Setswana. During the formal / development stage of the lesson, CS was used. The transcription contained instances of CS and borrowing in the form of clauses, phrases or single words, and CS was more intra-sentential and emblematic than inter-sentential.
- Home Economics (F and F) (cf. Transcription 2): At discourse-initiation stage that included greetings and housekeeping matters, only Setswana was used. The lesson introduction was also in Setswana but the teacher CS to English during the formal / development part of the lesson and also engaged borrowing. As in the Biology lesson, overall, there was more use of English than Setswana, but there were more instances of intra-sentential CS and emblematic CS than inter-sentential CS. Discourse closure also took place in Setswana only.
- History (Transcription 3): At discourse initiation, greetings were exchanged in Setswana. Borrowing was used in the discussion of housekeeping matters. When the lesson delivery began, the teacher switched back to English, but engaged minimal CS as the lesson progressed. At discourse closure, the teacher wound up the lesson in English. During this lesson, there were more instances of inter-sentential CS than intra-sentential CS or even emblematic CS.

This signifies that a teacher who CS less, engages in inter-sentential CS, but one who CS frequently, engages more in intra-sentential CS and emblematic CS than in inter-sentential CS. As previously mentioned, this was one of the few content lessons observed in which CS was used minimally; so the instance of minimal CS during a lesson of a content subject was an exception rather than the norm.

- English Language (Transcription 4): The lesson was conducted almost entirely in English. Discourse initiation and discourse closure were in English. During the formal part of the lesson, CS was minimal and it was inter-sentential rather than intra-sentential. In addition, emblematic CS in the form of **ga ke re** meaning *isn't it* was used to ensure that the listener is following what is being said or is in agreement. **Ee**, meaning *yes*, is yet another example of emblematic CS used to denote that the speaker or the listener is in agreement.
- Setswana (Transcription 5): At discourse initiation stage, greetings were exchanged entirely in Setswana; and discourse closure took place in Setswana as the lesson was wound up. However, borrowing occurred immediately when the formal part of the lesson began. During the course of the formal part of the lesson, nonce borrowing and borrowing proper were employed while the use of CS was minimal.

The evidence above shows that there was CS especially during the lessons of the content subjects. The use of CS by the teachers did not imply that they were not fluent in English. During lesson observations, there was no display on the part of the teachers that they were not able to express themselves well in English. Instead, CS was used as a teaching strategy to assist the learners to follow the lesson material (Akindele & Letsoela, 2001; Bissoonauth & Offord, 2001). The lessons were generally teacher-centred; the teacher was the main speaker while the learners were passive participants. There was minimal learner participation in the development of the lesson even when the teacher tried to engage the class through questions. Evidence also shows that speakers who code-switch more tend to use more intra-sentential CS than inter-sentential CS (for example, teachers of Biology and Home Economics in this study); but speakers who code-switch less tend to use inter-sentential CS than intra-sentential CS (for example, teachers of English L and L, Setswana and History). Further, inter-sentential CS is used to repeat material previously presented in the language of the

event without adding any new meaning. Similarly, the former (teachers who CS more) used emblematic CS more frequently than the latter (teachers who CS less). Furthermore, the teachers of content subjects who CS frequently also used borrowing more often than the teachers who CS minimally. The use of the different forms of borrowing was also evident during Setswana lessons and this will be discussed in detail in answering the next question.

From the findings, it is evident that what is perceived to be CS in the classroom is not CS per se; rather it is the use of the learner's language or a language that the majority of the learners speak and understand in order to overcome the communication barrier caused by the use of English, a language both the teachers and the learners agree the latter have a problem with regarding self-expression and comprehension. The results confirm what has already been stated above. Using examples of CS excerpts presented in the previous chapter and also in the present chapter, it is evident that what is termed CS in the classroom is somehow in contrast with what is generally understood to be CS in a social setting or as defined earlier in Chapter Two. In the latter, CS implies that the speaker who CS is proficient in the languages at his / her disposal; whereas in the case of the classroom, as demonstrated by excerpts from several lessons and supported by the views of the respondents above, CS signals that the learners are not proficient in English. CS is used as a communication strategy to ensure that the knowledge that the teacher imparts is received and understood by the learners. Also CS is used by the learners in order to be able to participate in the learning process (Akindele & Letsoela, 2001). The teachers were mindful of the fact that they were required to teach in English but faced with the learning difficulty caused by a lack of competence in English among the learners, they resorted to CS to overcome the language barrier. The incidence, earlier referred to in this chapter, of the learner who begged his teacher to allow him to relate his story (which was culturally-based) in Setswana instead of using English, brought the problem to the fore. However, the teacher did not accede to the request.

It appears therefore that what occurred in the classrooms of the settings investigated supports what van der Walt (2004) inferred when she said that there should be 'tolerance for the use of non-standard varieties of English and for other languages' in the classroom.

The researcher does not support the former view because the use of non-standard varieties of English in the classroom would be against the objective of improving English proficiency among learners. While the researcher recognizes that it is not practically possible to eliminate the use of CS totally in the classroom, its use, which essentially implies using other languages in class should be controlled; because its extensive use is also detrimental to English proficiency among learners. Therefore, CS should not be an impediment to language development. This point will be further discussed in the next question when the didactic and educational effects of CS are discussed.

8.5 RESEARCH QUESTION FOUR: THIS QUESTION WAS DIVIDED INTO FOUR PARTS AS FOLLOWS:

- *What are the didactic consequences of CS in the schools?*
- *Is CS educationally beneficial?*
- *Does the use of CS in a classroom situation slow down the pace of teaching and learning to the extent that it is detrimental to content coverage within the prescribed time?*
- *Is the practice of CS from English to Setswana in a classroom situation discriminatory to non-Setswana speakers?*

8.5.1 What are the didactic consequences of CS in the schools?

This research question was answered by the analysis of the teachers' responses to the questions contained in Table 5.15 and the learners' responses to the questions contained in Tables 6.9 and 6.13. The questions sought the respondents' views on CS use in the classroom, its didactic consequences in general, and specifically in lessons taught in English as a subject, and in Setswana lessons.

(a) <u>The teachers' views</u>

The results showed that, as indicated earlier, the teachers generally held positive views about CS in the classroom, be it CS to Setswana or to English. There were more teachers who did not support the view that CS negatively affected the attainment of a proficiency in English among the learners than those who did (40% vs. 37%).

Furthermore, 64% of the teachers of subjects taught in English were of the view that CS to Setswana enhanced understanding content among the learners. The results suggest that teachers who approved of CS were more concerned about the educational benefits of CS than about the learners' attainment of language proficiency in English. Those who were apprehensive about its use were concerned about its effect on English Language development. If learners were allowed to use Setswana in class, there would be less practice in speaking English. They would fail to acquire fluency in speaking English. Consequently, CS would have a negative effect on the learners' attainment of proficiency in English.

(b) The learners' views

As with the teachers, the learners' views were positive about CS use in teaching and learning. For instance, the majority of the learners (67%) agreed that CS to Setswana enhanced the learning of new concepts and also increased class participation, including group discussions (74%). Furthermore, 49% did not believe that the use of CS negatively impacted on acquiring a proficiency in English. On CS to English in a Setswana class, the learners' views were divided on whether or not it should be permitted. Forty two percent were in agreement, while 43% disagreed -- the latter with a marginal majority of only 1%. Despite this split response, the results also indicated that the majority of the learners did not object to the teachers' use of CS during a Setswana lesson as long as it was educationally beneficial, but they objected to the learners' CS, as indicated by 65% and 76% respectively.

The results suggest that in the learners' view, CS in a Setswana class has an educational role as much as it has in other lessons taught in English. However, the majority of the learners did not find it problematic for the teachers to CS to English during the lesson but objected if the learners did the same. From the results, both the teachers and the learners shared the view that the use of CS has positive didactic consequences irrespective of whether it is CS to Setswana or CS to English. It promotes lesson understanding among learners. While the teachers of the content subjects were of the view that CS does not prevent learners from attaining a proficiency in English, the teachers of language subjects, notably English (L and L) did not share this view. While learners shared the above-stated positive views about CS,

they were also of the opinion that the use of Setswana in general promotes learner participation in the learning process in class or group discussions.

(c) Qualitative data

The qualitative data also showed that CS had some positive as well as some negative didactic consequences in the schools.

i. Positive didactic consequences of CS

First CS contributes to the expansion of the vocabulary of a language by allowing the creation of new words. This was more evident during Setswana lessons when words that refer to concepts considered 'new' in the host language, or considered to be 'foreign' to the culture of the speakers of the host language were used, as observed by Kembo-Sure and Webb (2000). Such concepts may not have equivalent words in the host language. Even if they do, such words are hardly used in spoken communication but are evident in written communication. For instance, a number of borrowed words of English origin were used either with a Setswana prefix or suffix in class. Some examples are as follows:

Table 8.1: Examples of Setswana nouns and verbs borrowed from English

Nouns		**Verbs**	
Setswana	**English**	**Setswana**	**English**
Dustar-**a** (Extract 9, Bio.)	duster	Analaes-**a** Extract 40, HE)	Analyse
Bel-**e** (Extract 4, Bio.)	bell	Fit-**a** (Extract H.E.)	Fit
Di-classroom	classrooms	Fil-**a**	Feel
Di-waere (Extract 7, HE)	wires		

What takes place in the examples above is not CS *per se*, but borrowing. It is borrowing (nonce or proper) and CM that are credited for expanding the vocabulary of Setswana and not CS. Other examples of borrowing used during lessons appeared in the previous chapter (cf. Section 7.8.1, Tables 7.1 and 7.2).

Second, CS facilitates communication in the classroom because if it is used during a lesson that requires the use of English, Setswana plays a supporting role. Because almost all the learners understand Setswana, explaining some parts of the lesson or

repeating a question in Setswana, to some extent, prompted some response from the learners. This suggests that CS promotes understanding among the learners (Adendorff, 1993; Akindele & Letsoela, 2001). Extract 28 (cf. Chapter Seven) from a History lesson is an example of an instance whereby the teacher first asked a question in English, but on realizing that there was no response, he CS to Setswana. The same strategy was also used during Setswana lessons. Setswana was the main language of instruction, and English played a supporting role. The teacher often used a borrowed word from the guest language (English) in order to express an idea or concept that did not have a Setswana form, or if it had, it was often in a form of a long phrase. Such concepts are expressions of numbers, amount in currency, time, a period, or other concepts that originally were foreign to the host language (cf. Section 7.8 in the previous chapter). Some of the examples of borrowing are as follows:

- Five (number)
- Six hundred Pula (amount in currency)
- Four o'clock (time)
- School term (period)
- *Khansele* (Council) -- borrowing proper
- That's very good (praise or positive reinforcement)

Third, as discussed above, CS increased learner participation. When the teacher spoke in English or even asked a question in English, the learners did not readily respond. But as soon as he / she CS to Setswana, some learners responded by commenting or answering in Setswana (cf. Chapter Seven, Extract 6). This implied that the learners were more comfortable to respond in Setswana than in English. This was the tendency during the lessons that were taught in English.

ii. Negative didactic consequences of CS

However, some of the didactic consequences of CS were negative. CS stifled learner participation as illustrated during a Home Economics lesson (cf. Extract 39 below). Learners had been used to participating in Setswana during lessons taught in English, so much so that participation rate was low if a teacher addressed learners in English, but participation improved as soon as a teacher CS to Setswana. For instance, even when learners knew the answer to the teacher's question or when they were called

upon to contribute to the lesson, they were reluctant to participate when they were addressed in English. However, as soon as the teacher CS to Setswana, they also responded in Setswana. This indicated that the learners had no confidence in speaking English.

Extract 39: Home Economics (F and F)

Te: A silhouette **go tewa** our body … **go tewa** our body. … and now we look at the
it is meant *it is meant*
shape…. So this is our body **so mongwe le mongwe a itse gore figara ya gagwe**
everyone must know how her / his figure
entse jang. So, from now on **re ya go nna le mmirra** (mirror) we should know
looks like. *we are going to have a mirror*
gore re ntse jang. **Mongwe le mongwe a itse** ….**ka ha mmele wa gagwe o ntseng**
how we look like. Everyone must know how her / his body profile

ka teng.
is like.
One of my lecturers **wa** Fashion and Fabrics **ko universiting** used to tell us **gore** we should talk to us. *Of* *at university* *that*
You know, you look at the mirror and **o bo o re** "mirror mirror talk to me, talk to me";
You say
o apara.
when you are dressing up
C: [GIGGLES.]

Te: You just wear your underwear **hela**, **heh**! …you just wear your underwear; **o bo o**
Only, heh! *then you*
ipolelela gore, "hei I have a protruding tummy, I have a puffed face." **Nna** I know
tell yourself that, "hei *Me*
myself. So you look at yourself so that you choose the right clothes;
heh! Re a utlwana?
hei! Do we understand each other?

C: (some) **Ee mma**.

Yes ma'm.

Te: So, **go raya gore** after this lesson **mongwe le mongwe ha a boa kwa,**

It means that each one of you when you return from outside,

a bo a analaesa (analyze) **mmele wa gagwe**. So that you choose

must analyze her / his body.

[CLASS INTERRUPTS.]

C: (in chorus) **Ga re na diipone**.

We have no mirrors.

Te: **Mma**?

What?

C: (in chorus) **Ga re na diipone**.

We have no mirrors

Te: **Gakere re nale mirror ke o** [POINTING AT THE CLASS MIRROR.], **heh**? **Ee**.

Isn't that we have a mirror there heh? Yes.

C: **Aa! Re bo re apolela kae?**

What! Where do we remove our clothes?

Te: **O tsena hela ka kwa**, you just come here, **nnyaa re bo re tswala** the curtains;

You just get in there, no we just close

ga gona mathata.

there are no problems.

C: [LAUGHTER.]

There was minimal learner participation during this Home Economics lesson; but as soon as the teacher CS by using long utterances in Setswana -- as illustrated in the extract above -- the learners immediately responded in Setswana. The learners were not keen to participate in English but only waited for the right opportunity when the teacher CS to Setswana. They also took a cue from the teacher and responded in Setswana.

Because of the prevalent use of CS during the lessons, the learners developed an apprehension to speak English in class or they became accustomed to using Setswana

in class. For instance, the extract below demonstrates a learner's reluctance to contribute during the lesson because he was being addressed in English.

Extract 40: History lesson

Te: Some actually … or let me just say 'tiredness' is obviously a … one of the problems that these people may have encountered. Amh … what longest trip have you ever travelled? [NAME.] … Have you ever travelled?

Ln7: No.

Te: What about you? [NAME.] **A mme o bua nnete**? [REFERRING TO LEARNER 7.]

Is he really telling the truth?

T: **Ee**?

Yes?

In the extract above, the teacher asks the learner if he has ever undertaken a long journey, but the learner answers with a simple 'No'. The teacher then asked the class if the learner was telling the truth because he could sense that the learner was reluctant to participate, perhaps for fear of being expected to use English. This was a lesson in which the teacher did not CS as much as the other teachers of content subjects.

CS further affected negatively proficiency development in either English or Setswana as also observed by Akindele and Letsoela (2001) in their study. However, this was denied by the teachers of content subjects as well as by the learners (cf. Chapter 6, Table 6.9). During the lessons of content subjects, CS was a common occurrence, so much so that its use was considered normal. While its use did not seem to reflect the teachers' lack of fluency in English, it had a negative effect on fluency in English among the learners. For instance, during English lessons, when the learners were called upon to contribute, some attempted to use Setswana but had to use English when the teacher objected. This implied that the learners had no confidence in speaking English. By the same token, proficiency in Setswana was affected as well in that it was common for Setswana teachers to CS or use borrowing even where it was unnecessary to do so. As a result, the learners also took a cue from their teachers to CS or to use borrowing, but this was not entertained by the teachers. While CS facilitates

communication in the classroom, it affects the acquisition of a proficiency in English as the target language. To some extent, fluency in Setswana as the national language is affected, too. Consequently, the learners are neither fluent in any of the languages, or become accustomed to what is often colloquially referred to as *Tswenglish*, which refers to CM forms of Setswana and English, borrowing from Chris Patten (the former and last Governor of Hong Kong when it was under the British rule)'s reference to CM forms of Chinese and English as *Chenglish* (Lin, 1996: 49, in Ferguson, 2003: 38).

Although CS use facilitated spoken communication in the classroom, it did not enhance written communication because it was limited to spoken communication (Akindele & Letsoela, 2001). A similar observation was made by Letsebe (2002), namely that the use of CS during the lesson was limited in that during written work, such as tests, assignments, and examinations, CS was not permissible. During written communication the learners were expected to use the Standard English or the Standard variety of Setswana. Therefore, even though CS may assist the learners to understand the lesson content, they may not necessarily articulate themselves in written communication (Akindele & Letsoela, 2001). Consequently, their academic achievement may be compromised. Hence there is a need to link CS with the learners' academic achievement. Furthermore, in other situations where spoken communication is essential, such as a formal interview for a job, or for a scholarship for further studies, CS may not be a useful communication strategy since a candidate is expected strictly to use formal English.

However, as the present study was limited to only oral communication and the researcher did not have access to the learners' written work, it was not possible to establish the extent of the effect of CS on learners' written work.

The majority of the teachers, irrespective of the subject they taught, shared the view that CS improved learner understanding of the lessons. However, the proportion of the English teachers (50%) followed by Home Economics (57%) who shared this view was not as high as for the teachers of the other subjects (History: 71%; Biology: 79%). This is an indication that, although the English teachers appreciated the instructional benefit of CS, they had reservations about its use as it was contrary to their primary objective. Furthermore, the majority of the teachers of Biology (50%), History (57%),

and Setswana (55%) did not share the view that the use of CS affected negatively the learners' attainment of proficiency in English. However, the majority of the English teachers (62%) were of the view that CS prevented the learners from attaining a proficiency in spoken English as already alluded to above. Therefore, the nature of the subject that one taught had an effect on the teacher's view about CS in the classroom (except those of the Home Economics teachers as the proportion of those who agreed and those who disagreed were equal (40%).

In summary, both the quantitative and qualitative data complemented each other, showing that CS had both positive and negative didactic consequences.

On a positive note, CS allowed for effective communication flow between the teacher and the class. This resulted in the enhancement of learning through increased learner participation in the development of the lesson and in group discussions. The qualitative data confirmed this point partially because sometimes the learners participated if the teacher CS. At other times, CS did not yield any positive results, that is, it did not increase learner participation in the lesson. This indicates that the learners' participation in the learning process is not solely determined by their ability or inability to use the official language. This analysis was, however, beyond the scope of this study, but further research can address it. Furthermore, both the quantitative and qualitative data revealed that new concepts were better understood if explained in Setswana. The qualitative data also revealed that the creation of new vocabulary was made possible by the use of CM, borrowing proper, and nonce borrowing. However, quantitative data did not confirm that it was the case.

On a negative note, CS to Setswana stifled learner participation and also created a 'fear' among the learners to speak English in class, as already explained above (cf. Section 8.4.1 *ii*). This bordered on lack of confidence in expressing oneself in English, caused by a lack of competence in speaking English. This was revealed by qualitative data, contrary to what the respondents said, namely that they did not think CS affected negatively the attainment of a proficiency in English among learners. Once again, the present study could not support this fact, and future research in this regard would be helpful.

The results have shown that even though CS constitutes a violation of the LiEP of Botswana, it serves an educational role as far as classroom instruction is concerned. As pointed out earlier (cf. Section 8.4.1 *i*), if the learners understood the lesson content better when presented in Setswana, is it really necessary to continue to use English? In the researcher's view, Setswana is already being used in the teaching of these subjects through CS. Therefore, the argument that it is easier to learn new concepts in English or the implication that these subjects are better learnt in English than in Setswana is flawed. What is lacking is written material for these subjects in Setswana. The results of this study call for a serious examination of the LiEP and its implementation to see if it does not stifle learning. The teaching of English so that it becomes an effective LoLT also needs to be revisited, not only at the level of senior secondary school, but as early as at primary school.

8.5.2 Is CS educationally beneficial?

This research question was answered through the teachers' responses that appeared in Tables 5.11, 5.12, 5.13 and 5.16, and the learners' responses that appeared in Tables 6.11 and 6.12. The questions probed if there were any educational benefits of using CS in the classroom. The majority of the teachers (54%) were of the view that CS (especially between English and Setswana) had educational benefits in that it facilitated teaching and learning. The teachers' views were confirmed by the results in Table 5.11 (cf. Chapter 5) that outlined the different reasons that the teachers gave for using CS in the classroom, the most popular being that CS promoted lesson understanding among the learners (indicated by 51% of the teachers). The promotion of Setswana as a national language was not the primary aim of CS as only 4% of the teachers (three teachers) confirmed that they valued it. The researcher is however, of the opinion that even though CS to Setswana was not primarly meant to promote Setswana as a national language, indirectly, this was the case.

Learners too were allowed to use CS in class to perform different tasks (cf. Table 6.11). They were allowed to CS to Setswana to ask a question, answer the teacher's question, and to discuss class tasks. The least popular task was to summarize a lesson, as indicated by only 3% of the respondents (two teachers). The different reasons that the teachers gave for using CS and for allowing the learners to CS in the classroom

confirm what has been noted earlier, namely that CS was perceived as being educationally beneficial. Although there was evidence of CS in the classroom, more than 51% of the teachers indicated that they did not allow their learners to CS, implying that 49% of the teachers allowed CS. The results, therefore, suggest that just more than half the teachers did not object to CS.

The learners reiterated the teachers' view that CS in the classroom had educational benefits, be it CS to Setswana in a non-Setswana class or to English in a Setswana class. Learning became easier when a teacher CS to Setswana and also increased learner participation in the lesson, as indicated by 84% and 53% of the learners respectively. CS in a Setswana class also made learning easier if certain Setswana concepts not clearly understood were explained in English, as indicated by 58% of the learners (an example is the use of borrowing). Consequently, the learners were allowed to CS in class to perform different educational tasks, but to varying degrees. The most common task was to ask a question; as indicated by 42% of the learners. As was the case with teachers, the least performed task was to summarize a lesson. The learners, therefore, confirmed the views of the teachers that they, too were allowed to CS. However, 40% of the learners denied the use of CS in class, while the majority (60%) admitted that it was used because it was perceived as educationally beneficial.

The learners were allowed to CS from time to time during a lesson even though not all the teachers allowed it during their lessons, and that there was more CS among the teachers than among the learners.

The qualitative data showed that CS in the classroom is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it is educationally beneficial; and on the other, it hampers language development. During lessons of content subjects, teachers were concerned more about ensuring that their learners understood the content of the lesson, and less about assisting the learners to improve their proficiency in English as the LoLT, hence more CS to Setswana took place. They saw the latter as the role of the teachers of English. However, during English (L and L) lessons, teachers were very much aware that their role was to promote English language proficiency among learners, so less CS to Setswana took place.

(a) Positive educational effects of CS

The use of CS points to the fact that Setswana and other indigenous languages can be used effectively for educational purposes, as illustrated in Extract 41 below. It also promotes the creation of terminology through a related concept, namely borrowing; and helps to keep Setswana (for instance, the use of idiomatic expressions in Setswana), and proverbs during lessons taught in 'English' alive.

Extract 41: Biology lesson

Te: **Ha o nale** minor kidney failure, you can correct that by keeping to a strict diet.

If you have

So,the strict diet **e re buang ka yone ke gore motho wa teng o ta a … o ka advisiwa gore a seka a ja eng se le sentsi, kana a je eng mo go ntsi?**

that we are talking about is that the concerned person can be advised of what not to eat in abundance or to eat in abundance? ...

What would be the other? Because that is the one **e re reng** 'stick to the diet';

Which we say

ga ke re?

isn't it?

In the extract above, through CS, the teacher explains what 'sticking to a strict diet' entails.

Because the use of the standard variety of Setswana is mandatory in Setswana classes, and at times the use of certain words or expressions may not be readily understood, even by way of any form of borrowing, the teacher is able to use familiar English words to promote understanding among the learners or to clarify a point as illustrated in Extract 38 (cf. Chapter Seven). The teacher uses a familiar word, 'speech', in the form of nonce borrowing to give a clue to her class as to what **puisobatho** (public address) entails. Borrowing in a Setswana class is helpful educationally because much Setswana terminology is not standardized, to such an extent that different authors may

refer to the same concepts by using different names or words in their writings (Molosiwa, 2006). To help learners to understand, the teacher may use a borrowed word (often from English) that many learners may readily understand.

Notwithstanding the above, the effect of CS in a Setswana lesson did not fulfil the same role. Setswana teachers generally discouraged CS or the use of any of its related forms, even though they themselves used them. In Extract 42 below, the teacher disapproves of CM:

Extract 42: Setswana lesson

Ln1: Bolwetse jwa **AIDS** bo ne bo setse bo tsene ( )
AIDS disease was already prevalent ( )
Ln1: Bo tsene mo **fashioneng**.
It (AIDS) was fashionable.
Te: Wa re mo **fashioning**?
You are saying fashionable?

In the extract above, when the learner used borrowing to come up with the word **fashioneng** (fashionable) made of the noun *fashion* and the Setswana suffix –**eng** to denote adverb of manner, the teacher quickly responded by repeating the word of which she disapproved to signal to the learner that she disliked its use (line 3), and that she expected him to use the standard variety of Setswana. From the qualitative data, it was evident that Setswana teachers felt that their use of CS was justified in that usually they used it to clarify concepts that appeared ambiguous to the learners, but they did not find it justifiable for the learners to use CS or CM or even borrowing. No objection was raised when the learners used the acronym **AIDS,** the use of which is accepted due to a lack of an equivalent term in Setswana to refer to the same condition.

(b) Negative educational effects of CS

From the perspective of language development, constant use of CS creates a permanent habit of using Setswana in a lesson that is supposed to be taught in English. While learners have acquired BICS in English that is necessary in social settings, such as

speaking to a friend, a relative or on the telephone, it is CALP that is compromised by the constant use of CS in a teaching and learning situation. In that regard, CS in the classroom appears to be a legitimate LoLT, albeit unofficially. During the lessons of the content subjects, CS has created complacency among learners to practise using English in class. As earlier explained, the tendency among the learners was to remain silent even if they knew the answer to the teacher's question, and knowing that their silence would be interpreted to mean that they either did not understand the question or that they were unable to express themselves in English. As a result, the teacher would rescue the situation by CS to Setswana, and the learners would then seize the opportunity to respond in Setswana. The result, therefore, is a lack of proficiency in English among the majority of the learners. The situation is, however, different in Setswana classes as teachers actively discourage CS to English.

Therefore, CS does not promote fluency in the target language that the students need as the language for school-leaving examinations (Letsebe, 2002); for further studies and training; and eventually for work -- nationally as well as internationally. It may also result in a lack of fluency in either English or Setswana as the learners may become accustomed to the interchangeable use of at least two languages in one speech event.

CS in the classroom has been legitimized by default even though it is against the LiEP. Its constant use affects negatively the proficiency in English among the learners. While the teachers are of the opinion that the use of CS helps in addressing an educational problem, they are in the process creating another problem -- a language-development problem. Similarly, during Setswana lessons, CS does not promote fluency in Setswana, especially among the learners for whom Setswana is a second language.

In the view of the researcher, CS in the classroom is initiated by the teachers. They use it more than the learners do. If they were not to use it and did not allow its use, the learners would not use it. This is especially the case with the teachers whose HL is Setswana. However, its use is not without merit. Teachers CS and allow learners to CS to help the latter to counteract communication problems caused by a lack of competence in English, which is the prescribed LoLT.

Similarly, concerning Setswana lessons, the question is whether it is really necessary to teach one language in another language, especially in a language in which the majority of the learners are not fluent?

In conclusion, the results above have revealed that CS use in the classroom has positive and negative educational effects. This is the thrust of this study, it addresses a point raised by Webb (2002: 58) that '… the educational effects of CS have not been researched'. The results have shown that the use of CS is positive during the lesson of a subject taught in 'English' as it facilitates the explanation of content in the language understood by the majority of the learners. Similarly, the use of CS in a Setswana lesson allows for the explanation of certain concepts in English. Therefore, its use appears to have positive results, as well.

8.5.3 Does the use of CS in a classroom situation slow down the pace of teaching and learning (through the repetition of learning material to the extent that it is detrimental to content coverage within the prescribed time)?

This research question was answered after analyzing the teachers' and learners' responses to the questions contained in Table 5.14 and Table 6.16 respectively. The results show that the majority of both the teachers (69%) and learners (78%) did not find CS use a waste of teaching time. It did not affect the pace of the lesson because it was not mere repetition of the lesson material presented originally in English. Therefore, teaching and learning were not compromised. Consequently, CS use is seen as having no adverse effect on curriculum coverage.

The qualitative data also confirmed the views of the questionnaire respondents and showed that CS use in the classroom did not slow down the pace of teaching and learning and had no negative consequences on content coverage. CS did not involve presentation of the lesson material first in one language; and then in the other language. Rather, it was a systematic alternative use of the two languages as the lesson progressed. Where there was repetition, it was minimal and inconsequential as it served only to clarify a point made earlier (Akindele & Letsoela, 2001). Such practice was used as a questioning technique during lessons of subjects taught in 'English'; especially content subjects. The teacher often repeated in Setswana a question asked

earlier in English when there was no response from the class (cf. Chapter 7, Extract 28). The minimal use of repetition was observed also during Setswana lessons. Often the teacher made an utterance in Setswana and then repeated it in English to use a familiar term that learners readily understood, as shown in the two extracts below:

Extract 43: Setswana lesson

Te: Le fa go nale bo Tautona ba mafatshe a sele, fa o emelela, pele o dumedisa, o tshwanetse go leboga motsamaisa tiro pele e be e le gone o ka dumedisang bo Tautona. Motsamaisa tiro ke ene a tle a bidiwe **Master of Ceremony**, **Director of Ceremony**. [English]

Te: *Even if Presidents of other countries are present, when you stand up (to speak) before you greet (them) you must thank the Master of Ceremony first; and then you can greet the Presidents. The Master of the Ceremony is the one usually referred to as* (English).

Extract 44: Setswana lesson

Te: Mmele wa puisobatho o ne o tshwanetse go nna le eng?
The body of a public address is supposed to have what?

Ln: O tshwanetse go bo o itse gore o a go bua ka ga eng**.**
You are supposed to know what you are going to talk about.

Te: Ka sekgowa ke mo go tweng **knowledgeable**.
In English that is referred to as knowledgeable.

In the two examples above, the teacher uses a related concept, nonce borrowing, in the form of English words or expressions -- **Master of Ceremony / Director of Ceremony** and **knowledgeable** -- that she feels the learners are familiar with and will readily understand. Therefore, the form of repetition used is to provide clarification only where it is deemed necessary, instead of repeating the entire sentence.

Therefore, in the present study, the researcher found that there was no deliberate effort to repeat an entire lesson or part of it in Setswana as was the case in the research done by Martin-Jones and Saxena (2001). Further, unlike in the study of Akindele and Letsoela (2001) in Lesotho, where Sesotho was used to repeat the lesson material presented initially in English, in this study there was no repetition in Setswana of the lesson material initially presented in English or part of it, except for the teacher's question. This research is, however, similar to that of the Mauritian study undertaken by Bissoonauth and Offord (2001), in which the teacher CS from English to either French or Creole to accommodate the learner's deficient linguistic system and to facilitate comprehension. CS in this way is referred to as an exploratory choice within the MM of Myers-Scotton (Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Finlayson and Slabbert, 1997; and Kamwangamalu, 2000: 62). In the present study, CS during the lessons of subjects taught in 'English' was used for the same purpose. Therefore, it could not be considered to be a waste of time. It had no detrimental effect on curriculum coverage.

8.5.4 Is the practice of CS from English to Setswana in a classroom situation discriminatory to non-Setswana speakers?

This research question was answered through the learners' responses to the question contained in Table 6.10 (cf. Chapter 6). The question was posed directly to the learners as the direct recipients of classroom instruction. The aim was to solicit the views of the learners who did not speak Setswana on the effect of CS in the classroom. The majority of the learners (65%) were of the view that it was not fair to use Setswana in a class that contained non-Setswana speakers. The responses to this question are interesting, given that nearly all the learners in the study were citizens of Botswana (99.3%) or 2 239 learners, while non-citizens accounted for only 0.67% or 15 learners. The latter were usually learners whose parents were from other parts of Africa or elsewhere, and had come to Botswana for employment purposes. Hence they had little or no understanding of Setswana. Despite what the respondents (both teachers and learners) stated about CS, the majority of the learners were mindful of the fact that the educational benefits they reap from CS use may be disadvantageous to their other classmates who did not fully understand Setswana.

The results from the quantitative analysis are contradictory to what the qualitative data revealed. During lesson observations, the researcher noted that the teachers CS freely

but none of the few non-Batswana learners objected to CS use or signalled that they were being disadvantaged by its use. Even where the lesson material was partially repeated in Setswana, for instance, in the form of a question posed earlier in English and then repeated in Setswana, the assumption was that the non-Batswana learners had benefited from the presentation made earlier in English. Therefore, from the qualitative data, there was no visible evidence to suggest that non-Batswana learners were being discriminated against by the use of CS. Because there was a minute proportion of the learners who were not Batswana (0.67%), the benefits of CS use seemed to outweigh its non-usage. Furthermore, the data from the quantitative analysis showed that only one learner could not understand Setswana, thereby suggesting that 14 learners who were not citizens of Botswana understood Setswana. In addition, 0.45% of the learners (ten learners) could not speak Setswana, suggesting that five learners who were not citizens of Botswana could speak it. It is, however, the degree to which they spoke or understood Setswana that varied from learner to learner.

In summary, both the teachers and learners agreed that there were positive didactic consequences of CS use in the classroom, irrespective of the subject taught. However, in a Setswana lesson, the learners had no objection to the use of CS by the teachers but they objected to its use by the learners. The qualitative data also confirmed the view above even though there were some negative consequences, too. Furthermore, both the teachers and learners agreed that educationally, CS use was beneficial and that it was used more by the teachers than by the learners. As CS use did not involve repetition in Setswana of the lesson content previously presented in English, it was not viewed as affecting negatively the pace of teaching and learning. However, the learners concurred that CS use (especially from English to Setswana) could disadvantage a few learners who were not Setswana speakers. It appears that this setback was overlooked because of the insignificant number of the non-citizen learners involved, namely -- 15 (0.67%).

8.6 RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE

This question was divided into three sections as follows:

- *Does the use of CS in a classroom situation violate the LiEP of Botswana?*
- *Is the LiEP consistent with the practical realities of the classroom situation?*
- *If this is the case, should the LiEP be revised to ensure that the LoLT promotes maximum delivery and acquisition of knowledge and skills development?*

8.6.1 Does the use of CS in a classroom situation violate the LiEP of Botswana?

This research question was addressed partly through the teachers' responses contained in Tables 5.3, 5.17 (cf. Chapter Five), as well as through the learners' responses contained in Table 6.4 (cf. Chapter Six).

According to the Revised National Policy on Education (RNPE) of 1994 (Botswana Government White Paper No. 2, 1994), English is the LoLT throughout the school system from Standard Two of primary-school level. This is because of its status as an international language for education and for work as indicated by 67% of the teachers (cf. Chapter Five, Table 5.3). Notwithstanding the above, evidence from the responses given by the teachers and learners indicate that there is a prevalent use of Setswana and, to some extent, the local language of the area (Ikalanga) in class during teaching and learning. The following responses confirm this view:

The number of teachers who had no problem regarding CS was almost the same as for those who found CS problematic (45% vs. 47%). Eight percent of the teachers did not give their view. This suggests that they either did not CS or that they were not sure about its effect on teaching. CS was, therefore, used to address the language problem confronting the teachers and learners in the classroom. Consequently, the LiEP of Botswana is violated in the classroom.

The qualitative data also confirmed that there was a prevalence of CS in the classroom, irrespective of the subject taught. This constitutes a violation of the LiEP of Botswana. It was observed that because there was more CS use during the lessons of the content

subjects than during the lessons of the language subjects, there was more "contravention" of the LiEP during lessons of Biology, History and Home Economics than during lessons of English (L and L), and those of Setswana. The researcher did not witness any use of the local language (Ikalanga) for educational purposes. Although there was less CS use during Setswana lessons and more use of CM and the different forms of borrowing (even where there was an alternative Setswana word), nonetheless, this was also a violation of the LiEP. Teaching and learning of Setswana were to be done exclusively in Setswana. This was contrary to what the objectives of the Setswana syllabus states (Botswana General Certificate of Secondary Education and Teaching Syllabus for Setswana, 2000). Because Setswana as the national language is comprehensible to all the learners taking Setswana as a subject, there was no need to CS to English to enhance understanding.

The results have shown that the use of CS in the classroom is considered to be a contravention of the LiEP. However, in terms of the subjects taught in 'English', this violation may not be deliberate. Rather, it is meant to address the learners' lack of proficiency in English. This implies that the LiEP either does not adequately address the problem of English language acquisition or, if it does, the problem lies in the implementation thereof. The pronouncement of the LiEP that English should be used as LoLT from the second year of schooling onwards (Botswana Government White Paper No. 2, 1994) implies that the learners who enter senior-secondary school have had nine years of instruction in English. This comprises the learning of English as a subject and also learning other school subjects in English, except Setswana and French. The LiEP was meant to address the problem of the late introduction of English as LoLT after four years of primary schooling, which was regarded as too late to do so, and has hence contributed towards poor English proficiency among the learners (NCE 2, 1993: 113). If the current LiEP or the teaching of English was effective, then CS in the classroom should not have been an issue among the learners in the present study because they entered primary school after the revision of the LiEP in 1994. (The F 5 and F 4 classes entered primary school in 1995 and 1996 respectively.) However, the results have shown that CS continues to be viewed as a viable teaching strategy owing to communication problems in the classroom. This suggests that the learners have not acquired an adequate proficiency in English. Therefore the current LiEP has not achieved its intended objective.

Although minimal, the use of CS during Setswana lessons appears to be unwarranted. Because Setswana is intelligible to all the learners studying it as a subject, CS to English does not enhance the teaching of Setswana. If the aim is to ensure that the learners develop their proficiency skills in Setswana, the use of English is counter-productive. Although evidence from both quantitative and qualitative data has shown that the teachers of Setswana discouraged learners from CS in a Setswana class (even though they themselves CS), the practice of CS "pollutes" Setswana as a language. A similar observation was made by Hussein (1999) that CS from Arabic to English was viewed as a pollutant of the Arabic language. Similarly, it was reported that in Hong Kong, students found CS 'irritating' (Gibbons, 1987, in Lawson & Sachdev, 2000: 1345), and that there have been repeated official calls for teachers to refrain from what is called 'mixed code' teaching or what the last governor of Hong Kong, Chris Patten referred to as 'Chinglish', referring to a mix of Chinese and English when he said (Lin, 1996: 49 quoting from the *South China Morning Post Rep*ort of 13 May 1994, in Ferguson, 2003: 38):

> What we don't want is for young people to be taught in Chinglish, rather than in either English or Chinese, and that's what we are trying to avoid at the moment.

8.6.2 Is the LiEP consistent with the practical realities of the classroom situation?

This research question was answered through the teachers' and learners' responses contained in the following teachers' tables: Tables 5.2 and 5.6 (cf. Chapter Five); and the learners' tables: Tables 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.5, 6.6 and 6.17 (cf. Chapter Six). The objective was mainly to investigate the teachers' and learners' proficiency in English and, to some extent, in Setswana in the classroom. It also investigated the use of CS by both groups of respondents.

a. Teachers' views on the proficiency of the learners in English

The teachers' self-reports on fluency in English and Setswana were excluded here because, officially, the teachers could teach either in English or Setswana, depending on the nature of the subject they taught. Furthermore, such self-reports have already

been presented in Chapter Four (cf. Table 4. 6). The focus, therefore, was on the teachers' evaluation of their learners' proficiency in English and how they CS between English and Setswana in the classroom.

The results pertaining to proficiency in English showed that the learners experienced problems with writing, understanding and interpreting (test or examination questions) domains. The speaking domain was problematic but not as problematic as the other two mentioned. The results on English proficiency here refer to CALP rather than to BICS. At this level, learners have acquired sufficient BICS to be able to interact socially because according to Cummins (1979), a conversational fluency to a functional level in a second language such as English in Botswana is possible within approximately two years of initial exposure, whereas CALP takes between five to seven years to acquire. The results on learners' competence rate in speaking and understanding are significant in that they suggest that CS was likely to occur in the classroom to facilitate communication between teachers and learners.

b. Teachers' views of learners' language use in class

With respect to the learners' CS use in the classroom, the majority of the teachers (57%) -- both language and content teachers -- confirmed that learners CS between English and Setswana from time to time. In addition, the majority of the teachers (66%) said that the learners hardly speak without CS. Furthermore, the majority of the teachers of Setswana indicated that the learners use both the standard variety of Setswana and vernacular Setswana with more use of the latter than the former as indicated by 64% and 70% respectively. Although the central focus of this study is not on Setswana *per se*, it nonetheless has an effect on CS as CS is used mainly between English and Setswana. The results, therefore, suggest that there is a prevalence of CS in the classroom, more specifically CS between English and Setswana.

The results also showed that both boys and girls CS to Setswana, but more boys than girls CS in class as indicated by 79% of the teachers. In addition, more girls than boys expressed themselves well in both spoken and written English, as indicated by 51% and 50% respectively. Nonetheless, the difference in the number of teachers who said both boys and girls expressed themselves well in spoken and written English was significant at 41% and 49% respectively. The researcher can only surmise that

proficiency among girls could be due to the girls' desire to master English as a prestigious language. A similar observation was made by Bissoonauth and Offord (2001).

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

c. Learners' self-reports on proficiency in English and Setswana

The results now presented are based on the learners' self-reports on their proficiency in English as the target language. The results also present the teachers' proficiency rate in English as evaluated by their learners. The evaluation also included the teachers' English proficiency by gender and by subject taught.

The results (cf. Table 6.1 in Chapter Six) indicated that the learners showed competence in reading. However, they experienced problems with writing (be it in class work or during examination) as well with understanding and speaking English. The latter two suggest that CS was likely to occur in the classroom to aid both the speaking and comprehension of English among the learners.

As previously explained it was not possible for the researcher to confirm or refute the learners' assertion about their writing skills in class work or during an examination as the study was limited to spoken communication only. However, the data from the qualitative analysis would assist in confirming or refute the learners' assertion about their spoken English as well as their understanding of the language. Furthermore, because of the unavailability of oral examinations in either English or Setswana (Nkosana, 2006), the question on examinations only refer to written examinations.

The learners also evaluated their own language use **by gender** and the results (cf. Table 6.17 in Chapter Six**)** showed that boys and girls CS to Setswana in class, yet both expressed themselves well in spoken English, as indicated by 58% and 47% respectively. However, 37% of the learners said the girls expressed themselves well in spoken English, more so than the boys; confirming what the teachers said above about the learners' proficiency in English.

d. Learners' views on teachers' language use

Regarding the teachers' proficiency in English in class, the results (cf. Chapter Six**,** Table 6.3) showed that almost all the learners were of the view that their teachers were most proficient in English (even though 41% later said their teachers' CS could be due to a lack of proficiency in English). However, they did not rate their speaking skills as highly as the other language skills. The explanation for this could be that the learners' were more exposed to the teachers' speaking skill than to the other skills.

Evaluating the teachers' language use in class **by gender** (cf. Chapter Six, Table 6.5), showed that during lessons taught in English the majority of the learners (54%) said that both the male and the female teachers CS to Setswana, yet they expressed themselves well in spoken English. However, comparing the two groups of teachers, more learners said that male teachers were more fluent in spoken English yet they CS more than their female colleagues. In a Setswana class, both the male and female teachers CS to English, but male teachers CS more, as indicated by 43% and 49% respectively. This suggests that among the teachers who CS, the majority were male teachers. It is worth noting that numerically, there were more female teachers of Setswana than their male colleagues -- 19 female teachers (76%) and six male teachers (24%).

The learners' views on the teachers' language use in class (by subject) in relation to CS, fluency in spoken English and spoken Setswana were summarized (cf. Chapter Six, Table 6.6). The results show the following about CS in the classroom:

- CS occurs across lessons in all the subjects, but it occurs the least during Setswana lessons.
- Among subjects taught in English, CS occurs the least during English (L and L) lessons.
- Biology teachers CS more than teachers of other subjects taught in English.
- History teachers are the most proficient in English.
- The language teachers (the majority being Setswana teachers) are the most proficient in Setswana when compared to the other teachers.

The results suggest that the situation in the classroom is not consistent with what the LiEP requires. While the LiEP states that the teaching and learning of all subjects except Setswana should be done in English only, the evidence from the quantitative and qualitative data shows that this is not practical, given the low proficiency rate in English among the learners. It appears that currently, the teachers are of the view that if they were to adhere to the stipulations of the LiEP, little or no learning will take place. Hence CS is used mainly in the teaching of subjects taught in 'English' (but less in the English (L and L) classes, as already stated) to assist the learners to follow the lesson. The LiEP, inadvertently, appears to be the problem. The positive and negative implications of this practice have been discussed already in 6.4.2 above. Furthermore, the causes of the low proficiency rates in English among the learners should be investigated and possible remedies suggested. This is, however, beyond the scope of the present study.

While the LiEP calls for the exclusive use of English as the LoLT of all subjects except Setswana, classroom reality shows that there is more use of Setswana in the teaching of almost all the subjects. However, evidence from the classroom also showed that the teachers expressed themselves very well and did not display any deficiency in self-expression, but they CS to Setswana to assist the learners to follow the lesson. In the researcher's view, in some cases the teachers CS out of habit, as displayed by mostly Setswana teachers.

While both the teachers and learners concurred that the former (teachers) were proficient in English, they did not concur on the level of proficiency of the latter (learners). The learners highly rated their English proficiency (Chapter 6, Table 6.1), but the teachers thought otherwise. Evidence from the classroom also confirmed the teachers' views as the learners' participation was seriously hampered by an inability to express themselves as demonstrated already in the discussion of the preceding questions. They participated minimally during the lessons in which English was the LoLT. Often the teacher's question was met with silence unless he / she CS to Setswana, (cf. Chapter Seven, Extracts 6 and 27) for Biology and History lessons respectively). The reality is that the prescription by the LiEP that English is the LoLT is counterproductive in that it stifles class participation as previously demonstrated in Chapter Seven. The learners are not confident enough to express themselves freely in

English in the presence of their peers. At times, they fail to comprehend fully what the teacher is saying unless the teacher CS to Setswana and repeats the same information. This scenario brings into question the appropriateness and effectiveness of the LiEP. It seems as though the LiEP is not what it is intended to be. It acts as a barrier to communication and, consequently, to learning instead of facilitating it. The language of learning should not act as a barrier but should instead facilitate learning because as Webb (2002) rightly observed, language is central to all levels of educational development because it is through it that knowledge is transferred and specialized skills as well as attitudes are developed through it.

The results further suggest that, if the problem of communication in English is still experienced at senior-secondary school level, it is much worse at the lower levels of education -- at primary and junior secondary school levels, as observed by Arthur (2001) and Letsebe (2002) respectively. Furthermore, the problem is likely to recur at tertiary level unless remedial measures are put in place. To merely allow the status quo to continue, that is, allowing uncontrolled CS during lessons, worsens the situation. Because of its importance educationally and professionally at the national and international levels, it makes educational and professional sense to learn English and be able to acquire competence in its four domains. However, it is not inevitable that it should be used as the only LoLT, excluding a national language like Setswana that evidence has shown, is spoken and understood by the majority of the learners, and is already playing an instructional role in teaching and learning even in classes of subjects taught in 'English'.

8.6.3 Should the LiEP be revised to ensure that the LoLT promotes maximum delivery and acquisition of knowledge and skills development?

This research question was answered through the teachers' responses to questions contained in (Chapter Five, Table 5.4) and the learners' responses to questions contained in (Chapter Six, Table 6.7). The questions probed if it was not necessary to revise the LiEP to include Setswana and other local languages as LoLT's in primary schools or even throughout the education system; and to cease using English as LoLT and instead, teach it as a second / foreign language.

The results showed that the majority of the teachers (53%) and learners (83%) supported the view that the LiEP should be revised to include Setswana as LoLT; with a further 61% of the learners supporting its use at all levels of education alongside English because of its status as a national language. They recognized the important role it plays in education, especially at primary-school level. This is consistent with the observation made by Bamgbose (1991: 66) that the learner's language plays a very important role in knowledge acquisition and skills development because learning through it quickens information processing.

However, just over half the number of the teachers (51%) supported the inclusion of other local languages in education, well over half of the learners (56%) did not support this view. The teachers' view was consistent with an observation made during the NCE 2 (1993: 111) that the learners' local languages were important in the early learning years of their speakers. While the government acknowledges the importance of introducing other local languages in the education system, it nonetheless shows no commitment to effect this implementation. Teaching can only be done if the communities affected request that their local languages be taught as a co-curricular activity (NCE 2: 1993: 115). In the researcher's view, this is not realistic given the rural nature of many Botswana communities. Very few communities would have the courage to make such a request to government. Besides, one wonders why this request should come from the communities when the practice has been that Government takes the final decision on all matters educational on behalf of its citizens. The government should have taken the decision to introduce the teaching of these subjects as a co-curricular activity without resting the decision with the parents, even though the manner of offering these subjects as co-curricular activities smacks of a lack of commitment on the part of government to introduce them. There seems to be a deliberate effort on the part of Government to ignore this important national issue that is being viewed as the marginalization of the other local languages besides Setswana. If the status quo continues, it will eventually lead to a language shift (Kamwangamalu, 2000) and a cultural shift in favour of Setswana and its culture. Consequently, language death (Kamwangamalu, 2000) and cultural death will result as the speakers of these languages will not be able to pass on their languages and cultures from generation to generation. Language and culture are inseparable as it is through

language that one can express one's culture. Therefore, suppression of a language implies suppression of its culture.

Furthermore, the majority of the teachers (78%) and learners (61%) supported the continued use of English as LoLT and objected to the view that it be taught only as a second or foreign language. This implied that they supported the use of the two languages - English and Setswana - as LoLT but not the total replacement of the former (English) with the latter (Setswana). This implies that both the teachers and learners recognize the important role of English in their educational and working lives.

Despite the difficulties that the learners have in acquiring proficiency in English, the majority of the teachers do not want the status quo to change, obviously due to the status of English as a language of educational and career opportunities. As a language associated with power, English can be used either to include or exclude a person from a social group. Consequently, maximum content delivery, and full acquisition of knowledge and skills development will continue to be compromised. The end result is that the learners will continually fail to reach their full potential. The LiEP promotes a language that also happens to be a foreign language to the majority of the teachers and learners.

However, the results suggest that, to address the learners' lack of proficiency in English, the teachers call for the introduction of Mother-Tongue Based Bilingual Education (MTBBE) that will ensure the inclusion of Setswana and other local languages as additional LoLTs. This is not unexpected, given that the results (both quantitative and qualitative) thus far have demonstrated that already Setswana is used in the classroom via CS and, to a limited extent, Ikalanga as a local language is used as well. (The researcher, however, did not observe the use of a local language -- Ikalanga during any of the lessons observed although the results from the quantitative data indicated so). Therefore, the revision of the LiEP to include Setswana as an alternative LoLT and to introduce the other local languages in the education system would be merely formalizing a practice that both the teachers and learners say exists.

The learners' views, it seems, were influenced by the fact that Setswana, through CS, was being used already during the lessons of different subjects, while the local

languages were hardly used or not used at all. Therefore, it was inconceivable to them that educationally, these languages could function fully.

Despite the teachers' positive views about Setswana and other local languages stated above, a significant number of the teachers, although the minority, held an opposing view. Forty percent and almost one third (32%) objected to the use of Setswana and other local languages in education respectively. Seventeen percent of the teachers said that they were not sure about the use of other local languages in education. These were teachers who did not speak the local language or even if they did, could not use it as it was not provided for in the LiEP.

The qualitative data showed that although English is the prescribed LoLT, it is only theoretically the case. Practice suggests otherwise. Setswana as the national language already plays a role in education. Therefore its use as an alternative LoLT needs consideration. Both the teachers and learners are comfortable with using Setswana in class. Teachers use it to simplify the lesson content that may appear ambiguous to the learners, and the learners use it to make a contribution to the lesson. Furthermore, it was evident that the learners were more confident participating in Setswana than in English during the lesson. However, the same cannot be said about the local language (Ikalanga) as its use in class either for an educational or a social purpose was almost non-existent. Although a significant number of the teachers and learners spoke and understood it well, it was hardly used except for the two incidents already referred to under Research Question Two.

The results from both the quantitative and qualitative data have shown that a revision of the LiEP is necessary to accommodate Setswana and the other local languages. Once the LiEP covers the other languages besides English, the education system will respond accordingly by providing the necessary resources to support the new dispensation in the form of the training of the teachers to teach these languages, and the provision of written material in these languages. This will not only create employment but will go a long way towards addressing a malpractice that threatens national unity. Consequently, diversity in unity will be realized. An exclusive LiEP, such as the present one, gives the impression that Batswana can be developed only through the use of the English language. However, this is a fallacy as observed by

Bamgbose (1991), Batibo (2004), Kamwangamalu (2004: 34 quoting Diop, 1999: 6-7), and Shope, Mazwai, and Makgoba (1999: xi, in Kamwangamalu, 2004: 36), as well, that '… you cannot develop a people in a foreign language'. If the African Renaissance is to be realized, and Botswana subscribes to this notion, then a reformulation of an inclusive LiEP will go a long way towards endorsing this notion.

8.7 RESEARCH QUESTION SIX: DOES THE CURRENT LiEP PROMOTE NEGATIVE PERCEPTIONS ABOUT SETSWANA AND OTHER LOCAL LANGUAGES?

This research question, like the previous one, challenges the effect of LiEP on Setswana as a national language, as well as on the other local languages. The question was answered through the responses of the questions contained in Tables 5.18 and 5.21 (cf. Chapter Five) addressed to the teachers, and the responses of the questions contained in Tables 6.20 and 6.21 (cf. Chapter Six) addressed to the learners. The questions solicited the respondents' views on how they perceived the use of Setswana and other local languages in education.

8.7.1 Teachers' perceptions about Setswana in education

The teachers' perceptions about using Setswana in education were somehow positive as already expressed in Research Question Five above (cf. Section 8.6.3). The results showed that there were more teachers (51%) who agreed that Setswana should not only be used in Setswana classes but also in lessons of other subjects (the majority of them being teachers whose HL is Setswana, or teachers whose HL falls under 'Others') than those who were opposed to this practice (the majority of them being teachers whose HL is either Ikalanga or English -- 51% vs. 43%). However, there were more teachers who did not view the use of Setswana in class as a sign of national pride than those who did (44% vs. 33%). The teachers' views by HL were not unexpected. For educational considerations, teachers whose HL is Setswana would support any move that would enhance the status of their language; and teachers whose HL is Ikalanga would oppose any move that further marginalizes their HL. The teachers whose HL is English (two only) would not support any move that reduces the status of their HL that already is seen as prestigious to know. However, the positive views about Setswana held by the majority of the teachers whose HL falls under 'Others', including those

with more than one HL, suggest that these teachers have accepted the status of Setswana as a national language.

8.7.2 Learners' perceptions about Setswana in education

The learners' views about the use of Setswana in education were negative despite their support earlier in the previous question that it be used as LoLT alongside English. For instance, the results showed that the majority of the learners (45%) were of the opinion that it was easier for them to learn new concepts in English than in Setswana. The results also showed that the majority of the learners (51%) did not support the use of Setswana outside Setswana lessons, thereby implying that they did not support its use as LoLT except in Setswana lessons. The majority of the learners shared this view despite their different HLs (Setswana: 52%, Ikalanga: 51%, English: 87.5%, Others: 49% and learners with more than one home language: 48%).

8.7.3 Teachers' perceptions about using local languages (besides Setswana) in education

The teachers' perceptions about using the local language, such as Ikalanga in education, were generally negative and did not support its use in class (even though in the previous question, they stated that other local languages should also be used for teaching and learning). For instance, 75% of the teachers, irrespective of HL, objected to the learners' use of their local language in class. Fifty eight percent said that they did not use the learners' local language in class to enhance learner understanding. The majority of them were teachers whose HL is Setswana, or English or Ikalanga. The latter's view was unexpected as they shared a HL with the majority of the learners. Similarly, 69% shared the view that allowing the learners to use their own local language affected negatively the improvement of their proficiency in spoken English. The teachers shared this view, irrespective of their HL.

Despite the negative perceptions of CS to a local language expressed above, there were some teachers who were of the view that the learners' local language had a role to play in education. For instance, there were more teachers who stated that there was a need to use other local languages in class besides English than those who had reservations about it (47% vs. 32%); and allowing the learners to use their local language in class

increased class participation than those who did not think so (40% vs. 23%). In both instances, the former were teachers whose HL is Setswana, or Ikalanga, or 'Others'; the latter were the two teachers whose HL is English. However, some teachers indicated that they were not sure about the effect of the use of a local language in class. This suggests that these were teachers who either never CS to the learners' local language during their lessons because it was not permissible officially; to do so, or because they did not speak it.

8.7.4 Learners' perceptions about using local languages in education

Similarly, the learners' views about the use of the other local languages in education were also negative. This was consistent with their earlier view on whether or not other local languages should be used for teaching and learning. The results showed that, generally, the majority of the learners did not view the use of a local language as beneficial in education. For instance, 57% of them did not think that it was easier for them to learn in their own language than in English; 52% indicated that they objected to the teachers' use of a local language in class, and also did not see the need for the use of other local languages in class besides English, as 44% of them had indicated. Although the majority of the learners (53%) admitted that sometimes the teachers CS to a local language in class, they did not believe that the use of a local language was educationally beneficial. The learners also did not believe that it influenced positively their acquisition of spoken English, as indicated by 67%.

Notwithstanding these negative views about the use of local languages in education, there were a few positive ones, too. For instance, the majority of the learners (49%) agreed that allowing the learners to use their local language increased class participation (Akindele and Letsoela, 2001). The latter view is puzzling and contradictory in that, if the use of a local language increases class participation, then it implies that learning is taking place. Conversely, if the use of a local language has no positive educational value, that should include its effect on class participation and, eventually, learning. This suggests that the learners' negative views on the role of local languages in education are borne out of a mindset and attitude that local languages can not function effectively in education than reality.

The results also showed that a significant number of the learners, even though in the minority, had positive views on using local languages in education. For instance, 40% did not object to a teacher's use of a local language in class, as opposed to 52% who objected. Forty two percent saw the need to use local languages in class, as opposed to 44% who said there was no need. In the latter case, the difference was so insignificant that it is plausible to say that the learners' view was almost split. Furthermore, 23% were of the view that allowing the learners to use their local language in class did not adversely affect their English proficiency, and more than a quarter of the learners (27%) were of the view that it was easier for them to learn in their own language than in English. This suggest that some learners, although in the minority, recognized the educational benefits of using the local languages for teaching and learning even though it was not officially permissible to use them.

8.7.5 Summary of teachers' and learners' views on using Setswana in education

The results indicate that the teachers, although not that many, were of the view that Setswana, as a national language, has a role to play in education. However, the number of those who were opposed to its use (43%) signifies that some teachers were apprehensive about using Setswana for teaching and learning other subjects apart from Setswana. This could be due to a lack of technical terms to explain abstract concepts foreign to Setswana. Its limited work prospects could be a contributory factor, as well as the fact that it is not as prestigious a language as English.

Again not many teachers regarded the use of Setswana in class as a way of promoting it as a national language as it was outside their mandate. Rather, it was used to overcome a communication problem resulting from the lack of proficiency in English among the learners, as already discussed in the previous questions. Contrarily, the results implied that the learners' perceptions about the use of Setswana were negative as they believed that new concepts were better learnt in English than in Setswana, and they did not support the use of Setswana outside Setswana lessons, either.

8.7.6 Summary of the teachers' and learners' views on using local languages in education

The results showed that generally the majority of the teachers and the learners had negative perceptions about the use of a local language in class for teaching and learning. There were fewer teachers and learners who supported its use and thought that it had a role to play in education than those who objected to its use. A local language is viewed as having a minimal role to play in education, and is therefore regarded as a LFIC language.

The responses revealed that, owing to the promotion of English in Botswana to such an extent that it is the main language that is used in a HFFC, negative perceptions have been created about Setswana and the other local languages. Setswana is viewed as having a minimal role in education. The situation is even worse for a local language; it is viewed as almost of no value educationally. Therefore, a local language such as Ikalanga is viewed as a LFIC language by the majority of the teachers and learners.

The results have, therefore, shown that the current LiEP that promotes English only creates negative perceptions about the use of Setswana and other languages in education. It affects the learners' self-esteem as they are unable to express themselves well in English. It limits their educational and career opportunities as, by lacking a proficiency in English, their performance in school is compromised. It also affects negatively the learners' pride in their national language as well as in their home languages. They regard the former as having limited career opportunities, and the latter as having no educational and career opportunities at all.

8.7.7 Qualitative data

The exclusion of Setswana and other local languages from the LiEP promotes a negative perception about these languages. The use of CS (mainly from English to Setswana) is a demonstration that English as the only language promoted by the LiEP, is not completely effective in promoting teaching and learning. Evidence from the classroom indicates that, although Setswana is not officially recognized as an alternative LoLT at senior-secondary school level, its usefulness in education is

evident through the use of CS. However, Setswana is not fully utilized. The same observation was made by Letsebe (2002) when investigating the role of CS in junior secondary schools. CS is viewed by the teachers as a strategy they use to communicate with the learners because they do not understand English very well. Instead of exploring the areas in which teaching could be more effective in Setswana than in English, the teachers suppress it. For instance, in one of the classes observed, the teacher explicitly told his class not to discuss in Setswana a class task that they had been assigned. Therefore, a negative impression is created about the use of Setswana in education. Instead of allowing the learners to brainstorm in the language they speak well, and then present the task assigned in English, the teacher discouraged the learners from using Setswana and thereby stifled their thinking and contribution, even though research has shown that one's cognitive skills are well developed in one's MT (NCE 2, 1993: 111). Similarly, another teacher remarked that, because they teach Setswana, they are looked down upon by the learners (cf. Chapter Seven, Extract 34).

Evidence from the classroom also showed that other local languages besides Setswana were not used in class except when the learners were speaking informally among themselves, even though the respondents (both teachers and learners) had indicated that a local language like Ikalanga was used. In Extract 23 in the previous chapter, the teacher explicitly ordered his learners *not* to use their local language in class. One of the teachers used the local language sarcastically instead of exploiting its richness in expressing which topic he and his class were discussing.

These two instances demonstrate that a negative impression had been created about the use of other local languages in education. Because they are not used in any sphere except as home languages, and as they are not included in the LiEP, they were viewed as languages not fit to be learnt at school and to use in education.

8.8 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the quantitative and qualitative data were used to answer the main research questions. This included the discussion of the characteristics of CS and how it differs from similar concepts such as CM and the two forms of borrowing, namely borrowing proper and nonce borrowing. The extent of CS use in the classroom was

also revealed, including the different functions it performed in the classroom. Furthermore, it was proved that the phenomenon that occurs in classrooms in Botswana could not rightly be referred to as CS. Rather, it is more of the use of Setswana to overcome barriers to communication caused by the learners' lack of proficiency in English. The didactic consequences of the use of CS in the schools and its educational benefits were also discussed -- both the positive and negative ones. The prevalence of CS in the classroom, its effect on the pace of teaching and learning, and curriculum coverage were revealed, as well as its effect on non-citizen learners who may not be fluent in Setswana. The effect of CS use in the classroom on the LiEP of Botswana was also revealed -- whether or not the LiEP was consistent with the practical realities of the classroom situation -- and if there was any suggestion emanating from the use of CS that could warrant the revision of the LiEP to ensure that its inadequacies are addressed.

Finally, both the quantitative and qualitative data indicated that the current LiEP promotes negative perceptions about Setswana and other local languages. The results have shown that the teachers' perceptions about the use of Setswana in education are positive as they support its use in the teaching of other school subjects. However, the learners' perceptions were somehow negative, even though earlier they supported the use of Setswana for teaching and learning. The learners are of the view that unfamiliar Setswana concepts are better learnt in English than in Setswana. They also do not support the use of Setswana as LoLT at secondary-school level. The latter view is not unexpected, given that even at primary-school level, Setswana is not the LoLT. Their view is that Setswana is suitable for use as LoLT at primary school but not at secondary-school level. Therefore, among the learners, the current LiEP has created negative perceptions about the use of Setswana in education.

Furthermore, both the teachers' and the learners' perceptions about the use of the learners' local languages in education were generally negative even though, to some extent, they acknowledged their didactic effect, despite the teachers' earlier support of the use of local languages for teaching and learning. The implication of this scenario is that there is a need to revise the LiEP to introduce these languages in the education system at a very early stage. Should their benefits be appreciated at a very early stage, they will be accepted in education in the subsequent years of schooling. These

negative perceptions are evidence that language planning should be a “from bottom to top” process as espoused by Reagan (2002) and Donna Kerr (1976, in Mesthrie, 2002: 420) as discussed earlier in Chapter Two, section four. However, the revision of the LiEP cannot take place in isolation. The process should start with the revision of the language policy of Botswana in general.

In the next chapter, a summary of the study, conclusions reached, and recommendations made will be presented. It is also in the next chapter that the sub-problems that were identified at the beginning of the study will be revisited to determine whether or not the conclusions reached actually address them. The limitations of the study as well as its implications for further research will also be highlighted.